UNW

STUDY GUIDE

1.Addressing Systemic Gender Bias in Global Medical Research, Clinical Trials and Therapeutic Safety

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. LETTER FROM THE CHAIR BOARD 3
2. INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE 4
3. INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC 5
4. KEY CONCEPTS 6
5. CASE STUDIES 9
6. APPROACHES 26
7. USEFUL ARTICLES 29

1. LETTER FORM THE CHAIRBOARD

Dear Delegates,

It is our great pleasure to welcome you to the upcoming conference! We are very excited to have you join us and hope that the days ahead will be filled with interesting discussions, new ideas and plenty of memorable moments.

For many of you, this may be your first conference, while others may already be familiar with the experience. Regardless of how much experience you have, we encourage everyone to come with an open mind, a willingness to participate, and a positive attitude. These events are not only an opportunity to debate and develop solutions, but also a chance to meet new people, learn from one another, and enjoy being part of a larger community.

Throughout the conference, we hope to see you getting involved, sharing your perspectives, listening to others, and making the most of every opportunity available to you. Do not be afraid to speak up, ask questions, or step outside of your comfort zone. Some of the best moments of a conference often come from ideas and conversations that you did not expect.

At the same time, we hope that you remember that the conference is about more than just formal discussions. Take the time to get to know the other participants, enjoy the activities and make the most of the social side of the event. You will be surrounded by people with different experiences, interests and perspectives, and we hope that some of these connections will stay with you long after the conference ends.

Most importantly, remember to enjoy yourselves. There is no need to be perfect and there is no expectation that everyone will know everything from the start. Be curious, be respectful, be willing to participate, and most of all, have fun. We hope you leave the conference with new knowledge, greater confidence, plenty of good memories, and, hopefully, a few new friends along the way.

We are very much looking forward to meeting all of you and seeing everything you bring to the conference. Until then, enjoy your preparations and get ready for what we hope will be an amazing few days!

Good luck, and see you soon!

Your Chairs

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE

UN Women is the United Nations organisation that advocates for women's rights, gender equality, and the empowerment of women and girls. UN women was established in July 2010 by the UN General Assembly through merging together previous separate parts dedicated to gender equality. Today, UN Women works with governments, civil society, feminist movements and other partners to turn equality promises into action.

UN Women is an international forum to discuss equitably operating laws, institutions, public services and society. UN Women works in areas such as leadership, economic empowerment, freedom from violence, peace and security, humanitarian action, the implementation of international commitments to gender equality and, of course, women's health.

UN Women also supports the Commission on the Status of Women and assists governments in implementing international standards such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Beijing Platform for Action. It plays a central role in laying the foundations for norms, leading UN system work on gender equality, enabling policy and accountability.

For this topic, the committee can examine medical research as part of a larger equality question: whose experiences are counted when scientific evidence is produced, whose risks are measured, and whose needs are prioritized in health services? We do not intend to replace scientists or research ethics committees, but to explore the issue from a gender equality and human-rights perspective, and to advocate for collaboration that will improve health outcomes for all.

3. INTRODUCTION TO THE TOPIC

The topic “Addressing Systemic Gender Bias in Global Medical Research, Clinical Trials and Therapeutic Safety” concerns the entire chain by which medical knowledge is produced and converted into treatment. Systemic gender bias is broader than individual prejudice. It can arise from funding priorities, research questions, laboratory models, eligibility criteria, recruitment practices, informed-consent structures, statistical power, publication incentives, regulatory requirements, diagnostic assumptions, clinical guidelines and post-marketing surveillance.

The central problem

Historically, many biomedical research systems used the male body as a practical or implicit reference model. Some of the reasons were methodological convenience, concern about pregnancy-related risk, beliefs about hormonal variability, and the assumption that findings in men could be generalized to women. WHO notes that these historical patterns have limited understanding of how diseases present in women and how treatments work for them.

Modern evidence shows why that assumption can be scientifically unsafe. Biological sex can affect pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, immune responses, disease mechanisms and adverse drug reactions. Socially patterned gender exposures can also alter disease risk, help-seeking, treatment adherence, occupational exposures and access to care. NIH therefore expects sex to be considered as a biological variable in NIH-funded vertebrate animal and human research, including study design, analysis and reporting.

Inclusion is necessary but not sufficient

One of the most important distinctions for delegates is between representation and meaningful inclusion. A trial can include 50% women and still fail to fairly account for sex and gender, if outcomes are never analyzed by sex, if adverse events are not reported by sex, or if recruitment excludes important subgroups such as pregnant participants, older women, women with disabilities or women from underserved communities. Conversely, a trial studying a sex-specific condition should not be forced into an artificial 50/50 structure. The relevant benchmark is scientifically justified representation and valid analysis.

The pregnancy paradox

Pregnancy illustrates the ethical tension. Historically, pregnant and breastfeeding women were often excluded from trials to avoid fetal risk. Yet medicines are still used during pregnancy, sometimes without robust trial data. WHO reported in 2025 that exclusion of pregnant and breastfeeding women has created substantial evidence gaps about medicine and vaccine safety and efficacy during these periods. A more modern approach is to design ethically appropriate research that can answer pregnancy-specific questions when there is clinical equipoise and a clear potential benefit to women and infants is assesed.

The safety consequence

If a sex-related difference exists but is not measured, it cannot inform labeling, dosing, pharmacovigilance or clinical guidelines. The FDA's current regulatory work explicitly encourages increased enrollment of female participants, sex-specific analyses and the inclusion of sex-specific information in regulatory submissions. One well-known example is zolpidem: FDA review materials note that women clear zolpidem more slowly than men and have higher blood concentration after the same dose, contributing to a lower recommended starting dose for adult women.

The international evidence is therefore mixed: women's representation has improved substantially in many modern trials, but parity does not automatically mean scientific equity. For example, a 2022 U.S. analysis of 1,433 trials found an average of 41.2% female participation and persistent underrepresentation relative to disease prevalence in cardiovascular, psychiatric and cancer trials. A 2025 psychiatric-trial study found substantial underrepresentation of women in schizophrenia, opioid-use-disorder and PTSD trials despite disease burdens that are high among women.

4. KEY CONCEPTS

Systemic Bias

A pattern built into rules, institutions, incentives or common research practices that repeatedly disadvantages or overlooks a group, even without deliberate discrimination.

Sex

Biological characteristics relevant to health and disease, including chromosomes, reproductive anatomy, hormones and physiology. In research, sex should be defined and measured clearly rather than treated as a vague label.

Gender
Social roles, expectations, identities and relationships that can shape health behaviours, exposure to risk, access to care and interactions with healthcare systems.
Sex-and-Gender Analysis

A research approach that asks whether sex or gender could influence a research question, the study population, outcomes, treatment response or implementation of findings.

Clinical Trial
A research study in human participants designed to evaluate an intervention such as a medicine, vaccine, medical device, diagnostic method or treatment strategy.

Preclinical Research
Laboratory and animal research that occurs before or alongside human trials. Bias can begin here if research models do not reflect the biological diversity relevant to later patients.

Phase I
Early human research primarily focused on safety, tolerability and pharmacokinetics. Sex differences can matter because metabolism and drug exposure may differ between participants.

Phase II
Research that examines preliminary effectiveness, dose and short-term safety in people with the condition of interest.

Phase III
Larger studies used to establish effectiveness and monitor safety across broader patient populations before or around regulatory approval.

Post-Market Surveillance
The collection and analysis of safety and effectiveness information after a medicine or device is available to the public.

Adverse Drug Reaction
A harmful or unintended response to a medicine at normal doses. Sex-based differences in metabolism or exposure can contribute to different risks.

Underrepresentation
A situation in which a group is included at levels that are too low to reflect the population affected by the condition or to produce useful subgroup information.

Pregnancy Exclusion
The practice of excluding pregnant participants from research. It can protect against unknown fetal risks, but excessive exclusion can also create evidence gaps for medicines that pregnant patients may need.

Reproductive-Age Exclusion
Excluding women who could become pregnant from research, sometimes because investigators want to avoid pregnancy-related complications or follow-up requirements.

Sex-Disaggregated Data
Data reported separately by sex when appropriate so that researchers can see whether outcomes, harms or other measures differ.

Therapeutic Safety
The degree to which a treatment's expected benefits outweigh its risks for the people who receive it, including different patient populations and life stages.

Evidence Gap
An important clinical question for which available research is insufficient, inconsistent or not representative of the people affected.

Intersectionality
The idea that gender can interact with other characteristics such as age, race or ethnicity, disability, income, geography or migration status to affect research participation and health outcomes.

Informed Consent
A process in which participants receive understandable information about a study, including risks and benefits, before deciding freely whether to participate.

Research Equity
The principle that the benefits and burdens of research should be distributed fairly and that evidence should be useful to the populations affected by the health problem.

The evidence pathway continues after a medicine is approved. Pharmacovigilance systems can reveal adverse effects that were too rare to identify in pre-approval trials. If safety reports are not analysed by sex or if clinicians are not informed about meaningful differences in risk, the research gap can persist into everyday treatment. Therapeutic safety therefore requires continuous learning rather than a one-time approval decision.

5. CASE STUDIES

Algeria

Algeria has a mixed public-private health system and a research environment that is increasingly producing sex-specific evidence. For gender equality discussions, an important point is that women are not simply a "missing" group in Algerian research: there are substantial studies focused on women's health, but the breadth of evidence varies by disease and by region.

A useful national example is the 2016–2017 Algerian non-communicable disease risk-factor survey. A sex-specific analysis found metabolic syndrome in 39.1% of women compared with 29.1% of men in the study population. The pattern of risk factors also differed by sex, with abdominal obesity, low HDL cholesterol and high blood pressure particularly important among women. Such findings demonstrate why national datasets should be analysed by sex rather than relying only on overall averages.

Algerian research has also investigated breast cancer knowledge and screening behaviour among women, showing gaps in understanding of risk factors and screening practices. Recent research on polycystic ovary syndrome in western

Algeria further illustrates the value of studying women's conditions using local populations rather than assuming that findings from other countries automatically apply.

From a therapeutic-safety perspective, Algeria highlights three recurring priorities: collecting sex-disaggregated health data, investing in locally relevant women's health research, and improving access to high-quality trials outside major urban centres. The policy challenge is not only "include more women", but also to ensure that women from different regions and socioeconomic backgrounds are represented and that study findings are translated into accessible care.

A further research priority is making sex-specific evidence useful beyond specialist centres. National surveys can identify differences in risk, but these findings need to reach primary-care services, screening programmes and treatment guidelines. Research should also consider age, rural or urban residence, education and income because these factors can change both disease risk and the ability to access follow-up care. For a country with substantial regional variation, a trial that is technically representative on paper may still leave important communities out if recruitment is concentrated in a small number of teaching hospitals.

Argentina

Argentina has a long tradition of public health research and a large university and hospital research sector. Its national context is relevant because gender equality, sexual and reproductive health, chronic disease, and access to public healthcare all intersect with the quality of medical evidence.

Argentina has participated extensively in multinational and locally led clinical research. A large randomised clinical trial of a community health-worker intervention for uncontrolled hypertension recruited 1,432 low-income adults; 772 participants, or 53%, were women. The study is a useful example of how trials can intentionally reach populations that might otherwise be missed by conventional research recruitment.

Argentina has also developed research capacity around maternal health, reproductive health, cancer and chronic disease. The wider lesson is that women's inclusion can be strong in studies where women are highly affected, while representation and sex-

specific analysis still need attention in conditions that historically have been framed as “male” diseases, such as cardiovascular disease.

For therapeutic safety, Argentina’s experience supports a research model in which inclusion is combined with analysis of social context. Income, access to primary care, caring responsibilities, geography and health literacy can all influence whether women join trials and whether they benefit from study interventions. Policies that support community-based recruitment and clear communication can therefore improve both participation and the quality of evidence.

Argentina also demonstrates the value of linking clinical research with the public health system. Trials carried out through public hospitals or community networks can reach people who may be invisible to private-sector studies. Women’s participation can be strengthened when studies reduce travel requirements, communicate in plain language and recognise caregiving responsibilities. These practical choices are not merely logistical: they can change who is able to participate and therefore whose experience contributes to the final evidence base.

Australia

Australia provides one of the clearest examples of a country trying to move from general statements about equality toward specific requirements in publicly funded health research. The National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and the Department of Health now state that funded research should consider sex, gender, variations of sex characteristics and sexual orientation across the research process. The requirement was updated in late 2025 and embedded in NHMRC and Medical Research Future Fund grant programs from 2026.

A national cross-sectional study of recent Australian clinical research found that women represented a median of 55% of participants overall, but only 8.9% of mixed-sex studies analysed results by sex. Women were significantly underrepresented in cardiology and nephrology and overrepresented in psychiatry, care of the elderly and orthopaedics. This demonstrates why representation alone does not guarantee sex-sensitive science.

Australia's Women's Health Strategy has also called for better participation of women in clinical trials, stronger data on women's health and attention to sex and gender differences across healthcare. The strategy encourages research funding to address conditions that may be under-recognised, including chronic pain and women's cardiovascular health.

The therapeutic-safety lesson is particularly strong: a trial can contain many women and still fail to produce useful evidence about women if analyses are not performed. Australia therefore offers an example of a system-level approach in which funding rules, research design, consumer involvement and national health priorities reinforce one another.

Australia's current funding approach is notable because it moves sex and gender considerations upstream, before a study receives public support. This makes the issue part of research quality rather than an optional topic for a specialist women's-health programme. The model could be applied to many fields where historical assumptions have affected study populations, including cardiology, nephrology, pain, mental health and ageing. It also creates a clear incentive for researchers to explain when sex or gender is not relevant, rather than simply omitting the variables.

Brazil

Brazil is one of the largest research and pharmaceutical markets in Latin America, with major public institutions such as Fiocruz and a national health system that supports large population-based studies. Women's health research has developed substantially, but access, ethnicity, income and geography can affect who participates in research and who benefits from new therapies.

A notable example is the IPEC-FIOCRUZ women's HIV cohort, established in 1996 to study the natural history and healthcare experience of women living with HIV. Research from the cohort examined which women participated in clinical trials, helping researchers understand that participation is shaped by socioeconomic and demographic factors rather than simply the availability of a study.

More recent work includes the LINDA-Brasil multicentre randomised trial, which evaluated a telephone lifestyle intervention for women with recent gestational diabetes in the Brazilian national health system. The study is important because it tested a practical intervention in a population with a known long-term risk of diabetes and connected research with routine public-sector care.

Brazil also has strong research ethics and data-governance institutions, including the CEP/CONEP research-ethics system and the LGPD data-protection framework. Together, Brazil's experience suggests that gender equity in research needs both scientific representation and institutional safeguards: participants should be recruited fairly, protected during the study and able to trust how their health information is handled.

Brazil's large and diverse population makes intersectionality especially important. A woman's experience of a clinical trial can be shaped by race, income, geography, education, employment and access to the public health system at the same time. Strong research ethics therefore need to be paired with recruitment strategies that reach different communities. The country's experience with public-sector research also shows the value of maintaining long-term cohorts, because repeated follow-up can reveal safety and health trends that short trials cannot.

China

China has a very large health system, major biomedical research capacity and a rapidly growing clinical-trials sector. Its scale means that small differences in research design can affect millions of patients. The country is therefore increasingly relevant to questions about sex differences, population diversity and the generalisability of therapeutic evidence.

A 2026 multicentre Chinese study of 4,911 patients with non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction found that women were less likely than men to undergo revascularisation. After adjustment, women still had higher rates of major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events in the overall cohort, while the sex difference was not significant among patients who received revascularisation. The findings suggest that differences in treatment pathways can contribute to observed outcome gaps, not only biology.

Recent oncology research has also identified persistent female underrepresentation and reporting problems in lung-cancer clinical trials, despite the growing burden of lung cancer among women. This is important because a trial population may not reflect the real-world epidemiology of disease, even when the study is otherwise technically strong.

China's case highlights the importance of analysing both recruitment and treatment decisions. For therapeutic safety, sex-specific pharmacology should be combined with attention to whether women and men are offered the same diagnostic tests, procedures and evidence-based treatment once they enter the healthcare system.

China's scale makes disease-specific evidence particularly valuable. Large hospital systems can recruit enough participants to identify meaningful subgroup differences, but only if researchers plan for those analyses and report them clearly. The cardiovascular example also shows that therapeutic inequity may arise after diagnosis: if women receive fewer procedures or different treatment pathways, outcome differences can be wrongly interpreted as purely biological. Research design should therefore capture both clinical characteristics and key decisions made during care.

France

France operates within the European medicines and data-protection environment and has extensive clinical research infrastructure. The country also has a growing discussion about making clinical research more attentive to sex and gender, especially in fields where women have historically been overlooked.

A 2026 exploratory study examined the inclusion of women in French psychiatric clinical trials and focused specifically on the experiences and challenges reported by researchers. Its importance for this topic is that "underrepresentation" is not always caused by a formal rule excluding women. Recruitment methods, perceived burden, assumptions about patients and study logistics can all shape who enters a trial.

France has also developed broader work on sex and gender in medical science through universities, public research institutions and European research networks. European-level medicines policy increasingly recognises the need for more representative data and careful subgroup analysis, while French ethics and public-health institutions emphasise participant protection and informed consent.

The French case therefore illustrates a more subtle form of systemic bias: a country may have sophisticated clinical-research standards while still finding that women are less well represented or less well analysed in particular areas. Therapeutic safety depends on improving not only recruitment, but also the research culture that decides which subgroup questions are considered important enough to study.

The French experience also raises the importance of researcher attitudes. If investigators anticipate recruitment difficulties or assume that women are harder to retain in a study, those expectations can shape design decisions before a participant is approached. Training in inclusive recruitment and patient-centred trial design can help. This is particularly relevant in psychiatry and other fields where symptoms, diagnosis, stigma and treatment-seeking behaviour may be shaped by social expectations as well as biology.

Egypt

Egypt is one of the largest healthcare and research systems in the Arab world and has a large young and middle-aged population. Women's health research is particularly important in maternal health, reproductive health, breast cancer, non-communicable diseases and access to healthcare information.

Recent research in Ismailia examined women's access to sexual and reproductive health services and information. The study highlighted the influence of cultural, social and institutional factors on how women access health information and services. While access research is not the same as a clinical trial, it matters directly to research equity because people who face barriers to healthcare can also face barriers to trial recruitment, follow-up and informed consent.

Egypt has substantial clinical-research activity in areas such as oncology, cardiology and infectious disease, and large teaching hospitals can serve diverse populations. However, evidence gaps may remain when research does not adequately capture rural women, women with limited income, or patients whose care is influenced by family decision-making and transport constraints.

For therapeutic safety, Egypt demonstrates why gender bias should not be understood only as an issue of laboratory representation. A medicine can be well tested scientifically but still be unsafe in practice if patients cannot access follow-up care, do not receive understandable safety information, or are excluded from studies because participation is difficult to reconcile with work, family and transport responsibilities.

In Egypt, research equity can be closely connected to health-system access. Women who reach tertiary hospitals may be more likely to appear in research than women who rely on local services or face financial and transport constraints. Recruiting across different levels of care, using community engagement and ensuring that consent information is understandable can improve representativeness. These steps also help protect participants because they make it easier to identify whether the treatment is practical and safe in ordinary healthcare settings.

Germany

Germany has a highly developed healthcare and clinical-research system, strong ethics oversight and a legal culture that places considerable weight on patient rights and data protection. At the same time, German researchers have been active in the "gender medicine" movement, which asks how sex and gender affect disease, diagnosis and treatment.

German research and clinical datasets are increasingly being examined for whether sex and gender variables are captured in ways that make later analysis possible. A 2026 scoping review of German clinical research data found that gender-relevant variables are inconsistently available and recommended expanding routine data collection and machine-readable representation so that retrospective analysis can become more meaningful.

Germany is also home to research centres focusing specifically on sex- and gender-sensitive medicine, including work on cardiovascular disease, pharmacology and mental health. The broader European regulatory environment further encourages consideration of patient diversity in clinical development and risk assessment.
The German example shows that even when a country has strong research infrastructure, bias can persist as a data-quality problem. If a hospital system does not record relevant variables consistently, researchers may be unable to ask important questions later. Therapeutic safety therefore depends on building the right data architecture before the analysis begins.

Germany's data-rich health environment shows another side of systemic bias: the information needed to study sex and gender differences must exist in usable form. If variables are missing, inconsistently coded or not linked across datasets, researchers

may be unable to analyse outcomes even where a very large patient population is available. Improving data standards is therefore a preventative measure. It can also make future evidence reviews faster because researchers will not need to reconstruct basic population characteristics from incomplete records.

India

India has one of the world's largest and most diverse populations and has rapidly expanded its clinical-trials and biomedical-research capacity. Its research environment includes major public hospitals, universities, private sponsors and a large network of community health workers.

A 2025 qualitative study in Belagavi, Karnataka examined why pregnant women do or do not participate in randomised trials. Researchers found that expectations of better care, trust in health workers, household gender relations and community beliefs all influenced participation. The study is especially relevant because pregnancy is one of the areas where evidence gaps can become severe when safety concerns lead to routine exclusion.

India also has longstanding policy discussions about research ethics, informed consent, vulnerable groups and the inclusion of women. The Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) provides ethical guidance for human research, while the national clinical-trials system supports registration and oversight.

India's case shows that inclusion requires more than changing eligibility criteria. Trial information must be understandable, research and treatment must be clearly distinguished, and recruitment needs to account for household decision-making, transport, childcare and trust. For therapeutic safety, including pregnant and reproductive-age women where scientifically and ethically appropriate is essential because clinicians still need evidence when these patients become ill.

India's research environment highlights the importance of community trust. Pregnancy trials, in particular, can be affected by uncertainty about whether research is the same as treatment, by family decision-making and by fears about fetal harm. Better consent processes should explain these distinctions clearly and honestly. Community health workers can also act as bridges between researchers and participants when they are appropriately trained and when their role does not undermine voluntary decision-making.

Japan

Japan is a technologically advanced country with strong pharmaceutical and medical-device industries, a sophisticated regulator and an ageing population. Its recent policy discussions have increasingly acknowledged that medical symptoms, treatment response and risk can differ between men and women.

Japan has established a regulatory system through the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) and the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW). The country is also developing sex- and gender-specific medicine. Japan's government has highlighted research showing that symptoms and treatment outcomes can differ by sex and has described work on women's healthcare and sex/gender-specific approaches.

A key issue for Japan is the ageing population, because women make up a large proportion of older adults. Research on cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis, dementia, cancer and polypharmacy therefore has major implications for women's therapeutic safety. Older women may also be exposed to multiple medicines simultaneously, making sex differences in pharmacokinetics and drug interactions particularly important.

Japan's experience demonstrates that gender-sensitive medicine is not only about reproductive health. It can be a general framework for improving evidence across the life course, including for older women, where differences in metabolism, comorbidities and medication use can affect risk.

Japan's ageing population makes sex-specific evidence increasingly relevant to chronic disease and polypharmacy. Older women may have different body composition, hormone levels, kidney function and patterns of medicine use from younger participants, which can affect dosing and adverse events. Research programmes that include older women and examine how multiple medicines interact can therefore improve safety beyond the traditional focus on reproductive-age patients.

Nigeria

Nigeria has a large and young population, a rapidly expanding medical research community and major health challenges involving cancer, maternal health, infectious diseases and non-communicable diseases. It is also an important example of why countries need research that is both internationally credible and locally relevant.

A 2026 phase II pragmatic clinical trial of neoadjuvant treatment for HER2-positive breast cancer enrolled 53 Nigerian women aged 18–70. Among evaluable patients, 53% achieved a pathological complete response. The study recorded serious adverse events and provides locally generated evidence for a population that is often less visible in international drug-development programmes.

Nigeria has also strengthened its national research and data-governance environment. The Nigeria Data Protection Act 2023 created a statutory framework for personal data protection, and the country has institutions such as the National Health Research Ethics Committee and the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC) involved in research and medicines regulation.

The Nigerian case shows why global trials should not treat African populations as a single undifferentiated group. Women in Nigeria can experience different disease patterns, access barriers and treatment pathways from women in Europe or North America. Therapeutic safety is improved when trials build local capacity, collect reliable safety data and make it possible to translate findings into the health system where participants live.

Nigeria's local oncology trial also demonstrates why capacity-building matters. When a trial takes place within the country, clinicians, laboratories, ethics committees and patients all gain experience that can support later studies. This can reduce dependence on evidence generated elsewhere and improve the speed with which locally important safety signals are recognised. International partnerships are useful when they strengthen local research institutions rather than simply using local sites for recruitment.

Russian Federation

The Russian Federation has a substantial pharmaceutical and clinical-research system, with national registration requirements and large hospital networks. Research involving women spans reproductive health, oncology, cardiovascular disease, infectious disease and sexual health, but access to international evidence networks has changed considerably in recent years.

Russian studies have examined sex-specific outcomes and women's health in different contexts. For example, research among 540 women in southern Russia examined risk factors for female sexual dysfunction and found age, stress and menopause to be significant factors. Such work illustrates the importance of research that treats women's symptoms as clinical outcomes rather than assuming that evidence from men can be generalised.

Other Russian research has examined gender disparities in HIV risk and access to healthcare. One St Petersburg study found different patterns of injection-drug use, tuberculosis and family responsibilities between male and female patients, demonstrating that gender can influence both risk and healthcare needs.
For therapeutic safety, the Russian case highlights the importance of keeping clinical evidence connected to local populations even when international collaboration is difficult. Strong pharmacovigilance, transparent reporting of adverse events and continued participation of women in research remain important regardless of geopolitical circumstances.

Research in the Russian Federation also shows the importance of maintaining sex-specific public-health surveillance when broader health systems change. Women can experience different risks and treatment barriers even when overall service coverage looks similar. Continued collection of reliable sex-disaggregated data can help identify whether access and outcomes are changing over time. For clinical trials, transparent adverse-event reporting and internationally understandable terminology make it easier for findings to contribute to wider scientific knowledge.

Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia has made large investments in healthcare, biotechnology and research capacity under Vision 2030. The country has expanded cancer care, tertiary hospitals

and clinical research while also working within a social and cultural context that can shape how patients approach research and healthcare decisions.

A 2026 study of oncology clinical-trial participation in Saudi Arabia included 367 patients, 58.9% of whom were female. However, only 1.9% had prior clinical-trial experience and willingness to participate in a clinical trial was much lower than willingness to participate in observational research. Fear of side effects and lack of information were among the main barriers.

A national study of Saudi women's health also demonstrated the importance of population-level research in identifying disease patterns and risk factors that should inform clinical priorities. The country's large and rapidly modernising healthcare system creates an opportunity to build research that is both internationally competitive and responsive to local health needs.

Saudi Arabia therefore illustrates that inclusion is shaped by trust as much as by formal eligibility criteria. Therapeutic safety depends on informed consent that is understandable, access to independent information, clear communication about uncertainty, and systems for reporting adverse effects. Building public trust can be as important as changing the study protocol itself.

Saudi Arabia's recent oncology research on willingness to participate shows that fear of side effects is itself a research issue. Participants need understandable explanations of known and unknown risks, what happens if they withdraw and how their care will continue. Trust can also be strengthened when treating physicians are directly involved in research without blurring the distinction between routine care and voluntary participation. This can make recruitment fairer while protecting informed consent.

South Korea

South Korea has a highly developed pharmaceutical, biotechnology and hospital research sector. Its population is ageing rapidly and the country has become an important site for multinational and locally led clinical trials, particularly in oncology and medical devices.

A major example is a phase III breast-cancer trial conducted in 13 South Korean hospitals. The trial enrolled 735 women with node-positive breast cancer and compared radiotherapy strategies, collecting outcomes including disease-free survival, overall survival and toxic effects. This illustrates a research area where women are clearly the majority of the disease population and should be studied directly rather than through extrapolation from male-dominated evidence.

South Korean regulators, including the Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS), oversee clinical trials and medicine safety, and the country has invested heavily in harmonising its standards with international clinical-research systems. However, as in other advanced research environments, representation within one disease area does not automatically resolve broader sex and gender gaps across all medical research.

The South Korean case is especially useful for discussing disease-specific representation. The right question is not "Are women included?" in the abstract, but "Are the people who actually experience this disease represented, analysed and followed long enough to identify clinically important safety effects?"

South Korea's oncology research environment demonstrates the value of long-term outcome measurement. For many treatments, safety effects may become clearer after several years rather than during the initial treatment period. Trials that report disease-free survival, overall survival and toxic effects together create a more complete picture than trials that focus on a single short-term endpoint. The same principle can apply to other diseases where women and men may experience different long-term risks.

Sweden

Sweden has a strong tradition of public health research, nationwide health registers and gender-equality policy. It is also home to institutions that have developed the field of gender medicine and to national databases that allow researchers to analyse outcomes over long periods.

Swedish researchers developed Janusmed Sex and Gender, a clinical knowledge database that summarises how sex and gender differences can affect drug treatment. The work is based on evidence that men and women can differ in pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics and treatment response, and it is intended to support safer prescribing.

Sweden has also used cohort studies to investigate treatments across gendered health questions. The GETS study, for example, examined metabolic and functional changes in people receiving gender-affirming hormone treatment, illustrating the value of structured follow-up when hormone exposure is deliberately changed.
Sweden's experience is relevant because it treats sex and gender as part of routine clinical reasoning rather than as a one-time inclusion requirement. A therapeutic-safety strategy can therefore include clinical decision support, national registers, continuing research and regular updating of prescribing knowledge when new evidence appears.

Sweden's approach shows how research findings can be translated into clinical decision support. A sex- and gender-aware evidence base has greater practical value when doctors can access it during prescribing and when new evidence is used to update the tool. This helps avoid a situation in which good research exists in academic journals but is not reflected in treatment decisions. National registers can support this cycle by allowing researchers to check whether real-world outcomes match expectations from trials.

United Arab Emirates

The United Arab Emirates has a rapidly expanding healthcare sector, modern hospitals and a growing biomedical-research environment. Health research is increasingly connected to national innovation and digital-health strategies, while the UAE also draws patients and healthcare professionals from a highly diverse population.

Women's health research in the UAE includes maternal health, reproductive health, oncology, metabolic disease and chronic conditions. Because the population is ethnically diverse and includes many expatriate communities, research design has to consider whether findings from one population group apply to another and whether language or employment conditions create barriers to participation.

The UAE's hospitals increasingly participate in international clinical trials and research collaborations, creating opportunities to improve the evidence base for populations from the Gulf and wider Middle East. At the same time, robust consent processes and locally appropriate participant information are important because education levels, languages and access to healthcare can vary considerably within the resident population.

For therapeutic safety, the UAE case highlights the value of diversity-aware recruitment. It is not enough to include women as a single category if the study population does not reflect the ethnic, age and socioeconomic diversity of the people receiving treatment. Local ethics committees, hospital research offices and national regulation can help make that diversity visible and protect participants throughout the research process.

The UAE's diverse resident population also creates a strong case for recording relevant participant characteristics carefully and ethically. A single category such as "female" may conceal important differences in genetics, language, socioeconomic status, occupational exposures and healthcare access. Research teams should avoid collecting unnecessary personal information, but where variables are scientifically relevant they should be captured consistently enough to support meaningful analysis and protect privacy.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has one of the world's most established systems for publicly funded clinical research, including the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR), the NHS and a national medicines regulator. Women's health has increasingly become a specific policy priority, partly because research gaps were recognised across areas such as reproductive health, menopause, pain and cardiovascular disease.

The Women's Health Strategy for England identifies the need for more research into conditions that disproportionately affect women and for women to benefit more fully from research and innovation. The NIHR has also supported women's health research and research into barriers to participation, helping to move the debate beyond a simple question of whether women are "allowed" into trials.

One useful lesson from the UK is the importance of research infrastructure. Because the NHS can connect research with routine clinical care, researchers can design studies that recruit from real-world patient populations and follow participants after treatment. This creates opportunities for long-term safety surveillance, including differences in outcomes by age, sex and life stage.

The UK also illustrates the importance of public involvement. Women and patient organisations increasingly take part in deciding which research questions should be funded. From a UN Women perspective, that means gender equality is not only about being a participant in somebody else's trial; it is also about having a voice in deciding what health questions are studied in the first place.

The UK's public research infrastructure also creates opportunities for stronger patient involvement. When women's organisations and patients help choose research priorities, the research agenda can move toward issues that have previously received less attention. The same involvement can improve trial design by identifying barriers that professionals may overlook, such as pain concerns, childcare, scheduling and the way information is communicated. This makes participation more practical and can improve retention throughout longer studies.

United States

The United States is one of the most influential countries in global medical research, with major public funders, pharmaceutical companies, universities and regulators. Its policies have shaped the international discussion about women's inclusion because the NIH has required inclusion of women in funded clinical research for decades and has required appropriate analysis of subgroup outcomes.

The NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 directed NIH to ensure that women were included in clinical research and that clinical trials were designed to provide valid analysis of whether interventions affect women differently. NIH policy continues to require inclusion of women unless there is a compelling reason for exclusion; cost alone is not an acceptable justification. Applicable Phase III trials must also report valid analyses by sex and other demographic categories.

FDA evidence shows major improvement but also persistent gaps. In pivotal trials for drugs approved in 2013–2015, women represented 40.4% of participants across

102 new drugs, and sex-based analyses for efficacy and safety were reported for 93.1% of applications. More recent analyses indicate that women's overall participation has improved, but cardiovascular and autoimmune trials can still under-enrol women relative to the disease burden.

The United States also provides important therapeutic-safety case studies. Historical reviews identified drugs that were withdrawn after serious harms, with women sometimes experiencing greater risk, demonstrating why sex-specific pharmacology and adverse-event monitoring matter. The broader lesson is that inclusion, analysis and post-market surveillance have to work together. A participant can be present in a trial and still be poorly represented in the evidence if researchers do not examine whether effectiveness or harm differs by sex.

The US model shows why policy should cover the entire research lifecycle. NIH inclusion rules address recruitment and analysis, while FDA programmes monitor participation, safety and effectiveness. Yet current evidence shows that disease-specific gaps remain, particularly in cardiovascular and autoimmune trials. This means the next stage of progress is not simply higher overall enrolment; it is better targeting of persistent gaps, better subgroup analysis and stronger tools for evaluating risks for women of reproductive potential.

6. APPROACHES

that can strengthen research and therapeutic safety

The country examples in this guide point toward several practical areas for improvement. These are not a single universal policy package; different states may implement them through legislation, funding rules, research ethics review, regulator guidance or voluntary standards.

• Build sex and gender into research design from the beginning. Study protocols should explain when sex or gender is relevant, how participants will be recruited, and whether analyses need to be powered to identify important differences.
• Use representative recruitment rather than symbolic inclusion. Targets should reflect the population affected by the disease, and recruitment should consider age, pregnancy status where appropriate, ethnicity, disability, geography and socioeconomic barriers.

Improve pregnancy and reproductive-health evidence. Blanket exclusion may reduce immediate research complexity but can leave clinicians without evidence for medicines that patients may need during pregnancy or breastfeeding. Ethical frameworks should distinguish between genuine risk and historical habit.

• Report safety and efficacy by sex where scientifically appropriate. A combined average can hide a meaningful difference in benefit or harm. Regulators and journals can require clear reporting of sex-disaggregated outcomes and explain when subgroup analysis is not possible.

• Strengthen post-market pharmacovigilance. National reporting systems should be capable of identifying patterns in adverse drug reactions by sex and other relevant characteristics, with clear pathways for investigating safety signals.

• Involve patients and communities. Public participation can identify barriers researchers may overlook, including childcare, transportation, language, distrust, work schedules, stigma and fear of unknown side effects.

• Fund neglected women's-health questions. Equality is affected by what gets studied. Research priorities can include cardiovascular disease in women, endometriosis, menopause, autoimmune disease, chronic pain, maternal health, reproductive health, mental health and conditions where women's symptoms are under-recognised.

• Improve the research workforce. Training researchers, clinicians, ethics committees and statisticians in sex and gender analysis can make inclusion part of normal scientific quality control rather than a separate "women's issue".

• Use shared international standards. Multinational trials should not treat sex and gender differently at every study site without justification. Harmonised definitions, reporting requirements and data standards can make evidence easier to compare and strengthen global safety monitoring.

A useful principle is that equality in medical research is not achieved by adding women to a trial at the end. The goal is to make the entire evidence pathway more representative: what gets funded, what gets studied, who participates, what is measured, how results are analysed, how medicines are labelled, and how safety is monitored after approval. Bias can enter medical evidence long before a medicine reaches a pharmacy. Looking at the full research pathway helps explain why solutions need to work at several stages rather than relying on one recruitment rule.

1. **Choosing what to study**

Research priorities are shaped by funding, public health agendas, industry incentives and the questions scientists consider important. When conditions that mainly affect women receive less attention, evidence gaps can appear even if clinical trials themselves are well run. Women's health should therefore be understood broadly: cardiovascular disease, autoimmune illness, chronic pain, mental health, cancer, aging and neurological disease all belong within the discussion, not only pregnancy and reproductive health.

2. **Preclinical research and early testing**

Sex-related differences can appear in cells, tissues, animals and pharmacokinetics. Using only one sex in laboratory models can make later findings harder to interpret. Early-phase human studies are also important because they provide information about metabolism, dosing and tolerability. Regulators such as the FDA have noted that sex can affect how a drug is broken down or distributed in the body, which can influence dosing and safety.

3. **Recruitment and eligibility**

Eligibility criteria can protect participants, but they can also exclude people unnecessarily. Pregnancy and the possibility of pregnancy have historically been treated as reasons for broad exclusion. Modern ethical approaches increasingly ask whether the actual risk justifies exclusion and whether evidence can be generated responsibly instead. Recruitment also needs to account for childcare, transport, work, language, disability, trust and other practical barriers.

4. **Analysis and reporting**

Having women in a trial does not automatically produce sex-sensitive evidence. Researchers must decide when subgroup analysis is scientifically appropriate, ensure that sample sizes make important differences detectable, and report safety and effectiveness clearly. The 2019 FDA worldwide analysis is a useful example of why participation statistics and analysis statistics are separate questions: one tells us who was enrolled, while the other tells us what we learned about those participants.

5. Approval, prescribing and post-market safety

Even after a drug clears regulatory approval, bias can linger if sex-specific findings never make it into the label, the prescribing guidance, or ongoing safety monitoring. That means pharmacovigilance systems need to be able to actually catch adverse-event patterns broken down by sex and other relevant traits and regulators need to follow through by updating warnings, dosing advice, and clinical guidance whenever meaningful differences show up.

7. USEFUL ARTICLES
and sources for further research

The following sources can help gather information and improve your research, may you need more references.

[1] UN Women, About UN Women. https://www.unwomen.org/en/about-us/about-un-women

[2] UN Women, UN Creates New Structure for Empowerment of Women (2010). https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2010/7/un-creates-new-structure-for-empowerment-of-women

[3] UN Women, Commission on the Status of Women. https://www.unwomen.org/en/how-we-work/commission-on-the-status-of-women

[4] World Health Organization, Women's Health. https://www.who.int/health-topics/women-s-health

[5] NIH Office of Research on Women's Health, Sex as a Biological Variable. https://orwh.od.nih.gov/sex-as-biological-variable

[6] NIH, NOT-OD-15-102 Sex as a Biological Variable. https://www.grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/not-od-15-102.html

[7] WHO, Equity and health: inclusion of pregnant and breastfeeding women in clinical trials (18 Jun 2025). https://www.who.int/news/item/18-06-2025-equity-and-health--the-inclusion-of-pregnant-and-breastfeeding-women-in-clinical-trials

[8] FDA, Study of Sex Differences in the Clinical Evaluation of Medical Products (Draft Guidance, Dec 2025). https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/study-sex-differences-clinical-evaluation-medical-products

[9] FDA, Zolpidem approval/review materials. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2013/019908Orig1s032%2Cs034%2C021774Orig1s013%2Cs015review.pdf

[10] Bairey Merz et al., Enrollment of female participants in US drug and device Phase 1-3 trials (2022). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35247632/
[11] Koire et al., Sex differences in clinical trial enrollment in US psychiatric disorders (2025). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40834925/
[12] Gender Diversity of Research Teams and Clinical Trial Enrollment (2025). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41100085/
[13] Sex-Related Differences in Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Frequently Prescribed Drugs. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31873866/
[14] Participation of Women in Clinical Trials Supporting FDA Approval of Cardiovascular Drugs. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29724348/
[15] Sex differences in adverse drug reactions: Are women more impacted?. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36283857/
[16] Lancet review: Inclusion of women who are pregnant, lactating, or of reproductive potential in clinical trials (2025). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41429679/
[17] 2026 systematic review/meta-analysis of estrogen therapy (authors affiliated with Algeria and other countries). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41186572/
[18] BETTY Trial protocol, Argentina / Chagas treatment in women. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32831069/
[19] Gender bias in Argentine rheumatology research (2025). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40285893/
[20] Australia NHMRC/MRFF Statement on Sex, Gender, Variations of Sex Characteristics and Sexual Orientation. https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/research-policy/gender-equity/statement-sex-and-gender-health-and-medical-research
[21] NHMRC Gender Equity Strategy. https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/research-policy/gender-equity/nhmrc-gender-equity-strategy-2022-2025
[22] Australian Clinical Trials / ANZCTR. https://www.australianclinicaltrials.gov.au/about/find
[23] Brazil Ministry of Health, National Policy for Comprehensive Women's Health. https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/assuntos/saude-de-a-a-z/s/saude-da-mulher/pnaism/politica-nacional-de-atencao-integral-a-saude-das-mulheres
[24] Gender and health: profile and trends of scientific production in Brazil. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16924312
[25] Analysis of Drug Clinical Trials in Obstetrics and Gynecology: China, 2019-2023. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42475406/
[26] China NMPA, Drug Administration Law. https://english.nmpa.gov.cn/2019-09/26/c_773012.htm

[27] INSERM, Genre et santé. https://www.inserm.fr/dossier/genre-et-sante/
[28] INSERM, Research Programs - Women's Health, Couples' Health PEPR. https://www.inserm.fr/en/about-us/research-programs/
[29] Inserm Foundation, Women's Health. https://fondation-inserm.org/en/our-areas-of-action/meeting-major-societal-challenges/womens-health/
[30] Egypt: gender differences in ACS presentation and management (2024). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39014340/
[31] Egypt: sex-related differences in hypertension management. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33774923/
[32] Egypt: gender differences in self-rated health among university students. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26886289/
[33] Germany: Sex and gender differences in clinical medicine. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23027443/
[34] Germany: sex distribution in uro-oncology clinical studies (2026). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42371009/
[35] ICMR National Institute for Research on Women's Health. https://nirrch.res.in/
[36] Government of India, Clinical Trials Registry-India. https://www.india.gov.in/category/health-wellness/subcategory/health-resources/details/clinical-trials-registry-of-india
[37] ClinRegs, India clinical research regulation. https://clinregs.niaid.nih.gov/country/india
[38] ICMR Ethical Guidelines (pregnancy/nursing research). https://www.icmr.gov.in/icmrobject/custom_data/pdf/resource-guidelines/ethical_guidelines_0.pdf
[39] Japan MHLW, Comprehensive Support for Women's Health research program. https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_41567.html
[40] Japan AMED, 2026 Women's Health research call. https://www.amed.go.jp/koubo/03005/02/B_00003.html
[41] JapanGov, Bridging the Gender Gap in Healthcare (2025). https://www.japan.go.jp/kizuna/2025/03/bridging_the_gender_gap_in_healthcare.html
[42] Enrolment and retention of African women in biomedical research. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20642074/
[43] Yoruba women and autonomy in research participation. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26871880/
[44] Nigerian women with breast cancer: pilot mHealth randomized trial. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39585879/

[45] Pregnant women's participation in clinical trials in Kano, Nigeria (2026). https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.64898/2026.07.13.26357858v1.full
[46] Russian consensus on menopausal hormone therapy in women with CVD/metabolic disease (2026). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41640170/
[47] Saudi Food and Drug Authority, Clinical Trials. https://www.sfda.gov.sa/en/clinical-trials
[48] Saudi women's cardiovascular health review (2026). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42238285/
[49] Saudi-affiliated systematic review of PCOS treatment evidence. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37333786/
[50] Korean Study of Women's Health-Related Issues (K-Stori). https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5492879/
[51] Trend of Women's Health Research in Korea, 2012-2020. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10396432/
[52] Sweden: Janusmed Sex and Gender database. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37173796/
[53] UAE: Dubai Women's Health Study / National Policy context. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12935986/
[54] UK Parliament: NIHR sex and gender policy (2025). https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2025-05-08/HL7337/
[55] UK Parliament: renewed women's-health research funding requirements (2026). https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2026-03-26/HL16115
[56] UK emergency medicine trials sex/gender reporting review. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39266055/
[57] NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 / inclusion policy background. https://www.grants.nih.gov/policy-and-compliance/policy-topics/inclusion/women-and-minorities/guideline
[58] NIH current inclusion policy for women and minority groups in clinical research. https://grants.nih.gov/policy-and-compliance/policy-topics/inclusion/women-and-minorities/guideline

Exemplary Policy statement:

Honourable Chairs, Fellow Ambassadors,

On behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, we express our intense gratitude and appreciation for your eagerness to act and discuss today's highly
imperative topic, which is China's Belt and Road initiative.
Pakistan undoubtedly remains a strategically vital country within the BRI, with its joint cooperative with China named the "China-Pakistan Economic Corridor", which, throughout the years of its development, has proved to be extremely efficient for our economy and continues fostering the standards of living of our beloved citizens.

Nevertheless, although our economic ties with China are and will remain close, one must acknowledge, that the glorious state of Pakistan is independent and sovereign, thus, safeguarding our interests will always be our main priority. We believe that the negotiations upon the completion of the CPEC are not full and the provisions of the agreement can be changed in a way for them to be more advantageous to Pakistan and China respectively.

Pakistan opposes every form of neocolonialism and considers the policies of France, Germany and the US highly hypocritical, as the Chinese way of fostering world trade, which aforementioned countries dare to call "neocolonialism" cannot be compared to the atrocities conducted by French in Central Africa for the whole 60 years, as well as economic isolation and exploitation of South American states by the US.

Moreover, seeing their disadvantage in Southern Asia, these countries dare to further develop their trade relations with the terrorist state of India as a counterweight. And the fellow Ambassadors are willing to stand by these ideas?
We strongly encourage the world community to pick the right side. Let the Alla-ah guide us through our deliberations and ensure, that the agreement will be reached.

Glory to Pakistan. The Ambassador is open to any and all points of information and yields the floor.

8. RESERARCH GUIDE

As has been mentioned before, the Study Guide is not a PhD on the topic and should serve solely as a basis for further research. Ambassadors should possess knowledge personalised to the policy of their country, and the Study
Guide outlines only general information. We, the chairboard, have prepared a Further Reading section to help you with that. Furthermore, below you will find guidance for conducting research useful for any Model United Nations conference.

First and foremost, it is crucial to have elementary knowledge about the country an Ambassador is representing.

- What is the political system and governing body of my country?
- What is the classification of the economy (HIC, MIC, LIC, etc.) of my
country?
- What is the geographical location of my country?
- What is my country's foreign policy?

If you are an Observer, not all questions may apply. In the case of NGOs we recommend focusing on the aims and reason for its establishment, what strategies they undertake to solve problems, its funding, and areas of action. If you are representing a company, consider its primary interest when it comes to the topic.

In order to thrive during committee sessions, you need to understand the topic itself on a profound level. It is recommended to incorporate in your arguments statistics and be mindful of their source, but also causes and effects of a particular issue.

You have to have an idea of the policies and actions of other actors present in the committee. This is very important as it comes in handy during the General Speaker's List (GSL) (especially during Points of Information (PoI's)!), and during moderated caucuses. You want to research every wrongdoing they committed in the past, holes in their logic, their strange policies and actions – this will help you manipulate the rest of the committee to perceive their arguments as, essentially, nothing but a deflection, and for your ideas to be favoured. Take into account that this information should be credible, as any Ambassador is permitted to ask for the source of that information through raising a Motion to Cite the Source.

9. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FURTHER READING

A Reliable Friend and Ally | FPS Foreign Affairs - Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation

Homepage - National Energy and Climate Plan

The Prime Minister signed the Czech-American Defense Agreement completing the ratification process | Government of the Czech Republic

Defence investment and NATO's 5% commitment | NATO Topic

Decision - EU - 2025/429 - EN - EUR-Lex

Analyses: Extensive Danish Trade and Investment Relations with the United

States - Statistics Denmark

Samtale med tiltrædende præsident Trump - Statsministeriet

US market overview

Energy Sector Organisation Act-Riigi Teataja

Sijoittajaesitys-2025_June_web.pdf

Trade ministers to discuss EU's trade relations with United States and China -

Finnish Government

France et États-Unis : Les échanges commerciaux atteignent un pic historique en 2025, portés par l'aéronautique et la pharmacie - ÉTATS-UNIS |

Direction générale du Trésor

24 % der deutschen Pharma-Exporte 2024 gingen in die USA - Statistisches

Bundesamt

Meeting of NATO ministers of Defence (13 February 2025, Brussels) - Permanent Delegation of Hungary to NATO, Brussels

Solar gives Hungary's power system vital cover from nuclear fallout | Reuters Top Trading Partners 2024 Ireland's Trade in Goods 2024 - Central Statistics Office

Tánaiste updates Ministers on EU-US trade negotiations
Italian exports to US rise 7% in 2025 despite Trump's tariffs | Reuters
Italy's trade surplus with US dropped to 34 billion in 2025 - Istat - Business - Ansa.it
Italy’s Meloni says it’s a ’positive’ trade deal was reached, calls for clarity By
Reuters
How much trade was there between the Netherlands and the US in 2024? -
The Netherlands in Numbers 2025 | CBS
The Netherlands supports NATO 5% target | Government.nl
Deputy Prime Minister Radosław Sikorski takes part in Defence24 Days - Ministry of Foreign Affairs Republic of Poland - Gov.pl website
Portugal calls for deeper EU-US dialogue to avoid harmful tariffs | Reuters sahmcapital.com/redirect/news/content/romanian-pm-says-eu-us-tariffs-de al-eliminates-uncertainties-2025-07-28
Romania expects small growth hit from new US trade deal By Reuters
Spain agrees with NATO to skip 5% defence spending target | Reuters
Cross-party agreement on historic rearmament - Government.se
2f65f117-ea6c-468d-9d48-92c29766f8d2_en
OeNB Report 2025/5: Austrian economy to stabilize in 2025 - Oesterreichische Nationalbank (OeNB)
Austria - Market Overview