

1 **Title:** Planning for the End at the Beginning: A Lesson in Sharing Research Findings of
2 a Community-based COVID-19 Seroprevalence Survey

3

4 Anne M. Trolard¹, Emily Hickner¹, Victoria V. Anwuri¹, Kimberly J. Johnson², Charles W.
5 Goss³, Rachel E. Cohen⁴, Kate Donaldson⁴, Elvin Geng^{1,5}, Brett B. Maricque⁶

6

7 ¹Institute for Public Health, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63110,
8 USA

9 ²Brown School, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA

10 ³Division of Biostatistics, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO
11 63110, USA

12 ⁴St. Louis County Department of Public Health, Berkeley, MO 63134, USA

13 ⁵Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Washington University School
14 of Medicine, St. Louis, MO 63110, USA

15 ⁶McDonnell Genome Institute, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO
16 63110, USA

17

18

19 **Abstract**

20 Introduction:

21 Sharing research findings with participants is important but challenging. We evaluated a
22 plan to share findings with participants of a COVID-19 seroprevalence project.

23 Methods:

24 An electronic survey was distributed to participants after completion of the project to
25 determine reach of planned coverage of the findings.

26 Results:

27 Most respondents (80% n=428) had not seen the coverage; but nearly all (90%, n=388)
28 wanted to see the findings. Participants identified a brief visual report as their preferred
29 avenue. A second follow-up survey found that 99% of those who read the report
30 approved.

31 Discussion:

32 When researchers alone create a plan to share project findings, efforts may not reach
33 nor be in the format desired by participants.

34 Conclusions:

35 This work can serve as a model for collaborating with community to disseminate public
36 health data.

37

38 **Introduction**

39 People who participate in research studies consistently state that they would like to
40 receive aggregate findings from studies in which they participate¹⁻⁴. Participants report it
41 is their right to hear about the findings⁵ and that sharing findings builds trust between
42 researchers and communities. Conversely, trust erodes when researchers do not share
43 findings. The collective benefits of sharing findings extend beyond a specific study and
44 accrue when researchers commit to sharing³.

45 Health researchers do not routinely share findings with study participants even though
46 they express a desire, and sometimes even an intention, to do so⁶. Researchers report
47 many barriers to such sharing, including financial, time, and know-how constraints; as
48 well as concerns about presenting findings to a lay or non-scientific audience⁷.

49 Researchers' concerns regarding participant literacy are valid, and ensuring participants
50 are not harmed by the findings is imperative. There is certainly not a one-size-fits-all
51 approach. Without mandates to share, much less a framework or values system that
52 prioritizes participants' right to receive results, it is easy to see why researchers often
53 fall short of their intentions. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown us that engaging
54 people in the scientific process is crucial⁸.

55 We conducted a COVID-19 seroprevalence and survey project in St. Louis County
56 between August and October 2020⁹, which included a plan to share aggregate project
57 findings with participants and the entire community. The communication plan was put
58 together by a team that included media professionals, academics, and community
59 partners, but not participants. The goal of the present study was to assess the extent to

60 which participants received and were satisfied with the presentation of the project
61 findings.

62 **Materials and Methods**

63 The project was conducted in collaboration with the St. Louis County Department of
64 Public Health. A total of 2314 residents agreed to take a telephone survey that included
65 questions about their Covid-19 experiences and behaviors, and of those 1435 provided
66 an email address as part of registering for testing. Following conclusion of the project,
67 findings were shared through standard media channels, including: 1) a press
68 conference hosted by the county executive; 2) a media advisory posted on the county
69 website; 3) an article in a local magazine; 4) a local radio interview with the Principal
70 Investigator; 5) segments on local TV; and 6) articles by Washington University School
71 of Medicine.

72 After the project, the authors drafted a brief follow-up survey to understand if
73 participants saw coverage of the project findings, and if they found the coverage
74 satisfactory. This survey also asked what specific information participants might like to
75 receive and how they would like to receive it. The follow-up survey was sent by email to
76 participants who provided an email address.

77 **Results**

78 The follow-up survey was delivered to 1266 valid email addresses and of those 535
79 (42%) responded. This respondent group had 3% more females and 16% more white
80 respondents compared to those who participated in the seroprevalence project⁹.

81 An overwhelming majority of respondents, 80% (n=428), had not seen the project
82 findings. Those who had (n=107, 20%) were most likely to have read about the findings
83 in a Washington University communication (n=45, 42%); seen coverage on TV (n=31,
84 29%); or read the media advisory on the county website (n=17, 16%). Ninety-nine
85 percent of the 107 participants who had seen the findings were satisfied with the
86 information that was shared.

87 Ninety percent of those who did not see the findings reported wanting to see findings
88 (n=388). A total of 466 respondents shared the findings that most interested them.
89 Figure 1 details these preferences, showing that they cared most about seeing project
90 findings and how the county used the findings to help handle the pandemic. Most
91 respondents wanted to hear about the findings in a 1-2 page visual report sent by email
92 (n=343), followed by a 1-2 page visual report sent by mail (n=101) and attending a pre-
93 recorded webinar discussing the findings (n=60).

94 [insert Fig 1 here]

95 **Fig 1. Specific information and findings that participants wanted shared.**

96 Respondents could select multiple answers to this question. Responses are presented
97 in the order they were asked.

98 We drafted a visual report that included information requested by respondents and then
99 mailed and emailed per respondent request. Four weeks later, we followed up with
100 respondents to solicit feedback on the visual report and assess their interest in receiving
101 future findings (e.g., publications). One-hundred thirty-eight people provided feedback
102 (31%). Of the 102 that read the report, 99% indicated it was “Excellent” or “Pretty

103 Good". Additionally, 48% of respondents expressed interest in participating on a
104 community review board to review public health projects.

105 **Discussion**

106 Despite earnest efforts by our team to share the project findings using a diffusion
107 strategy, our efforts did not reach most respondents. This suggests that a diffusion
108 approach for sharing findings of public health projects can be ineffective in reaching the
109 majority of participants, and dissemination planning is needed. Notably, respondents
110 most commonly encountered findings in press releases from Washington University. We
111 suspect that many of these individuals had prior contact with the University or sought
112 out project findings themselves using the internet.

113 Respondents were willing to offer their preferences about how our team should share
114 project findings. The vast majority preferred to receive findings in a digital visual report.
115 This preference illustrates why project participants should be actively engaged in
116 developing a plan for sharing findings. Dissemination strategies could be developed in
117 collaboration with project participants prior to the end of the study, rather than solely by
118 researchers. This early collaboration is what participants themselves suggest⁵ and
119 could lead to projects where researchers engage participants as co-creators of new
120 knowledge.

121 Our follow-up survey was limited to those for whom we had email addresses, thus a
122 visual report may not be the preferred mode of communication for all participants.
123 However, the purpose of this work was not to identify the single best mode of

124 communication, but rather to demonstrate that engaging project participants in
125 discussions about how to share findings is manageable and fruitful.

126 The follow-up survey was not planned from the project's outset, and therefore the
127 resources needed to carry it out were limited. To our surprise, the overall process was
128 not resource intensive, yet we did find that specific resources were essential to our
129 success. First, we were able to re-contact project participants using email addresses
130 collected during enrollment. Second, we were able to use the database infrastructure
131 established for the seroprevalence testing phase of the project. Third, and most
132 importantly, our team included a graphic designer and a health communication and
133 training specialist who had the skill set to produce the visual report. Our future work will
134 build on this experience to engage participants in the planning and execution of public
135 health research projects.

136

137 **Conclusions**

138

139 The work reported here was well-received by participants and was rewarding for the
140 research team. Our team received dozens of personal emails expressing support and
141 appreciation for our commitment to sharing the project's results. We learned directly
142 from the people our work set out to serve, and established a foundation for engaging
143 people in the scientific process. This work can serve as a model for collaborating with
144 community members to improve dissemination of public health data. It is also a step in
145 the right direction for building trust between research institutions and the public.

146

147 **Acknowledgements**

148 We thank the St. Louis County Department of Public Health for their support and
149 partnership on this project. We thank the residents of St. Louis County for their
150 contributions to the COVID-19 seroprevalence survey and their engagement in this
151 project. This project was funded by the St. Louis County Department of Public Health.

152

153 **References**

154

155 1. Long CR, Stewart MK, Cunningham TV, et al. Health research participants'
156 preferences for receiving research results. *Clin Trials*. 2016;13(6):582-591.

157 doi:10.1177/1740774516665598

158 2. Partridge AH, Wong JS, Knudsen K, et al. Offering participants results of a clinical
159 trial: sharing results of a negative study. *The Lancet*. 2005;365(9463):963-964.

160 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71085-0

161 3. Fernandez CV, Kodish E, Shurin S, Weijer C. Offering to Return Results to Research
162 Participants: Attitudes and Needs of Principal Investigators in the Children's Oncology
163 Group. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol*. 2003;25(9):704-708. Accessed July 29, 2021.



164 <https://journals.lww.com/jpho->

165 [online/Fulltext/2003/09000/Offering_to_Return_Results_to_Research.6.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/jpho-online/Fulltext/2003/09000/Offering_to_Return_Results_to_Research.6.aspx)

166 4. Baylor A, Muzoora C, Bwana M, et al. Dissemination of Research Findings to
167 Research Participants Living with HIV in Rural Uganda: Challenges and Rewards.

168 *PLOS Med*. 2013;10(3):e1001397. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001397

- 169 5. Purvis RS, Abraham TH, Long CR, et al. Qualitative study of participants' perceptions
170 and preferences regarding research dissemination. *AJOB Empir Bioeth*. 2017;8(2):69-
171 74. doi:10.1080/23294515.2017.1310146
- 172 6. Long CR, Purvis RS, Flood-Grady E, et al. Health researchers' experiences,
173 perceptions and barriers related to sharing study results with participants. *Health Res*
174 *Policy Syst*. 2019;17(1):25. doi:10.1186/s12961-019-0422-5
- 175 7. McElfish PA, Long CR, James LP, et al. Characterizing health researcher barriers to
176 sharing results with study participants. *J Clin Transl Sci*. 2019;3(6):295-301.
177 doi:10.1017/cts.2019.409
- 178 8. Boele-Woelki K, Francisco JS, Hahn U, Herz J. How We Can Rebuild Trust in
179 Science—And Why We Must. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2018;57(42):13696-13697.
180 doi:10.1002/anie.201805342
- 181 9. Goss CW, Maricque BB, Anwuri VV, et al. SARS-CoV-2 active infection prevalence
182 and seroprevalence in the adult population of St. Louis County. *Ann. Epidemiol*. S1047-
183 2797(22)00036-9. Advance online publication.
184 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2022.03.002>
185
186



Figure