

Beyond Embargos: Accessibility Considerations for Building New Public Access Policies

Lisa McCorkell, MPP
Co-Founder, Patient-Led Research Collaborative



Disclosures

No relevant disclosures to report

Who is PLRC?

- Team of people with Long COVID and associated conditions, led by 4 women, now 50+ members over 4 continents
- Multidisciplinary backgrounds:
 - ◆ Survey design & participatory design
 - ◆ Qualitative research
 - ◆ Public policy
 - ◆ Research engineering
 - ◆ Data science & machine learning
 - ◆ Health activism
 - ◆ Medicine, medical research (NY Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medicine)
 - ◆ Neuroscience (University College London)
- Formed out of the Body Politic COVID Support Group (on Slack) in April 2020
- Conducted the first research on Long COVID in May 2020
- Have continued to do our own research, fund research, consult/partner on research, give feedback on research/guidelines/policy, push field of patient-led research forward, and advocate for better policies



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

EClinicalMedicine

journal homepage: <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/eclinicalmedicine>



Research Paper

Characterizing long COVID in an international cohort: 7 months of symptoms and their impact

Hannah E. Davis^{a,1}, Gina S. Assaf^{a,1}, Lisa McCorkell^{a,1}, Hannah Wei^{a,1}, Ryan J. Low^{a,b,1}, Yochai Re'em^{a,c,1}, Signe Redfield^a, Jared P. Austin^{a,d}, Athena Akrami^{a,b,1,*}

^a Patient-Led Research Collaborative

^b Sainsbury Wellcome Centre, University College London, London, United Kingdom

^c Department of Psychiatry, NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital / Weill

^d Oregon Health and Science University, Portland, OR, United State

nature reviews microbiology

Explore content ▾

About the journal ▾

Publish with us ▾

[nature](#) > [nature reviews microbiology](#) > [review articles](#) > [article](#)

Review Article | [Published: 13 January 2023](#)

Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and recommendations

[Hannah E. Davis](#), [Lisa McCorkell](#), [Julia Moore Vogel](#) & [Eric J. Topol](#) 

[Nature Reviews Microbiology](#) **21**, 133–146 (2023) | [Cite this article](#)

1.12m Accesses | 406 Citations | 15269 Altmetric | [Metrics](#)

ALL RESEARCH OUTPUTS

#70

of 24,671,780 outputs



PATIENT-LED
RESEARCH
COLLABORATIVE

Barriers to Accessing and Understanding Research Results

- Cost
- Time and energy intensive to search and read; cognitively taxing
- Understandability
 - Technical jargon
 - Often need a background in statistics/research
- Lacking context
- Implications of research not clearly stated
- Discussion about research not included
- Searchability
- Accessibility
 - Generally requires internet access
 - May not meet WCAG standards
 - Audio options
- Slow pace

Implications of Barriers

- The communities that research is about may not have access to research results about their own lives or even research they participated in.
 - Access decreases with lower socioeconomic status, education level, and internet access, exacerbating existing inequities
- Marginalized communities kept out of academia and doing their own research
- Leads to worse health outcomes
 - Patients and caregivers have less agency over health decision-making
 - Patients and caregivers not up-to-date on latest research
 - Patients and caregivers not as able to help inform healthcare providers on new research and what treatments to explore
 - Patients and caregivers are not as able to advocate for themselves
 - Patients and caregivers are not as able to contribute to/lead research

What does true access to research results mean?

To be able to:

- Read it
- Understand it
- Use it
- Share it
- Be part of it

All without causing harm

Patient-Led Research Scorecards

		-2	-1	0	1	2
		Non-collaboration	Minimal collaboration	Acceptable collaboration	Great collaboration	Ideal collaboration
Integration Into Research Process	Hypothesis Generation					
	Recognition of Biases					
	Accessible Engagement					
	Meaningful Decision-making between groups					
	Accountability between groups					
	Research Organization Readiness					
	Patient Burden					
	Patient/Partner Governance					
	Research Organization Readiness					
	Patient/Partner Governance					



Integration into the Research Process

-2 Non-collaboration	-1 Minimal collaboration	0 Acceptable collaboration	1 Great collaboration	2 Ideal collaboration
Publication				
<p>Study results are inaccessible to patients and/or behind an academic paywall. Findings are not communicated in lay terms.</p>	<p>Research organization summarizes findings in lay terms, but study results are inaccessible to patients and/or are behind an academic paywall.</p>	<p>Study results are freely accessible to patients and the public. Findings are summarized in lay terms in ways that are informative to the patient population.</p>	<p>Study results are freely accessible to patients and the public. Findings are summarized in lay terms and are actively disseminated to patient population. Patient-researchers co-write the interpretation and analysis.</p>	<p>Study results are freely accessible to patients and the public. Findings are summarized in lay terms and are actively disseminated to patient population. Patient organizations invite patients to co-write findings and reports. A channel of communication is available for patients to ask questions of the research organization.</p>

Recommendations to Ensure Equitable Access to Research Results

- **Free access to all**
- **Develop policies in partnership** with a) the communities the research is intending to serve/study, and b) people with disabilities to ensure the results are accessible
- Require **plain language summaries**, ideally written/reviewed by people in the communities the research is focused on (paid)
 - Question asked/answered, population the question/answer applies to, what the answer/result is
 - Links for further reading, discussion around research, context of research
 - Visuals/infographics
 - Address common questions people in that community will have
- Develop and disseminate guidance on **how to use/digest/search research**
 - For all research studies and content specific
- Require results to be written in a way that **represents the communities it is studying**
 - E.g. Require reporting of results by gender and race/ethnicity using best practices in language and how participants self-identify

Recommendations to Ensure Equitable Access to Research Results

- Proactively **disseminate research results to communities** through grant programs/community health workers
- **Aggregate findings** on a central site that is easily searchable (e.g. ME-pedia.org)
- Improve awareness that **libraries can help** with searching and accessing
- **Create UX/UI protocols** to easily highlight/navigate to most important parts of articles
 - Require glossaries of terms and abbreviations that are easy to access
- Ensure documents (PDFs, Word docs, webpages, etc.) are **accessible according to WCAG standards** and require audio versions
- Ensure articles that are **referenced can be accessed** for free, at least with a plain language summary
- Ensure **research participants have access to their own data**
- **Encourage preprints**, including by ensuring publication in journals for manuscripts that have been preprinted

Thank you!

lisa@patientledresearch.com

team@patientledresearch.com

