

Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.







Editorial

Compounded research challenges amid the COVID-19 pandemic



Ever since December 2019, more and more countries have become victims of the COVID-19 pandemic, entailing a major burden on healthcare infrastructures and crippling economies all over the world [1]. These unprecedented global times have prompted the scientific community to collaborate as a cohesive unit in yielding quality evidence aligned with the highest-priority societal goal of mitigating the morbidity and mortality associated with the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).

Despite the concerted endeavours of the scientific powerhouse, the real-time research challenges have considerably intensified amid the pandemic, particularly when the contributions of the scientific fraternity are under a perpetual microscopic scanner given the immensely broadened readership, in view of the understandably high hopes worldwide. With a colossal magnitude of COVID-related research being published, it becomes increasingly difficult to discern the "signals" from the "noise", necessitating a continuous reflection upon the relevance, reliability, reproducibility and robustness of the same. The "pendulum-swings" as a result of the premature acceptance of attributes like treatment-efficacy or contraindication, can have potential consequences. To name a few, the dramatic escalation of the hydroxychloroquine requirement in the pandemic times raises possible concerns of shortages for the cohort receiving medication for the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved indications, exemplifying the aforementioned fact [2,3]. Similarly, the threats surrounding the use of ibuprofen in COVID-19 limited the availability of acetaminophen for patients with a well-known contraindication to ibuprofen [3].

Nevertheless, the research community is not new to such examples (premature embracement of recombinant human activated protein-C, etc.) with these previous experiences only highlighting the need of maintaining a high quality standard of evidence for moving practice forward [4–6]. In this context, the FDA has recently outlined a regulatory document of guidance on the conduct of clinical trials related to the public health emergency of COVID-19 [7]. In addition to pragmatic guidelines dictating our research efforts backed by a meticulous peer-review, we researchers are also obligated to adhere to the principles of scientific integrity aiming at the most accurate and objective representation of the study results, despite a condensed time frame in a pandemic situation [8.9].

The concept of scientific-integrity is much more holistic (compared to scientific-misconduct encompassing the fraudulent publication practices, at large) and focuses closely on a firm adherence to the epistemic values in the way a scientist evaluates, discusses and accepts the research results. As an extension of the same, research-related accountability is pivotal while science serves society, wherein a sound comprehension of the scientific research can be augmented by ensuring an enhanced transparency (an improved research-representation quality by sharing methodological intricacies, protocols, patient-registries, appropriate regulatory approval, funding details, data-analysis script, etc.), vetting the involved experimental designs and techniques to minimise the associated biases, which could compound the study representation and interpretation alike [8,9].

Moreover, a second major concern emanates from the "viral" spread of misinformation (misleading information, a major plague to the scientific community and public health), which tends to transpire in a much greater extent during times of disaster, considering the humans' natural tendency to discover resolution in absence of its true existence [2,10]. Given the demanding situation, the healthcare fraternity can also be reasonably vulnerable wherein the intrinsic zeal to contribute may potentially blur the spectacle of critical appraisal. However, intentions kept aside, the contagion-effect of the misinformation phenomenon (the concurrent "infodemic", in its own peculiar ways) presents the biggest peril to the ongoing COVID-19 fight [10–12], as the popular adage most aptly puts it: "a lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is still putting on its shoes". The observations of Joshi et al. highlighting the gaps in the quality of COVID-19 health information on the most trending search engines bear testimony to the above mentioned [13]. In addition, Rovetta and Bhagavathula, in their analysis of Google searches and Instragram hashtags pertaining to COVID-19, reveal that myriad infodemic monikers circulate propagating information that potentially classifies as fake news or misinterpretation, all coming within the purview of misleading information [14].

Appropriate to the above mentioned context, Merchant and Asch delineate the remedial measures to safeguard the value of science in the social media age of "liking" and "retweeting" [15]. Their exemplary tenets can contribute to combat the menace of misinformation in times of the pandemic. Identifying the potential sources of misinformation at the level of social media blogs, news reports and other mass media regulators, the scientific community needs to engage at these sources (in the form of commentaries, interviews, expedited reviews and joint authorjournal posts, vetting the dissemination of information) to augment the resultant control on the derived narratives (alongside

the preservation of veracity) and to execute every possible opportunity to curtail the dissemination of the infodemic monikers, which tend to accelerate misinformation in one or the other form [14,15].

To conclude, the research fraternity discovers itself under the spotlight, much more than ever before. While every part of the community has their own lessons to learn from the pandemic, the peculiar research-related challenges have intensified as we navigate through this epic pandemic, which presents unique opportunities to learn long-term lessons in the subject of tenuously balancing the "hope" and the "hype" paralleled with the aim of strengthening the integrity of and the confidence in the medical research enterprise.

Funding

None.

Conflicts of interest

None.

References

- [1] Bong CL, Brasher C, Chikumba E, McDougall R, Mellin-Olsen J, Enright A. The COVID-19 pandemic: effects on low- and middle-income countries. Anesth Analg 2020;131:86–92.
- [2] Ingraham NE, Tignanelli CJ. Fact versus science fiction: fighting coronavirus disease 2019 requires the wisdom to know the difference. Crit Care Explor 2020:2:e0108.
- [3] Weiner DL, Balasubramaniam V, Shah SI, Javier JR. Pediatric Policy Council. COVID-19 impact on research, lessons learned from COVID-19 research, implications for pediatric research. Pediatr Res 2020;88:148–50.
- [4] Ranieri VM, Tompson BT, Barie PS, Dhainaut JF, Douglas IS, Finfer S, et al. PROWESS-SHOCK Study Group: drotrecogin alfa (activated) in adults with septic shock. N Engl J Med 2012;366:2055–64.
- [5] Magoon R. Implications of practice variability: comment. Anesthesiology 2020 (online first) https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.000000000003465.

- [6] Magoon R. Precision Cardiac Anesthesia: Welcome Aboard! J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth 2020;34:2551–2.
- [7] Food and Drug Administration. FDA guidance on conduct of clinical trials of medical products during COVID-19 public health emergency. Guidance for Industry, Investigators and Institutional Review Boards; 2020, https:// www.fda.gov/ regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/fdaguidance-conductclinical-trials-medical-products-during-covid-19-publichealth-emergency..
- [8] Research integrity is much more than misconduct. Nature 2019;570(5).
- [9] Magoon R, Jose J. Safeguarding anaesthesia research from spin. Br J Anaesth 2020. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2020.08.042 (ahead of print).
- [10] Mian A, Khan S. Coronavirus: the spread of misinformation. BMC Med 2020:18:89.
- [11] Datta R, Yadav AK, Singh A, Datta K, Bansal A. The infodemics of COVID-19 amongst healthcare professionals in India. Med J Armed Forces India 2020;76(3):276–83.
- [12] Cuan-Baltazar JY, Muñoz-Perez MJ, Robledo-Vega C, Pérez-Zepeda MF, Soto-Vega E. Misinformation of COVID-19 on the internet: infodemiology study. [MIR Public Health Surveill 2020;6:e18444.
- [13] Joshi A, Kajal F, Bhuyan SS, Sharma P, Bhatt A, Kumar K, et al. Quality of novel coronavirus related health information over the internet: an evaluation study. Scientific World Journal 2020;2020:1562028.
- [14] Rovetta A, Bhagavathula AS. Global infodemiology of COVID-19: analysis of google web searches and instagram hashtags. J Med Internet Res 2020:22:e20673.
- [15] Merchant RM, Asch DA. Protecting the value of medical science in the age of social media and "fake news.". JAMA 2018;320:2415–6.

Rohan Magoon^{a,*}, Ruchi Ohri^b

^aDepartment of Cardiac Anaesthesia, Atal Bihari Vajpayee Institute of Medical Sciences (ABVIMS) and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, Baba Kharak Singh Marg, New Delhi 110001, India

^bDepartment of Anaesthesia, Atal Bihari Vajpayee Institute of Medical Sciences (ABVIMS) and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, Baba Kharak Singh Marg, New Delhi 110001, India

*Corresponding author E-mail address: rohanmagoon21@gmail.com (R. Magoon)

Available online 16 September 2020