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Background

- Informed consent (form and process) fundamental to ethical engagement of human subjects as articulated in the Belmont Principles
  - Informs (respect for persons) and
  - Allows choice (autonomy)
If full regulatory consent not possible…

- Alteration
  - Some of the required elements of informed consent can be altered or not included
  - NOTE: There still is a consent form/process with a signature
- Waiver of consent
  - No consent
The Regulations

- Regulatory criteria for waiver or alteration are the **same**
  - Research can involve no more than minimal risk
  - It is not practicable to conduct the research without a waiver/alteration
  - If the research involves using identifiable private information or identifiable biospecimens, the research could not practicably be carried out without using such information or biospecimens in an identifiable format;
  - The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects; and
  - Whenever appropriate, the subjects or legally authorized representatives will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

- Investigators must justify
  - How criteria are met
  - Why a waiver/alteration is being requested
Waivers in PCTs

- Many trials:
  - Meet minimal risk criteria
  - Involve numerous institutions and thousands of subjects
- Concern that obtaining informed consent:
  - May alter the ‘real-world’ medical care being studied
  - May introduce an alteration of routine care
  - May introduce bias
  - Make research impossible to conduct
The Challenge…

- How to justify waiver of consent as the request/demand for transparency has increased?
  - From the public, funders, regulatory bodies
Request for transparency

- Studies of patients’ reactions to hypothetical scenarios
  - Patients “wanted to be told about research and have a choice, but were very open to disclosures being streamlined”
  - “…pragmatic clinical research without some type of notification and perhaps consent is currently not acceptable to the majority of the public and is associated with a lower trust in physicians and the places where care is provided.”
    - Weinfurt et al. Med Care. 2017;55;970-978
Consider

- Informed consent is not the only way to inform
Consider

- Informed consent is not the only way to inform
- Think notification
Consider

- Informed consent is not the only way to inform
- Think notification

- Talked with the PI’s of six studies using a waiver of informed consent with some type of notification
Notification with waiver of consent

- Amount of information…a range
  - Detailed study-specific to
  - General statement that research is being conducted

- Mode of presentation*
  - Posters, flyers, emails, snail mail
  - Face-to-face discussion

* Impact on level of certainty that the message was at least seen
Consequences of notification

- Logistics and cost

*For discussion in the future:*
  - When to offer an opt-out option
  - What if no opt-out and potential subjects
    - Have questions
    - Do not want to be in the research?
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ICD-Pieces: Improving Chronic Disease Management with Pieces

Miguel A. Vazquez, MD
Professor of Internal Medicine
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center
Hypothesis

PIECES (Information Technology) → Practice Facilitators → Guideline based-care in Primary Care Practices → Improved Outcomes for Patients with CKD, Diabetes & Hypertension

Reduced:
1. Hospitalizations
2. ED Visits
3. Readmissions
4. CV Events / Deaths
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ICD-Pieces

- **Patient Population**
  - Patients with triad of CKD, Diabetes and Hypertension

- **Intervention**
  - Facilitate delivery of guideline-based care

- **Waiver of informed consent**
  - Accepted interventions and primary care provider made final decisions to accept or not recommendations
  - Information provided in clinics: research study on CKD, Diabetes and HTN
  - Opt-out option provided (for patients and clinicians)
This research study will help us learn how to help providers give the best care to patients who have these 3 health problems: Chronic Kidney Disease, Diabetes and High blood pressure (Hypertension).

As part of this study, the study team will look at the information about you that Parkland collects at each of your clinic visits to see how your health is doing. The study team will not collect more data or do any extra tests just because you are in the ICD-Pieces research study. Even if your doctor did not use the information sent to him or her, your information is still important to the study. The privacy of your information is important, and we will use safe and secure ways to look at your personal information. At the end of the study, your name, date of birth, address, phone numbers, etc. will be taken off our records so nobody can link the information to you. The study team will not share any of your personal information with people who are not part of the study team.

If you do not want your information sent used in this study, please call 214-590-3073 to leave a message and your information will be removed.
Participating Health Systems

- UT Southwestern Medical Center
- Parkland: Public Safety Net
- Texas Health Resources: Private Nonprofit
- ProHealth Physicians: Private ACO
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs: Government Hospital
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# Patient Notification and Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health System</th>
<th>Notification</th>
<th>Patients enrolled</th>
<th>Opt-outs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>2,821</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Information sheet</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICD-Pieces

- Enrollment diverse population
- Health systems differed in population, geography, level of integration
- Flexibility in delivery of intervention and delivery information
  - Each health system used a different approach to inform patients
  - Lesson learned: Plan implementation strategy to inform potential participants
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Opting out of a Pragmatic Clinical Trial: The experience of the Nudge Study

P. Michael Ho, PhD, MD
Professor, School of Medicine
University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Center
VA Eastern Colorado Health Care System
The Nudge Study - Overview

- Pragmatic clinical trial seeking to improve medication adherence to patients’ already-prescribed cardiovascular (CV) medications though a series of theory-based text or voice messages to serve as “nudges”
  - Inclusion criteria: English/Spanish speaking patients with ≥ 1 CV condition of interest prescribed ≥ 1 medication of interest
- Due to our large enrollment numbers and patient identification procedures, traditional consent practices were not feasible
Patient identification and notification process

• Patients meeting inclusion criteria were identified through EHR. Staff mailed each patient an opt out packet via USPS.

• The packet included an introductory letter signed by the Site PI, frequently asked questions about the study, an opt out form, a self-addressed stamped envelope, and a 3-page voluntary survey for patients opting out of the study.
  – Patients that returned opt out consent forms or had packets returned by USPS were removed from the study
  – If patients did not return the opt out form within one month, they were considered eligible and their medication refill activity was monitored.
Title: Personalized patient data and behavioral nudges to improve adherence to chronic cardiovascular medications (Nudge)

Co-Principal Investigators: Michael Ho, MD, PhD; Sheana Bull, PhD, MPH

Protocol: 18-2779

Version date: 12/1/2020

The University of Colorado in collaboration with UCHealth is conducting a research study to see how well text messages could work to remind and encourage patients take medicines they have already been prescribed.

You are receiving this letter because you have been identified as a patient at UCHealth. We plan to send participants text messages to serve as reminders to fill your prescription for already prescribed cardiovascular related medications. In this study, we hope to follow you and other patients over 2 years.

Please review the information sheet attached in this packet. If you would like to join the study, you do not need to complete any forms. If you do not wish to participate, please complete the opt-out letter and send it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope, attached.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Larry A. Allen, MD, MHS
Frequently asked questions

INFORMATION ON THE STUDY

What is the title of this research study?
Personalized patient data and behavioral nudges to improve adherence to chronic cardiovascular medications (The Nudge Study)

Why is this research study being conducted?
Half of patients with cardiovascular disease do not take their medications as prescribed. This behavior can lead to increased medical risk or even death. Our study plans to learn if sending different text messages, serving as reminders or encouragement, may help patients take their medication more often if they have had trouble keeping up with their medicines.

How does the study work?
Our research team will identify patients taking prescription medicine that have already been prescribed by their doctor. If a patient does not refill their prescription within 7 days of their recommended refill date, they may receive a text message intervention.

At any time, participants can text STOP to stop receiving text messages. For voice messages/phone calls, pressing 0 will also opt you out of the study. The data that would otherwise be collected by your healthcare provider will continue to be viewed by the Nudge Study team after the intervention.

What if I don’t have a cell phone?
For patients that do not have a cell phone, a voice recording saying the same messages will be sent to your phone line instead.

What are you going to measure?
Opt out card

uc Heath

OPT-OUT CONSENT FORM

Title: Personalized patient data and behavioral nudges to improve adherence to chronic cardiovascular medications (Nudge)

Co-Principal Investigators: Michael Ho, MD, PhD; Sheana Bull, PhD, MPH

Protocol: 18-2779

Version date: 02/01/19

I DO NOT wish to take part in the above study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of participant</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of participant</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return this self-addressed, stamped postcard by: **11/10/2020** to no longer be enrolled in the study.
Secondary opt out during the intervention

- All patients enrolled in intervention arms had a secondary opportunity to opt out of the intervention by texting STOP after the first text message.
- Patients that texted STOP or expressed they would no longer like to receive texts in other words were removed from the study at any time during the intervention.
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Background

- Informed consent is frequently understood as one thing, with one goal (respecting autonomy).

- This framing suggests informing participants is valuable only when they are deciding whether to participate.
Thesis

- THAT is the role of disclosure as part of the full regulatory consent process.

- But, being informed can have value independent of full regulatory consent.

- Hence, even when conducting a study under a waiver of full regulatory consent: ask whether disclosure would be valuable.
Claim #1

Individuals are always informed to some extent and agree to something.

The practically relevant questions are: What should they know? What should they agree (not object) to?
Claim #2

To determine what should be disclosed, need to identify the goals of disclosure in the case.
Claim #3

Informed consent currently has the goal of respecting participant autonomy.

What should be disclosed is determined by what participants need to know to make a decision.

This suggests that when participants are not consenting there is no reason to inform them.
Claim #4

Information is often valuable even when it is not used to make a decision.
Goal #1

Preparation
Goal #2

Understand what doing/relationships
Goal #3

Understand what contributing to
Goal #4

Participants can express any concerns
Goal #5

Can promote participant engagement/support
Goal #6

Reduces chances of unethical research
Goal #7

Promotes public trust
Claim #5

Informing can have negative consequences.

Tailor what disclose to the specific study and the goals of disclosure.
Participants always know some things and agree to some extent. When not getting full regulatory consent, the relevant questions are:

1. What should they know?

2. What should they agree (not object) to?