

1 **Too much information? Asian Americans' preferences for incidental brain MRI findings**

2 Karthik Kota, MD MPH,^{1,2} Alice Dawson, MS, MA,^{1,3} Julia Papas,^{1,3} Victor Sotelo,^{1,3} Guibin Su, MD,³ Mei-
3 Ling Li, PhD,³ Woowon Lee,³ Jaunis Estervil, MD,³ Melissa Marquez,³ Shromona Sarkar,³ Lisa Lanza
4 Lopez, PhD,³ William T. Hu, MD, PhD, FAAN^{1,3}

5 Departments of ¹Neurology and ²Medicine, Rutgers-Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, and ³Center
6 for Healthy Aging, Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research, Rutgers Biomedical and
7 Health Sciences, New Brunswick, NJ, 08901.

8

9 **Title character count:** 85

10 **Abstract word count:** 288

11 **Word count:** 3399

12 **References:** 50

13 **Tables:** 3

14 **Figures:** 3

15

16 **Conflicts:** WTH has patents on CSF-based diagnosis of FTLTD-TDP, prognosis of mild cognitive impairment
17 due to Alzheimer's disease, and prognosis of spinal muscular atrophy treatment; has consulted for
18 Biogen, Fujirebio Diagnostics, and Roche.

19 **Corresponding author:**

20 William T. Hu, MD, PhD, FAAN
21 Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences
22 112 Paterson Street, Room 462
23 New Brunswick, NJ 08901
24 Email: William.hu@rutgers.edu
25 Phone: 732-882-8594

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **INTRODUCTION:** South Asian (SA) and East Asian (EA) older adults represent the fastest growing group
3 of Americans at risk for dementia, but their participation in aging and dementia research has been
4 limited. While recruiting healthy SA older adults into a brain health study, we encountered unexpected
5 hesitancy towards structural brain MRI analysis along with some stigmatizing attitudes related to
6 internal locus of control (LoC) for future dementia risks. We hypothesized that support for MRI-related
7 research was influenced by these attitudes as well as one's own MRI experience, perceived MRI safety,
8 and concerns for one's own risks for future dementia/stroke.

9 **METHODS:** We developed a brief cross-sectional survey to assess older adults' MRI experiences and
10 perceptions, desire to learn of six incidental findings of increasing health implications, and attitudes
11 related to dementia as well as research participation. We recruited a convenience sample of 256
12 respondents (74% reporting as 50+) from the New Jersey/New York City area to complete the survey,
13 and modeled the proportional odds (P.O.) for pro-research attitudes.

14 **RESULTS:** 77 SA and 84 EA respondents were analyzed with 95 non-Asian adults. White (P.O.=2.54,
15 $p=0.013$) and EA (P.O.=2.14, $p=0.019$) respondents were both more likely than SA respondents to
16 endorse healthy volunteers' participation in research, and the difference between White and SA
17 respondents was mediated by the latter's greater internal LoC for dementia risks. EA respondents had
18 more worries for future dementia/stroke than SA respondents ($p=0.006$), but still shared SA
19 respondents' low desire to learn of incidental MRI findings.

20 **DISCUSSION:** SA and EA older adults had different attitudes towards future dementia/stroke risks, but
21 shared a low desire to learn of incidental MRI findings. A culturally-appropriate protocol to disclose
22 incidental MRI findings may improve SA and EA participation in brain health research.

23

24 **KEYWORDS:** race/ethnicity; Asian; South Asian; East Asian; neuroimaging; MRI; incidental findings;
25 disclosure / ethics; clinical neurology; cognition; dementia; aged; immigrants; surveys and
26 questionnaires; informed consent / ethics

27

28 Color printing: Please have figure one and two be in color; figure three is in black and white

29 Abbreviations: East Asian (EA), South Asian (SA), Locus of Control (LoC), Principal Component Analysis
30 (PCA), Principal Component (PC)

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Asian Americans represent the fastest growing racial group in the U.S., nearly doubling in number from
3 2000 to 2019. Asian Americans report ancestry from East Asia, the Indian Subcontinent (South Asia),
4 and South East Asia, with over half of older Asian Americans living in California, New York, Texas, New
5 Jersey, and Washington.[1] Health record studies suggest older Asian Americans to have lower
6 prevalence of dementia diagnosis than older White adults,[2] but whether this is due to a difference in
7 dementia risk, detection, or stigma remains controversial.[3] This also contradicts the observation that
8 standardized dementia prevalence is comparable in Asia (5.63% in South to 7.15% in Southeast Asia),
9 Europe (4.65% in Central to 6.67% in Western Europe), and North America (6.77%),[4] but Asian
10 immigrants to the U.S. can differ from their counterparts in Asia according to educational
11 ascertainment,[5] socioeconomic status,[5] and health behaviors.[6] The most common causes of
12 dementia in older Asian Americans are also poorly understood. Among the Asian immigrant groups,
13 South Asian (SA) adults – primarily from India but also Bangladesh, Bhutan, the Maldives, Nepal,
14 Pakistan, and Sri Lanka – are noted in North American studies to have disproportionate atherosclerotic
15 and cardiovascular disease risks.[7] This potentially suggests greater vascular than degenerative
16 contribution to dementia among older SA adults; however, this assumption is complicated by
17 differential genetic risks, acculturation,[8] and greater stroke mortality among all Asian subgroups than
18 White adults.[9] Due to potential family objection to post-mortem neuropathological examination
19 related to religious reasons or knowledge,[10] ante-mortem biomarker studies are most likely to shed
20 insight into etiologies and mechanisms underlying dementia in older SA adults.

21

22 Structural brain MRI is a common clinical and research tool to detect cerebrovascular disease and
23 neurodegeneration. Most discussions have focused on its safety in, rather than acceptability to,

1 participants.[11] This is especially relevant in aging studies, where older adults face serial high field or
2 one-time ultra-high field MRI analysis of increasing duration and complexity for research.[12] One
3 recent study showed aggregated Asian American respondents as likely as other groups to express
4 willingness to undergo research brain MRI,[13] but less is known about disaggregated East Asian (EA)
5 and SA adults' willingness. Limited literature shows low knowledge of the non-radiation nature of MRI
6 in China[14] and nocebo effects of overly clinical MRI reports on patient outcomes in India.[15] How
7 these factors translate to North America remains largely unknown.

8
9 Beyond willingness to participate, incidental findings on brain MRI are identified in 1.7-4.3% of research
10 scans.[16] Disclosure and follow-up of incidental research MRI findings continue to be a relatively
11 under-examined topic,[17-19] with mainstream protocols in the U.S. and U.K. following regulatory
12 guidelines consistent with Western legal and ethical framework.[19-21] At the same time, their cultural
13 relevance may be overlooked when diverse older adults are recruited into aging research. While these
14 cultural factors may get less attention in clinical settings, their impact on research participation and trust
15 in researchers – especially among diverse older adults – remains unexplored.

16
17 In the course of recruiting diverse older adults into a prospective memory and aging study in the New
18 Jersey/New York City (NJ/NYC) area, we encountered significant concerns from potential SA participants
19 about the study's MRI component. Although MRI was previously considered a broadly acceptable non-
20 invasive modality in the U.S. and U.K., prior studies have not included large numbers of older SA
21 adults.[22] To better understand factors associated with MRI avoidance in SA older adults, we
22 developed a short survey to examine past MRI experiences (brain or body); desire to learn of incidental
23 findings on brain MRI; and attitudes towards brain MRI safety, dementia, and research participation.

1 For attitude-related questions, we emphasized several shared beliefs among SA older adults related to
2 focused on fear of future dementia since it is a known risk factor affecting dementia research
3 participation.[23, 24] Locus of control (LoC) refers to the belief that an individual's actions affects their
4 health outcome, and those with a high internal LoC tend to utilize less health care.[25] Relevant to this
5 study, SA adults have been found to participate less in health activities due to self-perceived high
6 LoC.[26] We hypothesized that SA older adults have low prior exposure to MRI, a low wish to learn of
7 incidental MRI findings, the belief that MRI is harmful, and high internal LoC related to brain health,
8 which lead to their low willingness to participate in MRI-related research. Since shared as well as
9 distinct experiences (e.g., immigration) and cultural beliefs among different U.S. Asian ethnic groups
10 shape perception and stigma associated with dementia and brain health,[27] we additionally recruited
11 EA and non-Asian older adults to test this hypothesis.

12

13 **2. Materials and Methods**

14 **2.1 Consent statement**

15 The anonymous MRI survey did not collect protected health information, and the study was considered
16 exempt human subject research by Advarra Institutional Review Board.

17

18 **2.2 Survey**

19 Our cross-sectional MRI survey collected information on racial/ethnic (option to select from Hispanic,
20 White, Black, East Asian [e.g., Chinese, Korean], South Asian, Other with write-in space) and age
21 categories (<50, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, 80+); experience with any or brain MRI (yes, no, not sure);
22 perceived prevalence of incidental findings on brain MRI among healthy people (<5%, 5-10%, 15-25%,

1 >50%); and ten Likert-scale questions on attitudes related to research and brain health, administered via
2 paper (n = 156) and online (n = 100). The two research-related questions were: *“Healthy people do not
3 need to participate in medical research, because there is no direct benefit to them”*; *“After my name is
4 removed from my brain scan, I am comfortable with the idea of scientists [who are not all physicians] I
5 have never met examine the images.”* Brain health-related questions included three on dementia risk
6 factors previously mentioned during community meetings with SA older adults (*“A diet low in meat is
7 effective in preventing Alzheimer’s disease and dementia”*; *“Brain diseases like Alzheimer’s and dementia
8 only happen to people who don’t regularly exercise their brains [e.g., through reading];”* *“Only people
9 with diabetes or strokes will develop dementia”*), two on MRI safety (*“Putting a person in a strong
10 magnetic field cannot cause long-term physical harm”*; *“Putting a person in a strong magnetic field
11 cannot cause long-term mental harm”*), and one each on forgetfulness (*“Forgetting conversations and
12 appointments I don’t care about is a normal part of aging”*), concerns about one’s own future brain
13 health (*“I am afraid that I might have dementia or strokes in the future”*)[28] and dementia-related
14 stigma (*“People with dementia should be separated from society for their and our safety”*) based on
15 their relationships to research participation.[29] Since the meaning of survey-based hypothetical
16 willingness to participate in research has been criticized, we did not include a question on
17 willingness.[30] All statements were examined for wording, clarity, and potential for misinterpretation;
18 piloted in 13 volunteers (seven SA older adults); and revised for clarity (one question). No pilot data
19 were included for subsequent analyses. Surveys were translated into Chinese, Korean, and Spanish
20 through forward and backward translation, followed by proofing by bilingual project scientists fluent in
21 these languages. We did not translate the surveys into SA languages since there were too many to offer
22 equitable representation, and did not have study personnel who were fluent and could guarantee
23 cultural appropriateness and freedom from bias for the surveys. Surveys took three to five minutes to
24 complete.

1

2 **2.3 Participants**

3 A convenience sample of participants was recruited to complete the survey between August 2022 and
4 January 2023. Potential participants were recruited from Rutgers General Internal Medicine Clinic (n=8),
5 Rutgers Neurology Clinic (n=37), community events related to aging and health disparities research
6 (n=64), and direct solicitation through research registries and word-of-mouth referrals (n=147).

7 Participants were eligible if they could read and respond to questions in English, Chinese (simplified or
8 traditional), Korean, and Spanish. We primarily recruited participants who were likely 50 years of age or
9 older. Respondents were told the study's purpose was to "understand attitudes and knowledge about
10 MRI and dementia." Participants were not offered incentives.

11

12 **2.4 Statistical analysis**

13 All statistical analysis was conducted in SPSS 28.0 (IBM-SPSS, Armonk, NY). Differences between groups
14 were analyzed by Chi-squared tests for variables of categorical nature (e.g., race/ethnicity, source of
15 recruitment) or regression analysis (e.g., ordinal for belief that healthy people should volunteer, linear
16 for summary measures). There were 28 EA participants responding in simplified or traditional Chinese,
17 and 13 EA participants responding in Korean. EA responding in Chinese or self-identified Chinese
18 ethnicity (n = 50) and EA responding in Korean or self-identified Korean ethnicity (n = 16) were older
19 than EA respondents who responded in English or did not specify ethnicity (n = 18; median age 60-69 vs.
20 <50), but were otherwise similar in MRI experience and attitudes. We thus analyzed all three
21 subgroups together as one EA group. No participant responded to the Spanish survey. 7 respondents
22 reported Other race/ethnicity, and were excluded from analyses according to race/ethnicity.

1

2 For attitudes related to research, responses to the two Likert-scale questions on research participation
3 were analyzed as dependent variables in ordinal regression models. Models involving five response
4 categories for healthy people as research participants met the parallel regression assumption. Models
5 involving sharing de-identified MRI did not meet the parallel regression assumption when five categories
6 were used, but did meet the assumption with three categories (disagree, neutral, agree), which may
7 reflect effects of extreme answers. Ordinal outcomes involving these three categories were thus used
8 for sharing de-identified MRI. For logistic and ordinal regression, odds ratio (O.R.) and proportional
9 odds (P.O.) are reported with 95% confidence interval (CI).

10

11 For attitudes related to brain health, we performed principal component analysis (PCA) on the eight
12 Likert-scale questions. Principal component (PC) scores were calculated, analyzed across racial/ethnic
13 groups using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), and then analyzed across age categories using ordinal
14 regression analysis. PC scores were also entered into regression models of attitudes on research
15 participation, and PC scores which differed between racial/ethnic groups were additionally entered into
16 mediation analyses.

17

18 For attitudes towards incidental MRI findings (Table 2) and regression-based mediation analysis (Table
19 4), a sample size of 249 (excluding self-identified “Other” respondents) was sufficient to achieve power
20 of 0.91 to detect an effect size of 0.3 at α of 0.05. For comparison of PCs, a sample size of 249 was
21 sufficient to achieve power of 0.88 to detect an effect size of 0.20 at α of 0.05.

22

1 **3. Results**

2 **3.1 MRI experiences and facts**

3 Among 256 respondents, 33%, 30%, 21%, 7%, and 6% identified as EA, SA, White, Black, and Hispanic
4 respectively. 66 (26%) reported age under 50 (Table 1), and Hispanic respondents were younger than SA
5 respondents ($p=0.020$). White respondents were more likely recruited via registries and word-of-mouth
6 referral than non-White respondents (100% vs 67%, $p<0.001$). The respondents were otherwise similar
7 in age and recruitment source.

8
9 There was no difference in perceived prevalence of incidental brain MRI findings ($p=0.320$), with most
10 (76%) over-estimating the prevalence of incidental finding. A minority believed MRI could increase
11 future cancer risks (12.5%; no difference by race/ethnicity, $p=0.226$). Compared to SA respondents,
12 White respondents were more likely to have had any MRI (OR 2.91, 95% CI 1.29-6.58, adjusting for age
13 and referral source; Table 1) or brain MRI (OR 3.82, 95% CI 2.20-6.62; Table 1).

14

15 **3.2 Incidental findings on brain MRI**

16 Most respondents (229/249, 92%) wished to learn about one or more incidental findings on their own
17 brain MRI. SA and EA respondents expressed the lowest, while White respondents expressed the
18 highest, desire to be informed of six incidental brain MRI findings (Fig 1). The greatest differences
19 existed in benign as well as serious incidental findings. Relative to SA respondents, wishing to be
20 informed of more incidental brain MRI findings was associated with White race ($B=1.28$, 95% CI 0.53-
21 1.92, $p<0.001$) but not EA ethnicity. Age and recruitment site did not influence the desire to learn
22 additional incidental findings.

1

2 Of note, 35% of respondents did not wish to learn of serious MRI findings with effective treatments, and
3 52% did not wish to learn of uncertain findings requiring further testing.

4

5 **3.3 Attitudes towards research participation, dementia, and MRI**

6 208 participants (81%) provided complete responses to the ten Likert-scale questions. Concerning
7 research participation, 139 (67%) disagreed with the statement *“Healthy people do not need to*
8 *participate in medical research, because there is no direct benefit to them”* (Table 1, Research Q1),
9 possibly reflecting the convenient nature of this cohort. Similarly, 115 (55%) agreed with the statement
10 *“After my name is removed from my brain scan, I am comfortable with the idea of scientists (who are not*
11 *all physicians) I have never met examine the images”* (Table 1, Research Q2). Compared to SA
12 respondents, White respondents were more likely to believe healthy people should volunteer
13 (P.O.=2.54, 95% CI 1.22-5.32, p=0.013) and share de-identified MRI for research (P.O.=2.33, 95% CI 1.45-
14 3.74, p<0.001; adjusting for age). EA respondents also were more likely than SA respondents to believe
15 healthy people should volunteer (P.O.=2.14 95% CI 1.13-4.05, p=0.019).

16

17 For the remaining Likert scale questions on attitudes related to brain health (Fig 2), PCA identified three
18 PCs (Table 3): long-term MRI safety (PC1), internal LoC for developing dementia (PC2), and respondents'
19 own worries for future dementia/stroke risks (PC3). Compared to SA respondents, White respondents
20 had lower internal LoC for dementia (p=0.043), and EA (p=0.006) and Hispanic (p=0.019) respondents
21 had greater worries for future dementia/stroke risks. Respondents 50+ also believed in greater internal

1 LoC than those <50 ($p=0.026$), but there was otherwise no difference among the older groups (50-59,
2 60-69, 70-79, 80+).

3

4 **3.4 Factors Associated with Favorable Research Attitudes**

5 We next analyzed whether the three PCs might mediate the difference in research-related attitudes
6 between SA and non-SA respondents.[29] Compared to SA respondents, we found White – but not EA –
7 respondents to associate dementia risks with less internal LoC and this mediated the difference in
8 attitudes towards healthy volunteers between the two groups (Fig 3A, 3B). In contrast, greater worry
9 for future dementia/strokes was associated with more willingness to share de-identified MRI for
10 research, but could not account for the greater willingness in White than SA respondents (Fig 3C, 3D).

11

12 **3.5 Factors associated with disclosure of incidental MRI findings**

13 Finally, we assessed whether MRI experience and attitudes related to dementia and research could
14 explain differences in desire to learn of incidental MRI findings between racial/ethnic groups (Fig 1).
15 Older age (60+) was associated with lower wish to learn of serious incidental findings regardless of
16 treatment availability, and worry over future dementia/stroke risks was generally associated with
17 greater desire to learn of uncertain as well as serious findings (Table 2). However, even after adjusting
18 for age group, recruitment site, worry of future dementia/stroke, and perceived MRI safety, low desire
19 among SA and EA respondents to learn of incidental MRI findings persisted (Table 2).

20

21 **4. Discussion**

1 Here we surveyed a cohort of older Asian and non-Asian Americans to better characterize their attitudes
2 towards aging brain health research participation. We found both SA and EA respondents to have less
3 interest in learning about incidental MRI findings than non-Asian respondents, and this difference was
4 not influenced by prior MRI experience, perceived MRI safety, or dementia-related attitudes. SA
5 respondents also showed relatively less support for healthy research volunteers and sharing their own
6 de-identified MRI with researchers. Since disease- and experience-related factors poorly accounted for
7 attitudes related to research between Asian and White adults, further studies are necessary to identify
8 broader cultural and social factors which underlie these notable differences.

9
10 Aging studies involving EA[31] and SA [32] older adults are starting to generate epidemiological insight
11 into psychosocial factors influencing brain health in these populations, but neuroimaging data –
12 including willingness to undergo advanced brain imaging – are lacking.[33] With some exceptions,[34,
13 35] cross-racial/ethnic studies on dementia attitudes (not including those which only assessed one
14 racial/ethnic group) have historically recruited mostly White, Black, and Hispanic participants. We did
15 not find a difference in perception of MRI safety among racial/ethnic groups, but we found greater
16 belief of internal LoC for dementia risks among SA respondents. We did identify greater worry for future
17 dementia/stroke among EA respondents, in keeping with findings from small prior studies on EA
18 immigrants and dementia caregivers.[36, 37] However, we found similarly low desire to learn about
19 incidental MRI findings among EA and SA respondents. One potential explanation is that worries over
20 future disease risks manifest differently between EA and SA adults. For example, whereas EA adults in
21 diabetes prevention research noted wish to maintain social harmony as a barrier to participation,[38] SA
22 adults would not participate due to a high belief in personal efficacy (e.g., can exercise diabetes away, so
23 do not need to do prevention).[26] If so, “I don’t want to know” associated with fear and “I don’t need

1 to know” associated with low self-perceived risks need to be better distinguished when considering
2 disclosure of incidental findings in aging research.

3
4 It is further noteworthy that immigration history and the surrounding (“host”) culture can additionally
5 influence older Asian adults’ behaviors. For example, one study found older Chinese adults’ dementia-
6 related worries to correlate with knowledge among those living in Melbourne, but not those in
7 Beijing.[39] Since past as well as current structural factors often regulate the regional entry of
8 immigrant groups, studies involving EA and SA older adults in other U.S. regions will be necessary to
9 pinpoint generalizable cultural and immigration-related elements underlying these group-level
10 behavioral differences.

11
12 The variable desire to learn of incidental MRI findings among racial/ethnic groups underscores the
13 urgency for thoughtful flexibility. Standards for disclosure of incidental findings in U.S. biomedical
14 research abide by the ethical threshold of “actionability.”[40] Actionability can be determined according
15 to well-established medical actions, patient/participant-initiated health-related actions, and life-plan
16 decisions.[41] Challenges in a one-size-fit-all disclosure strategy in brain imaging were noted as early as
17 2002.[11, 18, 20] We could find no culturally-sensitive algorithm to determine if, how, and how many
18 incidental findings from research MRI should be disclosed to older Asian adults living in the U.S. or U.K.;
19 practices vary in Chinese aging studies without influence from prevalence of incidental findings.[42, 43]
20 Multiple models have been proposed in disclosing genomic information to balance truth-telling and
21 doing-no-harm.[44] An “ask-tell-ask” approach might be appropriate in MRI research involving healthy
22 volunteers,[45] but stakeholder focus groups,[46] improved health literacy,[47] and incidental finding
23 committees[48] are all potential solutions. Yet, none of these methods has been empirically tested in

1 multi-cultural settings. It is also possible that, after trustworthy exposure to medical research and
2 asymptomatic disease detection, those who choose not to learn of incidental findings will shift their
3 preference in the same way the medical providers did for disclosing cancer diagnosis in the second half
4 of the 20th Century.[49] Therefore, picking a single convenient model may underestimate the cultural
5 adaptability of Asian older adults and asymmetrically place the onus of informed consent on the
6 research participants, even if a flexible or progressive disclosure model requires further evidence
7 generation and refinement.

8
9 This study's overall sample size is similar to previous ones analyzing disclosure of incidental MRI
10 findings,[19, 50] but the convenience sample has a number of limitations. Importantly, we could not
11 explain the different wishes for disclosure between Asian and White respondents despite assessing
12 several attitude-related domains, nor why EA respondents had greater support for healthy people as
13 research volunteers than SA respondents. We had to limit our surveys' length based on Asian older
14 adults' hesitancy in research participation, at the cost of collecting more detailed demographic and
15 socio-behavioral data. Gendered role (traditional and US-based), acculturation, socio-economic status
16 (challenging to assess in both retired persons and immigrants), and prior employment in medicine or
17 medical research are among factors which can influence attitudes. The geographic concentration of EA
18 and SA adults in the NJ/NYC made this study feasible, but our findings may not generalize to other U.S.
19 regions (especially those with different SA and EA immigration history). We performed PCA to derive
20 summary measures related to attitudes, but we did not assess the Likert scale questions' reliability over
21 time. Finally, while Hispanic and Black respondents also showed potentially distinguishing trends, these
22 two groups – as well as people of mixed or other race/ethnicity – were too small in number to explore
23 potential causes for such trends.

1

2 In conclusion, we found similar preferences related to incidental MRI findings between SA and EA adults
3 despite quite different support for research participation, internal LoC for dementia risks, and worries
4 for future dementia/stroke. Based on these and prior findings, we caution researchers in generalizing
5 the linkage between perceptions and behaviors from one ethnic group to another, and call for more
6 flexible – and potentially individual-based – tailoring of incidental finding disclosure in MRI-related
7 research.

8

9 **Acknowledgements**

10 We thank the South Asian Total Health Initiative and RWJBarnabas Health Chinese Medical Program for
11 their support in engaging older Asian adults.

12

13 **Conflicts**

14 WTH has patents on CSF-based diagnosis of FTLD-TDP, prognosis of mild cognitive impairment due to
15 Alzheimer’s disease, and prognosis of spinal muscular atrophy treatment; has consulted for Biogen,
16 Fujirebio Diagnostics, and Roche.

17

18 **Funding Sources**

19 This work has been supported by NIH R24 AG063729, NIH P30 AG059304, Rutgers Center for Advanced
20 Human Brain Imaging Research, and Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences.

1 **References**

- 2 [1] Budiman A, Ruiz NG. Key facts about Asian Americans, a diverse and growing population. Pew
3 Research Center; 2021.
- 4 [2] Mayeda ER, Glymour MM, Quesenberry CP, Jr., Whitmer RA. Heterogeneity in 14-year Dementia
5 Incidence Between Asian American Subgroups. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2017;31:181-6.
- 6 [3] Lee S, Kim D, Lee H. Examine Race/Ethnicity Disparities in Perception, Intention, and Screening of
7 Dementia in a Community Setting: Scoping Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19.
- 8 [4] Prince M, Wimo A, Guerchet M, Ali GC, Wu YT, Prina M. The Global Impact of Dementia-An analysis
9 of prevalence, incidence, cost and trends. *World Alzheimer's Report*. London: Alzheimer's Disease
10 International; 2015.
- 11 [5] Lee J, Zhou M. The Asian American achievement paradox. New York, NY, US: Russell Sage
12 Foundation; 2015.
- 13 [6] Chou CF, Johnson PJ, Blewett LA. Immigration and selected indicators of health status and healthcare
14 utilization among the Chinese. *J Immigr Minor Health*. 2010;12:470-9.
- 15 [7] Volgman AS, Palaniappan LS, Aggarwal NT, Gupta M, Khandelwal A, Krishnan AV, et al.
16 Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease in South Asians in the United States: Epidemiology, Risk Factors,
17 and Treatments: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018;138:e1-
18 e34.
- 19 [8] Needham BL, Mukherjee B, Bagchi P, Kim C, Mukherjee A, Kandula NR, et al. Acculturation Strategies
20 Among South Asian Immigrants: The Mediators of Atherosclerosis in South Asians Living in America
21 (MASALA) Study. *J Immigr Minor Health*. 2017;19:373-80.
- 22 [9] Jose PO, Frank AT, Kapphahn KI, Goldstein BA, Eggleston K, Hastings KG, et al. Cardiovascular disease
23 mortality in Asian Americans. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2014;64:2486-94.
- 24 [10] Pawar MN, Suryawanshi DM, Kumar JP. Myths and misconceptions about medico-legal autopsies
25 among the people of Tamilnadu, India. *J Forensic Leg Med*. 2015;34:159-63.
- 26 [11] Kulynych J. Legal and ethical issues in neuroimaging research: human subjects protection, medical
27 privacy, and the public communication of research results. *Brain Cogn*. 2002;50:345-57.
- 28 [12] Guo H, Siu W, D'Arcy RC, Black SE, Grajauskas LA, Singh S, et al. MRI assessment of whole-brain
29 structural changes in aging. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2017;12:1251-70.
- 30 [13] Salazar CR, Hoang D, Gillen DL, Grill JD. Racial and ethnic differences in older adults' willingness to
31 be contacted about Alzheimer's disease research participation. *Alzheimers Dement (N Y)*.
32 2020;6:e12023.
- 33 [14] Sin HK, Wong CS, Huang B, Yiu KL, Wong WL, Chu YC. Assessing local patients' knowledge and
34 awareness of radiation dose and risks associated with medical imaging: a questionnaire study. *J Med*
35 *Imaging Radiat Oncol*. 2013;57:38-44.
- 36 [15] Rajasekaran S, Dilip Chand Raja S, Pushpa BT, Ananda KB, Ajoy Prasad S, Rishi MK. The
37 catastrophization effects of an MRI report on the patient and surgeon and the benefits of 'clinical
38 reporting': results from an RCT and blinded trials. *Eur Spine J*. 2021;30:2069-81.
- 39 [16] Morris Z, Whiteley WN, Longstreth WT, Jr., Weber F, Lee YC, Tsushima Y, et al. Incidental findings on
40 brain magnetic resonance imaging: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b3016.
- 41 [17] Hayward R. VOMIT (victims of modern imaging technology)—an acronym for our times. *BMJ*.
42 2003;326:1273.
- 43 [18] Wardlaw JM, Davies H, Booth TC, Laurie G, Compston A, Freeman C, et al. Acting on incidental
44 findings in research imaging. *BMJ*. 2015;351:h5190.

- 1 [19] Phillips JP, Cole C, Gluck JP, Shoemaker JM, Petree L, Helitzer D, et al. Stakeholder Opinions And
2 Ethical Perspectives Support Complete Disclosure Of Incidental Findings In MRI Research. *Ethics Behav.*
3 2015;25:332-50.
- 4 [20] Booth TC. Incidental findings on imaging. *BMJ.* 2018;361:k2611.
- 5 [21] Office for Human Research Protections. Attachment F - Recommendations on Reporting Incidental
6 Findings. In: Services USDoHaH, editor. 2017.
- 7 [22] Puyol-Anton E, Ruijsink B, Mariscal Harana J, Piechnik SK, Neubauer S, Petersen SE, et al. Fairness in
8 Cardiac Magnetic Resonance Imaging: Assessing Sex and Racial Bias in Deep Learning-Based
9 Segmentation. *Front Cardiovasc Med.* 2022;9:859310.
- 10 [23] Grill JD, Karlawish J, Elashoff D, Vickrey BG. Risk disclosure and preclinical Alzheimer's disease
11 clinical trial enrollment. *Alzheimers Dement.* 2013;9:356-9 e1.
- 12 [24] Coley N, Coniasse-Brioude D, Igier V, Fournier T, Poulain JP, Andrieu S, et al. Disparities in the
13 participation and adherence of older adults in lifestyle-based multidomain dementia prevention and the
14 motivational role of perceived disease risk and intervention benefits: an observational ancillary study to
15 a randomised controlled trial. *Alzheimers Res Ther.* 2021;13:157.
- 16 [25] Kesavayuth D, Poyago-Theotoky J, Tran DB, Zikos V. Locus of control, health and healthcare
17 utilization. *Econ Model.* 2020;86:227-38.
- 18 [26] Vlaar EM, Nierkens V, Nicolaou M, Middelkoop BJ, Stronks K, van Valkengoed IG. Risk perception is
19 not associated with attendance at a preventive intervention for type 2 diabetes mellitus among South
20 Asians at risk of diabetes. *Public Health Nutr.* 2015;18:1109-18.
- 21 [27] Liang J, Jang Y, Aranda MP. Stigmatising beliefs about Alzheimer's disease: Findings from the Asian
22 American Quality of Life Survey. *Health Soc Care Community.* 2021;29:1483-90.
- 23 [28] Yun SW, Maxfield M. Correlates of Dementia-related Anxiety: Self-Perceived Dementia Risk and
24 Ageism. *Educ Gerontol.* 2020;46:563-74.
- 25 [29] Bardach SH, Kent S, Jicha GA. Alzheimer Disease Worries, Fears, and Stigma and Their Relationship
26 to Genetic and Interventional Research Engagement. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord.* 2021;35:75-9.
- 27 [30] Chu SH, Kim EJ, Jeong SH, Park GL. Factors associated with willingness to participate in clinical trials:
28 a nationwide survey study. *BMC Public Health.* 2015;15:10.
- 29 [31] Chang ES, Dong X. A battery of tests for assessing cognitive function in U.S. Chinese older adults--
30 findings from the PINE Study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2014;69 Suppl 2:S23-30.
- 31 [32] Kanaya AM, Kandula N, Herrington D, Budoff MJ, Hulley S, Vittinghoff E, et al. Mediators of
32 Atherosclerosis in South Asians Living in America (MASALA) study: objectives, methods, and cohort
33 description. *Clin Cardiol.* 2013;36:713-20.
- 34 [33] Lockhart SN, Schaich CL, Craft S, Sachs BC, Rapp SR, Jung Y, et al. Associations among vascular risk
35 factors, neuroimaging biomarkers, and cognition: Preliminary analyses from the Multi-Ethnic Study of
36 Atherosclerosis (MESA). *Alzheimers Dement.* 2022;18:551-60.
- 37 [34] Suzuki R, Goebert D, Ahmed I, Lu B. Folk and biological perceptions of dementia among Asian ethnic
38 minorities in Hawaii. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2015;23:589-95.
- 39 [35] Zhai S, Kim B, Li J, Wi D, Chey S, Li G, et al. Perceptions and Beliefs of Memory Loss and Dementia
40 Among Korean, Samoan, Cambodian, and Chinese Older Adults: A Cross-Cultural Qualitative Study. *J*
41 *Gerontol Nurs.* 2022;48:40-8.
- 42 [36] Gray HL, Jimenez DE, Cucciare MA, Tong HQ, Gallagher-Thompson D. Ethnic differences in beliefs
43 regarding Alzheimer disease among dementia family caregivers. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2009;17:925-
44 33.
- 45 [37] Lee SE, Lee HY, Diwan S. What do Korean American immigrants know about Alzheimer's disease
46 (AD)? The impact of acculturation and exposure to the disease on AD knowledge. *Int J Geriatr*
47 *Psychiatry.* 2010;25:66-73.

- 1 [38] Li-Geng T, Kilham J, McLeod KM. Cultural Influences on Dietary Self-Management of Type 2
2 Diabetes in East Asian Americans: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review. *Health Equity*. 2020;4:31-42.
- 3 [39] Zhao M, Lv X, Lin X, You E, Zhang H, Ellis KA, et al. Dementia knowledge and associated factors
4 among older Chinese adults: a cross-national comparison between Melbourne and Beijing. *Int*
5 *Psychogeriatr*. 2021;33:1057-67.
- 6 [40] OHRP. Attachment F - Recommendations on reporting incidental findings. In: Services DoHaH,
7 editor.2017.
- 8 [41] Moret C, Mauron A, Fokstuen S, Makrythanasis P, Hurst SA. Defining categories of actionability for
9 secondary findings in next-generation sequencing. *J Med Ethics*. 2017;43:346-9.
- 10 [42] Li S, Fang F, Cui M, Jiang Y, Wang Y, Kong X, et al. Incidental findings on brain MRI among Chinese at
11 the age of 55-65 years: the Taizhou Imaging Study. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9:464.
- 12 [43] Wang L, Lin H, Peng Y, Zhao Z, Chen L, Wu L, et al. Incidental Brain Magnetic Resonance Imaging
13 Findings and the Cognitive and Motor Performance in the Elderly: The Shanghai Changfeng Study. *Front*
14 *Neurosci*. 2021;15:631087.
- 15 [44] Appelbaum PS, Parens E, Waldman CR, Klitzman R, Fyer A, Martinez J, et al. Models of consent to
16 return of incidental findings in genomic research. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 2014;44:22-32.
- 17 [45] Back AL, Arnold RM, Baile WF, Tulsky JA, Fryer-Edwards K. Approaching difficult communication
18 tasks in oncology. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2005;55:164-77.
- 19 [46] Cole C, Petree LE, Phillips JP, Shoemaker JM, Holdsworth M, Helitzer DL. 'Ethical responsibility' or 'a
20 whole can of worms': differences in opinion on incidental finding review and disclosure in neuroimaging
21 research from focus group discussions with participants, parents, IRB members, investigators, physicians
22 and community members. *J Med Ethics*. 2015;41:841-7.
- 23 [47] Rancher CE, Shoemaker JM, Petree LE, Holdsworth M, Phillips JP, Helitzer DL. Disclosing
24 neuroimaging incidental findings: a qualitative thematic analysis of health literacy challenges. *BMC Med*
25 *Ethics*. 2016;17:58.
- 26 [48] Bhaskar SMM. An Equity and Justice-Informed Ethical Framework to Guide Incidental Findings in
27 Brain Imaging Research. *Clin Pract*. 2023;13:116-24.
- 28 [49] Sisk B, Frankel R, Kodish E, Harry Isaacson J. The Truth about Truth-Telling in American Medicine: A
29 Brief History. *Perm J*. 2016;20:15-219.
- 30 [50] Shoemaker JM, Cole C, Petree LE, Helitzer DL, Holdsworth MT, Gluck JP, et al. Evolution of universal
31 review and disclosure of MRI reports to research participants. *Brain Behav*. 2016;6:e00428.

1 **Table 1. Survey respondents' demographic information, MRI experience, wish to learn of**
 2 **incidental MRI finding, and research-related attitudes.** 66 (78%) East Asian participants
 3 volunteered ethnicity information or responded in a specific language (Chinese, Korean), and
 4 their responses are shown within each ethnic grouping but also as one East Asian group.
 5 Median age category in each racial/ethnic group was 60-69 except for East Asian, NOS (<50);
 6 Hispanic (50-59); and Other (<50). (* One Hispanic respondent did not provide age)

7

	Total East Asian (n=84)	Chinese or EA responding in Chinese (n=50)	Korean or EA responding in Korean (n=16)	EA, NOS or EA responding in English (n=18)	South Asian (n=77)	White (n=54)	Black (n=19)	Hispanic (n=15)	Other (n=7)
Age									
<50	22	5	5	12	13	14	5	7*	5
50-59	14	9	2	3	7	10	3	0	0
60-69	25	17	6	2	35	16	2	6	1
70-79	18	15	3	0	17	11	4	1	1
80+	4	3	0	1	5	3	4	0	0
Had any prior MRI (%)	42 (50%)	24 (48%)	8 (50%)	10 (56%)	39 (51%)	39 (72%)	13 (68%)	9 (60%)	3 (43%)
Had a prior brain MRI (%)	23 (27%)	13 (26%)	5 (31%)	5 (28%)	16 (21%)	26 (48%)	4 (21%)	5 (33%)	2 (29%)
Wish to learn of incidental MRI findings									
Entirely benign	24 (29%)	17 (34%)	3 (19%)	4 (22%)	27 (35%)	29 (54%)	8 (42%)	12 (80%)	4 (57%)
Past injury, no longer threat	22 (26%)	15 (30%)	2 (13%)	5 (28%)	29 (38%)	31 (57%)	8 (42%)	7 (47%)	4 (57%)
Common findings, can improve health	42 (50%)	26 (52%)	8 (50%)	8 (44%)	45 (58%)	33 (61%)	10 (53%)	9 (60%)	5 (71%)
Unclear findings, need more testing	29 (35%)	15 (30%)	7 (44%)	7 (39%)	33 (43%)	39 (72%)	8 (42%)	10 (67%)	4 (57%)
Serious finding with treatment	50 (59%)	25 (50%)	11 (69%)	14 (78%)	44 (57%)	43 (80%)	12 (63%)	12 (80%)	5 (71%)
Serious finding with no treatments	25 (30%)	13 (26%)	4 (25%)	8 (44%)	27 (35%)	35 (65%)	8 (42%)	7 (47%)	4 (57%)
Research Q1									
Strongly agree	n=78 7	n=47 5	n=16 0	n=15 2	n=70 11	n=47 1	n=14 0	n=15 2	n=7 0
Agree	3	1	2	0	6	3	2	1	1
Neutral	11	7	4	0	14	7	4	2	1
Disagree	12	7	3	2	12	10	3	7	1
Strongly disagree	45	27	7	11	27	26	5	3	4
Research Q2									
Strongly agree	n=78 32	n=47 18	n=16 9	n=15 5	n=68 21	n=46 18	n=14 0	n=15 6	n=7 1
Agree	14	9	3	2	10	17	2	1	3
Neutral	15	9	3	3	18	8	4	7	0
Disagree	9	5	1	3	10	0	3	0	1
Strongly disagree	8	6	0	2	9	3	5	1	2

8

1 **Table 2.** Factors associated with desire to learn of different incidental MRI findings. Values
 2 shown are odds ratio with 95% CI and p-values. Model for entirely benign findings not shown
 3 as it was not influenced by any factor other than racial/ethnic category.

	Past injury	Unclear findings	Serious findings with effective treatment	Serious findings with no effective treatment
Race				
South Asian	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Hispanic	0.99 (0.74, 1.32), p=0.940	1.27 (0.96, 1.69), p=0.096	1.16 (0.86-1.59), p=0.318	0.99 (0.75-1.31), p=0.947
White	1.24 (1.04-1.48), p=0.017	1.44 (1.21, 1.73), p<0.001	1.25 (1.04-1.51), p=0.018	1.37 (1.15-1.62), p<0.001
Black	1.05 (0.78-1.42), p=0.751	1.07 (0.79, 1.44), p=0.660	1.10 (0.80-1.51), p=0.541	1.02 (0.76-1.37), p=0.893
East Asian	0.84 (0.72-0.99), p=0.037	0.93 (0.80, 1.10), p=0.409	1.00 (0.85-1.17), p=0.986	0.90 (0.77-1.05), p=0.180
Age				
<50	Reference	N.S.	Reference	Reference
50-59	1.08 (0.88-1.34), p=0.451		0.94 (0.77-1.16), p=0.572	0.94 (0.76-1.16), p=0.555
60-69	0.96 (0.81-1.14), p=0.650		0.86 (0.73-1.02), p=0.078	0.76 (0.64-0.89), p=0.001
70+	0.83 (0.69-1.00), p=0.052		0.77 (0.65-0.92), p=0.005	0.70 (0.59-0.84), p<0.001
Recruitment Site				
Events	N.S.	N.S.	Reference	N.S.
Community Contacts			1.27 (1.09-1.49), p=0.003	
Clinic			1.14 (0.90-1.45), p=0.261	
Worry of future dementia/stroke	1.09 (1.02-1.16), p=0.010	1.08 (1.01, 1.15), p=0.025	1.08 (1.01-1.15), p=0.024	1.06 (1.00-1.13), p=0.058
MRI safe	1.09 (1.02-1.16), p=0.012	1.07 (1.01, 1.14), p=0.034	N.S.	1.10 (1.03-1.17), p=0.003

4

5

1 **Table 3. Principal component analysis of attitudes related to brain health (loading scores > 0.100**
2 **shown). PC 1 related to long-term MRI safety, PC2 related to internal locus of control (LoC) for**
3 **developing dementia, and PC3 related to respondents' own worries for future dementia/stroke risks.**

	PC1	PC2	PC3
A strong magnetic field cannot cause long-term mental harm	0.925		
A strong magnetic field cannot cause long-term physical harm	0.921	0.103	
Diet low in meat prevents Alzheimer's and dementia	0.293	0.185	0.235
Brain diseases happen to people who don't exercise their brains		0.829	0.113
People with dementia should be separated from society		0.743	
Only people with diabetes or strokes develop dementia		0.664	
I am afraid that I might have future dementia or strokes			0.834
Forgetting things that are not important to me is normal aging	0.102	0.149	0.720

4

5

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Fig 1.** Proportion of respondents who wish to be informed of incidental brain MRI findings by
3 types of finding (X-axis) and race/ethnicity. * $p \leq 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$, † $p < 0.05$.

4 **Fig 2.** Attitudes related to brain health according to race/ethnicity and PCA. PC1 primarily
5 involved long-term MRI safety (A, *low meat diet question had low loading overall but highest
6 loading on PC1); PC2 involved internal LOC for developing dementia (B); PC3 involved worries
7 for future dementia/stroke risks (C).

8 **Fig 3.** Mediation analysis for whether healthy people should volunteer in research (strongly
9 disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) and sharing de-identified MRI for research
10 (disagree, neutral, agree). Attitudes towards research participation were analyzed without (A,
11 C) or with (B, D) the inclusion of attitudes related to brain health (internal LoC for dementia
12 risks, fear for future dementia/stroke risks) as a mediator for difference between SA and other
13 racial/ethnic respondents. P.O.: proportional odd.

Fig 1. Proportion of respondents who wish to be informed of incidental brain MRI findings by types of finding (X-axis) and race/ethnicity. * $p \leq 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$, † $p < 0.05$.




Fig 2. Attitudes related to brain health according to race/ethnicity and PCA. PC1 primarily involved long-term MRI safety (A, *low meat diet question had low loading overall but highest loading on PC1); PC2 involved internal LOC for developing dementia (B); PC3 involved worries for future dementia/stroke risks (C).




Fig 3. Mediation analysis for whether healthy people should volunteer in research (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree) and sharing de-identified MRI for research (disagree, neutral, agree). Attitudes towards research participation were analyzed without (A, C) or with (B, D) the inclusion of attitudes related to brain health (internal LoC for dementia risks, fear for future dementia/stroke risks) as a mediator for difference between SA and other racial/ethnic respondents. P.O.: proportional odd.

