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Diagnoses of HIV Infection and Population by Race/Ethnicity, 2011—United States

Diagnoses of HIV infection
N = 49,273

- American Indian/Alaska Native: 21%
- Asian: 2%
- Black/African American: 47%
- Hispanic/Latino\(^a\): 28%
- Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander: <1%
- Multiple races: 2%
- Population, United States
N = 311,591,917

- White: 63%
- Hispanic/Latino\(^a\): 17%
- Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander: 5%
- Black/African American: 1%
- Asian: 2%
- American Indian/Alaska Native: <1%
- Multiple races: 1%

Note. Data include persons with a diagnosis of HIV infection regardless of stage of disease at diagnosis. All displayed data have been statistically adjusted to account for reporting delays, but not for incomplete reporting.

\(^a\) Hispanics/Latinos can be of any race.
Trends in Age-Adjusted* Annual Rates of Death due to HIV Infection by Race/Ethnicity, United States, 1990–2010

Note: For comparison with data for 1999 and later years, data for 1990–1998 were modified to account for ICD-10 rules instead of ICD-9 rules.
*Standard: age distribution of 2000 US population
** Hispanics/Latinos can be of any race.
Underrepresentation of Minorities in HIV/AIDS Research

Giffords et al., 2002. Nationally representative data from the HIV Cost and Services Utilization Study (n=2864; 1996-1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proportion of total receiving HIV Care</th>
<th>Proportion of total AIDS cases</th>
<th>Proportion of total in HIV Med Trials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of HIV+ individuals who had ever participated in HIV clinical research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, NH</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequences of Underrepresentation

• Limits to external validity of research
• Unequal opportunity for benefits

• In 1994, the NIH established guidelines mandating inclusion of women and minorities in epidemiologic and clinical studies
Reasons for Non-Participation in HIV Research

- Believing they do not qualify
- Distance from research environment/transportation limitations
- Not wanting to be a “guinea pig”
- Mistrust of researchers (perception that the informed consent process is primarily to protect physicians and hospitals)
- Feeling too sick to participate
- Language and literacy barriers (difficulty in understanding consent form terminology)
- No guarantee of being in the treatment arm
- Too much of a hassle
- Not in care

#1 Reason: Lack of knowledge/not being invited to participate
  - Provider bias in referring racial/ethnic minorities to studies
  - Minority Individuals DO want to participate – however, barriers and preferences need to be addressed
Community/Social Endorsement Approaches to Increase Minority Research Enrollment

- CBPR
- Buy-in/endorsement from community leaders
- Snowball sampling
- Minority research team members
Cost/Benefits of Research Participation

Costs

- Time/effort
- Burden of complex or difficult to understand procedures
- Risks
  - Side effects of treatment
  - Loss of dignity
  - Loss of privacy

Benefits

- Receiving services or treatment
- Monetary compensation
- Making a contribution to society
Data Collection Modalities

• Computer-assisted data collection technologies (tablets, CASI, A-CASI)
  + Maximizes privacy
  + Reduces data entry effort and error
  + A-CASI addresses literacy limitations
  - Intimidating/impersonal

• Paper questionnaires
  + Convenient and low cost
  - Risk of disengagement

• Face to face interview
  + Personal
  - Expensive
  - Risk of social acceptability bias
Aims of the Study

• Among adults living with HIV,
  – Describe the importance of cost/benefit and community/social endorsement factors when deciding whether to participate in a research study
  – Describe their comfort with three data collection modalities: face-to-face interview, paper survey and private computer screen
  – Examine whether the decision factors and comfort with the data collection modalities are related to participant characteristics (ethnicity, gender, age, education, or first-time study participation)
Methods

• Secondary analysis from a cross-sectional study

• Participants were 453 English-speaking adults living with HIV and attending two large HIV primary care clinics in Miami-Dade County Florida

• Study staff approached every third person that checked in for HIV health care services

• $10 compensation

• IRB approved
Participant Characteristics

- 57% Male
- 60% African American
- 35% Hispanic
- Mean age = 45.97 years ($SD = 9.17$)
- 75% unemployed
- 64% with high school education
  - Hispanics and Whites were more likely to have high school education than African Americans

- Time since HIV diagnosis
  - 57% more than 10 years
  - 21% 5-10 years
  - 17% 1-5 years before
  - 5% less 1 year
- 90% taking HIV medications
- 70% with previous research experience
## Measure: Decision Factors

How important are the following when you are deciding whether or not to participate in a research study: Not important (1), important (2) or absolutely important (3)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. being sure about the confidentiality of your information*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. understanding what the study is all about*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. that the study is not much of a hassle*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. receiving a benefit from the study (for example, services, information, treatment)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. society benefiting from the study*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. being treated with respect*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. someone you know participating in the study**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. someone similar to you working in the study**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. a leader in your community (for example, a pastor or a teacher) approving of the study**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. your health provider approving of the study**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Factor 1: Cost/Benefits, α = .88  
**Factor 2: Community/Social Endorsement, α = .93.
If you were being asked very personal questions in a research study (for example about HIV, sex, or drug use) how comfortable would you be answering,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>A little uncomfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. face to face with an interviewer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. on a paper questionnaire that you fill out yourself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. in private, on a computer screen while hearing the questions read to you on earphones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Importance of Research Participation
Decision Factors

• Cost/benefit, $M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.46$, rated as more important than community/social endorsement, $M = 2.11$, $SD = 0.70$.

• Cost/benefit items rated as “absolutely important” by the majority of participants,
  – confidentiality of information (66%)
  – being treated with respect (63%)
  – understanding the study (57%)
  – societal benefit (53%)

• Community/social endorsement item most often rated as absolutely important:
  – that a health provider approved of the study (44%)
## Results: Comfort with Data Collection Modalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort with Format</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>A little uncomfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td>11 2%</td>
<td>19 4%</td>
<td>423 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>18 4%</td>
<td>73 16%</td>
<td>361 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>73 16%</td>
<td>60 13%</td>
<td>319 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Importance of Decision Factors by Participant Characteristics

- Logistic regressions
- No differences by ethnicity, age or education
- Participants in their first study,
  - less likely to say cost/benefits were important, $B = -0.47$, $SE = 0.21$, $p = .025$, $OR = 0.63$.
  - less likely to say community/social endorsement was important, $B = -0.60$, $SE = 0.23$, $p = .008$, $OR = 0.5$. 
Results: Comfort with Data Collection Modalities by Participant Characteristics

• Ethnicity unrelated to preference
• Older age associated with greater preference for face-to-face interviews, $B = 0.78$, $SE = 0.21$, $p < .001$, OR = 2.18,
  – every ten additional years of age related to more than twice the odds for preferring a face-to-face interview
• High school grads vs non-grads,
  – more likely to prefer paper survey, $B = 0.65$, $SE = 0.25$, $p = .008$, OR = 1.91
  – more likely to prefer a private computer screen, $B = 0.44$, $SE = 0.22$, $p = .044$, OR = 1.55
• Participants in their first study less likely to prefer face-to-face interviews, $B = -0.82$, $SE = 0.40$, $p = .041$, OR = 0.44 than those with previous experience
Take Home Points

• No ethnicity or gender differences
• Cost/benefits
  – Confidentiality and R-E-S-P-E-C-T are key
  – Altruism as a motivational factor
• Social/community endorsement
  – Health care providers carry a lot of clout
  – Are they informing their minority patients? – This is the #1 barrier
• Data collection modalities
  – More people uncomfortable with computer, especially older and less educated
  – Need to balance respect and need for privacy: provide extra assistance and personal touch if using A-CASI
Limitations

- Hispanics limited to English-speakers
- Limited to 2 sites in 1 city
- Instruments not previously validated
- Research refusers not included
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