

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 participate^{1–4}. 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

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

Materials and Methods

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

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

Results

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

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

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

[insert Fig 1 here]

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

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

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

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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


Acknowledgements

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

References

1. Long CR, Stewart MK, Cunningham TV, et al. Health research participants' preferences for receiving research results. *Clin Trials*. 2016;13(6):582-591. doi:10.1177/1740774516665598
2. Partridge AH, Wong JS, Knudsen K, et al. Offering participants results of a clinical trial: sharing results of a negative study. *The Lancet*. 2005;365(9463):963-964. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71085-0
3. Fernandez CV, Kodish E, Shurin S, Weijer C. Offering to Return Results to Research Participants: Attitudes and Needs of Principal Investigators in the Children's Oncology Group. *J Pediatr Hematol Oncol*. 2003;25(9):704-708. Accessed July 29, 2021. https://journals.lww.com/jpho-online/Fulltext/2003/09000/Offering_to_Return_Results_to_Research.6.aspx
4. Baylor A, Muzoora C, Bwana M, et al. Dissemination of Research Findings to Research Participants Living with HIV in Rural Uganda: Challenges and Rewards. *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