

1 **Applying health equity implementation science frameworks to population genetic screening**

2

3 **Authors:**

4 Nandana D. Rao PhD,¹ Stephanie M. Fullerton PhD,² Brian H. Shirts MD PhD,³ Annie T. Chen
5 PhD,⁴ Nora B. Henrikson PhD⁵

6

7 **Affiliations:**

8 1. Institute for Public Health Genetics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

9 2. Department of Bioethics & Humanities, University of Washington School of Medicine,
10 Seattle, WA, USA

11 3. Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle,
12 WA, USA

13 4. Department of Biomedical Informatics and Medical Education, University of
14 Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

15 5. Kaiser Permanente Washington Health Research Institute, Kaiser Permanente Research
16 Affiliates Evidence-based Practice Center, Seattle, WA, USA

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 Implementation science frameworks with a focus on health equity have emerged to help guide
19 the introduction of new interventions into healthcare and community settings while limiting
20 health disparities. The purpose of this research was to explore the applicability of such
21 frameworks to guide the equitable implementation of population genetic screening programs. We
22 searched PubMed and reference lists for relevant frameworks and examples of their use in health
23 settings. We then assessed if and how selected frameworks provide guidance for different stages
24 of population genetic screening: recruitment, sample collection, result return, follow-up care and
25 prevention, and cascade screening. Findings were synthesized into a list of health equity
26 considerations specific to each stage. We identified 5 implementation frameworks that focus on
27 health equity. Guidance varied by framework type: determinant (explaining what affects
28 implementation outcomes), process (translating research into practice), or evaluation (assessing
29 implementation). Common characteristics included focusing implementation efforts on
30 populations who have historically experienced health inequities and adapting interventions to fit
31 local contexts. Process models also highlighted the importance of community partnerships.
32 Overall, frameworks offered broad recommendations applicable to population genetic screening
33 program implementation. However, gaps still exist in guidance provided for later stages of
34 population genetic screening. To improve the equitable implementation of genetic screening,
35 future programs may benefit from utilizing one or more of these frameworks or by incorporating
36 the health equity considerations and outcomes compiled in this analysis.

37

38

39 INTRODUCTION

40 Population genetic screening, or genetic screening of people regardless of personal or
41 family history of disease, has been proposed to increase the reach of genetic services and identify
42 more people at risk for preventable conditions (Grzymski et al., 2020; King et al., 2014; Limburg
43 et al., 2011). However, population screening is complex for many reasons including the need to
44 appropriately inform large numbers of people about the benefits and harms of genetic screening,
45 collecting DNA samples, and following people over time to ensure they receive appropriate care
46 based on their results. If not implemented with care and the needs of underserved people in mind,
47 population genetic screening may perpetuate or further exacerbate already existing health
48 disparities (Grzymski et al., 2018).

49 To limit harmful consequences, health equity must be a central consideration in the
50 design and implementation of population genetic screening programs. Health equity is defined as
51 everyone having a fair and just opportunity to be as healthy as possible (Centers for Disease
52 Control and Prevention, n.d.). Striving for health equity requires focusing on the needs of those
53 who are at greatest risk of poor health due to social circumstances (Braveman, 2014). It involves
54 the elimination of health differences that are linked to social determinants historically connected
55 to exclusion, such as race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, age, religion, disability,
56 sexual orientation, gender identity, and geographic location (Braveman, 2014).

57 Implementation science frameworks with a focus on health equity have emerged to guide
58 the introduction of new interventions into healthcare and community settings, and their
59 principles could improve the incorporation of genomic discoveries into healthcare (Chambers et
60 al., 2016; Roberts et al., 2017). How well such frameworks suit population genomic screening
61 programs is not well understood.

62 We conducted a systematic literature search to identify and describe published equity-
63 focused implementation science frameworks and assessed the applicability of these frameworks
64 to population genetic screening programs.

65

66 **METHODS**

67 Population genetic screening stages

68 We conceptualized population genetic screening in 5 major stages (Figure 1) based on the
69 design of existing pilot screening programs (David et al., 2021; East et al., 2021; Grzymiski et al.,
70 2018; Rao et al., 2023). Our descriptive model's stages include recruitment, sample collection,
71 return of results, follow-up care and prevention, and cascade screening (the notification of
72 biological relatives about genetic risk). This model formed the basis for our analysis of
73 framework applicability to population screening.

74 Framework identification

75 We searched PubMed for frameworks designed to promote health equity during the
76 implementation of health interventions using the following keywords: (“health equity” or “health
77 disparities” or “health inequalities”) and (“implementation” or “translation”) and (“framework”
78 or “model” or “theory”). One author, NDR, screened the resulting titles and abstracts. When
79 articles cited potentially relevant frameworks or included a review of frameworks, NDR
80 examined the reference lists for pertinent publications. Other frameworks previously known to
81 the authors were also considered. Article review was restricted to work published between
82 January 2010 and December 2021, as the focus on health equity in implementation science has
83 become more prominent relatively recently (Odeny, 2021).

84 Criteria for inclusion were frameworks focused on health equity and implementation of
85 health services, and that were developed for high-resource settings, as these are the most relevant
86 to population genetic screening. Frameworks were excluded if they were specific to a certain
87 health condition or intervention, provided little guidance for implementation or if the article was
88 not available in English. Discussion papers, or those that only described a need for considering
89 health equity during program implementation or provided no explicit framework or model, were
90 also excluded.

91

92 Data extraction and evaluation

93 For each of the selected frameworks, the following data was extracted: name, author, year
94 of publication, type, audience, development, and description. Framework type was determined
95 according to Nilsen's categorizations of implementation science theories, models, and
96 frameworks: determinant frameworks, process models, or evaluation frameworks (Nilsen, 2015).
97 Determinant frameworks are designed to assist with understanding barriers or facilitators that
98 influence implementation outcomes; process models to guide the process of translating research
99 into practice; and evaluation frameworks to specify implementation outcomes (Nilsen, 2015).

100

101 Data synthesis

102 We assessed the applicability of each framework to population genetic screening by
103 evaluating if and how the framework provided guidance for the 5 major stages of population
104 genetic screening we identified. To further our understanding of potential framework application,
105 we looked for examples of how each framework may have been used in other settings by

106 examining articles published through December 2021 that cited our selected frameworks. We
107 also searched for empiric evidence of framework validation.

108 We then compared the selected frameworks and discussed their strengths and weaknesses
109 with respect to guiding the implementation of population genetic screening. Using findings from
110 our applicability assessment, we also compiled a list of health equity considerations and
111 outcomes specific to each stage of population genetic screening.

112

113 **RESULTS**

114 The initial PubMed search yielded 1,013 results. An additional 37 articles were identified
115 through reference lists or because they were previously known to authors. Records were screened
116 by title and abstract followed by full text review (Figure 2). We identified five frameworks
117 designed to reduce or prevent health disparities during the implementation of health interventions
118 (Table 1). One framework was described in two of the selected articles.

119 We categorized the frameworks as one determinant framework (HEIF, Woodward et al.,
120 2019), three process frameworks (Proctor reframed, Baumann & Cabassa, 2020; Transcreation,
121 Nápoles & Stewart, 2018; EquIR, Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019), and one evaluation
122 framework (RE-AIM extension, Shelton et al., 2020). Researchers were the primary intended
123 audience for each framework. Frameworks were largely conceptually developed by the authors,
124 though one, EquIR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019), was developed using stakeholder
125 engagement (Table 2). Our search for evidence of framework validation yielded no information
126 about if and how any of the five frameworks had been validated.

127

128 The Health Equity Implementation Framework (HEIF)

129 *Description*

130 Woodward and colleagues developed HEIF by integrating the i-PARIHS implementation
131 science framework (Harvey & Kitson, 2016) and the Health Care Disparities Framework
132 (Kilbourne et al., 2006). HEIF is designed to help researchers determine factors related to
133 innovation uptake and disparities in healthcare to improve outcomes for marginalized
134 populations (Woodward et al., 2019). Health equity domains include culturally relevant factors,
135 the clinical encounter, and societal context (Table 2). Culturally relevant factors are specific to
136 intervention recipients based on their lived experience and can include characteristics such as
137 socioeconomic status, implicit bias, health literacy, trust in providers, language, race and
138 ethnicity. The clinical encounter encompasses interactions between providers and patients, which
139 influence if an intervention is offered by a provider or accepted by a patient. These encounters
140 are influenced by inner context at the local (e.g., clinic) and organizational (e.g., hospital) levels,
141 and outer context (e.g., the healthcare system). Finally, the societal context includes economies,
142 physical structures (how environments are built or arranged), and sociopolitical forces (social
143 norms or political forces). These impact health disparities by influencing the inner and outer
144 context, the clinical encounter, and culturally relevant factors. The HEIF has previously been
145 applied to design an interview guide and direct content analysis to identify implementation
146 factors and best practices for social needs screening in primary care settings (Drake et al., 2021).

147 *Application to population genetic screening*

148 The HEIF is well suited to provide guidance for anticipating possible barriers or
149 facilitators to implementation across all stages of population genetic screening (Table 3). For
150 example, during recruitment, attention to cultural factors can help researchers anticipate how
151 language and cultural beliefs influence informed consent and enrollment. HEIF's physical

152 structures domain can inform how in-person sample collection and return of results may
153 facilitate or impede screening depending on access to reliable transportation and the location of
154 facilities. Similarly, during follow-up care and prevention, understanding potentially inequitable
155 physical spaces can inform implementation. In the cascade screening stage, reflecting on
156 sociopolitical forces, such genetic privacy laws, may illuminate barriers to information sharing
157 among relatives.

158

159 Proctor reframed

160 *Description*

161 Baumann and Cabassa (2020) reframed the Proctor implementation science framework to
162 provide an example of how to apply an existing framework to address healthcare inequities. The
163 original Proctor framework posits that interventions differ from their implementation strategies
164 and requires the involvement of various stakeholders at multiple levels (Proctor et al., 2009). The
165 original Proctor also proposes outcomes in three interrelated but distinct domains:
166 implementation (e.g., feasibility, fidelity, acceptance), service (e.g., efficiency, safety,
167 effectiveness), and client (e.g., satisfaction, function). The reframed Proctor framework
168 emphasizes collaborating with stakeholders and community members throughout intervention
169 planning, design, and implementation in order to understand and meet the needs of historically
170 underserved communities (Table 2) (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020). It proposes continually
171 adapting programs based on the needs of populations with the goal of reducing inequities
172 through systematic changes to intervention and implementation strategies. Finally, Proctor
173 reframed suggests conducting descriptive and explanatory studies to identify factors that

174 contribute to inequities in implementation outcomes. We did not identify any published
175 applications of Proctor-reframed in health settings.

176 *Application to population genetic screening*

177 Proctor-reframed specifies guidance most relevant to the recruitment stage, including
178 ensuring that populations that have previously experienced inequities in genetic services are
179 included in population genetic screening programs. Suggested strategies for enhancing inclusion
180 are conducting programs in non-traditional settings such as in faith communities or community
181 centers. This framework also discusses how face-to-face presentations with community members
182 and person-to-person recruitment can assist with enrolling people who would otherwise not
183 participate.

184

185 Transcreation

186 *Description*

187 Transcreation is defined as the process of planning and delivering interventions to reduce
188 health disparities that resonate with the intended community (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018). Nápoles
189 and colleagues created this framework to address the differences that occur between original
190 intervention implementation settings (often among mainstream populations or in academic
191 settings) and when interventions are adopted among a population facing health disparities.

192 Collaboration is a central principle of Transcreation, which proposes stakeholder and
193 community involvement through the entire process of intervention design, implementation, and
194 adaptation (Table 2) (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018). This framework assumes the presence of an
195 established partnership between researchers and community members and a shared
196 understanding of the disparity to be addressed. As part of the framework's proposed

197 collaboration, Transcreation suggests involving community workers in implementation by
198 training them in intervention delivery. Fitting interventions to context and population needs is
199 also prominent.

200 Transcreation has previously been applied in other health settings; for example, it has
201 been used to adapt a stress management intervention for Latina breast cancer survivors living in
202 rural settings (Santoyo-Olsson et al., 2019).

203 *Application to population genetic screening*

204 Transcreation provides guidance most relevant for the initial recruitment stage of
205 population genetic screening by suggesting focusing attention on populations who experience
206 disparities in access to and utilization of genetic services (Table 3). Through the incorporation of
207 scientific evidence, programs can also adopt recruitment strategies that have been proven to work
208 in similar settings.

209 Unique to Transcreation is training community members in intervention delivery. This
210 idea is relevant for all population screening stages, as members can be trained to provide
211 cultural, informational and logistical support to specific communities within a general
212 population. During recruitment, this can promote informed decision-making. In the follow-up
213 and prevention stage, community members acting as patient navigators can assist individuals
214 with information about insurance or recommended medical interventions.

215

216 EquIR

217 *Description*

218 Eslava-Schmalbach and colleagues developed EquIR for researchers and decision makers
219 to reduce or prevent health inequities during the implementation of health programs or policies

220 (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019). This conceptual framework is cyclic, with social determinants
221 of health considered throughout. The cycle begins with identifying disadvantaged populations
222 and quantifying current health inequalities (Table 2). It then suggests developing and
223 implementing recommendations to meet the needs of disadvantaged populations with key players
224 such as health professionals, patients, community members, and stakeholders. It finishes by
225 recommending the monitoring of implementation outcomes (Table 2) and identifying how the
226 intervention has impacted the health status of populations receiving the intervention. From here
227 the cycle continues and the new population health status becomes the starting point of the
228 intervention. Beyond its initial development, we identified no examples of the use of EquIR to
229 guide implementation of health interventions.

230 *Application to population genetic screening*

231 Of the guidance proposed by EquIR, the described outcomes are most readily applied to
232 population genetic screening and can be used to understand how programs impact disadvantaged
233 populations at each stage. For example, measures of acceptability and appropriateness can be
234 applied during recruitment, sample collection, and return of results stages to understand
235 stakeholder perceptions of fit and usefulness of program procedures (Table 3). Measures of
236 fidelity and coverage may be useful during follow-up care and cascade screening stages for
237 understanding how often people receiving positive screening results are able to act on these
238 results and how often risk information is shared with biological relatives. In addition, the cyclical
239 nature of EquIR promotes ongoing program adjustments informed by these outcome measures.

240

241 RE-AIM extension

242 *Description*

243 The extension to the RE-AIM framework authored by Shelton and colleagues is designed
244 to promote sustainability and health equity. The original RE-AIM framework focuses on
245 evaluation and includes both individual and staff/setting level domains: Reach and effectiveness
246 (individual), adoption and implementation (staff/setting), and maintenance (individual and
247 staff/setting) (Glasgow et al., 1999, 2019). While the extension to RE-AIM discusses these same
248 domains and previously described indicators, Shelton et al. provide additional guidance to
249 consider health equity during the measurement of these indicators (Table 2). This guidance
250 focuses on assessing indicators over time across different populations of focus (defined by age,
251 race, ethnicity, disability, insurance status, literacy level or other social determinants of health),
252 to identify and address health inequities (Shelton et al., 2020). The extension to RE-AIM also
253 considers the link between health equity and costs or resources and suggests incorporating cost
254 estimates and resource requirements into planning discussions with stakeholders. This
255 framework has previously been used to evaluate the implementation of a COVID-19 vaccine
256 program seeking to facilitate equitable vaccine access and uptake among Latinx community
257 members (Marquez et al., 2021).

258 *Application to population genetic screening*

259 The outcome indicators and health equity considerations listed by RE-AIM extension
260 give measures that can be monitored at each stage of population genetic screening (Table 3).
261 During recruitment, relevant indicators include the number of people who are offered screening
262 and the number of people who agree to screening. Taking into account social determinants of
263 health when interpreting these indicators can determine if all populations are offered and enroll
264 in screening similarly and reveal which populations are not reached. Reach can also be

265 ascertained for sample collection, return of results, and cascade screening to find inequities that
266 may be emerging during these stages.

267 Measures of effectiveness across social determinants of health are also relevant for the
268 return of results, follow-up care, and cascade screening stages. For return of results, indicators
269 include the number of people experiencing psychosocial harms upon learning results. For follow-
270 up care and prevention, relevant indicators are the number of people who are able to engage in
271 preventive interventions who desire it and the number of people who experience psychosocial
272 harms because of difficulties accessing care. During cascade screening, indicators include the
273 number of biological relatives who receive testing.

274

275 Comparing frameworks

276 A number of characteristics were shared across the analyzed frameworks. The first was to
277 focus implementation efforts on populations who have historically experienced health inequities.
278 This is a crucial consideration as placing specific emphasis on underserved populations at the
279 beginning of implementation planning can reorient design and procedures to better prioritize the
280 needs of such communities. Another common element across frameworks was to adapt
281 interventions to fit local context and meet the needs of marginalized communities. Doing so can
282 limit the implementation gap, which occurs when the context where interventions are designed
283 and developed does not align with realities of implementation settings. Constraining this gap can
284 increase the appropriateness of an intervention (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020).

285 The identified frameworks were conceptually focused, rather than validated theories, and
286 the guidance provided varied by framework type, as expected. The process models, Proctor
287 reframed (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020), Transcreation (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018), and EquIR

288 (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019), for example, tended to be high-level, and provided
289 overarching considerations and recommendations for program design, implementation, and
290 evaluation rather than specific guidance that lends itself to individual stages of an intervention
291 like population genetic screening. Regarding screening, Proctor reframed (Baumann & Cabassa,
292 2020) and Transcreation (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018) recommendations applied most directly to
293 the recruitment stage. While all three process models described evaluating implementation
294 outcomes keeping social determinants and differences in outcomes across populations in mind,
295 they varied in the specificity with which they described and defined these outcomes.

296 In contrast, the determinant framework, HEIF (Woodward et al., 2019), provides an
297 explicit means to identify barriers to program implementation throughout all stages of population
298 genetic screening. Similarly, the evaluation framework, RE-AIM extension (Shelton et al.,
299 2020), detailed indicators and health equity considerations for monitoring program outcomes
300 relevant to all program stages.

301 Among the process models, Proctor reframed (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020), Transcreation
302 (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018), and EquIR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019), another main concept
303 was the importance of involving community partners and other stakeholders throughout
304 implementation. Such collaboration allows researchers to learn more about local customs and
305 build trust with community members (Cabassa & Baumann, 2013; Wallerstein & Duran, 2010).
306 Interventions can better be tailored to a specific population and integrate relevant perspectives,
307 norms, and social and cultural values. As a result, this may improve intervention acceptability
308 and effectiveness and prevent health disparities from emerging.

309

310 **DISCUSSION**

311 In this analysis we outline relevant equity considerations for population genetic screening
312 program implementation guided by five selected frameworks: HEIF (Woodward et al., 2019),
313 Proctor reframed (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020), Transcreation (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018), EquIR
314 (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019), and RE-AIM extension (Shelton et al., 2020). The HEIF
315 (Woodward et al., 2019), RE-AIM extension (Shelton et al., 2020), and outcome measures
316 provided in EquIR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019) were applicable to all stages of population
317 screening. Remaining guidance from EquIR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019) and ideas
318 proposed by Proctor reframed (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020) and Transcreation (Nápoles &
319 Stewart, 2018) tended to be broad and less applicable to each individual screening stage.

320 Results of our analysis may offer insights for researchers designing new population
321 genetic screening programs and assist with identification and selection of relevant frameworks to
322 direct implementation. To make the best use of the variety of recommendations brought up by
323 the different frameworks, these frameworks may best be used in tandem. For instance,
324 determinant domains can be used when process model steps suggest identifying implementation
325 barriers and specific indicators can be drawn from evaluation frameworks when steps call for
326 assessing implementation outcomes.

327 We found that guidance for later stages of population genetic screening programs, such as
328 follow-up care and cascade screening, was limited beyond central framework characteristics. For
329 true public health impact, individuals receiving positive screening results must have access to
330 services to delay or prevent disease onset. Health benefits may also be seen if genetic risk
331 information is communicated to relatives. However, frameworks lacked specific guidance about
332 how to ensure equitable referrals to follow-up care or promote adherence to recommended
333 medical interventions. Discussion about sharing health insights and how to engage biological

334 relatives who may be implicated by an individual's risk results was also missing. This is not
335 entirely surprising given that these frameworks were not specifically developed with genetic
336 services in mind, but demonstrates that some considerations specific to genetic testing are not
337 addressed by the current literature.

338 Additionally, implementation frameworks emphasizing health equity have limited
339 guidance for ongoing programs. While the cyclical nature of EquIR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al.,
340 2019) and ongoing evaluation measures provided by RE-AIM (Shelton et al., 2020) can be used
341 to some extent, guidance particularly relevant to genetics again appears to be absent. For
342 instance, frameworks provide little assistance about how to incorporate new risk information
343 over time or ensure that providers are up to date on genetic recommendations so that they can
344 best advise their patients. Again, as the frameworks analyzed here were not designed to be
345 genetics specific, gaps in guidance are expected and suggest a need for frameworks tailored for
346 genetic programs.

347

348 Population genetic screening health equity considerations

349 Synthesizing findings from the included frameworks, we have compiled a list of relevant
350 health equity questions and outcomes that warrant consideration during the implementation of
351 population genetic screening programs in order to limit health disparities (Table 4). Though not
352 exhaustive, questions may be useful throughout the design and implementation of future
353 screening programs and spur further discussion related to pursuing health equity. Broadly,
354 considerations include the accessibility and cultural sensitivity of different population screening
355 processes. Outcomes focus on understanding the distribution of benefits and harms from genetic
356 screening, and the acceptability of program procedures across various demographic groups.

357 One of the overall considerations for pursuing health equity is involving community
358 partners (Table 4). As members of the community are likely more in-tune with local settings
359 compared to researchers, they may be better equipped to understand and identify drivers behind
360 complex inequities (*Leveraging Community Expertise to Advance Health Equity*, 2021). Through
361 community engagement, researchers and public health professionals can ascertain what
362 communities identify as problems to be addressed and what community health priorities are. This
363 can inform if population genetic screening is a suitable intervention in a particular setting and
364 truly meeting community needs. Investment by communities in population genetic screening
365 programs can also promote sustainability of such programs.

366 Even with these health equity considerations identified, challenges may emerge when
367 incorporating these ideas into practice. For example, answers to these questions may vary by
368 communities included in a single screening program. Resource constraints may also prevent the
369 adoption of more equitable practices. Additionally, outcome measures may be difficult to
370 ascertain if they involve time-intensive data collection and the continued engagement of people
371 who have taken part in genetic screening. As such, researchers and health professionals looking
372 to implement screening programs may benefit from using these considerations to appropriately
373 plan and allocate resources.

374

375 Limitations

376 Our study may have been limited by the frameworks considered for analysis. Due to
377 stringent inclusion criteria, we may not have identified all relevant frameworks. In addition,
378 though we give a broad overview of implementation science frameworks that center health
379 equity, we did not assess the quality of these frameworks. However, our analysis of how

380 frameworks have been used in other settings provides an indirect measure of utility and quality.
381 Our assessment of framework applicability to population genetic screening programs may also
382 have been limited. Relevant stages, such as sample lab testing, were not included and some of
383 our analysis may be applicable to multiple stages though not detailed here. Despite these
384 limitations, our study is a first step in describing the current state of implementation science
385 frameworks that explicitly focus on health equity and how they can be applied to improve the
386 equitable implementation of population genetic screening programs.

387

388 **CONCLUSION**

389 Current implementation science frameworks that emphasize health equity offer broad
390 recommendations applicable to the implementation of population genetic screening programs.
391 However, gaps still exist in guidance provided for stages of screening that are ongoing, such as
392 follow-up care and cascade screening. Through our application of frameworks to population
393 genetic screening, we have created a list of considerations and outcomes that may assist with
394 more equitable implementation. Researchers planning to implement screening programs may
395 benefit from consulting these considerations or following guidance from analyzed frameworks.

396

397

398 **REFERENCES**

- 399 Baumann, A. A., & Cabassa, L. J. (2020). Reframing implementation science to address
400 inequities in healthcare delivery. *BMC Health Services Research*, 20(1), 190.
401 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-4975-3>
- 402 Braveman, P. (2014). What are Health Disparities and Health Equity? We Need to Be Clear.
403 *Public Health Reports*, 129(1_suppl2), 5–8.
404 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549141291S203>
- 405 Cabassa, L. J., & Baumann, A. A. (2013). A two-way street: Bridging implementation science
406 and cultural adaptations of mental health treatments. *Implementation Science*, 8(1), 90.
407 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-8-90>
- 408 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.). *What is Health Equity?* Retrieved July 15,
409 2022, from <https://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/healthequity/index.html>
- 410 Chambers, D. A., Feero, W. G., & Khoury, M. J. (2016). Convergence of Implementation
411 Science, Precision Medicine, and the Learning Health Care System: A New Model for
412 Biomedical Research. *JAMA*, 315(18), 1941–1942.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.3867>
- 414 David, S. P., Dunnenberger, H. M., Ali, R., Matsil, A., Lemke, A. A., Singh, L., Zimmer, A., &
415 Hulick, P. J. (2021). Implementing Primary Care Mediated Population Genetic Screening
416 Within an Integrated Health System. *The Journal of the American Board of Family*
417 *Medicine*, 34(4), 861–865. <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2021.04.200381>
- 418 Drake, C., Batchelder, H., Lian, T., Cannady, M., Weinberger, M., Eisenson, H., Esmaili, E.,
419 Lewinski, A., Zullig, L. L., Haley, A., Edelman, D., & Shea, C. M. (2021).
420 Implementation of social needs screening in primary care: A qualitative study using the

- 421 health equity implementation framework. *BMC Health Services Research*, 21(1), 975.
422 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06991-3>
- 423 East, K. M., Kelley, W. V., Cannon, A., Cochran, M. E., Moss, I. P., May, T., Nakano-Okuno,
424 M., Sodeke, S. O., Edberg, J. C., Cimino, J. J., Fouad, M., Curry, W. A., Hurst, A. C. E.,
425 Bowling, K. M., Thompson, M. L., Bebin, E. M., Johnson, R. D., AGHI Consortium,
426 Cooper, G. M., ... Korf, B. R. (2021). A state-based approach to genomics for rare
427 disease and population screening. *Genetics in Medicine: Official Journal of the American*
428 *College of Medical Genetics*, 23(4), 777–781. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41436-020-01034-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41436-020-01034-4)
429 4
- 430 Eslava-Schmalbach, J., Garzón-Orjuela, N., Elias, V., Reveiz, L., Tran, N., & Langlois, E. V.
431 (2019). Conceptual framework of equity-focused implementation research for health
432 programs (EquIR). *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 18(1), 80.
433 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-019-0984-4>
- 434 Glasgow, R. E., Harden, S. M., Gaglio, B., Rabin, B., Smith, M. L., Porter, G. C., Ory, M. G., &
435 Estabrooks, P. A. (2019). RE-AIM Planning and Evaluation Framework: Adapting to
436 New Science and Practice With a 20-Year Review. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7.
437 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00064>
- 438 Glasgow, R. E., Vogt, T. M., & Boles, S. M. (1999). Evaluating the public health impact of
439 health promotion interventions: The RE-AIM framework. *American Journal of Public*
440 *Health*, 89(9), 1322–1327.
- 441 Grzymiski, J. J., Coppes, M. J., Metcalf, J., Galanopoulos, C., Rowan, C., Henderson, M., Read,
442 R., Reed, H., Lipp, B., Miceli, D., Rybarski, S., & Slonim, A. (2018). *The Healthy*

- 443 *Nevada Project: Rapid recruitment for population health study* (p. 250274). bioRxiv.
444 <https://doi.org/10.1101/250274>
- 445 Grzymiski, J. J., Elhanan, G., Morales Rosado, J. A., Smith, E., Schlauch, K. A., Read, R.,
446 Rowan, C., Slotnick, N., Dabe, S., Metcalf, W. J., Lipp, B., Reed, H., Sharma, L., Levin,
447 E., Kao, J., Rashkin, M., Bowes, J., Dunaway, K., Slonim, A., ... Lu, J. T. (2020).
448 Population genetic screening efficiently identifies carriers of autosomal dominant
449 diseases. *Nature Medicine*, 26(8), Article 8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0982-5>
- 450 Harvey, G., & Kitson, A. (2016). PARIHS revisited: From heuristic to integrated framework for
451 the successful implementation of knowledge into practice. *Implementation Science*,
452 11(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-016-0398-2>
- 453 Kilbourne, A. M., Switzer, G., Hyman, K., Crowley-Matoka, M., & Fine, M. J. (2006).
454 Advancing Health Disparities Research Within the Health Care System: A Conceptual
455 Framework. *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(12), 2113–2121.
456 <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.077628>
- 457 King, M.-C., Levy-Lahad, E., & Lahad, A. (2014). Population-based screening for BRCA1 and
458 BRCA2: 2014 Lasker Award. *JAMA*, 312(11), 1091–1092.
459 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2014.12483>
- 460 *Leveraging Community Expertise to Advance Health Equity*. (2021, July 1). Urban Institute.
461 [https://www.urban.org/research/publication/leveraging-community-expertise-advance-](https://www.urban.org/research/publication/leveraging-community-expertise-advance-health-equity)
462 [health-equity](https://www.urban.org/research/publication/leveraging-community-expertise-advance-health-equity)
- 463 Limburg, P. J., Harmsen, W. S., Chen, H. H., Gallinger, S., Haile, R. W., Baron, J. A., Casey, G.,
464 Woods, M. O., Thibodeau, S. N., & Lindor, N. M. (2011). Prevalence of alterations in
465 DNA mismatch repair genes in patients with young-onset colorectal cancer. *Clinical*

- 466 *Gastroenterology and Hepatology: The Official Clinical Practice Journal of the*
467 *American Gastroenterological Association*, 9(6), 497–502.
468 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cgh.2010.10.021>
- 469 Marquez, C., Kerkhoff, A. D., Naso, J., Contreras, M. G., Diaz, E. C., Rojas, S., Peng, J., Rubio,
470 L., Jones, D., Jacobo, J., Rojas, S., Gonzalez, R., Fuchs, J. D., Black, D., Ribeiro, S.,
471 Nossokoff, J., Tulier-Laiwa, V., Martinez, J., Chamie, G., ... Havlir, D. V. (2021). A
472 multi-component, community-based strategy to facilitate COVID-19 vaccine uptake
473 among Latinx populations: From theory to practice. *PLOS ONE*, 16(9), e0257111.
474 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0257111>
- 475 Nápoles, A. M., & Stewart, A. L. (2018). Transcreation: An implementation science framework
476 for community-engaged behavioral interventions to reduce health disparities. *BMC*
477 *Health Services Research*, 18(1), 710. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3521-z>
- 478 Nilsen, P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks.
479 *Implementation Science*, 10(1), 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0>
- 480 Odeny, B. (2021). Closing the health equity gap: A role for implementation science? *PLOS*
481 *Medicine*, 18(9), e1003762. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003762>
- 482 Proctor, E. K., Landsverk, J., Aarons, G., Chambers, D., Glisson, C., & Mittman, B. (2009).
483 Implementation Research in Mental Health Services: An Emerging Science with
484 Conceptual, Methodological, and Training challenges. *Administration and Policy in*
485 *Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 36(1), 24–34.
486 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-008-0197-4>
- 487 Rao, N. D., Kaganovsky, J., Malouf, E. A., Coe, S., Huey, J., Tsinajinne, D., Hassan, S., King,
488 K. M., Fullerton, S. M., Chen, A. T., & Shirts, B. H. (2023). Diagnostic yield of genetic

- 489 screening in a diverse, community-ascertained cohort. *Genome Medicine*, 15(1), 26.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-023-01174-7>
- 491 Roberts, M. C., Kennedy, A. E., Chambers, D. A., & Khoury, M. J. (2017). The current state of
492 implementation science in genomic medicine: Opportunities for improvement. *Genetics*
493 *in Medicine*, 19(8), 858–863. <https://doi.org/10.1038/gim.2016.210>
- 494 Santoyo-Olsson, J., Stewart, A. L., Samayoa, C., Palomino, H., Urias, A., Gonzalez, N., Torres-
495 Nguyen, A., Coleman, L., Escalera, C., Totten, V. Y., Ortiz, C., & Nápoles, A. M.
496 (2019). Translating a stress management intervention for rural Latina breast cancer
497 survivors: The Nuevo Amanecer-II. *PLOS ONE*, 14(10), e0224068.
498 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0224068>
- 499 Shelton, R. C., Chambers, D. A., & Glasgow, R. E. (2020). An Extension of RE-AIM to Enhance
500 Sustainability: Addressing Dynamic Context and Promoting Health Equity Over Time.
501 *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8.
502 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00134>
- 503 Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2010). Community-Based Participatory Research Contributions to
504 Intervention Research: The Intersection of Science and Practice to Improve Health
505 Equity. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(S1), S40–S46.
506 <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.184036>
- 507 Woodward, E. N., Matthieu, M. M., Uchendu, U. S., Rogal, S., & Kirchner, J. E. (2019). The
508 health equity implementation framework: Proposal and preliminary study of hepatitis C
509 virus treatment. *Implementation Science*, 14(1), 26. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-019-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-019-0861-y)
510 0861-y

511 Woodward, E. N., Singh, R. S., Ndebele-Ngwenya, P., Melgar Castillo, A., Dickson, K. S., &
512 Kirchner, J. E. (2021). A more practical guide to incorporating health equity domains in
513 implementation determinant frameworks. *Implementation Science Communications*, 2(1),
514 61. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-021-00146-5>
515

516 **Table 1: Characteristics of included frameworks**
517

Framework and Author	Type	Audience	Development	Description
Health Equity Implementation Framework (HEIF) , (Woodward et al., 2019)	Determinant	Researchers	Integration of the implementation science framework, i-PARIHS (Harvey & Kitson, 2016), and the Health Care Disparities Framework (Kilbourne et al., 2006)	Framework to assist studying and modifying multilevel implementation and healthcare disparity factors
Reframing implementation science to address inequities in healthcare delivery (Proctor reframed) , (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020)	Process	Researchers	Reframes Proctor et al.'s conceptual model of implementation research (Proctor et al., 2009) to study healthcare inequities	Framework seeking to address inequities in healthcare by proactively tailoring interventions and implementation strategies to address social determinants of health and explicitly meet the needs of vulnerable communities/settings
Transcreation: an implementation science framework for community-engaged behavioral interventions to reduce health disparities , (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018)	Process	Community partners and researchers	Prior methodological frameworks, training resources, authors' experience	Framework for designing and implementing behavioral interventions specifically for communities experiencing health disparities
Conceptual framework of equity-focused implementation research for	Process	Decision makers and researchers	Literature review, stakeholder analysis	Conceptual framework designed to reduce or prevent the increase of

<p>health programs (EquIR), (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019)</p>				<p>existing inequalities during the implementation of programs, policies or health</p>
<p>An Extension of RE-AIM to Enhance Sustainability: Addressing Dynamic Context and Promoting Health Equity Over Time, (Shelton et al., 2020)</p>	<p>Evaluation</p>	<p>Not stated</p>	<p>Builds upon the previously developed RE-AIM framework (Glasgow et al., 1999, 2019)</p>	<p>Evaluates public health interventions across reach, efficacy, adoption, implementation, and maintenance domains. Focused on sustainability, with the goal of increasing health impact and health equity over time</p>

518

519

520

521 **Table 2: Components of included frameworks**
522

Framework	Components/Steps
HEIF (Woodward et al., 2019)	<p>Factors to understand healthcare disparity determinants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical encounter: patient-provider interaction • Culturally relevant factors: characteristics unique to a group of people in the implementation effort based on their lived experience • Societal context: physical structures, economies, sociopolitical forces • Context: micro, meso, or macro levels that correspond to inner and outer contexts • Recipients: individuals who influence implementation and those who are affected by its outcomes • Innovation: characteristics of the treatment, intervention, practice, or new “thing” to be implemented • Facilitation: implementation strategies that result in implementation coming to fruition
Proctor reframed (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020)	<p>Steps to design intervention and implementation strategies to address healthcare inequities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on reach from the very beginning 2. Design and select interventions for vulnerable populations with implementation in mind 3. Implement what works and develop implementation strategies that can help reduce inequities in care 4. Develop the science of adaptation 5. Use an equity lens for implementation outcomes
Transcreation (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018)	<p>Steps involved in designing, delivering, and evaluating intervention to reduce health disparities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify community infrastructure and engage partners 2. Specify theory 3. Identify multiple inputs for new program 4. Design intervention prototype 5. Design study, methods, and measure for community setting 6. Build community capacity for delivery 7. Deliver “transcreated” intervention (e.g., an intervention designed to resonate with the intended community and reduce health disparities) and evaluate implementation processes

<p>EquIR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019)</p>	<p>Cyclical steps to prevent the increase of inequalities during intervention implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Identify the health status of the population, including potentially disadvantaged population(s)2. Identify relevant research questions given the disadvantaged populations, quantify the inequalities to be solved, develop equity-sensitive recommendations for implementation3. Identify key players and barriers and facilitators for the implementation of equity-sensitive recommendations4. Design strategies to overcome identified barriers, define monitoring and evaluation strategies, and design the equity-focused communication strategies5. Monitor implementation outcomes using an equity focus (outcomes listed below)6. Return to step 1 – Population health status after implementation is the new starting point for further implementation <p>Implementation outcomes to evaluate equity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acceptability: perception among key implementation players including health professionals, stakeholders, patients, community, disadvantaged population• Adoption: intention, utilization, or action to try to employ the sensitive equity recommendation in the new program or intervention• Appropriateness: relevance or perceived fit, or usefulness or practicability of the program or intervention in the disadvantaged population• Feasibility: extent to which the program or intervention allows to reduce the barriers, and can be carried out in any setting, especially among disadvantaged populations• Fidelity: adherence of disadvantaged population to the equity-focused implementation program or intervention• Implementation cost: Total cost of the program implementation in disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged populations, and the final adjusted cost- effectiveness economic evaluation• Coverage: degree of reach, access, service spread or effective coverage (combining coverage and fidelity) on the disadvantaged population eligible to benefit from the program or the intervention• Sustainability: maintenance, continuation or durability of the program or
--	---

	intervention implemented through short, medium and long- term strategies, including disadvantaged populations
RE-AIM extension (Shelton et al., 2020)	<p>Health equity considerations for evaluation domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reach: Considering social determinants of health (SDOH), who is reached by intervention and who is not? Why? How can reach be improved for populations who are experiencing inequities?• Effectiveness: Are health impacts equitable across all groups based on SDOH? Why or why not? Do certain populations experience higher levels of negative effects?• Adoption: Did all settings adopt the intervention equitably? Which settings staff did/did not and why? Were low-resource settings able to adopt the intervention to the same extent as higher-resource settings? What adaptations will facilitate adoption?• Implementation: Were the intervention and implementation strategies equitably delivered across settings/staff? Which settings/staff were/were not successful in delivery and why? Do all settings/staff have capacity/resources to deliver the intervention on an ongoing basis? What adaptations are needed to promote equity and address SDOH?• Maintenance: Is the intervention being equitably sustained? What settings/populations continue to be reached by the intervention over time? Why? Do intervention adaptations exacerbate inequities over time? Do all settings have capacity to maintain delivery of the intervention? Are sustainability determinants the same across low and high-resource settings? How do SDOH impact inequitable implementation and sustainability?

523

524

525 **Table 3: Applicability of frameworks to population genetic screening programs**
 526

Framework/ Population Screening Stages	Recruitment	Sample Collection	Return Results	Follow-Up Care & Prevention	Cascade Screening
HEIF (Woodward et al., 2019)	Anticipate and identify barriers and facilitators using health equity domains: culturally relevant factors, the clinical encounter and societal context				
Proctor reframed (Baumann & Cabassa, 2020)	Include populations experiencing inequities. Conduct programs in non-traditional settings.				
	Collaborate with stakeholders and community members				
	Assess acceptability and adapt interventions				
Transcreation (Nápoles & Stewart, 2018)	Focus on populations experiencing inequities. Adopt recruitment strategies that have worked in similar settings.				
	Stakeholder and community participation				
	Involve and train community health workers				
EquiR (Eslava-Schmalbach et al., 2019)	Consider how programs and procedures may exclude disadvantaged communities				
	Quantify potential inequities				
	Develop recommendations to address inequities				
	Relevant outcomes: acceptability, appropriateness, coverage	Relevant outcomes: acceptability, appropriateness, coverage, fidelity	Relevant outcomes: acceptability, appropriateness, coverage, fidelity	Relevant outcomes: coverage, fidelity	Relevant outcomes: acceptability, coverage, fidelity
RE-AIM extension	# offered screening, #	# who want to	# who have results	# who engage in	# who communicate

(Shelton et al., 2020)	who enroll	receive screening, # who provide samples	available, # who receive results, # who experience psychosocial harms from results	preventive interventions who desire it, # who experience psychosocial harms because of difficulties accessing care (measure over time)	about risk with relatives, # of biological relatives who receive testing (measure over time)
------------------------	------------	--	--	--	--

527

528

529 **Table 4: Health equity considerations for population genetic screening programs**
 530

Stage	Health equity-focused questions	Outcomes assessed across social determinants
Recruitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If recruitment occurs in-person, is it at an accessible location? Do people have adequate transportation to the site? Are these physical spaces accessible to people with disabilities, including movement, hearing, vision, etc.? • If recruitment occurs online, how can people without regular internet access be reached? • What are relevant cultural beliefs about genetics in specific population groups? Are recruitment materials designed with these in mind? • What language are informational and consent materials provided in? Does this align with people’s preferred language? • How does socioeconomic status and insurance coverage influence screening enrollment? • How does a history of harms influence screening enrollment? • If screening is offered by providers, is it offered equally? What provider or patient factors influence if screening is offered? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people offered screening • Number of people who agree to screening • How do people (e.g., health professionals, community members) perceive screening? • Are recruitment and outreach procedures considered acceptable? • Does pre-screening information lead to informed decision-making about screening?
Sample collection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If sample collection takes place in-person, is it at an accessible location? Do people have adequate transportation to the site? Are these physical spaces accessible to people with disabilities, including movement, hearing, vision, etc.? Does collection take place during routine care? • If sample collection occurs at home, do 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of people who provide a sample among those who want to receive screening • How do people (e.g., health professionals, community members, stakeholders) perceive

	<p>people have a regular address a collection kit can be sent to and a mailbox for return?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are relevant cultural beliefs about genetics in specific population groups? Are sample collection and retention procedures designed with these in mind? • What language are materials about sample collection procedures provided in? Does this align with people’s preferred language? 	<p>the sample collection process? Are procedures considered acceptable?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How easy was it for people to collect samples? If needed, how easy was sample recollection?
Return of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If return of results occurs in-person, is it at an accessible location? Do people have adequate transportation to the site? Are these physical spaces accessible to people with disabilities, including movement, hearing, vision, etc.? • If return of results occurs online or via phone, how can people without regular internet or phone access be reached? • What are relevant cultural beliefs about genetics in specific population groups? Are clinical services provided with these in mind? • What language are clinical services provided in? Does this align with people’s preferred language? • Do all people with the same screening results receive the most appropriate level of guidance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of people who receive results among those who provide samples • Proportion of people who indicate experiencing psychosocial harms among those who receive screening results • How do people perceive the return of results process? Is the guidance provided acceptable? • How helpful or useful do people find the information learned through screening? • How much time is present between when people provide samples and when results are returned?
Follow-up care & prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are necessary clinics or specialists in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of people

	<p>accessible locations? Do people have adequate transportation to relevant facilities? Are these physical spaces accessible to people with disabilities, including movement, hearing, vision, etc.?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does socioeconomic status and insurance coverage influence prevention uptake? • Are all people with the same risk profiles referred to the same type of specialists or advised in the same way? 	<p>who discuss results with their provider among those receiving screening results^</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of people who meet with appropriate specialists among those who receive positive risk results • Proportion of people who adhere to appropriate medical interventions among those who receive positive risk results • Proportion of people who experience psychosocial harms or clinical harms^
<p>Cascade screening</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are genetic services accessible to biological relatives? • How do health beliefs, health literacy, and family dynamics influence how genetic risk is discussed within families? • Are all individuals offered the same support regarding risk communication? • What are local/state considerations for cascade screening (e.g., related to sharing genetic information)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of people who discuss genetic risk with biological relatives among those receiving screening results^ • Number of biological relatives who receive testing • How do people view genetic risk information sharing? Is such sharing considered acceptable?

<p>Overall considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are community partners and other stakeholders involved in program planning, design implementation, and evaluation?• What processes are in place to facilitate program adaptations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• To what degree do community partners or stakeholders report understanding of and involvement in program processes, trust in research partners, or benefits from program implementation?• How often are program procedures reviewed? By whom are they reviewed?• After receiving screening, would people recommend screening to others?
-------------------------------	---	--

531 ^Consider by type of screening result (e.g., positive or uninformative)

532

Figure 1

Five major stages of population genetic screening





Figure 2

Diagram of article search and selection process



*2 articles relevant to the same framework