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Overview

• Need for research on “risky” and “sensitive” behaviors with youth

• Need for research with youth populations that are vulnerable and experience health disparities.
  – Implications of avoiding such research

• What are the risks (and benefits) associated with this social and behavioral research?

• Is this research minimal risk as currently (un)defined.

• Case study of Project Q2
Need for research on “risky” and “sensitive” behaviors with youth

• Adolescent health risk behaviors, specifically substance use, conduct problems, and sexual risk-taking, are primary contributors to direct and indirect causes of morbidity and mortality\(^{[1-3]}\).
Implications of avoiding research on risky behaviors among youth

• 74 CDC endorsed evidence-based HIV prevention programs (including 17 for youth), there are none for adolescent MSM and only one “good-evidence” behavioral intervention for emerging adult MSM\[^{4,5}\].

• Most prevention funders require evidence of program effectiveness; the absence of such research on adolescent MSM effectively eliminates major sources of programmatic funding for this high risk group.

• Researchers shy away from research on adolescent MSM because of the belief (experience) that they could not receive IRB approval. IRB decisions are often motivated by value-laden concepts absent supportive evidence.
What are the risks in social and behavioral research with youth in this area?

• The Society for Adolescent Medicine (SAM)[6] reviewed the literature in this area and concluded the primary risks are:
  – Promoting or inducing unhealthy behavior (e.g., initiating sex after answering a survey of sexual behavior) is sometimes raised as a potential risk, but the SAM review of the literature dismissed this notion.
  – Loss of privacy or confidentiality (ANPRM data security rules address this).
  – Negative psychological reaction to participation.
Psychological Risks

- Sometimes used by IRBs as rational for study to be deemed greater than minimal risk.

We will be asking you personal questions about your sex life, mental and emotional health, any alcohol or drugs you may have used, and potentially criminal behavior. Although this information is confidential, some of these issues could make you feel uneasy or embarrassed. If there are questions you do not want to answer, you do not have to do so. You can stop taking part at any time. A staff member will be available if you want to talk about anything that comes up during the interview. We will also refer you to counseling services if you want.
What are the risks of a negative psychological reaction to social and behavioral research?
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Introduction

Regulatory boards charged with protecting human research subjects, such as institutional review boards (IRBs), have had an increasing influence on the conduct of research involving human subjects. Within the U.S., the IRB system is struggling to manage an expanding mission that extends beyond assessments of risk-benefit ratios to also sometimes include responsibility for managing conflicts of interest, compliance with regulations regarding accessing health records, assuring research protocols correspond to grant applications, and others (Ginsalus et al., 2007). At the same time, the scientific enterprise is becoming increasingly specialized, thereby diminishing the likelihood that any given IRB will have a member with expertise in the protocol under review. The implications of this so-called “mission creep” for researchers is that every aspect of the design and conduct of their study may be subject to modification by IRB members who are not subject-matter experts. Particularly in value-laden areas of scholarship, such as sexuality research, this creates the potential for individual values to threaten academic freedom and the quality and conduct of research that has the potential to improve sexual health.

The goals of this invited article are ambitious—a call to action to sexuality researchers to improve the IRB review of sexuality research by transforming it into an evidence-informed process. Transforming this process will require sexuality researchers to become experts in the ethical and regulatory issues involved in
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Aim: To understand factors that increase risk for mental health problems, substance use, and HIV among LGBT youth. Increase understanding of the development of sexual orientation.

Longitudinal (8 waves over 4 years) with CASI self-report and structured psychiatric interviews.

Target sample 250 in age range 16-20 at baseline
What is the participants experience?

- Project Q2 4th wave interview asked, “We are trying to understand what it is like to participate in one of our research studies. How did you feel answering the questions about…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Participants reactions to answering study questions among participants of all ages at 1-year follow-up interview (N = 181)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual behavior (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very uncomfortable</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistently low reports of distress

• Our findings of very few participants who report being uncomfortable answering these questions is consistent with past research:
  – Fendrich et al. (2007): adult men who have sex with men answering questions about sexual behavior and substance use[7]
  – Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2006): adolescents answering questions on drug use, suicidal behavior, and physical and sexual abuse[9].
Is this research minimal risk?

• Subpart D governs research with children, and the minimal risk standard (defined in Subpart A) determines what kinds of research can be conducted.
  – §46.408: Waiver of parental permission can be issued when research risks are minimal (or only a slight increase over minimal) and
    • The research could not practically be carried out without the waiver (§46.116d)
    • Parental permission is not a reasonable requirement (e.g. runaway, abused children) (§46.408c).
Minimal Risk

Project Q2

• “Did you feel like answering any of these questions made you more uncomfortable than a typical visit to your physician, doctor, psychologist, or counselor.”
• 54% “No, it was more comfortable answering these questions”
• 35% “About the same”
• 11%, “Yes, more uncomfortable answering these questions”

Is being uncomfortable a risk?

• 27% of children sometimes feel scared or afraid in their daily lives[12].

What are routine experiences in medical and psychological procedures?

• Routine medical and psychological procedures involving children include blood draws, screening for mental health problems, indications of abuse or neglect as well as tests to assess cognitive, social, academic, behavioral and emotional functioning. Questions about substance use, depression, and sexuality are part of routine medical and psychological examinations for children beginning in early adolescence[13].
Problems applying minimal risk standards to research with youth

• 2 IRBs (University of Illinois at Chicago [UIC] and a Community Based Organization [CBO])
  – 8/06- Submission to CBO IRB (primary data collection site)
  – 9/06- Submitted to UIC for Departmental Review
  – 9/06- IRB approval by CBO
  – 6 months and 4 rounds of review with UIC
    • Much of it had to due with determining the “risks” of the study, until they ultimately decided it was “only a slight increase over minimal risk” without articulating what these risk were.
  – 3/07- UIC IRB approved with CoC
  – 4/07- CBO IRB approval of amended protocol (month 10)...the work can begin
Benefits of research participation

- 45 CFR 46 specifies that a basic element of informed consent includes “A description of any benefits to the subjects or to others which may reasonably be expected from the research.”

- “Benefit” is not clearly defined.

- NIH Intramural Protocol Review Standards states that “A research benefit is considered to be something of health-related, psychosocial, or other value to an individual research subject [direct benefit], or something that will contribute to the acquisition of generalizable knowledge [social benefit].”
# Benefits of Research Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Age: 16-17 (n=52)</th>
<th>Age: 18-20 (n=221)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel like part of something important</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel like I am helping my community</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped me to have someone to talk to about my experiences</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel like I am helping other young men like myself</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gave me the opportunity to meet successful LGBT adults</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helped to know people care about other young men like myself</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering the questions helped me reflect on who I am</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Crew 450 made me feel supported</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Crew 450 helped me to think about my behavior</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1=Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Disagree  5=Strongly Disagree

- No significant differences between age groups for any item (p>.05)
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