

# 1 Ethical considerations related to drone use for environment and 2 health research: a scoping review protocol

3  
4 Remy Hoek Spaans<sup>1-2†\*</sup> ([remy.hoekspaans@bsc.es](mailto:remy.hoekspaans@bsc.es)), Bruna Drumond<sup>3†</sup>  
5 ([bruna.drumond@icict.fiocruz.br](mailto:bruna.drumond@icict.fiocruz.br)), Kim van Daalen<sup>1</sup> ([kim.vandaalen@bsc.es](mailto:kim.vandaalen@bsc.es)), Alison Derbyshire<sup>2</sup>  
6 ([Alison.Derbyshire@lstm.ac.uk](mailto:Alison.Derbyshire@lstm.ac.uk)), Adriano Da Silva<sup>3</sup> ([adriano.silva@fiocruz.br](mailto:adriano.silva@fiocruz.br)), Raquel Martins  
7 Lana<sup>1</sup> ([raquel.lana@bsc.es](mailto:raquel.lana@bsc.es)), Mauricio Santos Vega<sup>4</sup> ([om.santos@uniandes.edu.co](mailto:om.santos@uniandes.edu.co)), Gabriel Carrasco-  
8 Escobar<sup>5-6</sup> ([gabriel.carrasco@upch.pe](mailto:gabriel.carrasco@upch.pe)), Claudia Codeço<sup>3</sup> ([claudia.codeco@fiocruz.br](mailto:claudia.codeco@fiocruz.br)), Rachel Lowe<sup>1,7-</sup>  
9 <sup>8</sup> ([rachel.lowe@bsc.es](mailto:rachel.lowe@bsc.es))

10

- 11 1. Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC), Barcelona, Spain
- 12 2. Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (FIOCRUZ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- 13 3. Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), Liverpool, United Kingdom
- 14 4. Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia
- 15 5. Grupo en Biología Matemática y Computacional, Universidad de los Andes, Colombia
- 16 6. Health Innovation Laboratory, Institute of Tropical Medicine “Alexander von Humboldt”,  
17 Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru
- 18 7. Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies (ICREA), Barcelona, Spain
- 19 8. Centre on Climate Change & Planetary Health and Centre for Mathematical Modelling of  
20 Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

21

22 †These authors contributed equally to this work.

23 \* Corresponding author

24 E-mail: [remy.hoekspaans@bsc.es](mailto:remy.hoekspaans@bsc.es)

25

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 26 **Abstract**

27 **Introduction:** The use of drones in environment and health research is a relatively new phenomenon.  
28 A principal research activity drones are used for is environmental monitoring, which can raise concerns  
29 in local communities. Existing ethical guidance for researchers is often not specific to drone technology  
30 and practices vary between research settings. Therefore, this scoping review aims to gather the  
31 evidence available on how the use of drones is perceived by local communities, as well as current  
32 research practices, and ethical guidance related to drone deployment.

33  
34 **Methods and analysis:** This scoping review will follow the PRISMA-ScR and the Joana Briggs Institute  
35 guidelines. The literature search will be conducted using academic databases and grey literature  
36 sources. After pilot testing the inclusion criteria and data extraction tool, two researchers will double-  
37 screen and then chart available evidence independently. A content analysis will be carried out to  
38 identify patterns of categories or terms used to describe ethical considerations related to drone usage  
39 for environmental monitoring in the literature using the R Package RQDA. Discrepancies in any phase  
40 of the project are solved through consensus.

41  
42 **Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval is not required; only secondary data will be used. This  
43 protocol is registered on the Open Science Framework ([osf.io/a78et](https://osf.io/a78et)). The results will be disseminated  
44 through publication in a scientific journal and will be used to inform drone field campaigns in the  
45 Wellcome Trust funded HARMONIZE project. HARMONIZE aims to develop cost-effective and  
46 reproducible digital infrastructure for stakeholders in climate change hotspots in Latin America & the  
47 Caribbean and will use drone technology to collect data on fine scale landscape changes.

48

49

## 50 Introduction

51 Drones (definition in S1 File), also referred to as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or remotely piloted  
52 aerial systems (RPAS), have been taken up by civil society at an exponential rate over the past decade  
53 due to their high mobility, low costs, and high endurance for multiple tasks. Whilst initially developed  
54 for military use, drones have since been adopted for agriculture, commerce, humanitarian aid and  
55 disaster response, and more recently public health research. Within research applications, drone use  
56 can be roughly divided into two main categories: transportation/delivery and environmental  
57 monitoring (definition in S1 File). An example of transport/delivery is a study examining the feasibility  
58 of transporting medicine or blood products to remote health facilities [1]. Another example is using  
59 drones to deliver interventions for vector control (e.g., the release of *Wolbachia*-carrying mosquitoes  
60 or sterile insects, adulticide spraying, and larvicide delivery) [2,3]. These activities are characterised  
61 by linear flights between points and moving objects into or out of a location. Contrastingly,  
62 environmental monitoring does not involve any physical interaction with the environment but  
63 remotely records information about a phenomenon, area, or research subject. This includes activities  
64 such as recording multispectral imagery, taking air samples, and recording meteorological variables  
65 [4,5]. Flights are recorded over a study area by manually controlling the drone or programming pre-  
66 planned flights. Depending on the research aim, the same area may be covered repeatedly. This can  
67 raise concerns among local communities residing in the area.

68  
69 Emerging technologies are often accompanied by a vacuum of policy and ethical regulations [6]. In the  
70 case of drone use, several ethical themes have already been identified within humanitarian settings  
71 [7]. However, drone use for scientific research comes with its own set of challenges. In research  
72 settings, there is more time to assess ethical aspects and to engage with local communities before  
73 drone deployment than in humanitarian settings. Furthermore, the balance of ethical benefits and  
74 harms is likely different for research compared to humanitarian settings. While in humanitarian

75 settings rapid response time to protect people from physical harm may take precedence over  
76 perceived psychological safety or privacy of individuals, such trade-offs do not need to be made in a  
77 research setting.

78

79 Fig 1 illustrates the process through which ethical guidance within the research community is created  
80 and updated. In the context of drone use for remote sampling, this entails 1) creating a theoretical  
81 understanding of drone technology within research and corresponding ethical considerations, 2) the  
82 creation of ethical guidelines by institutions, which are then 3) applied by researchers when designing  
83 a new study, followed by 4) an assessment of the study by an ethical committee for approval, after  
84 which 5) the study is implemented in line with appropriate ethical practice which could involve  
85 mention of specific community engagement activities. When new ethical questions, information, or  
86 best practices are identified during the study, they will then contribute to further understanding of 1)  
87 theoretical ethical considerations.

88

89 **Fig 1. Five stages of the iterative research process during which ethical considerations are relevant.**

90 Each of these stages represent a moment during the research process where the researcher could  
91 reflect on how to incorporate ethics in their study. Knowledge and experience gained during each of  
92 the stages will inform the next stage, ultimately leading to improved ethical decision-making.

93

94 Ethical considerations can differ according to the perspectives of the stakeholders involved in the  
95 research process. We identify three main types of stakeholders: local communities, researchers, and  
96 institutions responsible for upholding ethical standards (universities, funders, non-governmental  
97 organisations [NGOs]). In this scoping review, we consider these perspectives to synthesise evidence  
98 on the ethical considerations in drone use for environment and health research. A definition of ethical  
99 considerations for the purpose of this scoping review can be found in the S1 File.

100

101 What the research community defines as ethical considerations within environmental and health  
102 research are rooted in the four bioethical principles of 1) respect for autonomy, 2) nonmaleficence, 3)  
103 beneficence, and 4) justice proposed and continuously developed by Beauchamp and Childress [8].  
104 Since then, other frameworks to analyse aspects related to ethics have been produced to  
105 accommodate new scientific discoveries and ways of thinking. The development of the ethical, legal  
106 and social aspects (ELSA) or issues (ELSI) framework as part of the Human Genome Project, was  
107 adapted to include considerations specific to emerging technologies and identifies eleven domains (S1  
108 File) [9]. The Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is broader than the more evaluative approach  
109 of ELSI and has a greater focus on the interaction between science and society. RRI can be described  
110 as "a transparent, interactive process by which societal actors and innovators become mutually  
111 responsive to each other with a view to the (ethical) acceptability, sustainability and societal  
112 desirability of the innovation process and its marketable products (to allow a proper embedding of  
113 scientific and technological advances in our society)" [9,10]. The RRI is implemented considering 5 key  
114 areas: 1) gender equality, 2) open access, 3) citizen engagement, 4) science education, and 5) ethics.  
115 Citizen engagement and ethics are of particular interest in the context of drone use.

116  
117 Although ethical frameworks have been used to analyse evidence gathered on drone use within  
118 healthcare and humanitarian settings, the same has not been done for drone use within  
119 environmental and health research [7,11]. Cawthorne *et al.*, in their review on the use of drones in a  
120 healthcare setting, used the four bioethical principles and added a fifth principle from the field of  
121 artificial intelligence; explicability [12]. Wang *et al.* based the analysis in their scoping review for drone  
122 use in humanitarian settings on the ELSI principles (S1 File) which they incorporated in a value-  
123 sensitivity framework for the University of Zurich's ethical guidelines for humanitarian drone use in  
124 collaboration with the Red Cross [13]. To our best knowledge, there is no unified set of publicly  
125 available guidelines for the use of drones for environment and health research.

126

127 While ethical dilemmas may arise during each of the research stages (Fig 1), not all information arising  
128 from these processes is documented or made publicly available. In this scoping review, we will  
129 therefore focus on the Research Implementation stage, as well as mapping which Ethical Guidelines  
130 incorporate drone use and are publicly available. Information emerging from the Research  
131 Implementation stage will likely include data from qualitative studies directly giving insight into  
132 community perceptions or that have ethical considerations as the research topic. Data from (likely  
133 quantitative) studies that do not have research ethics as the direct topic, but that make use of drones  
134 for environmental monitoring and describe interactions with the community or ethical considerations  
135 are also of interest.

136

137 This approach will enable us to compare and reflect on publicly available guidelines in the context of  
138 findings from original research reporting on the experiences of communities and researchers involved  
139 in drone research. Here, only the application of drones for environmental monitoring will be  
140 considered as this evokes different interactions with local communities and consequently different  
141 ethical considerations than drone use for transport/delivery. The results of this work can support  
142 researchers planning or currently conducting studies using drones for environmental monitoring,  
143 ethics committee members, and research institutions or NGOs aiming to provide ethical guidance.

144

## 145 **Rationale**

146 There is a need to describe evidence available on current research ethical practices regarding  
147 interactions between researchers and local communities, on how drone use is perceived by these  
148 communities, as well as existing ethical guidelines to identify best practices and ethical concerns that  
149 have remained unaddressed in research using drones for environmental monitoring.

150

## 151 **PCC**

152 **Population:** 1) Local communities inhabiting research areas where drones are used for  
153 environmental monitoring. 2) Researchers conducting drones for environmental monitoring. 3)  
154 Institutions issuing ethical guidance within environmental and health research.

155 **Concept:** Ethical practice relating to the interaction between drone research activities and local  
156 communities. Specifically, local communities' perceptions, experiences, and opinions concerning the  
157 use of drones in research in their territories.

158 **Context:** Using drones for environmental monitoring within environment and health research in  
159 populated areas.

160

## 161 **Research aim**

162 **Research aim:** Summarise all evidence available on ethical considerations surrounding drone use  
163 within environmental and health research.

164

165 This will be addressed by summarising three types of evidence, that correspond to the stakeholders'  
166 perspectives, through the following sub-questions:

- 167 ● What are the perceptions, experiences and views of local communities related to drones  
168 used for environmental monitoring? (qualitative studies and questionnaires)
- 169 ● How do researchers using drones for environmental monitoring currently interact with local  
170 communities and how is this documented? (case or implementation studies)
- 171 ● What ethical guidelines exist to inform the design and implementation of studies using  
172 drones for environmental monitoring? (ethical guidelines)

## 173 **Materials and methods**

### 174 **Search strategy**

175 The academic literature search will be conducted using the following databases: EBSCO Medline  
176 Complete, SCOPUS, Web of Science (WoS), Global Health Database, and the Virtual Health Library  
177 (VHL) Regional Portal. A primary search is developed for Ebsco Medline Complete in collaboration with  
178 an information specialist (AD), based on three core concepts - “drone(s)”, “environmental monitoring”  
179 and “ethical considerations” or “community perceptions” - described in Table 1 and S1 File and  
180 informed by Wang *et al.*’s search strategy [7]. A combination of free-text terms and Medical Subject  
181 Headings (MeSH) will be used. This strategy will be peer-reviewed by a second information specialist  
182 (ADS) and adapted for the other databases. Following the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies  
183 (PRESS) 2015 guidelines, the search will be peer-reviewed by an information specialist [14]. Reference  
184 lists of relevant articles will be checked to identify further literature meeting the inclusion criteria and  
185 Google Scholar will be used to carry out forward and backward citation searching. No time restrictions  
186 will be applied to the search: all articles from the inception of the searched databases to the date of  
187 the literature search will be included. If full-text articles are unavailable, the corresponding authors  
188 will be contacted to request access via e-mail or ResearchGate. No initial language restrictions will be  
189 imposed. Sources in Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, and English will be processed by native speakers from  
190 the author list. For data extraction from other language sources, translation to English will be  
191 attempted via freely available online resources such as Google Translate.

192

193 **Table 1. Core concepts and search terms for the primary search strategy developed for Ebsco**

194 **Medline Complete.**

Core concept	Search terms
Drone	(drone* OR UAV* OR UAS* OR Unmanned Aerial Devices (MH)) OR ((unmanned OR uncrewed) AND ("aerial vehicle*" OR "air vehicle*" OR "aerial system*" OR "aerial device*" OR aircraft))



Environmental monitoring	"remote* sens*" OR data OR image* OR photograph* OR map* OR surveillance OR survey* OR monitor* OR Remote Sensing Technology (MH) OR Environmental Monitoring (MH) OR Environmental Indicators (MH) OR Data Collection (MH) OR Population Surveillance (MH)
Community perceptions or ethical considerations	(community OR public) AND (perception* OR aware* OR engag* OR participat* OR accept* OR involve* OR concern OR cooperat* OR support* OR response* OR view* OR consent OR compliance)) OR ethic* OR "social impact*" OR "societal impact" OR privacy OR confidential* OR Ethics (MH) OR Community Participation (MH) OR Cooperative Behaviour (MH) OR Informed Consent (MH) OR Privacy (MH) OR Confidentiality (MH) OR Research Subjects (MH) OR "code of conduct" OR "code of ethics" OR "ethics code"

195 (MH) = Medical Subject Heading (MeSH), a controlled and hierarchically organized vocabulary produced  
 196 by the National Library of Medicine.

197

198 For each database, the search terms, number of papers retrieved, and date of collection will be  
 199 reported, as depicted in Table 2.

200

201 **Table 2. Template for data table to report retrieved search results.**

Database	Search terms	Number of papers	Date

202

203 The authors will undertake searches of the grey literature using Google Advanced Search and the grey  
 204 literature databases such as the Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE). Search terms will be

205 iteratively adapted from Table 1, PDF and Word file types will be targeted and only the first 5 pages  
206 of results are included. After the general screening, using a method similar to forward citation  
207 searching, a list of websites and organisations that are deemed to do relevant work involving drones  
208 in a health or environment research setting will be compiled. This will include non-governmental  
209 organizations (NGOs), international organisations, universities, aviation authorities, research funders,  
210 and research institutions. Examples include UNICEF, International Committee of the Red Cross,  
211 University of Zurich, UK Civil Aviation Authority, and World Health Organisation. Using Google  
212 Advanced Search, the web domains of these organisations will be searched. These repositories will  
213 not be searched, but non-published theses will be included if they show up through the grey literature  
214 search and fit the inclusion criteria.

215

## 216 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

217 Table 3 describes the inclusion and exclusion criteria that will be used for abstract and title and full-  
218 text screening.

219

220 **Table 3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria.**

	<b>Inclusion criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion criteria</b>
1	Drones used for research purposes	Recreational, commercial, military, or humanitarian use
2	Focus of the study is on drones to collect environmental monitoring data	Drones were used for other purposes such as transport, tracking, etc.
3	Location of drones deployed involves human populations	Studies implemented in uninhabited areas

4	Document mentions interactions between researchers and communities and/or ethical considerations, concerns, or views related to drone use	No interactions between researchers and the community are described or ethical considerations are not discussed
5	Academic literature including: quantitative studies (e.g., cross-sectional, cohort, case-control), qualitative studies (e.g., action research, ethnographic, phenomenological, case), mixed-method studies, perspective papers	Conference abstracts or studies with no full-text available (after reaching out to the corresponding author by email or Researchgate)
6	Grey literature issued by research institutions, research funding agencies, regional, local and national governmental bodies, multilateral organisations, and non-governmental organisations, theses	Forms of grey literature such as blogs, podcasts, news stories, social media posts
7	Most current version of the document	Document was a draft, has not been officially released, or has been replaced with another document published later
8	Primary research articles and originally written grey literature.	Studies with a secondary study design that reported on data already included in another study. For example, systematic reviews and other summaries or synthesis of primary

		articles and originally written pieces .
9	Ethical guidelines collated in such a way that they comprise of a unique perspective by the primary author with original details (even if based on previously constructed principles)	Ethical guidelines that are duplicated from another original source (indicated by reference, or time of publication).
10	Records in any language. If the original language is not English, the record will be assigned to a native speaker within the team. If no native speaker is available, online translation services will be used.	If translations are ambiguous or assessed to be of poor quality, the record will be excluded.

221

222 Pilot testing of the inclusion and exclusion criteria will be conducted by: 1) double-screening a random  
223 sample of 50 records (25 academic and 25 grey literature), and 2) assessing resulting conflicts and  
224 clarifying inclusion and exclusion criteria if deemed necessary. This process will be repeated until an  
225 inter-rater reliability of 90% is reached.

226

## 227 **Evidence selection**

228 After removing duplicates within Zotero, records are imported into Ryyan (<https://rayyan.ai/>) and  
229 double-screened by two independent researchers [15]. One researcher is Brazilian and based at the  
230 Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz) with experience in Geography, Environment and Health research,  
231 whilst the other is Dutch and based at the Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC) in Spain with field  
232 experience using drones in Malawi.

233

234 The first screening round will be based on titles and abstracts following the inclusion and exclusion  
235 criteria. The second screening round will focus on the full-texts. For grey literature, the first round is  
236 based on the title and summary (where available) or the first page of the document. After completion  
237 of the round, results are compared, and conflicts are discussed until a consensus between the two  
238 researchers is reached. If a consensus cannot be reached a third arbitrator will make the decision.

239

240 The number of full-text sources excluded and reasons for exclusion are tracked and reported through  
241 a flowchart of the review process, in line with the PRISMA guidelines [16].

242

## 243 **Data charting**

244 We expect to retrieve studies and reports that include both qualitative and quantitative data, as well  
245 as ethical guidelines. Whereas some records will likely have ethical practices and/or considerations as  
246 the direct research topic, we also expect to retrieve studies that use drones and only partially describe  
247 their ethical considerations and practices. It is also expected that the degree to which drones are the  
248 focus will differ between ethical guidelines.

249

250 Data will be independently extracted by two researchers from all eligible evidence. An extraction sheet  
251 will be jointly developed, and pilot tested by two researchers on 5 records. Iterative improvements  
252 are made until both reviewers agree the tool captures the information well.

253

254 The following information will be extracted from each included record (where relevant and available):

255

256 ● Bibliographic information (authors / organisation, year of publication, title, country of origin  
257 of the first author and last author)

258 ● Type of literature (journal article, pre-prints, thesis, dissertation, report, guideline, etc.)

- 259 ● Study design (qualitative studies (e.g., case study, action research, ethnographic, grounded
- 260 theory), quantitative studies (e.g., cross-sectional, prospective or retrospective cohort, case
- 261 control), other)
- 262 ● Dominant perspective of the source (researcher, local community, institution issuing
- 263 guidance)
- 264 ● Study aims and objectives
- 265 ● Characteristics of the study population (e.g., age, sex) in which the drone is deployed
- 266 ● Geographical location (i.e., territory, country, region) in which the research was conducted
- 267 ● Land use and cover (agricultural / built up / grassland / savanna / rainforest, etc.)
- 268 ● Type of data collected by drone
- 269 ● Drone model
- 270 ● Flight plan (altitude, coverage, pattern, planned/manual etc. )
- 271 ● Dates the study was conducted, and follow-up period
- 272 ● Main outcome(s) (i.e., ethical considerations)
- 273 ● Main finding(s) (main findings regarding ethical research practices and community
- 274 engagement strategies; community perceptions)
- 275 ● If ethical approval was sought (yes/no)
- 276 ● Type of interaction with the community (interviews, focus groups, other types of
- 277 participatory methodologies and community engagement strategies)
- 278 ● Mention theory related to ethics (yes/no)
- 279 ● If mentioned, which ethics-related theories or frameworks are used
- 280 ● Ethical considerations mentioned (implicit/explicit/none)

281

282 Disagreements will be resolved through consensus between two researchers. If a consensus is not  
283 reached, a third arbiter will be involved.

284

## 285 **Analysis of the evidence and presentation of the results**

286 Data summaries, maps and graphs will be produced for quantitative results for each main type of  
287 evidence i) community perceptions, ii) current ethical research practices with a focus on community  
288 engagement, and iii) ethical guidelines, based on the results from the data extraction tool.

289

290 A content analysis will be conducted to identify patterns of categories or terms used to describe ethical  
291 considerations related to drone use for environmental monitoring in the literature. The content  
292 analysis will synthesise themes around i) community perceptions, ii) current ethical research and  
293 community engagement practices, and iii) ethical guidelines concerning the use of drones for  
294 environmental monitoring in environment and health research. We will also identify the theoretical  
295 approaches from the field of ethics used in these studies. Two researchers will independently use  
296 inductive analysis to generate and agree on a codebook. The R Package RQDA version 0.2-8 will be  
297 used to code the qualitative evidence into categories and format it for further analysis [17]. The results  
298 will be presented in a narrative synthesis, supplemented with thematic maps, tables, and graphs with  
299 descriptive statistics on included studies and their outcome.

300

## 301 **Ethics and dissemination**

302 Ethical approval is not required for this study, no original patient or participant data will be collected.

303 The authors plan on publishing the Zotero repository of the search and screening results via the Open

304 Science Framework (OSF). The results of the study will be published in a peer-reviewed scientific

305 journal.

306

## 307 **Changes to the protocol**

308 The heterogeneous nature of the evidence base may cause a need to adapt the methodology as new  
309 themes or sources of evidence emerge. All deviations and refinements made to the protocol will be  
310 reported in the published scoping review.

311

## 312 **Acknowledgements**

313 Conceptualisation: RHS, BD, CC, RL

314 Methodology: RHS, BD, KvD, AD, ADS, CC, RL

315 Writing - Original Draft, RHS, BD

316 Writing - Review & Editing: KvD, RML, MSV, GCE, CC, RL

317 Visualisation: RHS

318 Supervision: CC, RL

319 Funding acquisition: RL, GCE, MSV, CC

320

## 321 **References**

- 322 1. Nisingizwe MP, Ndishimye P, Swaibu K, Nshimiyimana L, Karame P, Dushimiyimana V, et al.  
323 Effect of unmanned aerial vehicle (drone) delivery on blood product delivery time and wastage  
324 in Rwanda: a retrospective, cross-sectional study and time series analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*.  
325 2022 Apr 1;10(4):e564–9.
- 326 2. Carrasco-Escobar G, Moreno M, Fornace K, Herrera-Varela M, Manrique E, Conn JE. The use of  
327 drones for mosquito surveillance and control. *Parasit Vectors*. 2022 Dec 16;15(1):473.
- 328 3. Mechan F, Bartonicek Z, Malone D, Lees RS. Unmanned aerial vehicles for surveillance and  
329 control of vectors of malaria and other vector-borne diseases. *Malar J*. 2023 Jan 20;22(1):23.
- 330 4. Stanton MC, Kalonde P, Zembere K, Hoek Spaans R, Jones CM. The application of drones for  
331 mosquito larval habitat identification in rural environments: a practical approach for malaria  
332 control? *Malar J*. 2021 May 31;20(1):244.



- 333 5. Gallacher D. Drone Applications for Environmental Management in Urban Spaces: A Review. *Int*  
334 *J Sustain Land Use Urban Plan.* 2017 Feb 1;3.
- 335 6. Moor JH. Why We Need Better Ethics for Emerging Technologies. *Ethics Inf Technol.* 2005 Sep  
336 1;7(3):111–9.
- 337 7. Wang N, Christen M, Hunt M. Ethical Considerations Associated with “Humanitarian Drones”: A  
338 Scoping Literature Review. *Sci Eng Ethics.* 2021 Aug 3;27(4):51.
- 339 8. Beauchamp T, Childress J. *Principles of biomedical ethics.* 7th ed. New York, NY: Oxford  
340 University Press; 2013.
- 341 9. von Schomberg R. A Vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In: *Responsible Innovation*  
342 [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2013 [cited 2023 Feb 14]. p. 51–74. Available from:  
343 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118551424.ch3>
- 344 10. Directorate-General for Research and Innovation (European Commission), Schomberg R von.  
345 *Towards responsible research and innovation in the information and communication*  
346 *technologies and security technologies fields* [Internet]. LU: Publications Office of the European  
347 Union; 2011 [cited 2023 Mar 30]. Available from: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/58723>
- 348 11. Cawthorne D, Robbins-van Wynsberghe A. An Ethical Framework for the Design, Development,  
349 Implementation, and Assessment of Drones Used in Public Healthcare. *Sci Eng Ethics.* 2020 Oct  
350 1;26(5):2867–91.
- 351 12. Floridi L, Cowls J, Beltrametti M, Chatila R, Chazerand P, Dignum V, et al. AI4People—An Ethical  
352 Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations. *Minds*  
353 *Mach.* 2018 Dec 1;28(4):689–707.
- 354 13. Wang N, Christen M, Hunt M, Biller-Andorno N. Supporting value sensitivity in the humanitarian  
355 use of drones through an ethics assessment framework. *Int Rev Red Cross.* 2022  
356 Apr;104(919):1397–428.
- 357 14. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS Peer Review of  
358 Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2016 Jul 1;75:40–6.

- 359 15. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for  
360 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016 Dec 5;5(1):210.
- 361 16. Tricco A, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K, Straus S. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-  
362 ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet]. 2018 Oct 2 [cited 2023 Mar  
363 31];169(7). Available from: [https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/M18-](https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/M18-0850?rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed&url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org)  
364 [0850?rfr\\_dat=cr\\_pub++0pubmed&url\\_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr\\_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org](https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/M18-0850?rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed&url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org)
- 365 17. HUANG R. RQDA: R-based Qualitative Data Analysis [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2023 Mar 31].  
366 Available from: <http://rqda.r-forge.r-project.org/>
- 367 18. European Union. COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2019/ 947 of 24  
368 May 2019 on the rules and procedures for the operation of unmanned aircraft [Internet].  
369 2019/947 2019. Available from: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019R0947&rid=9)  
370 [content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019R0947&rid=9](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019R0947&rid=9)
- 371 19. Asadzadeh S, de Oliveira WJ, de Souza Filho CR. UAV-based remote sensing for the petroleum  
372 industry and environmental monitoring: State-of-the-art and perspectives. *Sci Direct* [Internet].  
373 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 31];208(D). Available from:  
374 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0920410521012675>
- 375 20. Hassanalian M, Abdelkefi A. Classifications, applications, and design challenges of drones: A  
376 review. *Prog Aersp Sci*. 2017 May 1;91:99–131.

377

## 378 **Supporting information**

379 **S1 File. Definitions of the key concepts and ELSI principles used by Wang *et al.*.**

380 **S2 File. PRISMA-ScR checklist**



Figure1