

Effects of Health Technology Use and Digital Health Engagement on Clinical Trial Participation: Findings from the Health Information National Trends Survey

Nicholas C. Peiper, PhD, MPH,^{1,2} Stephen Furmanek, MS,³ Kelly McCants, MD,^{4,5} Edward H. Brown Jr, MS, MBA, CCRP^{3,4}

¹ Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky, USA

² Eating Anxiety Treatment Laboratory, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky, USA

³ Population Health Research, Norton Healthcare, Louisville, Kentucky, USA

⁴ Institute for Health Equity, Norton Healthcare, Louisville, Kentucky, USA

⁵ Advanced Heart Failure and Recovery Program, Norton Heart and Vascular Institute, Louisville, Kentucky, USA

Corresponding author:

Edward H. Brown Jr, MS, MBA, CCRP
Population Health Research Program
Norton Research Institute
224 East Broadway, Ste 404
Louisville, KY 40202
E-mail: edward.brown@nortonhealthcare.org
Phone: +1 502-552-4959

Acknowledgments:

This study was supported by an unrestricted grant through the Abbott Laboratories Diversity in Clinical Research Initiative. Dr. Peiper reports research support through the National Institutes of Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Dr. Peiper reports scientific advisory fees and stock options from Meru Health. Mr. Brown reports research support through the CDA Foundation and scientific consultation fees from Meru Health.

Abstract

Background: Clinical trials are critical to scientific advances and medical progress, although awareness and participation remain low in the general population. The existing literature indicates that clinical trial knowledge and participation is multifactorial. Yet, little is known about the association between clinical trial participation with health technology use and digital health engagement to search for health information, interact with medical providers, and seek health supports.

Objective: Examine the multivariate association between clinical trial knowledge and participation with past-year health technology use and digital health engagement with medical providers.

Design: Cross-sectional data from a federal surveillance system.

Participants: A total of 3,865 US adult respondents from the Health Information National Trends Survey 5, Cycle 4 conducted in 2020.

Main Measures: The two outcomes were clinical trial knowledge (no knowledge, a little knowledge, a lot of knowledge) and participation (never invited, invited did not participate, invited and participated). There were four binary indicators of health technology use for the following purposes in the past year: searching for health or medical information, communicating with a doctor's office, looking up medical test results, and making medical appointments. There were four binary indicators of digital health engagement in the past year: sharing health information on social media, participating in a health forum or support group, watching health-related videos on YouTube, and awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov.

Key Results: Survey-weighted multivariate regression models demonstrated that awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov had the largest associations with clinical trial knowledge and participation. Digital technology use to engage with medical providers and electronic health records was associated with clinical participation, although the vast majority of respondents had never been invited.

Conclusions: Findings from this study can inform the design of large-scale digital health campaigns and quality improvement programs focused on increasing clinical trial participation.

Background

Clinical trials are critical to scientific advances and medical progress. As of July 2024, there are 501,869 registered studies on ClinicalTrials.gov, of which 67,295 are recruiting participants.¹ These studies include a wide variety of scientific disciplines and include studies to test the efficacy of prevention, treatment, and screening interventions. Despite the benefits of clinical trials, they remain difficult to implement largely due to issues surrounding enrollment and retention such as transportation barriers, travel requirements, fear of adverse events, and medical distrust.²⁻⁵ Furthermore, adequate inclusion of women, racial and ethnic minorities, and other health disparity populations continues to be a large challenge.^{6,7} These findings illustrate a critical need to more thoroughly understand the factors that may improve clinical trial knowledge and participation.

The existing literature indicates that clinical trial knowledge and participation is multifactorial. For example, several national studies have recently found lower clinical trial knowledge and participation among certain demographic groups, including older adults, racial and ethnic minorities, people living in rural localities, and patients with medical comorbidities.⁸⁻¹² Other studies have found that social determinants of health (SDOH) play an important role in clinical trial knowledge and participation.⁷ For example, Williams and colleagues (2023) found that financial barriers (e.g., lack of insurance coverage and psychosocial supports) to clinical trial participation were common (>50%) in a nationally representative sample of US adults.¹³ Yet, less is known about how health technology use and digital health engagement are associated with clinical trial knowledge and participation.

Understanding health technology use and digital health engagement is critical in identifying potential strategies to increase clinical trial knowledge and participation. Studies

indicate that using digital technologies to search for health information and engage with healthcare providers is associated with higher health literacy and satisfaction with clinical services.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Other studies have found low awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov and other digital health platforms in both clinical and population samples throughout the world.^{18,19} Because clinical trial awareness remains low in general populations throughout the world,²⁰ studies that investigate the association between health technology use and digital health engagement with research participation can inform the design of large-scale digital health campaigns and quality improvement programs focused on increasing diversity in clinical research.²¹

To address this need, this study investigated the association between health technology use and digital health engagement with clinical trial knowledge and participation in the general population. The primary objective was to examine multivariate associations between clinical trial knowledge and multiple measures of health technology use and digital health engagement in the past year. The secondary objective was to examine multivariate associations between clinical trial participation and multiple measures of health technology use and digital health engagement in the past year. We hypothesized that health technology use and digital health engagement will be significantly associated with higher clinical trial knowledge and participation after adjusting for demographic and social factors.

Methods

Study Design

We used data from the Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS), a federal surveillance system sponsored by the US National Cancer Institute, to collect nationally representative data about the American public's use of health-related information.²² The HINTS

program monitors various changes in the pattern of health information seeking and usage over time. This study focuses on the HINTS 5 Cycle 4 (H5C4) that collected data from non-institutionalized civilian adults ages 18 and older in 2020. HINTS applied a two-stage, stratified random sampling methodology that first selected residential addresses across the US, then one adult within each household. The residential addresses were grouped into high- and low-minority strata to ensure adequate representation of racial and ethnic minorities.

Study Sample

Data were obtained from 3,865 adult respondents. The overall household response rate was 30.3%. All H5C3 responses were weighted to reflect selection probabilities adjust for non-response to provide a nationally representative sample with regard to age, gender, education, race, ethnicity, and census region. Additional details about H5C3 may be found elsewhere.

Study Measures

Clinical trial knowledge was measured using a three-point Likert scale (no knowledge, a little knowledge, and a lot of knowledge). Ever being invited to participation in a clinical trial (yes/no) and participating in a clinical trial (yes/no among those invited) were combined into a clinical trial participation variable with three categories (never invited, invited but did not participate, invited and participated). Binary indicators of digital technology use in the past year included looking for health or medical information, communicating with a doctor's office, looking up medical test results, and making medical appointments. Binary indicators of digital health engagement in the past year included sharing health information on social media,

participating in a health forum or support group, watching health-related videos on YouTube, and awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov.

Demographics included age (18-34, 35-49, 50-64, 65-74, 75+), gender (male, female), sexual orientation (heterosexual, gay or lesbian, bisexual, other), race and ethnicity (non-Hispanic [NH] White, NH Black, Hispanic, NH Asian, NH Other), education (less than high school, high school diploma, some college, college graduate or higher), and urban-rural status (metropolitan, non-metro). Health factors included health insurance status (yes, no), lifetime chronic diseases (none, one or more), healthcare provider access (yes, no), and general health (excellent, very good, good, fair, poor).

Statistical Analyses

Our initial analyses examined weighted frequencies for the dependent and independent variables. We then conducted cross-tabulations to examine bivariate differences in the prevalence of clinical trial knowledge and participation across the digital health variables as well as demographic and health correlates. To test our primary hypothesis, we conducted ordinal regression to evaluate the relationship between clinical trial knowledge with health technology use and digital health engagement. This calculated adjusted rate ratios (aRR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the health technology use and digital health engagement variables associated with clinical trial knowledge. To test the second hypothesis, we fit a multinomial logistic regression model to examine multivariate associations between clinical trial participation with health technology use and digital health engagement. This yielded aRR's and 95% CI's for the health technology use and digital health engagement variables associated with clinical trial participation. All analyses incorporated the overall sample weight and post-stratification

variables to account for the complex sampling methods of H5C4. Multiple imputation with chained equations was used to account for missing data. A two-sided p-value of 0.05 denoted statistical significance. R Studio version 4.3.1 was used to execute all analyses, using packages *mice* and *svyVGAM*.^{23,24}

Results

The weighted proportions of the digital health variables, demographics, and health correlates are shown in Table 1. Overall, the average age was 48.4 years (SD=18.3) and 50.8% of participants were female. Most of the sample was NH White (63.2%), heterosexual (92.6%), from a metropolitan area (87.8%), and had health insurance (90.9%).

The most common digital technology use in the past year was to search for health and medical information (72.5%) followed by making medical appointments (49.3%), communicating with a doctor's office (46.9%), and looking up medical results (42.0%). For digital health engagement in the past year, watching health-related YouTube videos was the most common (40.4%) followed by sharing health information on social media platforms (14.1%), participating in a health forum or support group (9.7%), and awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov (7.0%).

Table 2 shows the overall prevalence of clinical trial knowledge and multivariate associations. Nearly half of the sample (48.9%) reported a little knowledge, 41.7% reported no knowledge and 9.5% reported a lot of knowledge. In the ordinal regression models, awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov was the largest association with clinical trial knowledge (aRR=7.60, 95% CI=4.82-12.00). Significant associations were also observed for searching for health and medical information (aRR=1.35, 95% CI=1.06-1.71), communicating with a doctor's office (aRR=1.64,

95% CI=1.25-2.14), and watching health-related YouTube videos (aRR=1.36, 95% CI=1.02-1.82). Among the demographics, higher education (aOR=3.78, 95% CI=2.16-6.60) and provider access (aRR=1.85, 95% CI=1.22-2.22) were associated with higher clinical trial knowledge.

Table 3 shows the prevalence of clinical trial participation and multivariate associations. Overall, 9.7% of respondents were invited to participate in a clinical trial, with 5.3% who did not participate and 4.4% who participated. Digital health variables of making medical appointments (aRR=1.79, 95% CI=1.07-2.99) and awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov (aRR=2.60, 95% CI=1.23-5.54) were significantly associated with participation in the multinomial logistic regression model. Higher education was also associated with an increase in participation (aRR=5.46, 95% CI=1.82-16.38). Participants aged 65-74 years (aRR=2.36, 95% CI=1.00-5.58) and 75 years and older (aRR=2.93, 95% CI=1.17-7.37) were more likely to participate than those aged 18-34 years. Among those who participated in clinical trials, participants were less likely to be NH Asian compared to NH White (aRR=0.14, 95% CI=0.03-0.61). For those who were invited and did not participate, those participating in health forums or support groups (aRR=2.32, 95% CI=1.22-4.39) were more likely to have not participated. Participants 50-64 (aRR=2.37, 95% CI=1.05-5.32) and 65-74 (aRR=2.98, 95% CI=1.28-6.90) years old were more likely than 18-34-year-olds to have not participated. NH Blacks were more likely than NH Whites to have not participated (aRR=2.25, 95% CI=1.23-4.11).

Discussion

This study evaluated the association between health technology use and digital health engagement with clinical trial knowledge and participation in a general population sample. The main results partially supported our primary hypothesis, as searching for health and medical

information, communicating with a doctor's office, watching health-related videos on YouTube, and awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov were significantly associated with higher clinical trial knowledge. The secondary hypothesis was also partially supported, with making appointments with medical providers and awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov being significantly associated with clinical trial participation. Awareness of ClinicalTrials.gov was the strongest correlate for both knowledge and participation after adjusting for demographics and health factors, suggesting that promotion of digital research platforms should be a component of patient and provider education programs focused on increasing clinical trial participation. The current study builds upon previous research on clinical trial knowledge and participation by demonstrating important ways that a variety of digital technologies and platforms may help to increase inclusion in research.^{14–}

21,25,26

We found that multiple measures of digital technology use to engage with providers and electronic health platforms were associated with higher clinical trial awareness and participation. Because the majority of clinical research participants report learning about studies from their healthcare provider,^{27,28} promoting uptake of digital technologies may facilitate additional opportunities for provider interactions that increase awareness about the option of clinical research participation.^{29,30} For example, emergent research has found evidence that integrating clinical research procedures into routine clinical care workflows within electronic health record systems—both patient- and provider-facing—can boost recruitment rates and streamline enrollment procedures.^{31,32} Other studies have demonstrated the acceptability of clinical research decision-making tools and artificial intelligence platforms in optimizing key research processes.^{33–37}

Nevertheless, among the 10% who received an invitation to participate in a clinical trial, less than half went on to participate. In particular, Black respondents were relatively more likely to have been invited but not participated. This may be a function of more severe patterns of comorbidities and adverse SDOH among Black populations that increase the likelihood of service utilization and being invited to participate in clinical trials.^{38,39} Similarly, other HINTS studies have found that Black respondents are less likely to report being influenced by doctors and family members to participate in clinical trials,¹² which is also consistent with longstanding distrust of the medical community that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.^{40,41} In addition, Asians had the lowest rates of being invited (3.6% vs 9.7% overall) and were 86% less likely to have participated. As provider access and communications were associated with both clinical trial knowledge and participation, the effects observed in this study may be related to cultural factors (e.g., social stigma, familial shame) shown to influence low rates of service utilization among Asians compared to other racial groups.⁴² Moreover, recent studies indicate that Asians as an aggregate category appear to have more favorable quality of life than NH Whites, masking significant variability in morbidity and mortality among Asian subpopulations.⁴³⁻⁴⁵ This suggests that certain Asian subpopulations may be less likely to receive medical care, thereby decreasing opportunities during medical encounters and follow-ups to be invited into a clinical trial.^{11,46,47} Additional research is needed to evaluate the impact of disaggregating race and ethnicity on differences in clinical trial knowledge and participation,^{43,48} including implications for recent changes by the US Office of Management and Budget in how race and ethnicity will be collected to reduce misclassification.

Several limitations are acknowledged. The cross-sectional design precludes the ability to infer temporality between the significant correlates of clinical trial knowledge and participation.

Pragmatic trials and novel observational studies (e.g., natural experiments, regression discontinuity, observational-implementation hybrid approach) will be necessary to more rigorously evaluate the real-world effectiveness of digital health interventions to increase clinical trial participation.^{49–53} While this study employed data generalizable to the adult population, the small proportion of clinical trial participation reduced the precision of estimates in certain demographic subpopulations. The limited sample size may have also led to Type II errors for race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. Upcoming HINTS cycles should re-administer the clinical trials questions to allow for larger analytical samples and more rigorous investigation across subpopulations. Similarly, access to digital technologies, availability of broadband internet, and digital health literacy have been found to be lower in a variety of health disparity populations, yet significant gaps remain about the individual and structural factors driving digital health inequities.^{18,19,54} Intersectionality and participatory action approaches will be necessary to better align research participation efforts with the needs of specific subpopulations.^{55–58} In addition, future studies should focus on developing strategies to counter mis- and dis-information rapidly propagated on social media and other digital platforms that increase science rejection.^{59–61} Exposure to such information may contribute to misperceptions about the benefits of clinical research that conflict with established scientific evidence and reduce the likelihood of clinical trial participation.⁶²

Based upon the study's findings, large-scale health promotion campaigns should be implemented to distribute digital resources about clinical trial participation. Further adaptations should be considered based upon demographic and health factors. Intervention studies should determine the real-world effectiveness of integrating clinical research procedures into routine clinical care workflows and electronic health record systems as well as testing other emergent

health technologies like AI. Taken together, the findings from this study will inform the development of quality improvement programs that improve clinical trial participation.

References

1. ClinicalTrials.gov. Trends and Charts on Registered Studies. Updated August 16, 2024. Accessed August 17, 2024. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/about-site/trends-charts>.
2. Westergaard RP, Beach MC, Saha S, Jacobs EA. Racial/ethnic differences in trust in health care: HIV conspiracy beliefs and vaccine research participation. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2014;29(1):140-146. doi:10.1007/s11606-013-2554-6
3. Narayanan S, Chua JV, Heil E. COVID-19: Pitfalls in offering research participation as therapy in clinical settings. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2020;35(11):3359-3360. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06158-6
4. Kripalani S, Heerman WJ, Patel NJ, et al. Association of health literacy and numeracy with interest in research participation. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2019;34(4):544-551. doi:10.1007/s11606-018-4766-2
5. Chau AJ, Sudore RL, Hays RD, et al. Telephone outreach enhances recruitment of underrepresented seriously ill patients for an advance care planning pragmatic trial. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2023;38(8):1848-1853. doi:10.1007/s11606-022-08000-7
6. Bibbins-Domingo K, Helman A, Dzau VJ. The imperative for diversity and inclusion in clinical trials and health research participation. *JAMA*. 2022;327(23):2283-2284. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.9083
7. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, et al. *Improving Representation in Clinical Trials and Research: Building Research Equity for Women and Underrepresented Groups*. (Bibbins-Domingo K, Helman A, eds.). National Academies Press (US); 2022. doi:10.17226/26479
8. Tanner A, Kim SH, Friedman DB, Foster C, Bergeron CD. Promoting clinical research to medically underserved communities: current practices and perceptions about clinical trial recruiting strategies. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2015;41:39-44. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2014.12.010
9. Buckley PR, Murry VM, Gust CJ, Ladika A, Pampel FC. Racial and Ethnic Representation in Preventive Intervention Research: a Methodological Study. *Prev Sci*. 2023;24(7):1261-1274. doi:10.1007/s11121-023-01564-8
10. Cho Y, Shang S, Zhou W. Comorbidities were associated with cancer clinical trial discussion and participation: findings from the Health Information National Trends Survey-Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program (2021). *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2023;163:62-69. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.09.016
11. Nguyen OT, Turner K, Lee J, Hong YR, Al-Jumayli M, Alishahi Tabriz A. Clinical trial knowledge among U.S. adults aged 65 years and up: Findings from a 2020 national survey. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2023;71(6):1917-1922. doi:10.1111/jgs.18255

12. Walker DM, Swoboda CM, Shiu-Yee K, Tarver WL, Nolan TS, Joseph JJ. Diversity of Participation in Clinical Trials and Influencing Factors: Findings from the Health Information National Trends Survey 2020. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2023;38(4):961-969. doi:10.1007/s11606-022-07780-2
13. Williams CP, Geiger AM, Norton WE, de Moor JS, Everson NS. Influence of Cost-Related Considerations on Clinical Trial Participation: Results from the 2020 Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS). *J Gen Intern Med.* 2023;38(5):1200-1206. doi:10.1007/s11606-022-07801-0
14. Taj F, Klein MCA, van Halteren A. Digital health behavior change technology: Bibliometric and scoping review of two decades of research. *JMIR MHealth UHealth.* 2019;7(12):e13311. doi:10.2196/13311
15. Hilty D, Chan S, Torous J, Luo J, Boland R. A framework for competencies for the use of mobile technologies in psychiatry and medicine: Scoping review. *JMIR MHealth UHealth.* 2020;8(2):e12229. doi:10.2196/12229
16. Jacob C, Sezgin E, Sanchez-Vazquez A, Ivory C. Sociotechnical factors affecting patients' adoption of mobile health tools: Systematic literature review and narrative synthesis. *JMIR MHealth UHealth.* 2022;10(5):e36284. doi:10.2196/36284
17. Wannheden C, Åberg-Wennerholm M, Dahlberg M, et al. Digital health technologies enabling partnerships in chronic care management: Scoping review. *J Med Internet Res.* 2022;24(8):e38980. doi:10.2196/38980
18. Yao R, Zhang W, Evans R, Cao G, Rui T, Shen L. Inequities in Health Care Services Caused by the Adoption of Digital Health Technologies: Scoping Review. *J Med Internet Res.* 2022;24(3):e34144. doi:10.2196/34144
19. Woolley KE, Bright D, Ayres T, Morgan F, Little K, Davies AR. Mapping inequities in digital health technology within the World Health Organization's European region using PROGRESS PLUS: Scoping review. *J Med Internet Res.* 2023;25:e44181. doi:10.2196/44181
20. Langford A, Resnicow K, An L. Clinical trial awareness among racial/ethnic minorities in HINTS 2007: sociodemographic, attitudinal, and knowledge correlates. *J Health Commun.* 2010;15 Suppl 3(sup3):92-101. doi:10.1080/10810730.2010.525296
21. Occa A, Merritt AS, Leip A, Stapleton JL. What influences trust in and understanding of clinical trials? An analysis of information and communication technology use and online health behavior from the Health Information National Trends Survey. *Clin Trials.* 2024;21(1):95-113. doi:10.1177/17407745231204813
22. Nelson DE, Kreps GL, Hesse BW, et al. The Health Information National Trends Survey (HINTS): development, design, and dissemination. *J Health Commun.* 2004;9(5):443-460; discussion 81-4. doi:10.1080/10810730490504233

23. van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *J Stat Softw*. 2011;45(3). doi:10.18637/jss.v045.i03
24. SvyVGAM: Design-based inference in vector generalised linear models. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN). Accessed July 26, 2024. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=svyVGAM>
25. Song H, Omori K, Kim J, et al. Trusting social media as a source of health information: Online surveys comparing the United States, Korea, and Hong Kong. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016;18(3):e25. doi:10.2196/jmir.4193
26. Rising CJ, Gaysynsky A, Blake KD, Jensen RE, Oh A. Willingness to share data from wearable health and activity trackers: Analysis of the 2019 Health Information National Trends Survey data. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2021;9(12):e29190. doi:10.2196/29190
27. Feuer Z, Matulewicz RS, Basak R, et al. Non-oncology clinical trial engagement in a nationally representative sample: Identification of motivators and barriers. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2022;115:106715. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2022.106715
28. Yadav S, Todd A, Patel K, et al. Public knowledge and information sources for clinical trials among adults in the USA: evidence from a Health Information National Trends Survey in 2020. *Clin Med*. 2022;22(5):416-422. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2022-0107
29. Hesse BW, Nelson DE, Kreps GL, et al. Trust and sources of health information: the impact of the Internet and its implications for health care providers: findings from the first Health Information National Trends Survey. *Arch Intern Med*. 2005;165(22):2618-2624. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/article-abstract/766849>
30. Paige SR, Krieger JL, Stellefson ML. The influence of eHealth literacy on perceived trust in online health communication channels and sources. *J Health Commun*. 2017;22(1):53-65. doi:10.1080/10810730.2016.1250846
31. Lobach DF, Boxwala A, Kashyap N, et al. Integrating a patient engagement app into an electronic health record-enabled workflow using interoperability standards. *Appl Clin Inform*. 2022;13(5):1163-1171. doi:10.1055/s-0042-1758736
32. Goldhaber NH, Jacobs MB, Laurent LC, et al. Integrating clinical research into electronic health record workflows to support a learning health system. *JAMIA Open*. 2024;7(2):ooae023. doi:10.1093/jamiaopen/ooae023
33. Fang Y, Idnay B, Sun Y, et al. Combining human and machine intelligence for clinical trial eligibility querying. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2022;29(7):1161-1171. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocac051
34. Cullen MR, Lemeshow AR, Amaro S, et al. A framework for setting enrollment goals to ensure participant diversity in sponsored clinical trials in the United States. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2023;129:107184. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2023.107184

35. Dai HJ, Chen CC, Mir TH, et al. Integrating predictive coding and a user-centric interface for enhanced auditing and quality in cancer registry data. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J*. 2024;24:322-333. doi:10.1016/j.csbj.2024.04.007
36. Kasahara A, Mitchell J, Yang J, Cuomo RE, McMann TJ, Mackey TK. Digital technologies used in clinical trial recruitment and enrollment including application to trial diversity and inclusion: A systematic review. *Digit Health*. 2024;10:20552076241242390. doi:10.1177/20552076241242390
37. Park J, Fang Y, Ta C, et al. Criteria2Query 3.0: Leveraging generative large language models for clinical trial eligibility query generation. *J Biomed Inform*. 2024;154(104649):104649. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2024.104649
38. Lolic M, Araojo R, Okeke M, Woodcock J. Racial and ethnic representation in US clinical trials of new drugs and biologics, 2015-2019. *JAMA*. 2021;326(21):2201-2203. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.16680
39. Geskey JM, Kodish-Wachs J, Blonsky H, Hohman SF, Meurer S. National Documentation and Coding Practices of Noncompliance: The Importance of Social Determinants of Health and the Stigma of African-American Bias. *Am J Med Qual*. 2023;38(2):87-92. doi:10.1097/JMQ.000000000000112
40. Minaya C, McKay D, Benton H, Blanc J, Seixas AA. Medical Mistrust, COVID-19 Stress, and Intent to Vaccinate in Racial-Ethnic Minorities. *Behav Sci* . 2022;12(6). doi:10.3390/bs12060186
41. Thompson HS, Manning M, Mitchell J, et al. Factors Associated With Racial/Ethnic Group-Based Medical Mistrust and Perspectives on COVID-19 Vaccine Trial Participation and Vaccine Uptake in the US. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(5):e2111629. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.11629
42. Misra S, Jackson VW, Chong J, et al. Systematic Review of Cultural Aspects of Stigma and Mental Illness among Racial and Ethnic Minority Groups in the United States: Implications for Interventions. *Am J Community Psychol*. 2021;68(3-4):486-512. doi:10.1002/ajcp.12516
43. Adia AC, Nazareno J, Operario D, Ponce NA. Health conditions, outcomes, and service access among Filipino, Vietnamese, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean adults in California, 2011-2017. *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(4):520-526. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2019.305523
44. Baluran DA. Life expectancy, life disparity, and differential racialization among Chinese, Asian Indians, and Filipinos in the United States. *SSM Popul Health*. 2023;21(101306):101306. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2022.101306
45. Sharma A. A national profile of functional limitations among Asian Indians, Chinese, and Filipinos. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2020;75(5):1021-1029. doi:10.1093/geronb/gby092

46. Yu SM, Huang ZJ, Singh GK. Health status and health services access and utilization among Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, South Asian, and Vietnamese children in California. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(5):823-830. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.168948
47. Park H, Choi E, Wenzel JA. Racial/ethnic differences in correlates of psychological distress among five Asian-American subgroups and non-Hispanic Whites. *Ethn Health*. 2020;25(8):1072-1088. doi:10.1080/13557858.2018.1481495
48. Wang K, Grossetta Nardini H, Post L, Edwards T, Nunez-Smith M, Brandt C. Information loss in harmonizing granular race and ethnicity data: Descriptive study of standards. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(7):e14591. doi:10.2196/14591
49. Benson K, Hartz AJ. A comparison of observational studies and randomized, controlled trials. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;342(25):1878-1886. doi:10.1056/NEJM200006223422506
50. Hernán MA, Robins JM. Using big data to emulate a target trial when a randomized trial is not available. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2016;183(8):758-764. doi:10.1093/aje/kwv254
51. Handley MA, Lyles CR, McCulloch C, Cattamanchi A. Selecting and improving quasi-experimental designs in effectiveness and implementation research. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2018;39(1):5-25. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-014128
52. Kessler RC, Bossarte RM, Luedtke A, Zaslavsky AM, Zubizarreta JR. Machine learning methods for developing precision treatment rules with observational data. *Behav Res Ther*. 2019;120(103412):103412. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2019.103412
53. Knox J, Schwartz S, Duncan DT, et al. Proposing the observational-implementation hybrid approach: designing observational research for rapid translation. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2023;85:45-50. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2023.03.008
54. Coss NA, Gaitán JM, Adans-Dester CP, et al. Does clinical research account for diversity in deploying digital health technologies? *NPJ Digit Med*. 2023;6(1):187. doi:10.1038/s41746-023-00928-2
55. Badr J, Motulsky A, Denis JL. Digital health technologies and inequalities: A scoping review of potential impacts and policy recommendations. *Health Policy*. 2024;146(105122):105122. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2024.105122
56. Mothupi M, Dasgupta J, Hosseini Jebeli SS, et al. Using an intersectionality approach to transform health services for overlooked healthcare users and workers after covid-19. *BMJ*. 2023;381:e072243. doi:10.1136/bmj-2022-072243
57. Cornish F, Breton N, Moreno-Tabarez U, et al. Participatory action research. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*. 2023;3(1):1-14. doi:10.1038/s43586-023-00214-1
58. Marra C, Stern AD. Tepid uptake of digital health technologies in clinical trials by pharmaceutical and medical device firms. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2024;115(5):988-992. doi:10.1002/cpt.3192

59. de Boer J, Aiking H. Citizens and conspiratorial anti-science beliefs: Opposition versus support in 38 countries across Europe. *Public Underst Sci*. Published online April 17, 2024;9636625241245372. doi:10.1177/09636625241245371
60. Rutjens BT, Većkalov B. Conspiracy beliefs and science rejection. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2022;46(101392):101392. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101392
61. Calleja N, AbdAllah A, Abad N, et al. A public health research agenda for managing infodemics: Methods and results of the first WHO infodemiology conference. *JMIR Infodemiology*. 2021;1(1):e30979. doi:10.2196/30979
62. Hillyer GC, Beauchemin M, Hershman DL, et al. Discordant attitudes and beliefs about cancer clinical trial participation between physicians, research staff, and cancer patients. *Clin Trials*. 2020;17(2):184-194. doi:10.1177/1740774520901514

Table 1. Overall distribution of demographic and health correlates

Characteristics	Raw N=3,865
	Weighted % (95% CI)
Age	
18-34	27.1 (25.3-28.9)
35-49	24.6 (22.5-26.7)
50-64	27.4 (25.6-29.2)
65-74	12.3 (11.8-12.8)
75+	8.7 (8.2-9.1)
Gender	
Male	49.2 (48.3-50.2)
Female	50.8 (49.8-51.7)
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual	92.6 (90.9-94.2)
Gay or lesbian	2.9 (1.8-4.3)
Bisexual	2.8 (1.9-3.8)
Other	1.7 (1.0-2.5)
Race and Ethnicity	
NH White	63.2 (62.4-64.0)
NH Black	11.3 (10.5-12.2)
Hispanic	16.7 (16.2-17.2)
NH Asian	5.6 (4.8-6.4)
NH Other	3.2 (2.7-3.7)
Educational Attainment	
Less than high school	8.0 (6.4-9.7)
High school diploma	22.4 (20.6-24.3)
Some college	38.8 (37.1-40.6)
College graduate or higher	30.7 (30.0-31.5)
Urban-Rural Status	
Metropolitan	87.8 (86.2-89.2)
Non-metropolitan	12.2 (10.8-13.8)
Health Insurance	
Yes	90.9 (90.5-91.3)
No	9.1 (8.7-9.5)
Lifetime Chronic Diseases	
None	41.3 (39.2-43.4)
One or more	58.7 (56.6-60.8)
Regular Provider Access	
No	37.8 (35.3-40.3)
Yes	62.2 (59.7-64.7)
General Health	
Excellent	12.3 (10.7-14.1)
Very good	37.3 (34.9-39.8)
Good	36.2 (34.0-38.5)
Fair	12.1 (10.4-13.8)
Poor	2.0 (1.5-2.6)
Past-Year Digital Technology Use	
Looked for health/medical info	72.5 (70.2-74.7)
Communicated with doctors office	46.9 (44.6-49.2)
Looked up medical test results	42.0 (39.0-45.0)
Made appointments with provider	49.3 (46.6-52.0)
Past-Year Digital Health Engagement	
Shared health info on social media	14.1 (12.3-15.9)
Participated in forum or support group	9.7 (8.3-11.3)
Watched health-related videos on YouTube	40.4 (37.8-42.9)
Heard of ClinicalTrials.gov	7.0 (5.6-8.6)

Table 2. Results from ordinal logistic regression of demographic and health correlates of clinical trial knowledge

Characteristics	Level of Clinical Trial Knowledge			aRR (95% CI)
	No Knowledge Weighted % (95% CI)	A Little Knowledge Weighted % (95% CI)	A Lot of Knowledge Weighted % (95% CI)	
Overall (N=3865)	41.7 (38.9-44.4)	48.9 (46.3-51.5)	9.5 (7.9-11.2)	—
Age				
18-34	43.4 (36.3-50.6)	45.7 (39.1-52.5)	10.9 (7.1-15.3)	1.00
35-49	37.3 (31.7-43.0)	51.6 (45.1-58.2)	11.1 (7.3-15.5)	1.11 (0.74-1.65)
50-64	40.8 (36.9-44.7)	51.4 (47.1-55.6)	7.9 (6.3-9.6)	0.96 (0.66-1.39)
65-74	36.7 (31.7-41.9)	54.6 (49.2-59.9)	8.7 (6.5-11.2)	1.19 (0.75-1.89)
75+	58.3 (51.8-64.7)	35.0 (29.5-40.8)	6.6 (4.2-9.5)	0.68 (0.39-1.19)
Gender				
Male	42.6 (38.0-47.3)	48.1 (43.6-52.6)	9.3 (7.1-11.8)	1.00
Female	40.7 (37.2-44.3)	49.7 (46.2-53.2)	9.6 (8.0-11.3)	0.91 (0.70-1.18)
Sexual Orientation				
Heterosexual	42.3 (39.4-45.1)	48.5 (45.8-51.3)	9.2 (7.5-10.9)	1.00
Gay or lesbian	24.5 (12.5-39.0)	66.0 (52.7-78.1)	9.5 (3.8-17.5)	1.40 (0.48-4.05)
Bisexual	36.2 (21.3-52.7)	42.2 (26.2-59.2)	21.5 (9.2-37.2)	1.86 (0.88-3.95)
Other	45.1 (22.1-69.4)	49.0 (26.4-71.8)	5.9 (2.0-11.6)	0.73 (0.25-2.14)
Race and Ethnicity				
NH White	38.1 (35.0-41.2)	51.9 (48.7-55.1)	10.0 (8.0-12.3)	1.00
NH Black	43.5 (35.4-51.7)	48.5 (40.9-56.1)	8.0 (4.7-12.1)	0.92 (0.66-1.30)
Hispanic	52.0 (43.5-60.5)	40.5 (33.3-47.9)	7.5 (4.0-11.9)	0.77 (0.47-1.26)
NH Asian	48.1 (34.6-61.9)	38.2 (26.6-50.4)	13.7 (7.3-21.7)	0.70 (0.41-1.21)
NH Other	40.8 (26.4-56.0)	53.4 (38.5-68.0)	5.8 (3.1-9.4)	0.81 (0.47-1.40)
Educational Attainment				
Less than high school	68.1 (57.2-78.0)	29.3 (19.5-40.2)	2.7 (1.3-4.4)	1.00
High school diploma	54.5 (48.6-60.4)	42.7 (36.9-48.6)	2.8 (1.7-4.1)	1.56 (0.92-2.64)
Some college	42.2 (37.9-46.5)	51.0 (46.8-55.2)	6.8 (4.5-9.6)	2.01 (1.19-3.38)
College graduate or higher	24.8 (20.9-28.8)	55.8 (51.8-59.8)	19.4 (15.8-23.4)	3.78 (2.16-6.60)
Urban-Rural Status				
Metropolitan	40.8 (37.9-43.7)	49.5 (46.8-52.2)	9.7 (8.0-11.6)	1.00
Non-metropolitan	47.7 (38.8-56.7)	44.7 (36.3-53.3)	7.6 (3.5-13.3)	0.89 (0.57-1.39)
Health Insurance				
Yes	39.7 (36.8-42.6)	50.3 (47.5-53.1)	10.0 (8.3-11.9)	1.00
No	61.1 (48.4-73.0)	35.0 (24.0-46.9)	4.0 (1.5-7.5)	0.60 (0.33-1.10)
Lifetime Chronic Diseases				
None	41.6 (36.5-46.9)	49.6 (44.6-54.7)	8.7 (7.0-10.6)	1.00
One or more	41.7 (38.0-45.4)	48.4 (44.9-51.8)	10.0 (8.0-12.2)	1.00 (0.73-1.37)
Provider Access				
No	51.5 (46.8-56.2)	41.1 (36.6-45.7)	7.4 (5.5-9.6)	1.00
Yes	35.7 (32.2-39.2)	53.6 (50.1-57.1)	10.7 (8.6-13.0)	1.64 (1.22-2.22)
General Health				
Excellent	32.8 (24.5-41.6)	49.3 (42.2-56.4)	18.0 (12.5-24.2)	1.55 (0.63-3.85)
Very good	39.8 (35.2-44.5)	50.1 (45.7-54.5)	10.1 (7.8-12.7)	1.16 (0.53-2.55)

Good	43.4 (38.9-48.0)	50.2 (45.3-55.0)	6.4 (4.6-8.5)	1.05 (0.47-2.39)
Fair	48.7 (40.8-56.6)	43.3 (36.0-50.7)	8.0 (4.5-12.5)	1.05 (0.43-2.54)
Poor	56.0 (38.3-73.0)	34.9 (18.4-53.6)	9.0 (3.8-16.1)	1.00
Past-Year Digital Technology Use				
Looked for health/medical info	35.6 (32.6-38.7)	52.8 (49.8-55.8)	11.6 (9.5-13.8)	1.35 (1.06-1.71)
Communicated with doctors office	29.3 (26.0-32.8)	56.6 (53.1-60.1)	14.0 (11.2-17.1)	1.64 (1.25-2.14)
Looked up medical test results	31.6 (27.4-36.0)	54.0 (50.5-57.4)	14.4 (11.5-17.6)	0.94 (0.67-1.33)
Made appointments with provider	34.7 (31.1-38.4)	51.4 (48.1-54.8)	13.9 (11.3-16.7)	1.07 (0.82-1.39)
Past-Year Digital Health Engagement				
Shared health info on social media	28.6 (23.5-33.9)	58.3 (52.1-64.4)	13.1 (9.4-17.3)	1.17 (0.87-1.58)
Participated in forum or support group	19.3 (13.8-25.5)	64.5 (55.6-72.8)	16.2 (9.6-24.2)	1.20 (0.84-1.72)
Watched health-related videos on YouTube	33.2 (29.1-37.4)	53.2 (48.7-57.6)	13.6 (10.9-16.6)	1.36 (1.02-1.82)
Heard of clinicaltrials.gov	10.0 (6.6-14.1)	46.8 (34.7-59.0)	43.2 (31.5-55.3)	7.60 (4.82-12.00)

Table 3. Results from multinomial logistic regression of demographic and health correlates of clinical trial participation

Characteristics	Not Invited	Invited, Did not Participate (n=231)		Invited and Participated (n=196)	
	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	aRR (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	aRR (95% CI)
Overall (N=3865)	90.3 (88.5-92.0)	5.3 (3.9-6.8)	—	4.4 (3.3-5.7)	—
Age					
18-34	94.2 (91.4-96.5)	2.4 (1.0-4.2)	1.00	3.4 (1.4-6.3)	1.00
35-49	89.9 (86.4-92.9)	5.9 (3.4-9.0)	2.45 (0.99-6.04)	4.2 (2.3-6.7)	1.37 (0.54-3.47)
50-64	88.7 (84.6-92.2)	6.7 (3.8-10.3)	2.37 (1.05-5.32)	4.6 (3.1-6.5)	1.63 (0.76-3.51)
65-74	86.2 (82.9-89.3)	8.1 (5.6-11.0)	2.98 (1.28-6.90)	5.7 (3.8-7.9)	2.36 (1.00-5.58)
75+	90.3 (86.4-93.6)	4.1 (2.4-6.2)	1.52 (0.82-2.80)	5.6 (3.4-8.4)	2.93 (1.17-7.37)
Gender					
Male	90.8 (87.8-93.4)	5.2 (3.1-7.8)	1.00	4.1 (2.6-5.9)	1.00
Female	89.9 (87.8-91.8)	5.4 (4.2-6.6)	0.87 (0.52-1.45)	4.8 (3.2-6.6)	1.00 (0.54-1.86)
Sexual Orientation					
Heterosexual	90.8 (89.0-92.4)	5.0 (3.8-6.5)	1.00	4.2 (3.1-5.4)	1.00
Gay or lesbian	78.2 (58.9-92.6)	12.6 (2.6-28.5)	2.48 (0.43-14.50)	9.2 (0.6-26.1)	2.24 (0.23-21.44)
Bisexual	85.1 (73.4-93.9)	5.4 (1.3-11.9)	1.34 (0.45-3.96)	9.5 (2.8-19.6)	2.2 (0.65-7.42)
Other	94.2 (83.7-99.5)	4.8 (0.1-16.0)	0.82 (0.03-23.92)	1.0 (0.1-2.8)	0.2 (0.04-1.11)
Race and Ethnicity					
NH White	90.6 (88.3-92.7)	4.8 (3.2-6.7)	1.00	4.6 (3.4-6.0)	1.00
NH Black	84.4 (79.4-88.9)	11.2 (7.3-15.9)	2.25 (1.23-4.11)	4.3 (2.0-7.4)	1.12 (0.50-2.51)
Hispanic	91.7 (87.2-95.3)	3.6 (1.6-6.4)	1.13 (0.48-2.66)	4.6 (1.9-8.4)	1.43 (0.62-3.31)
NH Asian	96.4 (92.4-99.0)	2.9 (0.7-6.4)	0.61 (0.17-2.19)	0.7 (0.1-1.8)	0.14 (0.03-0.61)
NH Other	87.3 (77.5-94.6)	6.1 (2.3-11.6)	1.33 (0.49-3.60)	6.5 (1.0-16.4)	1.46 (0.37-5.74)
Educational Attainment					
Less than high school	94.6 (91.4-97.1)	4.3 (2.1-7.2)	1.00	1.2 (0.4-2.4)	1.00
High school diploma	91.6 (87.6-94.8)	5.1 (2.5-8.5)	1.11 (0.47-2.65)	3.4 (1.7-5.6)	2.86 (0.89-9.24)
Some college	90.8 (88.3-92.9)	5.4 (3.6-7.5)	1.08 (0.39-2.99)	3.9 (2.4-5.6)	3.00 (1.03-8.77)
College graduate or higher	87.7 (84.8-90.4)	5.6 (3.6-7.9)	1.20 (0.41-3.52)	6.7 (4.7-9.1)	5.46 (1.82-16.38)
Urban-Rural Status					
Metropolitan	89.9 (88.1-91.6)	5.6 (4.3-7.1)	1.00	4.5 (3.4-5.7)	1.00
Non-metropolitan	93.1 (88.0-96.9)	3.0 (0.6-7.1)	0.47 (0.14-1.65)	3.9 (1.3-7.8)	0.91 (0.36-2.31)
Health Insurance					
Yes	89.9 (87.9-91.7)	5.7 (4.2-7.3)	1.00	4.4 (3.3-5.7)	1.00
No	94.5 (87.9-98.7)	1.1 (0.2-2.8)	0.33 (0.07-1.53)	4.3 (0.6-11.3)	1.65 (0.27-10.03)
Lifetime Chronic Diseases					
None	94.7 (93.0-96.2)	2.1 (1.3-3.0)	1.00	3.2 (1.9-4.8)	1.00
One or more	87.2 (84.6-89.7)	7.5 (5.4-9.9)	3.18 (1.81-5.62)	5.3 (3.8-7.0)	1.55 (0.88-2.72)
Provider Access					
No	94.2 (91.9-96.1)	2.6 (1.5-4.1)	1.00	3.2 (1.8-5.0)	1.00
Yes	88.0 (85.3-90.4)	6.9 (4.9-9.2)	2.01 (1.02-3.95)	5.2 (3.8-6.7)	1.29 (0.73-2.28)
General Health					
Excellent	91.3 (86.2-95.2)	4.6 (1.8-8.7)	1.57 (0.42-5.91)	4.1 (1.4-8.1)	0.35 (0.04-2.74)
Very good	90.9 (88.1-93.4)	4.8 (3.0-6.9)	1.11 (0.47-2.62)	4.3 (2.8-6.2)	0.33 (0.06-1.79)
Good	91.2 (88.7-93.4)	4.9 (3.3-6.8)	0.88 (0.36-2.14)	3.9 (2.4-5.7)	0.28 (0.04-1.95)

Fair	86.1 (80.6-90.8)	8.3 (4.9-12.5)	1.30 (0.44-3.87)	5.6 (2.6-9.5)	0.42 (0.06-3.16)
Poor	82.2 (67.4-93.2)	6.7 (2.8-12.0)	1.00	11.2 (1.6-27.7)	1.00
Past-Year Digital Technology Use					
Looked for health/medical info	89.5 (87.5-91.4)	5.3 (4.0-6.8)	0.87 (0.47-1.60)	5.1 (3.8-6.7)	1.55 (0.84-2.87)
Communicated with doctors office	88.5 (86.2-90.7)	6.0 (4.3-7.9)	0.78 (0.42-1.45)	5.5 (3.8-7.6)	0.83 (0.48-1.42)
Looked up medical test results	88.2 (85.4-90.7)	6.1 (4.2-8.2)	0.83 (0.44-1.58)	5.8 (3.8-8.1)	0.99 (0.49-2.03)
Made appointments with provider	87.7 (84.8-90.3)	6.4 (4.3-8.8)	1.32 (0.80-2.17)	5.9 (4.1-8.1)	1.79 (1.07-2.99)
Past-Year Digital Health Engagement					
Shared health info on social media	85.0 (79.4-89.7)	9.4 (5.7-13.9)	1.45 (0.80-2.64)	5.7 (2.6-9.7)	0.86 (0.35-2.1)
Participated in forum or support group	77.9 (71.2-84.0)	12.7 (7.8-18.6)	2.32 (1.22-4.39)	9.3 (5.1-14.6)	1.88 (0.91-3.87)
Watched health-related videos on YouTube	88.0 (84.7-91.0)	6.7 (4.4-9.4)	1.36 (0.69-2.68)	5.3 (3.6-7.4)	1.21 (0.68-2.16)
Heard of ClinicalTrials.gov	80.0 (72.7-86.4)	8.2 (4.9-12.2)	1.48 (0.77-2.83)	11.8 (5.8-19.6)	2.60 (1.23-5.54)