Click Here



```
Ethical guidelineRespect for persons is the concept that all people deserve the right to fully exercise their autonomy. Showing respect for persons is a system for interaction in which one entity ensures that another has agency to be able to make a choice. This concept is usually discussed in the context of research ethics. It is one of the three basic
principles of research ethics stated in the Belmont Report issued by the Office of Human Subject Research; it comprises two essential moral requirements: to recognize the right for autonomy and to protect individuals who are disadvantaged to the extent that they cannot practice this right.[1][2]An autonomous person is defined as an individual who
is capable of self-legislation and is able to make judgments and actions based on their particular set of values, preferences, and beliefs. Respecting a person's autonomy thus involves considering their choices and decisions without deliberate obstruction. It also requires that subjects be treated in a non-degrading manner out of respect for their
dignity. In practice, respect for persons is operationalized by obtaining Informed Consent from all individuals who are going to be research subjects. The standard case for applying respect for persons is when the person receiving the health intervention is of sound mind, fit to make personal decisions, and empowered to choose from various options.
Other cases involve showing respect to people who for whatever reason are not free to choose among the typical range of options when making a decision.[3][4]In medical research ethics, the term Vulnerable Populations generally refers to individuals whose situations do not allow them to protect their own interests. The categories of individuals that
constitute Vulnerable Populations are outlined under The Common Rule (45 CFR 46, Subparts A-D). These include individuals who are minors, prisoners, pregnant, physically disabled, mentally disabled, ment
entitled to protection, and additional ethical justification is needed to involve such populations in human subject studies. In such cases, a balance should be established between protecting subjects from exploitation and depriving these subjects would
include that some studies could not be carried out without a vulnerable population. Another justification would be that the aim of the study is to gain knowledge to improve diagnosis, prevention or treatment of diseases associated specifically with that population. [5]Menlo ReportBeneficenceJustice? "Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines
for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research". Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Archived from the original on April 26, 2012. "6.4.1 Respect for Persons". Www.bitbybitbook.com. Retrieved 2021-04-24. Cook, D.; Moore-Cox, A.; Xavier, D.; Lauzier, F.; Roberts, I. (2008). "Randomized Trials in Vulnerable Populations". Clinical
Trials. 5 (1): 6169. doi:10.1177/1740774507087552. PMID18283082. S2CID206772258.^ Levine, Robert J. (1988). Ethics and regulation of clinical research (2004). "Vulnerability, Vulnerability, Vulnerability, Vulnerable Populations, and Policy". Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal. 4
(14): 411425. doi:10.1353/ken.2004.0044. hdl:10822/556901. PMID15812988. S2CID19094496. {{cite journal}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)^ "2. International Organization of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) and World Health Organization
(WHO) Geneva, Switzerland, 2002" (PDF). Archived from the original (PDF) on 2010-08-23. Retrieved from "As a library, NLM provides access to scientific literature. Inclusion in an NLM database does not imply endorsement of, or agreement with, the contents by NLM or the National Institutes of Health. Learn more: PMC Disclaimer | PMC
Copyright Notice . Author manuscript; available in PMC: 2022 Apr 6. The ethical principle of respect for persons in clinical research has traditionally focused on protecting individuals rights, needs, interests, and
feelings.. However, there is little empirical evidence about how to effectively convey respect to potential and current participants in a clinical genomics implementation study. We interviewed 40 participants in English (n=30) or Spanish (n=10) about their experiences
with respect in the study and perceptions of how researchers in a hypothetical observational study could convey respect or a lack thereof. Most interviewees were female (93%), identified as Hispanic/Latino(a) (43%) or non-Hispanic white (38%), reported annual household income under $60,000 (70%), and did not have a Bachelors degree (65%); 30%
had limited health literacy. We identified four key domains for demonstrating respect: (1) personal study team interactions, with an emphasis on empathy, appreciation, and non-judgment; (2) study communication processes, including following up and sharing results with participants; (3) inclusion, particularly ensuring materials are understandable
and procedures are accessible; and (4) consent and authorization, including providing a neutral informed consent and keeping promises regarding privacy protections. While the experience of respect to potential and current research
participants. Further empirical and normative work is needed to substantiate these domains and evaluate how best to incorporate them into the practice of research. Keywords: Research ethics, informed consent, clinical trialsDemonstrating respect for potential and current research participants is an ethical requirement for clinical researchers
conducting human subjects research.[12] Respect is generally understood to require recognizing persons as autonomous agents, capable of self-determination. To show a lack of respect is to refuse an individuals decision, deny their ability to act on their decision, or withhold information
necessary to make an informed decision.[1] Yet respect for persons has broaderbut less well understoodimplications than protecting autonomy; it refers generally to regarding another persons rights, needs, interests, and feelings,[3] and effectively demonstrating respect may help build trust between researchers and participants.[45] To the extent
that mistrust is a barrier to diverse research participation that contributes to inequities in the implementation of research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect and trust may be especially important for how research findings, [67] better understanding respect to the finding respect to the fi
inherently subjective and likely to vary across individuals, communities, and cultures.[11] It is therefore necessary to understand what behaviors demonstrate respect from the perspective of a wide range of potential participants. Some empirical work has been done to assess patients perspectives on respect in the critical care setting[1213] and
community-based clinics.[14] In the research setting, it has been suggested that respect encompasses post-enrollment supports throughout a study, such as maintaining privacy and emphasizing the right to withdraw.[15] However, prior empirical studies have not specifically asked what participants view as respectful behaviors in research. To address
this gap, we interviewed a diverse group of participants about what actions they perceived as conveying respect, or a lack thereof, in research participants views on how clinical researchers can meaningfully demonstrate respect to potential and current participants. We conducted semi-
structured, qualitative interviews with participants in the clinical genomics implementation study Cancer Health Assessments Reaching Many (CHARM). We chose a descriptive, exploratory methodology to capture participants in their own words; this approach allowed us to draw on participants insights to develop
a pragmatic yet meaningful understanding of the empirically understanding of the empirically understanding frameworks or theories. [1618] CHARM was part of the Clinical Sequencing Evidence-Generating Research (CSER) consortium, funded by the National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI) with
co-funding from the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) and the National Cancer Institute (NCI).[19] In CHARM, English- and Spanish-speaking patients age 1849 years at Kaiser Permanente Northwest (KPNW), an integrated healthcare delivery system in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area, and Denver Health
(DH), an integrated safety-net health system in Denver County, Colorado, were invited by email, text, postcard, phone call, in-person recruitment, or provider referral to complete a patient-facing, web-based family history risk assessment. Individuals identified as at risk for Lynch syndrome or hereditary breast and ovarian cancer syndrome[2021]
were eligible to enroll in CHARM through a consent process on the same web application. [22] Potential participants could complete the risk assessment and consent entirely on their own, with phone assistance of study staff. Participants submitted a saliva sample by mail or in person for clinical exome
sequencing for cancer risk.[2324] They could also opt to receive additional findings (medically actionable secondary findings and carrier findings unrelated to hereditary cancer). During the time this interview study was conducted, all participants received results from a genetic counselor by phone. Participants were asked to complete a baseline and
two follow-up surveys, the first within 1 month and the second approximately 6 months following results disclosure, and language preference were reported at the start of the family history questionnaire. The baseline survey
included additional demographic questions and the BRIEF health literacy screening tool, a 4-item measure of health literacy validated against two previously validated measures. [25] Two non-overlapping cohorts of CHARM participants were eligible for our interviews: those who had (1) submitted a saliva sample but not yet received results, and (2)
received negative results and completed the first follow-up survey. We limited the second cohort to those receiving negative results (i.e., no primary or additional findings) to avoid requesting additional study activities when they might be invited to do other study interviews related to positive findings. To ensure we could reach thematic saturation on
issues raised by participants who were members of groups traditionally underrepresented in research, we further limited interview recruitment to CHARM participants whose study records indicated they were members of a racial/ethnic minority group and/or residents in a geographic area with limited socioeconomic status, and we used purposive
structured interview guide based on our study questions and review of the relevant literature related to evaluating respect and trust in research and healthcare. Key questions related to evaluating respect and trust in research and healthcare. The final
interview guide and protocol were approved by the KPNW IRB, with IRBs at all other sites involved in this interview study agreeing to rely on that determination. Interview questions, Ill ask you to think back to when you were invited to join the
CHARM research study. Do you remember deciding whether you wanted to join the CHARM research study? [clarify if needed] Could you tell me about anything that made you feel a lack of respect when you were making that decision? Suggested
probes [following each question]:[lack of respect only, if they cant think of anything] Could you imagine anything that might make you feel a lack of respect? What about the way the research study was
set up? Were there any parts of the research study that made you feel [a lack of] respect and lack of respect in hypothetical observational studyNow Id like to imagine a different type of research study. In this research study, imagine that the research study that made you feel [a lack of] respect in hypothetical observational studyNow Id like to imagine a different type of research study. In this research study, imagine that the research study that made you feel [a lack of] respect in hypothetical observational studyNow Id like to imagine a different type of research study.
peoples medical records to compare how different medications affect peoples health. Does that example make sense? [clarify if needed]In this example, what sorts of things could the research team do in this research study to show a lack of
respect?Suggested probes [following each question]:How could they set up the research study in a way that shows [a lack of] respect?How could research staff who are talking with patients show [a lack of] respect?All interviewers (three English speakers and one
native Spanish speaker) were trained on the interviews guide. All interviews were conducted one-on-one by phone and audio recordings were professionally transcribed, and Spanish recordings were professionally transcribed in
Spanish then translated to English by certified transcript for accuracy and removed potentially identifying information. Cleaned transcripts were uploaded to the cloud-based qualitative analysis platform Dedoose (dedoose.com) for coding
and analysis. We used a qualitative descriptive approach to analyze the data to identify researcher-specific behaviors that it allows the data to guide coding and uses the participants own words when possible to describe the phenomenon. [18] We
developed a qualitative coding framework using deductive and iterative inductive techniques.[17] Our coding framework was created, it was tested on another two transcripts and additional revisions were made. The final
framework included 15 sub-codes that captured activities that interviewees identified as conveying respect in the research setting. Then two coders were trained on and systematically applied the framework to all transcripts, meeting periodically with a third study team member to review codes, resolve discrepancies, and identify potential changes to
the framework. Transcripts were coded independently in batches and 25% of all transcripts were coded under each sub-code, which we then iteratively reviewed to identify where content overlapped or shared similarities such that it could be grouped
10 in Spanish. Interviewees were primarily female (93%). Most identified as Hispanic/Latino(a) (43%) or non-Hispanic white (38%); reported annual household income under $60,000 (70%), including 48% under $40,000; and did not have a Bachelors degree (65%), including 18% without a high school diploma or equivalent. Thirty percent had limited
health literacy. Complete interviewee characteristics are shown in Table 2.Interviewee characteristics (N=40)n(%)Recruitment siteKPNW20(50)DH20(50)Preferred languageEnglish30(75)Spanish10(25)Mean age (range)36(2349)SexFemale37(92.5)Male3(7.5)Race/ethnicityAsian4(10)Hispanic/Latino(a)17(42.5)Middle Eastern or North
certificate8(20)Associate college degree, or completed post-high school training with degree or certificate5(12.5)Bachelors degree8(20)Graduate or professional degree4(10)No response2(5)Annual household incomeLess than $20,0008(20)$20,000 to $39,99911(27.5)$40,000 to $59,9999(22.5)$60,000 to $79,9994(10)$80,000 to
$99,9991(2.5)$100,000 to $139,9993(7.5)$140,000 or more2(5)No response2(5)Limited health literacy*12(30) Based on our interviews, we identified four key categories of activities through which a research team can demonstrate respect to participants: personal study team interactions, study communication processes, inclusion, and consent and
authorization. Exemplar quotes and examples of how to convey respect are shown in Table 3. We did not identify differences between interviewees based on cohort, clinical site, or language preference, so our results are presented collectively. Domains of respect in research Domain Exemplar quote(s) Examples of how to convey respect Personal study
team interactionsThe last woman that I spoke to was just super awesome, and she answered all my questions and gave me the time. You guys seem very informative, patient, and then really respectful. (145)Since they would be asking about the
patients medical history, being judgmental maybe about their lifestyle, or their medical conditions. That would be a big one. (136)Demonstrate kindness, patience, non-judgment, and interest in the participant as a personCheck in
 with the participant to make sure they understandShow appreciation for the participants contributionsEmphasize the benefits of the study for the individual and for societyCommunication processesAfter participating, it would be nice to kind of like have the statistical information, what the study is. And just kind of feel like, Oh, I participated and this
is the result of the study. (129)You guys had cool ways of communicating. I sometimes was not available by phone. So making the appointments by email to get the results, to talk to a genetic counsellor, that was really nice. And getting that scheduled appointment and not doing the phone tag, If I get you, I get you, I get you, type of a thing. That was really
helpful. (133)Offer multiple ways of getting in touch with the study team (phone, email, etc.) Have a specific point of contact whom participants throughout the study Share individual results and overall study findings with participants Share any relevant information
with participants healthcare providerInclusionI mean, basically, simple questions, something anybody of any education can understand what that means. (146)The researchers were able to meet with me at the
closest location and was being really respectful and nice. And just willing to work with me as far as where we had to meet up at and do the study. And she made sure that I was comfortable, if I wanted to do it on a small computer or on a big screen.
(105)Have study staff or interpreters who speak the participants languageWrite all study materials using clear and simple languageWrite all study materials using cle
what youre providing and what youre getting into, especially as a participant when youre participating for a research study. When you have the information, and you know what youre getting into, that really helps. (161) They sent me an email saying, If you would like to participate, were going to give you a call. So they gave me a chance to think
about it. And I knew that my time-- if I didnt want to participate in this interview, for example, I could have been okay with that. And they would have been okay with that I have the choice. (132)Thoroughly and neutrally describe
the study so people can decide whether to joinAllow plenty of time to make a decisionGive choices about levels of participationEnforce all privacy protections with members of the research team. Interviewees consistently noted that team
members kindness, patience, and interest in their perspectives, often conveyed through taking time with them, indicated respect. Most also felt respected when the recruitment staff explained the study thoroughly, checked for comprehension, and were available to answer questions. These perspectives are provided below. For me, it comes down to
how they treat me. They dont treat me like a patient. They dont treat me like a patient. They dont treat me like a person. (146)Ive felt that they take their time with people, at least in my case; that they treat me like a person check in and really make sure that I was understanding everything just having that
awareness of nonverbal cues that might indicate that Im not sure about things or dont really want to participate. (126)Some interviewees commented on the importance of feeling appreciated for their contributions and having the research team highlight their role in achieving the studys goals and potential societal benefits. Additionally, some said
they would have felt disrespected if they felt like the research staff were judging them based on their personal characteristics or for their degree of understanding of the study, particularly during the recruitment process. Others highlighted the importance of the research staff treating each person as an individual. Representative quotes are listed
below. I guess that the main thing is just showing appreciation and thanking somebody like, This is really important for our research and we really appreciate your participation. (122) wasnt made to feel stupid if I didnt know something. If I didnt understand something, I could have it explained clearly and concisely. (114) Respect the process of each
person, because we are all quite different and we dont all take things the same way. (153)Beyond individual interactions, about half of interviewees discussed the processes of communication that the project had in place. Many discussed the importance of getting prompt responses and reminders about study activities and next steps, including
appropriate follow-up. About half of interviewees discussed receiving or having access to information, including their personal test results, health-related data, and overall study outcomes, as part of being respected. Representative quotes are shown below. Not having the information, kind of being left in the dark, so that would be very disrespecting.
So I think just making sure that they follow up, that they follow up, that they stay on the ball, and do their best not to let things fall through the cracks. . Our time is valuable. And somebody not taking what were putting into it seriously is like saying that our time doesnt matter. (132)I totally like the fact that that information was shared with my PCP. Thats really
awesome because that does help out in your care. So that was really good. (161)Interviewees said they appreciated having a specific point of contact, but also multiple means of communication should be done using appropriate language; if the information wasness.
too specific, overly complex, or unavailable in the relevant languages, that would show a lack of respect by minimizing the time burden on participants. Another explained: When the little kit arrived to send back the sample, the instructions were
written really well, and not confusing, and not confusing, and not too long. I think its respectful to make instructions very clear. (131)More than half of interviewees identified inclusion as an element of respectful research. This meant ensuring the information provided was comprehensible to all potential participants and that people of all races and ethnicities,
education levels, abilities, languages, and cultures could participate. Many of these interviewees said that clear and simple study materials, to ensure anyone would be able to answer the questions, were inherent to a respectful study: Giving as much possible information about what the study is while keeping it relatively simple for people to read,
think, would be really great. Because then everybody would be included that even if their reading level isnt particularly high or whatever the case may be. (114)Interviewees also noted the importance of study staff offering support and accommodations to improve accessibility, such as by helping to understand the materials or access the information
on a computer: A person from the clinic asked me if I had any issues with using the computer, I told them that I did, and so someone came over and took down my questionnaire. (153)Others, about half of all interviewees, identified aspects of the study design that improved accessibility, including not having to pay anything to participate and being
able to enroll and complete all study activities from homeincluding web-based enrollment, providing a saliva sample by mail, completing surveys online and interviews by phone, and getting study results by phone or letter instead of needing to come in for an appointment. One person appreciated being able to participate remotely due to their social
anxiety; for others it was more accommodating of their work or childcare schedules: With me working nights and so many hours, if I had to go to the hospital during the day and fill out the forms and stuff, I probably wouldnt have gotten it done. (101) About a quarter of interviewees explicitly discussed the importance of the informed consent process
for showing respect. Even if they did not specifically mention informed consent, most interviewees discussed transparency about key consent elements as part of respect, desiring a clear and thorough explanation of the studys objective(s), design, procedures, value, risks and benefits, data collection practices, and privacy protections. They wished to
have this information available to them in a consistent and convenient manner and said that research being conducted without their knowledge or without a clear explanation of the purpose would show a lack of respect: Oh, I liked that there was a lot of consent. I mean, its reams and reams of information, but at the same time, its good to know the
consents and that kind of stuff. I know that the medical community doesnt always have it as straight as that. (154)We dont even ask for authorization. I want to know that if you all are counting my participation, that I am the one authorizing it and not that you
all are making decisions for me. (128)Close to half of interviewees also said it was important to present study information neutrally. They appreciated that participation was described as not mandatory, there was no pressure, and they had adequate time to reach their decision. Some added that having opt-in or -out options felt particularly respectful,
appreciating that they could choose which results they wanted to receive and even change their mind later: It was very clear why people say no, why people say yes. I felt like it was very neutral and it wasnt trying to push you in one direction or the other. I feel like thats respectful when people dont try and push their own agenda. (106) After I [joined
the study], I was like, Im not sure I actually want to know and so Im pretty sure I still have the option of like not getting that information even though I participated and that was missed. So like I want to be a part of research and I think it is super important but just knowing that I have the option of whether or not what I want to do with that was missed.
information afterward. (108)Many interviewees specifically discussed the importance of ensuring privacy, anonymity, and/or confidentiality, including having institutional policies to protect confidentiality, including having institutional policies to protect confidentiality. Many discussed the importance of ensuring privacy, anonymity, and/or confidentiality, including having institutional policies to protect confidentiality.
want a very clear statement that that information would be kept private. I would want to know for myself that that information would not affect my ability to live a happy, functioning life in society. So having a very clear and non-negotiable kind of a statement stating that my information will never be used like that would be important to me. (132)
[What would show a lack of respect?] Collecting information that was not originally okayed, just carelessness in some way letting people to have access that was not people who werent supposed to or something like that. (108)In interviews with research participants from diverse racial/ethnic, socioeconomic, and language backgrounds, we identified
personal study team interactions, study communication processes, inclusion, and consent and authorization as domains research teams might implement each of these findings. First, our interviews suggest that personal interactions with research
staffparticularly those working at the front lines of recruitmentare a common way for potential and current participants to perceive respect. This finding illustrates the importance of building a culture of respect among all members of a research team and ensuring team members can effectively carry out their critical role in conveying that culture to
participants. One way for research teams to empower their staff to interact with participants as respectfully as possible might be to provide formal training in skills like empathy and professionalism. While many individuals have experience or innate abilities in these areas, training can provide tools to strengthen these skills among all team members
and keep them front of mind during interactions with participants. However, training opportunities for staff are limited outside of basic required modules in good clinical practice and human subjects research, especially for training that focuses on demonstrating respect and building trust. [2830] To best develop these trainings, empirical work is
needed to further clarify what participants need from these interactions and which of these priorities must be achieved through staff interactions versus other means, while also understanding how individual
needs and preferences may differ. Empirical work should identify barriers that research staff face in meeting those needs, including how best to build a culture of respect within the research teams and institutions where they work.[3132] In addition to training, the value that participants place on feeling appreciated for their contributions suggests
that research teams may want to explore the possibility of emphasizing the studys likely societal benefits during recruitment and consent. While this approach may run counter to usual IRB guidance for how to engage with potential participants, [33] openly acknowledging the ways that participants are contributing to scientific advancement may be an
important starting point in developing a trusting relationship. [34] Second, a research teams overall approach to communication, while seemingly logistical in nature, are highly visible to participants and can demonstrate that the study team
is taking their contributions seriously and making an effort to meet them where they are. To this end, research teams could consider developing concrete plans for how to communicate, perhaps through a newsletter or website, about things like individual results, study findings, or changes to risks or benefits, [15] or even the possibility of study
termination, [35] to ensure these communications are timely and complete. Third, interviewees emphasized how a study staff, and offering remote access to study participation for those backgroundssuch as drafting materials in accessible language, providing high-quality translations are timely and complete. Third, interviewees emphasized how a study staff, and offering remote access to study participants from diverse backgroundssuch as drafting materials in accessible language, providing high-quality translations are timely and complete. Third, interviewees emphasized how a study staff, and offering remote access to study participants from diverse backgroundssuch as drafting materials in accessible language, providing high-quality translations are timely and complete. Third, interviewees emphasized how a study staff, and offering remote access to study participants from diverse backgroundssuch as drafting materials in accessible language, providing high-quality translations.
unable to attend in personcould demonstrate respect. The lack of diversity in clinical trials is widely recognized as problematic, and many barriers not only work to include individuals who might otherwise have been excluded, but may also signal to the broader community of participants and
potential participants that the study is genuinely invested in equity and inclusion. One way to minimize barriers is for researchers to explore non-traditional approaches like web-based enrollment, which are increasingly shown to be effective and ethically sound, [22,3637] and proactively consider how to incorporate these approaches into their
studies. Fourth, interviewees said being respectful meant being as transparent as possible and providing people with meaningful choices about whether and how to participate whenever reasonable. Informed consent, which incorporates values such as transparency and individual control, [38] is well recognized as part of conveying respect in research
[39] Our findings suggest that participants may desire transparency and choices that go beyond what is offered by a typical informed consent process. Applying these findings across different research settings, this might mean considering offering options about which categories of genomic sequencing results to receive[40] or using a dynamic consent
process to allow biobank participants to make ongoing choices. [4142] While these processes may add some degree of burdenfor example, in the biobank context, challenging whether seeking broad consent for future research uses is sufficient in all cases research teams should be thoughtful about what choices they are or are not offering to
participants and be aware of how this may affect participants perceptions of respect. At the same time, our findings illustrate the importance of managing and executing privacy and data sharing promises made during the consent process. Although our sample size was robust and our interviewees represented several different dimensions of diversity
this qualitative study was limited to English- and Spanish-speaking participants in one study at two clinical sites. In particular, men and people who identified as racial/ethnic minorities other than Hispanic/Latino(a) were underrepresented. Individuals with other backgrounds and languages, with different or no research experience, and/or at different
clinical locations may think about respect differently. While we did not identify differences between groups of interviewes, this study was not designed to compare groups so there may be differences that we were unable to detect in our interviewes. The experience of respect, or a lack thereof, is inherently subjective, and our interview findings
highlight four key domains that diverse participants identified for research teams to make, others will require additional evidence or a shift in normative
thinking to incorporate them into research. Further empirical and normative work should explore these potential approaches and evaluate their impact on perceived respect, trust, and recruitment and retention. The authors would like to thank Alexander Rangel Humphrey and Daniela Ramos for conducting interviews; Briana Arnold, Sonia Deutsch
Tia Kauffman, Ana Reyes, and the rest of the CHARM team for their support with recruitment and project logistics; Paige Jackson and Chelese Ransom for assisting with interview guide pilot testing; and participants at the Treuman Katz Center for Pediatric Bioethics peer review session who provided constructive feedback on this manuscript. This
study was funded by NHGRI grant K01HG010361 (PI: Kraft) and the Clinical Research (no award number, PI: Kraft). Additional support was provided by the CHARM study (U01HG007292, MPIs: Wilfond, Goddard) and the CSER Coordinating
Center (U24HG007307) as part of the CSER consortium funded by NHGRI with co-funding from NIMHD and NCI. The contents of this paper are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. The CSER consortium thanks the staff and participants of all CSER studies for their important
contributions. More information about CSER can be found at A. Kraft, Treuman Katz Center for Pediatric Bioethics, Seattle Childrens Hospital and Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Bioethics and Palliative Care, Department of Pediatrics, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Bioethics, Seattle Childrens Hospital and Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Bioethics, Seattle, WA, USA;
Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT, USA. Seema K. Shah, Mary Ann & J. Milburn Smith Child Health Research, Outreach, and Advocacy Center; Stanley Manne Childrens Research Institute; Ann & Robert H. Lurie Childrens Hospital of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA; Department of Pediatrics,
 Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USADevan M. Duenas, Treuman Katz Center for Pediatric Bioethics, Seattle Childrens Hospital and Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA.Kristin Muessig
Department of Translational and Applied Genomics, Kaiser Permanente Northwest, Center for Health Research, Portland, OR, USA. Douglas J. Opel, Treuman Katz Center for Pediatrics, University of
Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, WA, USAKatrina A.B. Goddard, Department of Translational and Applied Genomics, Kaiser Permanente Northwest, Center for Pediatric Bioethics, Seattle Childrens Hospital and Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Medicine, Seattle Childrens Hospital and Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Medicine, Seattle Childrens Hospital and Research Institute, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Medicine, Seattle, WA, USA; Division of Med
Bioethics and Palliative Care, Department of Pediatrics, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, WA, USA1. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Protection of Human Subjects of Research. The Protection of Human Subjects of Research Research
Commission; 1978. [PubMed] [Google Scholar] Google G
[PubMed] [Google Scholar]4.Dave G, Frerichs L, Jones J, et al. Conceptualizing trust in community-academic research partnerships using concept mapping approach: A multi-CTSA study. Eval Program Plann2018;66:7078. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.10.007 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]5.Cascio MA, Racine E. Person-
oriented research ethics: integrating relational and everyday ethics in research. Account Res2018;25(3):170197. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2018.1442218 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]6.Popejoy AB, Fullerton SM. Genomics is failing on diversity. Nature2016;538(7624):161164. doi: 10.1038/538161a [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]6.Popejoy AB, Fullerton SM. Genomics is failing on diversity.
Scholar]7. Hindorff LA, Bonham VL, Brody LC, et al. Prioritizing diversity in human genomics research. Nat Rev Genet2018;19(3):175185. doi: 10.1038/nrg.2017.89 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]8. Kraft SA, Cho MK, Gillespie K, et al. Beyond consent: building trusting relationships with diverse populations in precision medicine
research. Am J Bioeth2018;18(4):320. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2018.1431322 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]9. Sabatello M, Callier S, Garrison NA, et al. Trust, precision medicine research, and equitable participation of underserved populations. Am J Bioeth2018;18(4):3436. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2018.1431328 [DOI] [PMC free
article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]10.Garrison NA. Genomic Justice for Native Americans: impact of the Havasupai case on genetic research. Sci Technol Human Values2013;38(2):201223. doi: 10.1177/0162243912470009 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]11.Elander J, Beach MC, Haywood C Jr. Respect, trust, and the management
of sickle cell disease pain in hospital: comparative analysis of concern-raising behaviors, preliminary model, and agenda for international collaborative research to inform practice. Ethn Health2011;16(45):405421. doi: 10.1080/13557858.2011.555520 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]12.Beach MC, Forbes L, Branyon E, et al. Patient
and family perspectives on respect and dignity in the intensive care unit. Narrat Ing Bioeth2015;5(1A):15A25A. doi: 10.1136/jme.2008.027235 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [PubMed] [P
[Google Scholar]14.Beach MC, Branyon E, Saha S. Diverse patient perspectives on respect in healthcare: A qualitative study. Patient Educ Couns2017;100(11):20762080. doi: 10.1016/j.pec.2017.05.010 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]15.Emanuel EJ, Wendler D, Grady C. What makes clinical research ethical?
JAMA2000;283(20):27012711. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.20.2701 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]16.McIntosh MJ, Morse JM. Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews. Glob Qual Nurs Res2015;2:2333393615597674. doi: 10.1177/2333393615597674. doi: 10.1177/2333393615597674. doi: 10.1177/2333393615597674. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.20.2701 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]17.Charmaz KConstructing diversity in semi-structured interviews.
Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis. London, England: London Sage Publication 2006. [Google Scholar]18. Sandelowski MWhatever happened to qualitative description? Res Nurs Health2000;23(4):334340. doi: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]19. Amendola LM, Berg JS, Horowitz CR, et al. The Clinical Sequencing
Evidence-Generating Research Consortium: integrating genomic sequencing in diverse and medically underserved populations. Am J Hum Genet2018;103(3):319327. doi: 10.1016/j.ajhg.2018.08.007 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]20.Kastrinos F, Uno H, Ukaegbu C, et al. Development and validation of the PREMM5 model for
comprehensive risk assessment of Lynch syndrome. J Clin Oncol2017;35: 21652172. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2016.69.6120 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]21.Bellcross C, Hermstad A, Tallo C, et al. Validation of version 3.0 of the Breast Cancer Genetics Referral Screening Tool (B-RSTTM). Genet Med2019;21(1):181184. doi:
10.1038/s41436-018-0020-x [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]22.Kraft SA, Porter KM, Duenas DM, et al. Participant reactions to a literacy-focused, web-based informed consent approach for a genomic implementation study. A]OB Empirical Bioeth (in press). [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]23.National Comprehensive Cancer
Network (NCCN). Genetic/familial high-risk assessment: breast and ovarian V3. In: NCCN. Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology2019. [Google Scholar]25. Haun J. and Oncology2019. [Google Scholar]26. Haun J
Noland-Dodd V, Varnes J, Graham-Pole J, Rienzo B, Donaldson P. Testing the BRIEF health literacy screening tool. Fed Pract2009; December; 2431. [Google Scholar] 26. Elo S, Kyngas H. The qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. J Adv Nursing 2008; 62(1):107115. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 27. Saldaa [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content analysis process. [The Coding Manual for Qualitative content a
Researchers. London, England: London Sage Publications 2016. [Google Scholar]28.Davis AM, Hull SC, Grady C, et al. The invisible hand in clinical research: the study coordinators critical role in human subjects protection. J Law Med Ethics2002;30(3):411419. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]29.Anderson EE, Newman SB,
Matthews AK. Improving informed consent: stakeholder views. AJOB Empir Bioeth2017;8(3):178188. doi: 10.1080/23294515.2017.1362488 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]30.Dickert NW, et al. Partnering with patients to bridge gaps in consent for acute care. Am J Bioeth2020;20(5):717. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2020.1745931
[DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]31.Kraft SA, Duenas DM, Lewis H, et al. Bridging the research engage at least on the participant gap: A research agenda to build effective research relationships. Am [Bioeth2020;20(5):3133. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2020.1745936 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]32.Anderson EE. Partnering with research staff
members to bridge gaps in consent. Am J Bioeth. 2020;20(5):2830. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2020.174593 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]33.Kraft SA, McMullen C, Lindberg NM, et al. Integrating stakeholder feedback in translational genomics research: an ethnographic analysis of a study protocols evolution. Genet MedPublished Online
First:24February2020. doi: 10.1038/s41436-020-0763-z [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]35.Largent EA, Karlawish J. Rescuing research. Patient. 2018;11:577579. doi: 10.1007/s40271-018-0331-7 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]35.Largent EA, Karlawish J. Rescuing research.
participants after Alzheimer trials stop early: sending out an SOS. JAMA NeurolPublished Online First: 3February 2020. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2019.4974 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] 36. Yuen J, Cousens N, Barlow-Stewart K, et al. Online BRCA1/2 screening in the Australian Jewish community: a qualitative study. J Community
Genet Published Online First: 26December 2019. doi: 10.1007/s12687-019-00450-7 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]37. Cadigan RJ, Butterfield R, Rini C, et al. Online education and e-consent for Gene Screen, a preventive genomic screening study. Public Health Genomics 2017;20:235246. doi: 10.1159/000481359 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]37. Cadigan RJ, Butterfield R, Rini C, et al. Online education and e-consent for Gene Screen, a preventive genomic screening study. Public Health Genomics 2017;20:235246. doi: 10.1159/000481359 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar] [PubMed] [
article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]38.Dickert NW, Eyal N, Goldkind SF, Grady C, et al. Reframing consent for clinical research: a function-based approach. Am J Bioeth2017;17(12): 311. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2017.1388448 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]39.Jansen LA. Taking respect seriously: clinical research and the demands of informed
consent. J Med Philos2018;43(3):342360. doi: 10.1093/jmp/jhy006 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]40.Kraft SA, McMullen CK, Porter KM, et al. Patient perspectives on the use of categories for decision making about genomic carrier screening results. Am J Med Genet A2018;176(2):376385. doi: 10.1002/aimg.a.38583 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]40.Kraft SA, McMullen CK, Porter KM, et al. Patient perspectives on the use of categories for decision making about genomic carrier screening results.
Scholar]41.Thiel DB, Platt J, Platt J, Platt J, Platt J, Platt J, Platt T, et al. Testing an online, dynamic consent: a potential solution to some of the challenges of
modern biomedical research. BMC Med Ethics2017;18(1):4. doi: 10.1186/s12910-016-0162-9 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar], the free encyclopedia that anyone can edit.117,185 active editors 7,002,000 articles! Learn
how you can take part in the encyclopedia's continued improvement. Members of the victorious Blondie crewThe Boat Race 2018 took place on 24March. Held annually, The Boat Race is a side-by-side rowing race between crews from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge along a 4.2-mile (6.8km) tidal stretch of the River Thames in south-west
London, England. For the third time in the history of the event, the men's, the women's and both reserves' races were all held on the Tideway on the same day. The women's race saw Cambridge lead from the start, eventually winning by a considerable margin to take the overall record to 4330 in their favour. In the women's reserve race, Cambridge's
Blondie (crew pictured) defeated Oxford's Osiris by nine lengths. The men's reserve race was won by Cambridge's Goldie, who defeated Oxford's Isis by a margin of four lengths. The men's reserve race was the final event of the day and completed a whitewash as Cambridge won, taking the overall record to 8380 in their favour. The men's reserve race was the final event of the day and completed a whitewash as Cambridge won, taking the overall record to 8380 in their favour.
around 250,000 spectators live, and broadcast around the world. (Fullarticle...)Recently featured: Radar, Gun Laying, Mk.I and Mk.IIAndrea NavageroNosy KombaArchiveBy emailMore featured articlesAboutKitty Marion... that Kitty Marion (pictured) was force-fed over 200 times during a hunger strike?... that the North Korean destroyer Choe Hyon
is the largest ship constructed for the Korean People's Navy?... that after the release of High and Low, director Akira Kurosawa received telephone calls imitating his film that threatened to kidnap his daughter?... that May Bradford Shockley is why Silicon Valley is where it is?... that the conservation of a goat might endanger the survival of Aquilegia
paui?... that Iov Laking predicted in a school writing assignment that within ten years she would be making a living as an artist?... that Taiwanese restaurant chain Formosa Chang drew inspiration from McDonald's for its non-greasy atmosphere and corporate practices?... that Haridas Mitra had his death sentence commuted after the intervention
of Mahatma Gandhi?... that "Steve's Lava Chicken" recently became the shortest song to enter the UK Top 40? ArchiveStart a new articleNominate an articleNominate and articleNominate articleNominate and articleNominate articleNominate articleNominate and articleNominate articleNomina
League title. In motor racing, lex Palou wins the Indianapolis 500. In basketball, the EuroLeague concludes with Fenerbahe winning the Final Four Playoff. Ongoing: Gaza warM23 campaignRussian invasion of UkrainetimelineSudanese civil wartimelineRecent deaths: Harrison Ruffin TylerPhil RobertsonMary K. GaillardPeter DavidAlan YentobGerry
ConnollyNominate an articleMay 31: Dragon Boat Festival in China and Taiwan (2025); World No Tobacco DayBessarion 455 Petronius Maximus, the ruler of the Western Roman Empire, was stoned to death by a mob as he fled Rome ahead of the arrival of a Vandal force that sacked the city. 1223 Mongol invasion of Kievan Rus': Mongol forces
defeated a Kievan Rus' army at the Battle of the Kalka River in present-day Ukraine. 1468 Cardinal Bessarion (pictured) announced his donation of 746 Greek and Latin codices to the Republic of Venice, forming the Biblioteca Marciana. 1935 A magnitude-7.7 earthquake struck Balochistan in British India, now part of Pakistan, killing between 30,000 announced his donation of 746 Greek and Latin codices to the Republic of Venice, forming the Biblioteca Marciana.
and 60,000 people.2013 An extremely large, powerful, and erratic tornado struck Central Oklahoma, killing eight people and injuring more than 150 others. Albertino Mussato (d.1329) Joseph Grimaldi (d.1837) Dina Boluarte (b.1962) More anniversaries: May 30 May 31 June 1 Archive By emailList of days of the year About Cucumis
metuliferus, the African horned cucumber, is an annual vine in the cucumber and melon family, Cucurbitaceae. Its fruit has orange skin and lime-green, jelly-like flesh. It is native to Southern Africa, where it is a traditional food. Along with the gemsbok cucumber and the citron
melon, it is one of the few sources of water during the dry season in the Kalahari Desert. This photograph, which was focus-stacked from 25 separate images, shows two C.metuliferus fruits, one whole and the other in cross-section. Photograph credit: Ivar LeidusRecently featured: Ignace TonenAustralian white ibisHell Gate BridgeArchiveMore
featured picturesCommunity portal The central hub for editors, with resources, links, tasks, and announcements. Village pump Forum for discussions about Wikipedia and the broader Wikimedia movement. Teahouse Ask basic questions about using or editing
Wikipedia. Help desk Ask questions about using or editing Wikipedia. Reference desk Ask research questions about encyclopedia. Wikipedia is written by volunteer editors and hosted by the Wikimedia Foundation, a non-profit organization that also hosts a range of other volunteer
projects: CommonsFree media repository MediaWikiWiki software development Meta-WikiWiki software development Meta-WikiWikimedia project coordination WikisourceFree-content library WikispeciesDirectory of species WikiversityFree learning tools
WikivoyageFree travel guide WiktionaryDictionary and thesaurusThis Wikipedia is written in English. Many other Wikipedias are available; some of the largest are listed below. 1,000,000+ articles Bahasa IndonesiaBahasa MelayuBn-lm-
gCataletinaDanskEestiEsperantoEuskaraMagyarNorsk bokmlRomnSimple EnglishSloveninaSrpskiSrpskohrvatskiSuomiTrkeOzbekcha 50,000+ articles AsturianuAzrbaycancaBosanskiFryskGaeilgeGalegoHrvatskiKurdLatvieuLietuviNorsk nynorskShqipSlovenina Retrieved from "2This article is about the year 455. For other uses, see 455
 (disambiguation). This article needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources: "455" news newspapers books scholar JSTOR (April 2019) (Learn how and when to remove this message) Calendar
yearYearsMillennium1stmillennium1stmillennium1stmillenniumCentury5thcentury 6thcenturyDecades430s440s450s 460s470sYears452453454455 by topicLeadersPolitical entitiesState leadersReligious leadersCategoriesBirthsDeathsDisestablishmentsvte455 in various calendar455CDLVAb urbe condita1208Assyrian
calendar5205Balinese saka calendar376377Bengali calendar1405Buddhist calendar1405Buddhist calendar1405Buddhist calendar147448Hebrew calendar1405Buddhist calendar147448Hebrew calendar1405Buddhist cal
```

catedoard "Year Samural 1951." State Samural 1957. Fail You go State Special Control of the Vision of State Control of State
(links edit)510s (links edit)View (previous 50 next 50) (20 50 100 250 500)Retrieved from "WhatLinksHere/4th century"

Principle of respect in research. Principles of respect for person in the belmont report. What is respect for persons ethics. How does the principle of respect for persons relate to informed consent in research. Principle of respect for persons.