



HAL
open science

The impact of COVID-19 on research

L. Harper, N. Kalfa, G.M.A. Beckers, M. Kaefer, A.J. Nieuwhof-Leppink,
Magdalena Fossum, K.W. Herbst, D. Bagli, Espu Research Committee

► To cite this version:

L. Harper, N. Kalfa, G.M.A. Beckers, M. Kaefer, A.J. Nieuwhof-Leppink, et al.. The impact of COVID-19 on research. *Journal of Pediatric Urology*, 2020, 16 (5), pp.715-716. 10.1016/j.jpuro.2020.07.002 . hal-03369455

HAL Id: hal-03369455

<https://hal.umontpellier.fr/hal-03369455>

Submitted on 21 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Infirmiers libéraux : premiers acteurs des soins palliatifs en phase avancée et terminale à domicile

Private practice nurses: major actors of home palliative care for patients with advanced and end-stage disease

Maxime ADLOFF ^{a,*1}, Sylvie MAURICE ^{a,b,2}, Bernard PATERNOSTRE ^{a,c,2}, Thierry VIMARD ^{d,2}

^a Université de Bordeaux, 28ter, rue de Lyon, 33000 Bordeaux, France

^b Santé publique, CHU de Bordeaux, 33000 Bordeaux, France

^c Service d'accompagnement et de médecine palliative, CHU de Bordeaux, 33000 Bordeaux, France

^d Équipe mobile de soins palliatifs, l'Estey Mutualité, 39, rue François-de-Sourdis, 33000 Bordeaux
France

*Auteur correspondant ; e-mail : pro.maximeadloff@gmail.com

¹ Interne de médecine générale

² Médecin

Titre court : Infirmiers libéraux, premiers acteurs des soins palliatifs en phase avancée

The impact of covid-19 on research.

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has swept across the globe causing hundreds of thousands of deaths, shutting down economies, closing borders and wreaking havoc on an unprecedented scale. It has strained healthcare services and personnel to the brink in many regions and will certainly deeply mark medical research both in the short and long-term.

Prior to the COVID pandemic, virology research (including influenza) represented less than 2% of all biomedical research. However, the number of laboratories and investigators that have pivoted to address COVID related research questions is astonishing, likely comprising 10-20% of current biomedical investigation, showing the incredible adaptability of the research community¹. The multinational support rapidly infused for COVID-19 research is in the billions of euros². The sharing of research findings and research data has never been as rapid and efficient³. The crisis has also brought disease, health, and healthcare back to the forefront of societal issues, and will have a lasting impact on public spending. However, with all this optimism and focus, there is a downside.

To begin, the COVID-19 crisis has led to a massive influx of publications. Not only are specialty journals being flooded with submissions by authors being unwittingly granted much needed writing time, but publications on COVID have literally inundated us. More than 20,000 papers have been published since December 2019, many in prestigious journals. There are also an increasing number of studies being uploaded to preprint servers, such as BioRxiv, for rapid dissemination prior to any peer review. However, we cannot assume that the time and quality available for peer review is able to keep pace with the explosion of publication. There is need for increased caution in the wake of this massive influx of submissions, especially since we are increasingly seeing these results being picked up by the media and diffused to a less attuned audience. In recent weeks, several prestigious journals, including the Lancet and the New England Journal of Medicine, have published retractions of earlier and potentially major COVID-related findings^{4,5}. On June 15, 2020, The New York Times highlighted potential lapses in the peer review process affecting major scientific journals⁶.

We must strive to improve scientific quality always. The current debate over the use of hydroxychloroquine further illustrates the undermining of the scientific process when faced with global desperation for ready-made truths and solutions^{4,7,8}. Science needs time, and good science needs a lot of it for data to grow and knowledge to evolve, but this process is ill-prepared to handle the rush for solutions to the COVID crises.

Moreover, just as COVID-19 has shown social, racial, and economic health disparities, the pandemic seems also to have accentuated existing gender inequalities within the field of research⁹. Indeed, early

analyses suggest that female academics are publishing less and starting fewer research projects than their male peers. This might be an effect of the lockdown and the fact that more women than are men are juggling caring for families and children despite both “working” from home ^{10,11} .

Travel, social, and funding restrictions will also take a serious toll on scientific research worldwide. Research staff and resources have been purposely and purposefully prioritized to COVID-19 activities above all else. Distancing and transmission issues have caused most non-COVID clinical research to be suspended, causing a reduction in recruitment of research subjects and a delay in data entry into clinical trial databases¹². Research-related hiring has been suspended because of travel restrictions and young researchers might soon find themselves out of a job if their subject is not the pandemic. Indeed, though government-funded medical research bodies worldwide say they are committed to maintaining the continuity and breadth of biomedical research, how the economic downfall will influence government spending remains to be seen. Furthermore, research funding that relies on public fundraising is expected to drop substantially and many researchers will see a significant decrease in funding opportunities ¹³. The global impact the crisis will have on the economy makes it hard to imagine that future research funding will not be substantially affected.

During this crisis, many resources were understandably redirected toward preparing for and caring for COVID-19 patients, but the collateral damage to so many patients with non-COVID-19 medical conditions that did not receive, or failed to seek, treatment will surely emerge ¹⁴. Finally, children have also paid a high price for the redirecting of medical resources, with delays in their medical and surgical management, as well as vaccinations ^{15,16}. This may be especially problematic when many aspects of pediatric care is based on their developmental clock, which even the pandemic cannot stop. Whether this was the best option will certainly be analyzed in retrospect. Congenital anomalies alone account for over 400,000 deaths worldwide every year, and inflict a considerable burden both on children, families, and healthcare systems ¹⁷. Thus, it is essential that funding for medical research does not follow the same pattern with a disproportionate decrease in funding for non-COVID research including pediatric and developmental urology.

COVID-19 has already changed the world, not only because of the disease itself, but because of the long-term effects of the world’s reaction to the pandemic. While the pandemic may have brought with it some silver linings, it is crucial that the scientific community conduct current and future research broadly and openly, lest future pandemic preparedness in research repeat the hard-fought lessons of today.

References

1. NIH. Estimates of Funding for Various Research, Condition, and Disease Categories (RCDC). February 2020. https://report.nih.gov/categorical_spending.aspx
2. European Commission. Press release. May 2020.
3. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/research/coronavirus/>
4. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Ruschitzka F, Patel AN. Hydroxychloroquine or chloroquine with or without a macrolide for treatment of COVID-19: a multinational registry analysis [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 22] [published correction appears in Lancet. 2020 May 30;:]. Lancet. 2020;S0140-6736(20)31180-6.
5. Mehra MR, Desai SS, Kuy S, Henry TD, Patel AN. Retraction: Cardiovascular Disease, Drug Therapy, and Mortality in Covid-19. N Engl J Med. [retraction of: N Engl J Med. 2020 May 1;:]. N Engl J Med. 2020;NEJMc2021225.
6. The Pandemic Claims New Victims: Prestigious Medical Journals. New York Times, June 2020.
7. Yazdany J, Kim AHJ. Use of Hydroxychloroquine and Chloroquine During the COVID-19 Pandemic: What Every Clinician Should Know. Ann Intern Med. 2020;172(11):754-755.
8. Statement from the Chief Investigators of the Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 thERapY (RECOVERY) Trial on hydroxychloroquine, 5 June 2020
9. Dorn AV, Cooney RE, Sabin ML. COVID-19 exacerbating inequalities in the US. Lancet. 2020;395(10232):1243-1244.
10. P Vincent-Lamarre, CR Sugimoto, V Larivière. The decline of women's research production during the coronavirus pandemic. Nature index. 19 May 2020
11. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/may/12/womens-research-plummets-during-lockdown-but-articles-from-men-increase>
12. Upadhaya S, Yu JX, Oliva C, Hoton M, Hodge J, Hubbard-Lucey VM. Impact of COVID-19 on oncology clinical trials. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery 19, 376-377 (2020)
13. P. Webster. How is biomedical research funding faring during the COVID-19 lockdown? Nature medicine. April 2020.
14. Rosenbaum L. The Untold Toll - The Pandemic's Effects on Patients without Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2020;10.1056/NEJMms2009984).
15. J Stephenson. Sharp Drop in Routine Vaccinations for US Children Amid COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Health Forum. 2020; 1(5):e200608.
16. United Nations policy brief: The Impact of Covid-19 on children. 16th April, 2020.
17. Boyle B, Addor MC, Arriola L, et al. Estimating Global Burden of Disease due to congenital anomaly: an analysis of European data. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2018;103(1):F22-F28.