

Last update: July 2021

The Representative Studies Rubric:
A Tool to Enhance Representation in Clinical Research

Office of HIV/AIDS Network Coordination (HANC) Legacy Project
Contact: Brian Minalga (bminalga@fredhutch.org)

Background/Rationale

Clinical research, including studies responding to the HIV/AIDS epidemic and other diseases, consistently fails to enroll representative populations. Cisgender women, transgender people, pregnant people, people who inject drugs, and communities of color in the US—particularly Black, Indigenous, and Latinx communities—remain underrepresented. A [review of Phase 3 trials for new antiretrovirals](#) (ARVs) found that cisgender White men account for 6% of the global HIV epidemic, yet they represent 51% of participants in randomized controlled trials for new ARVs. This review provides just one example of the ongoing, institutionalized problem of misrepresentation that cuts across all clinical research—therapeutic and preventive, historical and contemporary.

Researchers often mischaracterize underrepresented populations as “hard-to-reach” and “mistrustful.” In reality, the underrepresentation of these populations stems from a legacy of patriarchal, colonial, and racist policies and practices that have been institutionalized within the field of research. For example, most major research networks have only recently begun to collect transgender-inclusive data from study participants. The erasure of transgender people from data represents policy and practice that mars transgender representation in clinical research—not a failure of transgender people to participate in research.

[The International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights](#), signed but not ratified by the United States, defines “the right of everyone to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.” While cisgender White men reap the benefits of clinical research—in which they are vastly overrepresented—underrepresented populations suffer the serious consequences of their exclusion. For example:

- Due to the [DISCOVER study’s](#) exclusion of people vulnerable to HIV acquisition through receptive vaginal sex, the United States FDA could not approve Descovy for PrEP in this population, thus exacerbating [existing gaps](#) in PrEP coverage.
- On average, people who can become pregnant [have to wait six years](#) after licensure of ARVs before any published data are available demonstrating safety and efficacy of the same ARVs in pregnancy.
- Black, Indigenous, and Latinx Americans continue to be underrepresented in HIV clinical research, while [HIV-related disparities](#) for these populations continue to grow.

Since 2009, the [HANC Legacy Project](#) has worked nationally to increase awareness of and build support for HIV clinical research by addressing factors that influence the participation of historically underrepresented communities. Over the years, The Legacy Project has worked collaboratively with [Community Partners](#), the [NIAID Division of AIDS Cross-Network Transgender Working Group](#), the [HIV Prevention Trials Network Black Caucus](#), the [Women’s HIV Research Collaborative](#), and many additional partners to produce numerous trainings,

Last update: July 2021

guidance documents, statements, and calls to action to enhance representation in HIV/AIDS clinical research. While many of these interventions have been implemented to some extent, they have not been fully optimized, and HIV clinical research continues to exclude and underrepresent the aforementioned populations.

The Representative Studies Rubric (RSR)

Building on the twelve-year history of the HANC Legacy Project, we have designed a tool, the Representative Studies Rubric (RSR), to guide and monitor enhanced representation in clinical research. The RSR assesses individual studies for the extent to which they are designed to include or exclude underrepresented populations. The RSR consists of a twelve-item questionnaire that examines the representation of study populations in terms of:

- age
- ethnicity
- gender
- injection drug use
- pregnancy
- race, and
- sex assigned at birth.

The RSR is also designed to identify erroneous and inappropriate language used in protocols, as language itself can exclude or otherwise impede the participation of underrepresented populations.

The RSR can be implemented in a variety of ways depending on a research team's needs. For example, the RSR can be used retrospectively to appraise representation of study populations within a research team's portfolio of studies that have already made it into the field. More importantly, the RSR can be implemented *proactively* during protocol development. When used proactively, it can ensure that study teams address critical questions pertaining to the enrollment of underrepresented populations, serving as a tool to facilitate inclusion, scientific integrity, and the application of scientific progress for those who need it most.

The HANC Legacy Project recommends that research teams operationalize the RSR early in the development of each study protocol. It can be used simply as a checklist to clearly define the study population and provide scientific justification for the exclusion of any underrepresented group(s). It can also be used to facilitate scientific discussion among study teams who might not otherwise consider the questions of representation that the RSR poses. Two of the items in the RSR also include hyperlinks to guidance documents by which individual studies can be measured for inclusion and accurate language. When meaningfully implemented, the RSR can help to create a future for science that honors *everyone's* right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.

Last update: July 2021

The RSR Questionnaire (in raw format)

Study Title:

Study Aim:

Countries of Enrollment:

Study Size:

1. People in the following age categories are both eligible and included.

Eligible: Population is not listed in exclusion criteria.

Included: Population is to no extent denied access by the descriptions of the study population.

(E.g. Transgender men are excluded from—though possibly eligible for—studies that define the study population as “women.”)

- a. 0-12 [Yes] [No]
- b. 12-18 [Yes] [No]
- c. 18-34 [Yes] [No]
- d. 34-55 [Yes] [No]
- e. ≥55 [Yes] [No]

States scientific justification for age-based exclusion(s)?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Comments:

2. Cisgender women are both eligible and included.

Eligible: Population is not listed in exclusion criteria.

Included: Population is to no extent denied access by the descriptions of the study population.

(E.g. Transgender men are excluded from—though possibly eligible for—studies that define the study population as “women.”)

- a. Yes
 - b. No
- i. States scientific justification for exclusion?
 1. Yes
 2. No

Comments:

3. Gender-non-binary individuals are both eligible and included.

Eligible: Population is not listed in exclusion criteria.

Included: Population is to no extent denied access by the descriptions of the study population.

(E.g. Transgender men are excluded from—though possibly eligible for—studies that define the study population as “women.”)

Last update: July 2021

- a. Yes
- b. No
 - i. States scientific justification for exclusion?
 - 1. Yes
 - 2. No

Comments:

4. Persons who inject drugs are both eligible and included.
Eligible: Population is not listed in exclusion criteria.
Included: Population is to no extent denied access by the descriptions of the study population.
(E.g. Transgender men are excluded from—though possibly eligible for—studies that define the study population as “women.”)
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - i. States scientific justification for exclusion?
 - c. Not specified

Comments:

5. Transgender men are both eligible and included.
Eligible: Population is not listed in exclusion criteria.
Included: Population is to no extent denied access by the descriptions of the study population.
(E.g. Transgender men are excluded from—though possibly eligible for—studies that define the study population as “women.”)
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - i. States scientific justification for exclusion?
 - 1. Yes
 - 2. No

Comments:

6. Transgender women are both eligible and included.
Eligible: Population is not listed in exclusion criteria.
Included: Population is to no extent denied access by the descriptions of the study population.
(E.g. Transgender men are excluded from—though possibly eligible for—studies that define the study population as “women.”)
- a. Yes
 - b. No

Last update: July 2021

- i. States scientific justification for exclusion?
 1. Yes
 2. No

Comments:

7. Study participation is unrestricted by participants' potential to become pregnant.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - i. States scientific justification for restriction?
 1. Yes
 2. No

Comments:

8. Study documents correctly apply the [DAIDS Cross-Network Transgender Working Group](#) guidance to define the study population in terms of:
 - a. Gender identity [Correctly applied] [Incorrectly applied]
 - b. Sex assigned at birth [Correctly applied] [Incorrectly applied]

Comments:

9. Includes sex-specific and/or gender-specific analyses (e.g. menstruation, menopause, biological tissues, endogenous/exogenous hormones, etc)?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Not specified
 - d. Not Applicable

Comments:

10. Includes specific and measurable goals/plans to enroll:
 - a. American Indians / Alaska Natives [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]
 - b. Black Americans [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]
 - c. Cisgender women [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]
 - d. Latinx people in the US & territories [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]
 - e. People in specific age groups [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]

Last update: July 2021

- f. People who inject drugs [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]
- g. Transgender people [Yes, enrolling with goals/plans] [No, enrolling without goals/plans] [Not enrolling this population]

Comments (include what the recruitment goals are (if any) and what resources are available to meet them):

11. The community engagement strategy prioritizes underrepresented populations relevant to the study.

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Community engagement strategy is not included in the protocol

Comments:

12. Study-related documents correctly apply the [NIAID HIV Language Guide](#).

- a. Yes (there is NO stigmatizing language)
- b. No (there IS stigmatizing language)

Comments: