

Methods Article

Community Collaboration in Public Health Genetic Literacy: Co-Designing Educational Resources for Equitable Genomics Research and Practice

Juhi Salunke^a, Grace Byfield^a, Sabrina N. Powell^a, Daniel Torres^{a,b}, Grace Leon-Lozano^a, Jahnelle Jackson^c, Andreas K. Orphanides^{d,e}, Jonathan Shaw^e, Thomas Owens^e, Jonathan S. Berg^a, Elizabeth Branch^f, Lennin Caro^{e,g}, Stefanija Giric^a, Julianne M. O'Daniel^a, Bradford C. Powell^a, Ken Ray^e, Megan C. Robertsⁱ, Carla Robinson^e, Samantha Schilling^h, Nicole Shaw^j, Erin Song^e, Margaret Waltz^k, Ann Katherine M. Foreman^a, Kimberly Foss^a, Laura V. Milko^a

^aDepartment of Genetics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

^bMS Genetic Counseling Program, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC United States.

^cDepartment of Pathobiology & Translational Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

^dNC State University Libraries, Raleigh, NC, United States

^eCommunity Research Board, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

^fUNC School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

^gCamino Research Institute, Charlotte, NC, United States

^hDepartment of Pediatrics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

ⁱEshelman School of Pharmacy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

^jOlilu Designed, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

^kDepartment of Social Medicine and Center for Bioethics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, United States

Short Title: Genomics & Genetics Educational Modules: Community Collaboration in Genetic Literacy

Corresponding Author:

Laura V. Milko

E-mail address: laura_milko@med.unc.edu

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Keywords: Community engagement, Community-based participatory research, Decision-making, Education in genetics, Ethnic/racial minorities, Genetic research, Genetic screening, Genetic education, Health equity, Implementation science, Public health, Public Health Genetic Literacy, Public health genetics

Abstract

Introduction

Unequal representation in genetic and genomic research is due to various factors including historically inequitable and unjust institutional research practices, potential mistrust of biomedical research among underrepresented populations, and lack of access to or awareness of research opportunities. Facilitating sustainable dialogue between diverse communities and genetic researchers can cultivate trusting, bidirectional relationships, potentially encouraging greater participation in research. Herein, we describe the co-creation of public health educational materials and dissemination plans.

Methods

We describe co-creation by genetics clinicians, researchers, and community members of Genetics and Genomics Educational modules. These modules are aimed at enhancing genetic literacy with a goal to facilitate informed decision-making regarding genetic research and health services. We used Designing for Dissemination and Sustainability, which is grounded in Dissemination and Implementation science, and the Fit to Context process framework to guide the process. This approach ensures the public health context and diverse audience for the modules are considered throughout their development. Additionally, it ensures that broader goals such as dissemination, equity, and sustainability are integrated from the outset, fostering long-term impact and effectiveness.

Conclusion

This article offers an evidence-based template for adoption or adaptation by other community-engaged groups, aimed at bolstering equity and sustainability in the development of health care interventions, with an emphasis on accessible public health literacy. The co-creation of both materials and dissemination plans between researchers and community members may improve the cultural appropriateness and relevance of public health genetics campaigns. Ongoing research is needed to assess the impact on receptiveness and participation.

Introduction

Rapid progress in DNA-based population screening, focusing on actionable disease-predisposing genetic variation in asymptomatic individuals, holds tremendous potential to mitigate adverse health outcomes and drive the advancement of precision public health [1]. However, widespread application of this technology in a healthy population faces numerous challenges to acceptance by the public, exacerbated by insufficient research in communities that reflect the population at large [2,3]. Research on participation in clinical translational genomic studies reveals a disproportionate representation of higher-resourced individuals and those with European ancestry, while lower-resourced and racially minoritized populations may be apprehensive about the disclosure of genetic data, its security, potential misuse, and the associated costs and risks of future discrimination [4–8]. Due to a lack of trust in and knowledge about genetic and genomic research, if only specific segments of society engage in genomic research existing health disparities will be exacerbated in clinical practice [9–11].

Mistrust of and misinformation about genomics, particularly in historically marginalized groups, must be addressed before genomic technology can be equitably applied to improve public health outcomes. Numerous studies have found that multilingual and culturally responsive educational resources could build genetic health literacy and awareness, and subsequently improve participation in research [12–15]. Research has shown the profound impact of fostering trust-based relationships and bidirectional communication, emphasizing the inclusion of communities historically marginalized and exploited by biomedical research, notably Black and African American people who have been systematically excluded from the advances made with their contributions [16–21]. This inclusive approach has been shown to enhance interest and participation in research, particularly when intended beneficiaries are engaged throughout the development process [22–26].

However, most publicly available genetic educational resources are tailored towards individuals with higher education levels or a background in science or medicine, often overlooking underserved communities with lower literacy levels. These materials typically concentrate on disease-specific or test-related information, which might not effectively convey essential genetic concepts to a broader audience [27,28]. Furthermore, educational materials aimed at patients frequently lack input from the very communities they seek to serve, resulting in limited relevance and effectiveness [29,30], creating a gap between the evidence-based interventions' design and their adoption by the communities for which they are intended.

The Age Based Genomic Screening (ABGS) study, funded by the National Human Genome Research Institute and led by researchers at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), seeks to

integrate targeted genomic screening into routine pediatric well-child visits. At the core of the design and development of the ABGS study is a robust commitment to community partnership throughout its duration, along with the application of models and framework from Dissemination and Implementation (D&I) science with the goal of enhancing access and equity across diverse settings[31].

One such model, Designing for Dissemination and Sustainability (D4DS), encompasses four key phases during the development of a new health intervention —Conceptualization, Design, Dissemination, and Impact—aimed at ensuring the fit of an intervention with the contextual characteristics of its target audience and setting, and planning for active dissemination and sustainability from the outset of development [32]. Throughout the development of an intervention, process, determinants, and evaluation frameworks from D&I science provide structure for the D4DS methodology. The Fit to Context (F2C) process framework underpins and organizes the D4DS elements to enhance success across each of the four phases. Determinants frameworks, such as the Practical, Robust Implementation and Sustainability Model (PRISM)[33], prioritize understanding of beneficiaries, adopters, and contextual characteristics, ensuring iterative alignment between the intervention and its evolving context. Outcomes frameworks such as Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance (RE-AIM) [34], facilitate iterative evaluation ensuring continued alignment with context and equitable reach, adoption, sustainment, and health impact over time [35]. This thorough approach optimizes feasibility and adoption among diverse audiences through ongoing community partnerships, feedback, and evaluation, thereby fostering health equity through tailored strategies and systemic changes.

ABGS is a novel proposal aimed at expanding screening opportunities for children for actionable genetic conditions, building upon the established public health success of newborn screening (NBS), which universally screens newborns for conditions offering clear health benefits through early detection and treatment. Unlike NBS, which operates on an 'opt-out' basis due to its critical role in public health, ABGS seeks to expand the scope of screenable conditions, including some with lower penetrance and later onset in childhood. This expansion necessitates a shift to an 'opt-in' approach. The transition to "opt-in" screening for ABGS requires the establishment of new mechanisms to guide parents and providers through the complex decision-making and consent processes inherent in the program. Recognizing this need, we aim to bridge this gap by creating educational resources on public health genomics developed through participatory design with community members. Our approach is rooted in the D4DS foundation, operationalized by the Fit-to-Context (F2C) process framework, as we outline our current and future goals for development.

Methods

Application of the Fit-to-Context (F2C) Process Framework

We use the F2C framework, building upon the foundational D4DS principles and methods, to guide the development of resources aimed at enhancing public health genetic literacy and fostering equitable participation in genetic and genomic research. Expanding on D4DS, the F2C framework pairs actions and outcomes for each of the iterative phases of Conceptualization, Design, Dissemination, and Impact with specifically relevant research methods and approaches. The adoption of the F2C facilitated the systematic application of D4DS approaches, drawing from diverse fields such as D&I, communications, marketing, and the arts. The goal is to craft a public health intervention tailored to its target audience, with considerations for future dissemination and sustainability from the project's inception (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Designing for Dissemination and Sustainability (D4DS) phases, with adapted constructs based on the Fit to Context (F2C) process framework, used in the development of the Genetic and Genomic Educational Modules. The application of F2C guides the process, ensuring contextual alignment to meet diverse educational needs while advancing dissemination, equity, and long-term sustainability objectives.

Phase 1: Conceptualization

The initial Conceptualization phase of D4DS underscores the importance of community partnerships in understanding the need, demand, and capacity for a new intervention aimed at addressing a health issue of significance to communities. The subsequent subsections outline our prioritization of the F2C objectives and outcomes for the Conceptualization phase in developing public health genetics educational resources. These priorities include establishing a community-academic partnership, consulting primary literature to gain insight into known and established community needs and demands for such resources, as well as addressing contextual factors essential for health equity and capacity for change.

Establishing Community-Academic Partnership and Genetic Educational Priorities

In 2021, UNC researchers assembled a Community Research Board (CRB) comprising parents from diverse backgrounds across NC and involved them as active research collaborators [23]. Currently, the approximately 25 person (membership varies slightly due to occasional attrition and new recruitment) ABGS collaborative research team comprises a multi-disciplinary team of researchers and clinicians from UNC with expertise in relevant fields (including bioethics, social science, education, community engagement, newborn screening, dissemination and implementation science, health communication and decision-making, genetic counseling, pediatrics, and clinical genetics), and CRB parents with invaluable perspectives, lived experiences, and cultural insights, who collaborate on the research design, conduct, and materials of the ABGS study. Onboarding of new CRB members required education in genomic screening, along with its ethical, legal, and social implications (ELSI), to enable them to contribute informed perspectives regarding pediatric genomic screening. As this capacity-building exercise has expanded to the co-design of publicly accessible genetic health literacy resources via a community-academic partnership, members of the ABGS collaborative research team meet monthly via video conference and periodically in person to engage in an informal version of Community Engagement Studios [36] to discuss the research design, conduct, and materials of the ABGS study.

Initially, ABGS researchers curated capacity-building topics for the new CRB members to cover essential medical genetic concepts vital for building public health genetic literacy and facilitating informed decision-making regarding involvement in research or use of genetic health services (Table 1). Despite UNC research team members' broad backgrounds in genetics research and clinical practice, we struggled to effectively convey crucial information to CRB members in an engaging and accessible manner. In early capacity-building sessions, CRB feedback played a pivotal role in shaping the trajectory of future resource development. The input from the CRB influenced decisions regarding content, length, delivery mode, readability, and ensured the resources resonated appropriately and effectively with their intended public audience.

Evaluating Evidence, Needs, and Demand for Public Health Genetic Literacy

The increasing accessibility of genomic technology and information across clinical, commercial, media, and social media platforms has coincided with a surge in misinformation and gaps in genetic and genomic understanding. Consequently, there is a pressing need for resources to bridge these gaps outside specialized genetics environments, especially considering that individuals possess varying levels of literacy. Kaphingst et al. [29] distinguish between genetic knowledge and genetic

literacy, highlighting that genetic literacy not only involves acquiring adequate knowledge of genetics and genomics but also entails the ability to effectively communicate and apply this knowledge in personal, social, and professional settings [37]. They underscore the importance of future empirical research in identifying the essential domains of genetics - and genomics-related skills and knowledge for the dissemination and utilization of genomic information in both public health and clinical settings, as well as understanding the relationship between these domains and the application of genetic knowledge [38,39]. We have adopted the Kaphingst et al. definition of genetic literacy from

During almost 20 planned or invited engagement and education events in NC, members of the ABGS collaborative research team actively participated to raise awareness of genetic and genomic among the public. ABGS participation aimed not only to educate but also to engage with community members, eliciting their thoughts, ideas, and concerns regarding genetic and genomic research. Through these interactions, specific community priorities have emerged prominently, guiding the development of educational resources tailored to address these urgent concerns. Community priorities included the demand for transparent information regarding the purpose and procedures of genetic and genomic research and health services, as well as questions and concerns about data storage, privacy, access rights, and the potential risks, benefits, and relevance to themselves, their families, and their communities. Additionally, community members have raised questions about whether genetic screening may reveal conditions not covered by health insurance or federal health programs, despite the availability of preventive or management strategies. Overall, community members persist in their desire to expand their understanding about genetic and genomic information, a factor known to increase recruitment of Black and African American participants in genomic research [40,41].

Prioritizing Equity in Context and Capacity for Change

Historical events of abuse and exploitation perpetuated by researchers from academic and medical institutions against racialized minorities, as well as marginalized, lower-resourced, and disabled individuals and communities in the U.S. has led to enduring mistrust of biomedical research and the healthcare system among these populations [21,42]. Furthermore, ongoing health discrimination and disparity, such as insufficient communication and exclusion from community research and developed outcomes, exacerbate this mistrust and discourage participation in genetic and genomic research, despite its potential to mitigate health inequities if implemented with representation from all populations [43–45]. Nevertheless, amidst these persistent barriers, many members of underserved communities maintain interest and an open-mindedness toward genetic and genomic research and

public health interventions, driven by the prospect of disease prevention and an altruistic regard for future generations [25,46,47]. To resolve this tension, additional research into the best practices for developing and disseminating educational resources on genetics and genomics with particular emphasis on empowering and informing marginalized and harmed communities is necessary[48].

Current research emphasizes the communication gap that exists between underrepresented communities, increasingly targeted for participation in genomics research, and presumably well-intentioned yet culturally distant researchers [4,20,49]. These studies reveal a significant mismatch between study materials, recruitment strategies, and incentives, and the specific cultural contexts they are employed in, often resulting in a comprehension gap between researchers and the core values of the communities they aim to engage. Recognizing these discrepancies, it becomes necessary to adhere to the principles of communication science, and tailor engagement and recruitment approaches to align with the cultural nuances significant to the target communities. Fortunately, there is growing adoption of such practices, supported by an increasing number of funders, such as the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute and the National Human Genetics Research Institute. The organizations are actively funding academic-community partnerships aimed at pursuing these inclusive practices. The D4DS paradigm offers valuable insights to optimize research products and innovations co-designed through these partnerships, ensuring broad reach and feasibility from their inception.

Phase 2: Design

During the D4DS Design phase, collaborative efforts focus on developing research products and formulating active dissemination and sustainability plans that align seamlessly with the intended context. F2C objectives and outcomes aim to ensure congruence with the established needs, demands, and capacity for change within the community or population represented by the partners. Incorporating active dissemination and sustainability plans within the Design phase is crucial, as they require customization to messaging, packaging, and distribution channels that resonate effectively with the intended audience and setting. In the following subsections, we outline our current and ongoing efforts, including co-designing the Genetics and Genomics Educational Modules, preliminary dissemination of the modules within communities to establish bidirectional communication and receive feedback, implementing a feasibility pilot, and outlining future plans for sustainability.

Co-Designing Genetics and Genomics Educational Modules

Insights from early module drafts utilized in community health events broadened the scope of resources being co-developed by the ABGS collaborative research team into seven comprehensive Genetics and Genomics Educational Modules (“the modules”) (Table 1). Initially conceived of and developed as presentation slide decks, they serve as dynamic storyboards, providing a flexible framework for the development of various media formats. Each module follows a structured format comprising an introductory message, a main body of educational content, and a set of 'takeaway concepts', with an average presentation duration of under 15 minutes. To ensure the accessibility of the content, the modules are crafted in plain language, with readability tailored to a 5th to 8th-grade level. Consistent language and illustrations are used across all modules to maintain coherent messaging throughout the sequence, although they can be presented either sequentially or as standalone learning objects. Customized scripts are designed to facilitate both independent and collaborative presentations.

Table 1: ABGS Genetics & Genomics Education Modules.

Module Number	Title	Main Topics
1	DNA – What is it and what does it do?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What DNA and genes are • How genes affect traits within families • Connections between genes and disease
2	How Traits are Inherited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarities and differences between each person’s DNA • Genetic inheritance patterns • Disease risk inheritance throughout families
3	Your Genes and Your Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How gene variants can affect the body’s function • Examples of different types of gene changes (point mutation/deletions/missense) • How gene variants can have different implications for health (variable expressivity/penetrance)
4	Genetic Testing and Screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different purposes of genetic testing and screening • Examples of when providers would perform genetic testing versus genetic screening • How results for testing and screening differ and the process for returning results to patients
5	Safeguards in Genetic & Genomic Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of information used in genetic and genomic research • Overview of prior harms in biomedical research that led to changes in research participant protections • Informed consent and current safeguards protecting human research participants

6	Possible Risks and Benefits of Genetic Screening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Examples of how genetic screening can affect public health ● Multilevel benefits and risks of genetic screening ● Informed consent and decision-making
7	All About the Age-Based Genomic Screening Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Description of ABGS approach ● Implementation of the ABGS pilot study ● Example conditions included in screen and what a participating family can expect during the screening process

The first four modules, completed at the time of publication, delve into the scientific principles of genomic medicine. The subsequent duo of modules, currently at various stages of review and development, explore ethical, legal, social, and technological dimensions of genetic and genomic screening and research. These modules address complex topics such as historical instances of unethical biomedical research and the contemporary research safeguards developed in response. The planned Module 7 will further build upon the content covered in the previous modules by introducing the ABGS study itself.




Figure 2: (A) Initially, a linear process was employed for the co-design of the modules. (B) An expanded approach to module creation was later adopted, entailing iterative cycles of reviews among the subgroups of the ABGS collaborative research team. This iterative approach was implemented to ensure the incorporation of diverse perspectives and insights, enriching the developmental process of the modules.

Initially, the co-development process followed a linear path (Figure 2A) with a small writing team comprising UNC researchers creating a basic draft of the module. Then this team gathered and incorporated feedback from the CRB through templated Google forms and video conference discussions, with a focus on assessing the appropriateness, accessibility, relevance, and clarity of the genetic concepts and images. This feedback loop was then replicated with the UNC research team, who provided input regarding the accuracy and depth of the content. ABGS researchers within the writing team then integrated this feedback to refine the modules, ensuring better alignment with the target audience's needs.

Following this, a health literacy librarian from UNC's Health Sciences Library assessed readability using the metrics of Flesch-Kincaid Reading Grade Level and SMOG (Simple Measure of Gobbledygook)[50], identified areas of unnecessary complexity, and suggested plain language terms for broader accessibility. Following the literacy review, the ABGS researchers ensured the module content retained its scientific veracity. To address the dilemma of balancing readability with scientific precision, the ABGS collaborative research team began co-developing an accompanying plain language glossary of essential genetic terms as a supplement to the modules.

Ultimately, the challenges encountered during the co-creation process, balancing visual and scientific accuracy and consistency, while ensuring broad accessibility, prompted the team to transition from a linear to an iterative design approach. The diverse composition of the CRB led to a spectrum of recommendations, at times conflicting with each other, or with the research team's understanding of patient education practices. Although this adjustment added complexity to tracking and incorporating feedback, we believe it fostered a more inclusive approach where all perspectives were equally heard and considered.

The new iterative design process utilized in module development involved multiple rounds of review among researchers and between UNC researchers and the CRB at various stages (Figure 2B). Following each iteration, the module underwent refinement, resulting in a more polished version [51] that advanced to the next stage. Given the added complexity of the review process, we established documentation practices to accurately manage feedback and suggestions arising from each review cycle. During deliberations on the suggestions, ABGS researchers documented the rationale behind each decision, sharing them with the CRB. Revisions underwent a review process for group consensus, often resulting in additional changes aimed at strengthening the connection between the content and the intended audience. The number of review rounds needed to finalize each module varied, influenced by factors such as topic complexity and the extent of feedback

required. In cases where consensus could not be reached, executive decisions were made by the ABGS principal investigators to avoid collaborative stalemates. Following these rigorous iterative cycles, the modules were translated into comics and custom-illustrated slides accompanied by scripts for public distribution.

Engaging Communities in Dissemination and Education

We prioritized accessibility by integrating user-friendly graphics alongside the content. Farinella showed that illustration, particularly in comic-style format, is highly effective in medical and science education [51]. This approach facilitates understanding of complex concepts by presenting engaging narratives with playful characters and visual metaphors. We posit that incorporating illustrations could enhance the accessibility of complex genetic topics, especially for individuals with limited prior knowledge in the field. To accomplish this goal, the ABGS collaborative research team collaborated with a professional science illustrator to craft vibrant comic-style graphics. These illustrations feature an iconic anthropomorphic narrator, “Gene”, who simplifies key genetics educational concepts for a lay audience through straightforward visuals, analogies, and relatable examples. These graphical and narrative elements are consistently applied across all module storyboards to maintain coherence. During development, we utilized these illustrations in comic books that encapsulate the content of each module. These comics serve to reinforce the concepts presented in the slides or offer an independent modality for conveying ideas about genetics and genomics. Additionally, the comics underwent iterative reviews by the ABGS collaborative research team to ensure alignment with the drafted module content in the storyboards and to secure full team approval before subsequent dissemination.

The module comics, available in both full-color editions and black-and-white coloring book versions, are distributed at various community events across North Carolina. These events, such as health fairs, STEM expos, workshops at high schools, and Heritage Month celebrations, serve as platforms for engaging with diverse communities and fostering awareness and interest in genomic medicine, by engaging the public in discussions with representatives of the ABGS project (including both researchers and CRB members). By encouraging productive interactions prior to recruiting parents for the ABGS pilot study, our objective is to establish an open exchange of information between researchers and the community. This lays the groundwork for fostering relationships and bidirectional communication with stakeholders in potential implementation areas. The initial feedback garnered from individual community members at these events has shown a great deal of enthusiasm for the design and content of the comics. By connecting with members of diverse

communities through accessible educational content, we can spark discussions about genetics and screening perceptions, thereby acquiring valuable insights into the learning needs and preferences of different community members (Table 2).

Table 2: Examples of ABGS Community Outreach.

Event	Audience	Mode	Medium	Modules (#)
Lunch & Learn sessions	Community members and champions	Virtual	Slide presentation	1-5
School Presentations	Parents, teachers, administrators	Virtual/ In-person	Comics, slide presentation, videos, infographics, interactive electronic content	3, 4, & 6
ABGS Focus Group	Parents & guardians	In-person	Slide presentation, videos, infographics	3, 4, & 5
Community Outreach Events	General public	In-person	Comics, infographics, interactive electronic content	1-7
Onboarding	New ABGS-CRB partnership members	Virtual/ In-person	Slide presentation	1-7

The storyboards, the initially created slide presentations, offer a flexible format for the development of additional future media types such as brochures, animated videos, interactive web content, and infographics. This approach allows us to customize our outreach efforts to suit diverse audiences. By leveraging the same storyboard for multiple media types, we can streamline the creation process and ensure consistency in messaging. To better understand community preferences regarding messaging, packaging, and distribution channels, the ABGS team incorporated two survey questions into a poster board displayed at community engagement events, allowing attendees to share their preferences independently. Participants indicated their interest level in learning about genetic screening and their preferred method of learning this information through "dot voting", marking their choices by placing sticky dots on relevant categories. The first question gauged interest in hypothetical genetic screening in children for actionable genetic conditions, offering response options ranging from "very interested" to "not at all interested." The second question prompted participants to select their top three preferred methods for learning about genetic screening for children from the choices: attending live educational events, watching videos, visiting websites, playing app-based games, engaging with social media content, reading pamphlets, consulting with a child's doctor, and others.

Preliminary results from over 500 attendees across four community events held within North Carolina's Research Triangle area in 2023 and 2024 indicate that most respondents are at least "somewhat interested" in genomic screening. From this ad hoc approach for obtaining information

about preferences, the top three methods for learning more about genomic screening are visiting a website, watching a video, and consulting with the child's doctor. This feedback underscores the importance of online resources and healthcare provider guidance in disseminating information about genomic screening to the public, and suggests that once complete, we should prioritize adapting the modules to video.

Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study

Building upon the preliminary feedback and interactions with community members, which indicated learner preferences for genetic and genomic educational materials, we devised an explanatory mixed-methods feasibility study. This study aims to investigate whether the modules can augment genetic health literacy and subsequently bolster the likelihood of research participation. Simultaneously, as we introduce the modules to facilitate meaningful interactions with the public at community events, we are examining the impact of the educational content and delivery methods on event attendees. Consented participants are randomly assigned to one of four groups, each exposed to different educational material and delivery methods. They are then asked to view this material and complete pre- and post-surveys measuring genomic knowledge and willingness to participate in genomic research. Additionally, a diverse subset of survey respondents will undergo interviews to explore their perceptions and preferences regarding learning about and engaging in genomic research.

Conceptual frameworks and models from D&I science are increasing being adapted for the application of an equity lens to the assessment of context and implementation [52,53]. To this end, we developed a semi-structured interview guide based on multi-level contextual domains from PRISM [33] with modifications by Fort et al. [54] to emphasize health equity. We also utilized the health equity implementation framework (HEIF), which was specifically developed for assessing both implementation and health equity determinants [55].

Through this pilot study, our goal is to gather insights into preferred learning modalities and sources of information in genetic and genomic medicine, thereby assessing determinants likely to influence dissemination, adoption, and sustainability. Ultimately, we seek to uncover issues with research participation that may not have been addressed during engagement events and to gain a contextual understanding of individuals' perceptions of the modules and delivery methods. By comparing and integrating data from quantitative and qualitative sources, we anticipate gaining a richer and more comprehensive understanding of how genomic knowledge and community members' perceptions

impact their decision-making about participating in genomic research. This understanding will guide further refinement of the modules to prepare for a larger rollout to various communities and invested users.

Adapting Module Content for Future Sustainability

The slideshow presentations, full-color comics, and coloring book versions of the modules are licensed under a Creative Commons license "CC BY" (Creative Commons, n.d.), accessible at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. Once finalized, they will be readily available for download on the "Parent & Community Engagement" page of the ABGS website (www.med.unc.edu/genetics/abgs). Early drafts of the modules serve as tools to foster active and reciprocal networks with local community representatives. These individuals, intended champions of the modules' use and dissemination, are pivotal partners possessing significant insight, influence, and access within their respective communities. Establishing and nurturing such trusting relationships is fundamental for the ABGS project's ability to effectively respond to the needs of target communities, including addressing health equity priorities and creating culturally appropriate, feasible, and acceptable content. These connections play a crucial role in identifying effective communication channels and delivery methods [56].

Phase 3: Dissemination

During the D4DS Dissemination phase, the research product developed in the preceding phase is actively shared through accessible and culturally appropriate methods and communication channels. In this phase, our priorities will include expanding and enhancing community partnerships through capacity-building activities, utilizing optimal content distribution methods in diverse communities, translating content into Spanish to promote equity, and engaging with clinical providers and other potential adopters and champions to integrate the use of the modules into genetics and genomics research and practice.

Building Equitable Access Through Language Translation

To expand our outreach efforts, we have established a bilingual ABGS Spanish translation team, comprised of a genetic counselor, a graduate student, and a research assistant. The primary goal of this team is to ensure that all modules are accessible in both English and Spanish. We selected Spanish due to its prevalence as the second most spoken language in North Carolina, with 7.9% of the population exclusively using Spanish, and over 1.1 million people in the state identifying as

Hispanic/Latino [57]. To guarantee accuracy and accessibility, our Spanish translation team, along with several bilingual members of the CRB, engage in an iterative process of translation, review, and discussion. This approach mirrors the iterative review process used for the modules, aiming to maintain the fidelity of translated materials while prioritizing readability, accessibility, and comprehensibility for the Spanish-speaking audience.

The bilingual members of the ABGS collaborative research team have facilitated our participation in community outreach at Spanish cultural events. Our early outreach with Spanish-speaking populations has shown considerable interest in genomic screening for children. We have observed that delivering information in a familiar language fosters inclusivity and greatly enhances enthusiasm for engaging with the material. Engaging with community members in multiple languages is crucial, and our commitment to providing unbiased and fact-based information serves as a powerful tool in fostering genuine connections and dispelling prevalent misinformation.

Disseminating Modules through Community Outreach

Critical for ensuring sustainability, substantial capacity-building activities will be required to establish successful community partnerships for disseminating the modules within communities of interest. The conceptualization and design of these modules were significantly influenced by prior engagement and awareness efforts, as well as data collection with various partners advocating for health equity among underserved groups including refugee/immigrant families, Latino/a and Hispanic, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and Black communities, and rural communities in eastern and western North Carolina. Tailored strategies resulting from these engagement activities will aim to promote health equity by positively influencing dissemination and process outcomes, fostering trust, connection, interest, and uptake (Table 3). We will leverage the results of the mixed methods study to further refine the modules before disseminating them to a wider audience through collaborations with public adopters and champions.

Table 3: PRISM contextual factors, partners, insights, and impacts

Contextual Domains	Insights	Engagement	Tailoring Strategies
---------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------

Multi-level Partner Characteristics	Ensure equitable participation in design and dissemination, esp. of historically marginalized and underserved communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CRB involved in co-creation process of the modules ● Public adopters and influencers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-creation involves CRB members reflecting the sociodemographic characteristic of the intended recipients ○ Ongoing partnerships with diverse community leaders
Multi-level Perspectives on the Intervention	Understand needs and priorities for improving health equity and for culturally appropriate, feasible, and acceptable content for historically marginalized and underserved communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guided discussions with public adopters and influencers ● Interactions with community members at outreach events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Illustrating personal/family relevance by tailoring content around specific conditions such as Sickle Cell disease ○ Using relevant and relatable examples ○ Simplifying and streamlining messages. Including a plain language glossary
External Environment	Address historical and ongoing racism, discrimination and lack of access and discuss mitigation efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discussions with public adopters and influencers ● Interactions with community members at outreach events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Explicitly addressing historical abuses and lack of inclusivity and describing regulations/legislation in place to protect study participants and patients ○ Transparency about all aspects of a genomic research study or clinical offering
Implementation and Sustainability Infrastructure	Identify effective communication channels and best practices for developing and delivering educational resources to underserved communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Guided discussions with public adopters and influencers ● Interactions with community members at outreach events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initial messaging from trusted community sources ○ Delivery preferences are videos and websites ○ Communication channels via identified preferences ○ Team members reflecting diversity of communities

A multifaceted educational and awareness campaign will require a diverse array of communication methods tailored to the preferences of the communities involved. Visual aids, including illustrations and videos, play a crucial role in enhancing content engagement [35,58–60]. Utilizing popular platforms like Facebook, TikTok, and YouTube has proven effective [59,61] for reaching diverse audiences actively seeking health related resources and we plan to promote the modules via these outlets in the future [62]. However, there remains a significant need for research on best practices

for designing educational resources aimed at increasing public interest and willingness to participate in genomic research, particularly within underserved and marginalized communities [63]. As we analyze the data from the mixed methods study, we will assess whether the specific content and/or method of delivery of educational materials used in participant engagement efforts influences willingness to participate in research.

Bilingual members of the CRB have suggested utilizing the translated modules, once completed, to educate and engage bilingual community health workers (CHW) as agents for disseminating and enhancing capacity through education and training. Leveraging CHWs, who often have deep ties within the communities they serve, can foster trust and acceptance of new initiatives. By involving CHWs in the dissemination and ongoing adaptation of modules, we can ensure that the content remains relevant and effective across diverse community contexts.

Connecting with Primary Care Providers

Ultimately, ABGS implementation will entail primary care providers (PCPs), including pediatricians, family medicine physicians, physician assistants and nurse practitioners, integrating genomic screening into routine well-child visits, and presenting information to parents in clear, concise language. This approach aims to enhance clinical utility and improve accessibility of genomic screening. Regular discussions between providers and parents, along with gradual introduction of the child to genomic concepts, are expected to foster genetic literacy and confidence in making informed decisions among older children and adults.

However, the widespread adoption of pediatric genomic screening in primary care settings will require addressing implementation challenges since this paradigm shift moves genomic screening from specialized settings to primary care. Research indicates that many PCPs feel inadequately prepared to discuss genetic offerings with patients [64–67]. We believe that the modules could serve as a valuable resource in this context, potentially assisting providers in navigating conversations about research or clinical offerings. While additional resources will be needed to support PCPs in obtaining consent and managing results, the modules offer a promising tool to help providers gain confidence in discussing genetic and genomic research, testing, and screening with their patients.

Phase 4: Impact

During the D4DS Impact phase, the research product is evaluated to gauge its effects on both health and health equity, while also considering continual alignment with contextual factors and the

necessity for adaptation. In this phase, we will use RE-AIM for multilevel evaluation of external validity over a variety of settings.

Assessing and Adapting the Modules for Equitable Impact

To ensure equitable impact, we iteratively assess RE-AIM outcomes to plan and organize the dissemination of the modules into communities, as well as to identify equity-enhancing approaches and address any unintended consequences of adaptations (Table 4). In addition to surveys and qualitative measures, we will utilize automated approaches such as YouTube Studio channel analytics (e.g., impression rates, unique viewers, click-through rates), Google Analytics metrics for the project website (e.g., session duration, pages per session, source of traffic), and patient administrative data (with consent) from clinic partners (e.g., gender, age, race, ancestry). Emphasizing continuous improvement over time is crucial for sustaining the impact of these modules. As we identify more opportunities for adoption and receive requests for adaptations, we will plan to remain responsive to the evolving needs of communities. An iterative process will enable us to refine the modules to better address the unique challenges and circumstances faced by different populations.

Table 4: RE-AIM framework applied to the Module Development process

Phase	Outcome	Measurement
Design	<i>Acceptability, Appropriateness, & Feasibility</i>	Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM), Feasibility of Intervention Measure (FIM), and Intervention Appropriateness Measure (IAM), via surveys with potential end users (e.g. researchers, clinicians, and community partners with a focus on including and serving marginalized and underrepresented communities).
	<i>Effectiveness</i>	UNC-Genomic Knowledge Scale for pre- and post-module viewing
	<i>Usability</i>	System Usability Scale of potential end users as described above
	<i>User Satisfaction</i>	Key informant interviews of potential end users about whether the value proposition is validated, and the packaging, messaging, and communication channels are culturally appropriate and consistent with audience needs
	<i>Sustainability</i>	Alignment with capacity and context of providers: Provider REport of Sustainment Scale (PRESS), Clinical Sustainability Assessment Tool (CSAT) and researchers and community partners: Program Sustainability Assessment Tool (PSAT)
	<i>Awareness & Intent to Adopt</i>	Number and representativeness of organizations and individuals within those organizations engaging with and communicating interest in adopting the modules
Dissemination	<i>Cost</i>	Estimated cost of personnel time to train research collaborators and community partners to deliver the modules, cost of necessary adaptations

	<i>Adaptation</i>	Number and representativeness of organizations that adapt or request adaptations to the modules, as well as the no. and types of adaptations and contexts to improve equity
	<i>Adoption</i>	Number and representativeness, and transferrable processes from entities using the modules assessed via surveys and key informant interviews; no. of downloads from ABGS website and YouTube channel, assessment of usage and context via surveys and key informant interviews
	<i>Implementation Fidelity</i>	Current settings and continued fit to context v. adaptation of the modules via key informant interviews and focus groups with broader scale adopters (e.g. professional and federal organizations)
Impact	<i>Sustained Equitable Impact</i>	Change in levels of interest and trust in and willingness to participate in future genetic and genomic research via key informant interviews with longstanding community partners; the reach and representativeness of research project enrollment after potential participants view the modules; the degree to which use of the modules is operationalized at the organizational level; representativeness of qualitative and quantitative metrics of patients' health, well-being, and quality of life

Discussion

Research investigating both professional and public perspectives on genomic screening in individuals of all ages indicates significant interest but also persistent apprehension regarding the implementation of such screening [66,68–71]. For parents considering genomic screening for their children, concerns range from anxiety over decisions concerning the disclosure of genetic information and data security to prioritizing immediate needs over elective genomic sequencing [69,72]. Additionally, worries about costs, future discrimination, and the psychological impact of discovering untreatable health conditions are common [70]. Effective and equitable integration of genomic screening into pediatric well-child care requires the establishment of trust with diverse community partners to discern sought-after information and determine optimal communication methods. Left unaddressed, these individual concerns could erode public trust in and impede the uptake of public health screening initiatives aimed at reducing health disparities.

The widespread deficiency in genetic health literacy among the public significantly impacts both clinical research outcomes and patient care. Furthermore, this gap is widened by various sociodemographic and other factors, resulting in a pronounced discrepancy in comprehension and communication between researchers and community members [2,20]. This discrepancy can particularly affect the recruitment and enrollment of underserved individuals into genetic and genomic research. To address this challenge, we have taken a proactive approach to better understand community perspectives on enhancing public health genetic literacy before attempting

to recruit or enroll community members for ABGS. In line with the D4DS paradigm's emphasis on co-designing user-friendly bilingual educational resources, our ABGS collaborative research team worked closely with a science illustrator and a graphic artist. Together, we iteratively crafted modules that integrated feedback from both community members and experts, ensuring information is presented in an engaging and accessible manner.

The community-academic partnership forged by the ABGS collaborative research team has significantly enhanced the value of the modules. Drawing on diverse perspectives, we worked to ensure that our materials resonated with the communities we serve and effectively conveyed crucial information about genetics. In addition to module development, our team actively engaged with the public to gain insight into the needs of underserved communities. During these engagements, community leaders emphasized the importance of reliable information to facilitate equitable access to healthcare advancements, including genomic screening. They expressed a need for educational materials that address topics such as family history discussions, modes of genetic inheritance, and the importance of sharing genetic testing and screening results with close blood relatives. Furthermore, interactions with underserved communities underscored the need for educational resources presented in lay language. Such materials not only promote genetic literacy but also foster trust between these communities and the medical establishment. They play a crucial role in facilitating informed decision-making and ensuring equitable participation in research.

Through our outreach efforts to community members, we also became aware of the need to carefully understand the public perceptions about the effectiveness of genetic and genomic testing and screening in different populations. Many people are aware that most genetic research has been done in individuals of European ancestry and that research is lagging for other ancestral backgrounds. This is especially true of research in common complex diseases, where studies require thousands or tens of thousands of cases and controls, and the genetic architecture of disease risk may vary across different ancestral populations. However, due to the nature of rare disease research, disparities play a more nuanced role in the effectiveness of genetic testing for Mendelian/monogenic conditions. It can therefore be difficult to disentangle the perceived and actual impact of disparities in research participation from the potential benefits and limitations of genomic screening for each individual.

Greater participation in genetic research and data sharing will enrich the knowledgebase about disease-causing variants, thereby promoting the virtuous cycle of improving equity of genetic testing outcomes. This nuanced understanding is pivotal, serving as a crucial equity marker for genetic health services, and forming the basis for a compelling value proposition aimed at encouraging participation

in genetic research and data sharing among these communities. Furthermore, a significant health equity concern lies in the restricted access to cutting-edge research and potential therapies within racially minoritized populations. Clearly addressing these issues in educational resources not only fosters inclusivity but also strengthens the incentives for engagement in genetic and genomic research within these communities.

We encountered several barriers during the project. Coordinating input from researchers and clinicians during the module development proved demanding, as did the limited availability of resources to conduct outreach. Balancing feedback from various invested users, including researchers, clinicians, and CRB members required careful handling to prevent conflicts within the ABGS collaborative research team and ensure that all perspectives were thoroughly considered. To address this, we developed a multilevel pathway to ensure all feedback was accurately documented. Disseminating the modules at outreach events has presented constraints including insufficient personnel or material resources to attend events. To overcome this, we will focus efforts on areas of highest need for populations underserved in genetics, collaborating with community partner organizations to explore more intimate settings to deploy the modules, such as Lunch & Learns and listening sessions rather than broader community-wide events, such as fairs or street festivals.

Our approach is centered on collaborative development and eventual widespread utilization of the modules. We prioritize adaptability and flexibility to incorporate feedback from a diverse array of community partners. This iterative strategy allows us to continually improve the modules, making them more relevant and effective, in line with the principles of D4DS methodology and the F2C framework. Thus, our collaborative efforts extend beyond the collaboration between ABGS researchers and CRB members to create the educational modules. Our efforts also encompass broader community outreach, including presentations and dissemination to local public-school classrooms, clinical providers, community members and connectors, as well as research collaborators, with the aim of eliciting responses and engagement from diverse potential end users. While our exploration of these concepts is centered on participation in genomic research, we advocate for the wider adoption of this methodology by researchers to foster more equitable relationships with all communities.

Conclusion

The effective translation of genomic discoveries into equitable public health contexts hinges on understanding and addressing genetic literacy. This will require further research to define genetic literacy, establish guidelines for proficiency, and develop interventions tailored to individuals with

varying levels of overall literacy. Drawing from related fields such as health communication, health services research, and dissemination and implementation science, interventions can be designed to enhance communication and information dissemination. User-centered design approaches, including co-creation with community members, are essential for developing culturally and linguistically responsive genetic literacy interventions and dissemination strategies. Collaboration among researchers, practitioners, and community members is vital for advancing public health genetic literacy and optimizing the use of genomic information in research, healthcare, and society at large.

Statements

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Terri Ottosen, UNC health literacy librarian, and Sharisse Jimenez, a core member of the Spanish translation team, as well as Rachel Phillips for assistance with grammatical edits. We would also like to acknowledge with gratitude many community members who have freely shared their valuable insights to inform the co-development of the modules.

Statement of Ethics

Please address the following aspects in your Statement of Ethics.

Study approval statement: The future evaluation of the module through a study protocol has been reviewed and been given an exemption by the UNC Institutional Research Board under study number 23-2772.

Consent to participate statement: In future evaluation of the module content with mixed-methods studies, any study participants will be required to give written consent for any surveys or interviews conducted.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Funding Sources

The project was supported by the National Human Genome Research Institute, National Institutes of Health, through Grant Award Number 5R01HG012271, as well as the North Carolina Translational and Clinical Sciences Institute under grant number CTSC0209. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

Author Contributions

Grace Byfield, Kimberly Foss, Sabrina Powell, Daniel Torres, Ann Katherine Major Foreman, Jahnelle Jackson, Grace Leon-Lozano, Juhi Salunke, Margaret Waltz, Julianne O'Daniel, Bradford Powell, Samantha Schilling, Megan C. Roberts, Stefanija Giric, Elizabeth Branch, Jonathan Berg, Laura Milko, Thomas Owens, Ken Ray, Carla Robinson, Lennin Caro, Erin Song, Andreas Orphanides, Jonathan Shaw, and Nicole Shaw contributed to the conception and design of the manuscript and modules. Grace Byfield, Jahnelle Jackson, Grace Leon-Lozano, Laura Milko, Sabrina Powell, Daniel Torres, and Juhi Salunke wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the development of the Genetics and Genomic Modules and the manuscript revision and read and approved the submitted version.

Data Availability Statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Bibliography

- 1 Milko LV, Khoury MJ. Editorial: DNA-based population screening for precision public health. *Front Genet.* 2022 Oct;13:1061329.
- 2 Terry SF, Bonhomme N. Nothing about us without us: guidelines for genetic testing. *Genet Test Mol Biomarkers.* 2013 May;17(5):357–8.
- 3 Madden EB, Hindorff LA, Bonham VL, Akintobi TH, Burchard EG, Baker KE, et al. Advancing genomics to improve health equity. *Nat Genet.* 2024 Apr DOI: 10.1038/s41588-024-01711-z
- 4 Kaphingst KA, Bather JR, Daly BM, Chavez-Yenter D, Vega A, Kohlmann WK. Interest in cancer predisposition testing and carrier screening offered as part of routine healthcare among an ethnically diverse sample of young women. *Front Genet.* 2022 Apr;13:866062.
- 5 Hindorff LA, Bonham VL, Ohno-Machado L. Enhancing diversity to reduce health information disparities and build an evidence base for genomic medicine. *Per Med.* 2018 Sep;15(5):403–12.
- 6 Kerkhoff AD, Farrand E, Marquez C, Cattamanchi A, Handley MA. Addressing health disparities through implementation science—a need to integrate an equity lens from the outset. *Implement Sci.* 2022 Jan;17(1):13.
- 7 Canedo JR, Miller ST, Myers HF, Sanderson M. Racial and ethnic differences in knowledge and attitudes about genetic testing in the US: Systematic review. *J Genet Couns.* 2019 Jun;28(3):587–601.
- 8 Canedo JR, Wilkins CH, Senft N, Romero A, Bonnet K, Schlundt D. Barriers and facilitators to dissemination and adoption of precision medicine among Hispanics/Latinos. *BMC Public Health.* 2020 May;20(1):603.
- 9 Turbitt E, Roberts MC, Hollister BM, Lewis KL, Biesecker LG, Klein WMP. Ethnic identity and engagement with genome sequencing research. *Genet Med.* 2019;21(8):1735–43.
- 10 Ginsburg GS, Phillips KA. Precision medicine: from science to value. *Health Aff (Millwood).* 2018 May;37(5):694–701.
- 11 Atutornu J, Milne R, Costa A, Patch C, Middleton A. Towards equitable and trustworthy genomics research. *EBioMedicine.* 2022 Feb;76:103879.
- 12 Roberts MC, Mader JM, Turbitt E, Smit AK, Landry L, Olstad DL, et al. Using a Participatory Approach to Develop Research Priorities for Future Leaders in Cancer-Related Precision Public Health. *Front Genet.* 2022 Jun;13:881527.
- 13 Shen EC, Srinivasan S, Passero LE, Allen CG, Dixon M, Foss K, et al. Barriers and facilitators for population genetic screening in healthy populations: A systematic review. *Front Genet.* 2022 Jul;13:865384.
- 14 Pérez Jolles M, Fernández ME, Jacobs G, De Leon J, Myrick L, Aarons GA. Using Implementation Mapping to develop protocols supporting the implementation of a state

- policy on screening children for Adverse Childhood Experiences in a system of health centers in inland Southern California. *Front Public Health*. 2022 Aug;10:876769.
- 15 Radecki Breitkopf C, Williams KP, Ridgeway JL, Parker MW, Strong-Simmons A, Hayes SN, et al. Linking education to action: A program to increase research participation among african american women. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2018 Oct;27(10):1242–9.
 - 16 Stonewall J, Fjelstad K, Dorneich M, Shenk L, Krejci C, Passe U. Best practices for engaging underserved populations. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*. 2017 Sep;61(1):130–4.
 - 17 Pérez Jolles M, Martinez M, Garcia SJ, Stein GL, Mentor Parent Group Members, Thomas KC. Involving Latina/o parents in patient-centered outcomes research: Contributions to research study design, implementation and outcomes. *Health Expect*. 2017 Feb;20(5):992–1000.
 - 18 Lemke AA, Esplin ED, Goldenberg AJ, Gonzaga-Jauregui C, Hanchard NA, Harris-Wai J, et al. Addressing underrepresentation in genomics research through community engagement. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2022 Sep;109(9):1563–71.
 - 19 Lemke AA, Harris-Wai JN. Stakeholder engagement in policy development: challenges and opportunities for human genomics. *Genet Med*. 2015 Dec;17(12):949–57.
 - 20 Middleton A, Costa A, Milne R, Patch C, Robarts L, Tomlin B, et al. The legacy of language: What we say, and what people hear, when we talk about genomics. *HGG Adv*. 2023 Oct;4(4):100231.
 - 21 Kraft SA, Cho MK, Gillespie K, Halley M, Varsava N, Ormond KE, et al. Beyond consent: building trusting relationships with diverse populations in precision medicine research. *Am J Bioeth*. 2018 Apr;18(4):3–20.
 - 22 Griesemer I, Staley BS, Lightfoot AF, Bain L, Byrd D, Conway C, et al. Engaging community stakeholders in research on best practices for clinical genomic sequencing. *Per Med*. 2020 Nov;17(6):435–44.
 - 23 Powell SN, Byfield G, Bennetone A, Frantz AM, Harrison LK, James-Crook ER, et al. Parental guidance suggested: engaging parents as partners in research studies of genomic screening for a pediatric population. *Front Genet*. 2022 Mar;13:867030.
 - 24 Hussain SF, Vogel AL, Faupel-Badger JM, Ho L, Akacem LD, Balakrishnan K, et al. DEIA is essential to advance the goals of translational science: Perspectives from NCATS. *J Clin Transl Sci*. 2023;7(1):e33.
 - 25 Ochs-Balcom HM, Jandorf L, Wang Y, Johnson D, Meadows Ray V, Willis MJ, et al. “It takes a village”: multilevel approaches to recruit African Americans and their families for genetic research. *J Community Genet*. 2015 Jan;6(1):39–45.
 - 26 Patel K, Inman W, Gishe J, Johnson O, Brown E, Kanu M, et al. A Community-Driven Intervention for Improving Biospecimen Donation in African American Communities. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2018 Feb;5(1):15–23.
 - 27 Dressler LG, Jones SS, Markey JM, Byerly KW, Roberts MC. Genomics education for the public: perspectives of genomic researchers and ELSI advisors. *Genet Test Mol Biomarkers*. 2014 Mar;18(3):131–40.

- 28 Chen L-S, Goodson P. Barriers to adopting genomics into public health education: a mixed methods study. *Genet Med*. 2009 Feb;11(2):104–10.
- 29 Kaphingst KA. Future forecasting for research and practice in genetic literacy. *Public Health Genomics*. 2023 Sep;26(1):159–64.
- 30 Gasteiger N, Vercell A, Khan N, Dowding D, Davies AC, Davies A. Digital interventions for genomics and genetics education, empowerment, and service engagement: A systematic review. *J Community Genet*. 2023 Jun;14(3):227–40.
- 31 Milko LV, Berg JS. Age-Based Genomic Screening during Childhood: Ethical and Practical Considerations in Public Health Genomics Implementation. *Int J Neonatal Screen*. 2023 Jun;9(3). DOI: 10.3390/ijns9030036
- 32 Kwan BM, Brownson RC, Glasgow RE, Morrato EH, Luke DA. Designing for dissemination and sustainability to promote equitable impacts on health. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2022 Apr;43:331–53.
- 33 McCreight MS, Rabin BA, Glasgow RE, Ayele RA, Leonard CA, Gilmartin HM, et al. Using the Practical, Robust Implementation and Sustainability Model (PRISM) to qualitatively assess multilevel contextual factors to help plan, implement, evaluate, and disseminate health services programs. *Transl Behav Med*. 2019 Nov;9(6):1002–11.
- 34 Glasgow RE, Vogt TM, Boles SM. Evaluating the public health impact of health promotion interventions: the RE-AIM framework. *Am J Public Health*. 1999 Sep;89(9):1322–7.
- 35 Kwan BM, Luke DA, Adsul P, Koorts H, Morrato EH, Glasgow RE. Designing for Dissemination and Sustainability: Principles, Methods, and Frameworks for Ensuring Fit to Context. In: Brownson RC, Colditz GA, Proctor EK, editors. *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health*. , 3rd ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford University Press; 2023.
- 36 Joosten YA, Israel TL, Williams NA, Boone LR, Schlundt DG, Mouton CP, et al. Community engagement studios: a structured approach to obtaining meaningful input from stakeholders to inform research. *Acad Med*. 2015 Dec;90(12):1646–50.
- 37 Daly BM, Kaphingst KA. Variability in conceptualizations and measurement of genetic literacy. *PEC Innovation*. 2023 Dec;2:100147.
- 38 Kaphingst KA, Stafford JD, McGowan LD, Seo J, Lachance CR, Goodman MS. Effects of racial and ethnic group and health literacy on responses to genomic risk information in a medically underserved population. *Health Psychol*. 2015 Feb;34(2):101–10.
- 39 Kaphingst KA, Blanchard M, Milam L, Pokharel M, Elrick A, Goodman MS. Relationships Between Health Literacy and Genomics-Related Knowledge, Self-Efficacy, Perceived Importance, and Communication in a Medically Underserved Population. *J Health Commun*. 2016;21 Suppl 1:58–68.
- 40 Scherr CL, Ramesh S, Marshall-Fricker C, Perera MA. A review of african americans' beliefs and attitudes about genomic studies: opportunities for message design. *Front Genet*. 2019 Jun;10:548.

- 41 Skinner HG, Calancie L, Vu MB, Garcia B, DeMarco M, Patterson C, et al. Using community-based participatory research principles to develop more understandable recruitment and informed consent documents in genomic research. *PLoS ONE*. 2015 May;10(5):e0125466.
- 42 Drake BF, Boyd D, Carter K, Gehlert S, Thompson VS. Barriers and Strategies to Participation in Tissue Research Among African-American Men. *J Cancer Educ*. 2017 Mar;32(1):51–8.
- 43 Bustamante CD, Burchard EG, De la Vega FM. Genomics for the world. *Nature*. 2011 Jul;475(7355):163–5.
- 44 Lee SS-J, Appelbaum PS, Chung WK. Challenges and potential solutions to health disparities in genomic medicine. *Cell*. 2022 Jun;185(12):2007–10.
- 45 West KM, Blacksher E, Burke W. Genomics, health disparities, and missed opportunities for the nation’s research agenda. *JAMA*. 2017 May;317(18):1831–2.
- 46 Walker ER, Nelson CR, Antoine-LaVigne D, Thigpen DT, Puggal MA, Sarpong DE, et al. Research participants’ opinions on genetic research and reasons for participation: a Jackson Heart Study focus group analysis. *Ethn Dis*. 2014;24(3):290–7.
- 47 Buseh AG, Stevens PE, Millon-Underwood S, Townsend L, Kelber ST. Community leaders’ perspectives on engaging African Americans in biobanks and other human genetics initiatives. *J Community Genet*. 2013 Oct;4(4):483–94.
- 48 Lewis MA, Bonhomme N, Bloss CS. A new era, new strategies: education and communication strategies to manage greater access to genomic information. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 2018 Jul;48 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S25–7.
- 49 Allen CG, Judge DP, Levin E, Sterba K, Hunt K, Ramos PS, et al. A pragmatic implementation research study for In Our DNA SC: a protocol to identify multi-level factors that support the implementation of a population-wide genomic screening initiative in diverse populations. *Implement Sci Commun*. 2022 Apr;3(1):48.
- 50 Grabeel KL, Russomanno J, Oelschlegel S, Tester E, Heidel RE. Computerized versus hand-scored health literacy tools: a comparison of Simple Measure of Gobbledygook (SMOG) and Flesch-Kincaid in printed patient education materials. *J Med Libr Assoc*. 2018 Jan;106(1):38–45.
- 51 Farinella M. The potential of comics in science communication. *JCOM*. 2018 Jan;17(01):Y01.
- 52 Shelton RC, Adsul P, Oh A, Moise N, Griffith DM. Application of an antiracism lens in the field of implementation science (IS): Recommendations for reframing implementation research with a focus on justice and racial equity. *Implementation Research and Practice*. 2021 Nov;2:26334895211049480.
- 53 Allen CG, Olstad DL, Kahkoska AR, Guan Y, Ramos PS, Steinberg J, et al. Extending an antiracism lens to the implementation of precision public health interventions. *Am J Public Health*. 2023 Nov;113(11):1210–8.
- 54 Fort MP, Manson SM, Glasgow RE. Applying an equity lens to assess context and implementation in public health and health services research and practice using the PRISM framework. *FrontHealth Serv*. 2023 Apr;3:1139788.

- 55 Woodward EN, Matthieu MM, Uchendu US, Rogal S, Kirchner JE. The health equity implementation framework: proposal and preliminary study of hepatitis C virus treatment. *Implement Sci*. 2019 Mar;14(1):26.
- 56 Concannon TW, Grant S, Welch V, Petkovic J, Selby J, Crowe S, et al. Practical guidance for involving stakeholders in health research. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2019 Mar;34(3):458–63.
- 57 US Census Bureau. S1601: Census Bureau Table [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 May 13]. Available from: <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2022.S1601?g=040XX00US37>
- 58 King AJ. Using comics to communicate about health: an introduction to the symposium on visual narratives and graphic medicine. *Health Commun*. 2017 May;32(5):523–4.
- 59 Gupta A, Cafazzo JA, Ilzerman MJ, Swart JF, Vastert S, Wulffraat NM, et al. Genomic health literacy interventions in pediatrics: scoping review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021 Dec;23(12):e26684.
- 60 Zamora AN, Brown JEH, Outram S, Ackermanb SL. Using visual storytelling to share aggregate findings with families participating in clinical genomics research. *Genetics in Medicine Open*. 2024 Apr;101844.
- 61 Miller BC, Goldenberg AJ, Bonhomme NF. Digital peer-to-peer information seeking and sharing: Opportunities for education and collaboration in newborn screening. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet*. 2021 Mar;187(1):64–9.
- 62 Lewis MA, Uhrig JD, Adams ET, Brown JA, Sanders A, the RTI International All of Us Innovator Team. Engagement marketing for social good: Application to the All of Us Research Program. *Frontiers in Genetics*. 2022
- 63 Klein WMP, McBride CM, Allen CG, Arredondo EM, Bloss CS, Kaphingst KA, et al. Optimal Integration of Behavioral Medicine into Clinical Genetics and Genomics. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2019 Feb;104(2):193–6.
- 64 Mikat-Stevens NA, Larson IA, Tarini BA. Primary-care providers’ perceived barriers to integration of genetics services: a systematic review of the literature. *Genet Med*. 2015 Mar;17(3):169–76.
- 65 Sharma Y, Cox L, Kruger L, Channamsetty V, Haga SB. Evaluating primary care providers’ readiness for delivering genetic and genomic services to underserved populations. *Public Health Genomics*. 2021 Sep;1–10.
- 66 Joshi E, Mighton C, Clausen M, Casalino S, Kim THM, Kowal C, et al. Primary care provider perspectives on using genomic sequencing in the care of healthy children. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2020;28(5):551–7.
- 67 Campion M, Goldgar C, Hopkin RJ, Prows CA, Dasgupta S. Genomic education for the next generation of health-care providers. *Genet Med*. 2019 Nov;21(11):2422–30.
- 68 Brothers KB, Vassy JL, Green RC. Reconciling opportunistic and population screening in clinical genomics. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2019 Jan;94(1):103–9.

- 69 Kerruish N. Parents' experiences 12 years after newborn screening for genetic susceptibility to type 1 diabetes and their attitudes to whole-genome sequencing in newborns. *Genet Med*. 2016 Mar;18(3):249–58.
- 70 Moultrie RR, Paquin R, Rini C, Roche MI, Berg JS, Powell CM, et al. Parental views on newborn next generation sequencing: implications for decision support. *Matern Child Health J*. 2020 Jul;24(7):856–64.
- 71 Johnston J, Lantos JD, Goldenberg A, Chen F, Parens E, Koenig BA, et al. Sequencing newborns: A call for nuanced use of genomic technologies. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 2018 Jul;48 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S2–6.
- 72 Moultrie R, Lewis M, Fitzgerald T. Values and beliefs important for parental decisions to have genetic screening for a child. In: n/a n/a, editor. Poster to be presented at: St. Louis, MO: Association of Public Health Laboratories Newborn Screening and Genetic Testing Symposium; 2016.