American Journal of Applied Science and Technology

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue 02 2026
PAGE NO. 93-96

Leveraging Artificial Intelligence and Decentralized Methodologies to Mitigate Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Clinical Research: A Comprehensive Framework for Health Equity

Dr. Elena Vance

Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Digital Health, University of Oslo

Received: 01 February 2026; **Accepted:** 16 February 2026; **Published:** 27 February 2026

Abstract: The persistent underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minority groups in clinical trials remains a critical barrier to achieving global health equity. While biomedical innovation progresses at an exponential rate, the benefits of these advancements are frequently distributed unevenly due to systemic biases in patient recruitment, trial design, and geographical accessibility. This research explores the convergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), and decentralized clinical trial (DCT) methodologies as transformative tools for enhancing equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). By synthesizing data from the Veterans Health Administration, cardiovascular outcome trials, and nephrology research, this study identifies specific demographic gaps, such as the disproportionate mortality rates and transplant waitlisting disparities affecting Black individuals. The paper evaluates how AI can optimize patient identification through Electronic Health Records (EHR) and how telemedicine can bridge the "place-based" disparities that hinder participation in low-resource settings. Furthermore, the research investigates the role of genetic ancestry, specifically West African lineage, in modulating therapeutic responses, arguing that diverse enrollment is a scientific necessity rather than a mere regulatory checkbox. The proposed framework advocates for a multi-layered approach-integrating AI-driven recruitment, decentralized infrastructure, and regulatory foresight-to ensure that the next decade of drug development is both technologically advanced and socially just.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Clinical Trials, Health Equity, Racial Disparities, Decentralized Research, Machine Learning.

INTRODUCTION

The moral and scientific imperative to achieve health equity has never been more pressing. As defined by the World Health Organization, health equity is the absence of unfair, avoidable, or remediable differences in health among groups of people (World Health Organization, 2022). In the realm of clinical research, this equity is frequently compromised. Historically, clinical trials have relied on a homogenous participant base, often excluding the very populations most burdened by the diseases under study. This systemic exclusion leads to a lack of generalizability in clinical data, potentially resulting in suboptimal treatment outcomes for minority populations. The literature indicates a profound literature gap: while we understand that disparities exist, the integration of cutting-edge computational tools to solve these disparities is still in its nascent stages.

The problem is multifaceted. Mortality disparities are well-documented; for instance, evidence from the Veterans Health Administration reveals significant gaps in health outcomes for racial and ethnic minority groups compared to their white counterparts (Peterson et al., 2018). These gaps are not merely biological but are rooted in socioeconomic factors, geographical limitations, and the historical lack of trust in medical institutions. In specialized fields like nephrology, the situation is even more dire. Data from the United States Renal Data System (2021) suggests that Black Americans face higher rates of End-Stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) yet experience significant racial disparities in preemptive waitlisting and deceased donor kidney transplantation (Reese et al., 2021). These disparities are often exacerbated by "place-based" factors, where the specific location of a patient dictates their access to high-quality care and trial participation (Golestaneh et al., 2021).

The emergence of AI and ML offers a potential paradigm shift. As Topol (2023) notes, the convergence of AI and medicine represents the future of clinical trials, providing tools to parse through massive datasets to identify potential participants who might otherwise be overlooked. However, technology alone is not a panacea. The implementation of AI must be paired with structural changes, such as the adoption of decentralized clinical trials (DCTs). DCTs, supported by telemedicine, allow research to move from the ivory towers of academic medical centers into the communities where patients live (Dorsey & Topol, 2020). This is particularly vital in low-resource settings where the traditional infrastructure for clinical research is absent (Makanga et al., 2023).

The integration of AI/ML-based strategies for enhancing EDI in randomized clinical trials (RCTs) is not just a trend but a necessity for regulatory compliance and scientific integrity (Abbidi & Sinha, 2026). The European Medicines Agency (2021) has already begun reflecting on how regulatory science must evolve by 2025 to incorporate these digital shifts. This article seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of these intersecting domains, examining how technology can be harnessed to dismantle the barriers to inclusion and ensure that the future of medicine is equitable for all.

METHODOLOGY

This research utilizes a multidisciplinary evidence-synthesis approach, combining bibliometric reviews, evidence maps, and theoretical analysis of computational frameworks. The primary methodology involves a systematic evaluation of existing literature across three core domains: clinical trial diversity, AI/ML applications in drug development, and decentralized health infrastructure.

To assess the current state of representation, the study examines bibliometric data from heart failure clinical trials spanning 2000 to 2020. This longitudinal analysis provides a baseline for understanding the global representation of trial leaders and participants (Zhu et al., 2022). Furthermore, the methodology incorporates an evidence review of the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) to map mortality disparities. This map serves as a critical dataset for identifying specific disease states where minority groups are at higher risk but under-represented in interventional research (Peterson et al., 2018).

The evaluation of AI/ML strategies is conducted through a landscape mapping of AI in clinical trials. This involves analyzing the technical capabilities of AI in patient recruitment, such as natural language processing (NLP) for EHR screening and predictive modeling for participant retention (Walraven & Demeulemeester, 2021; Brennen et al., 2022). The methodology also scrutinizes the drug development lifecycle, identifying where AI can intervene to reduce bias, from molecule discovery to post-market surveillance (Makady et al., 2022).

Special attention is given to the genomic and physiological factors that necessitate diverse trials. The study reviews the SPRINT trial data, specifically looking at the association of genetic West African ancestry with blood pressure response and cardiovascular risk (Rao et al., 2021). By correlating genetic markers with clinical outcomes, the methodology demonstrates the scientific risk of homogenous sampling (Umeukeje & Young, 2019). Finally, the methodology examines the logistical frameworks of telemedicine and DCTs, evaluating their feasibility in low-resource settings and their impact on patient-centricity (Dorsey & Topol, 2020; Makanga et al., 2023).

RESULTS

The findings of this research illustrate a stark contrast between the potential of modern medicine and the reality of its delivery. A descriptive analysis of mortality data shows that despite the universal access model of the VHA, racial and ethnic minorities still face higher mortality rates in several key categories (Peterson et al., 2018). In the context of kidney health, the disparities are quantifiable and systemic. Black patients are significantly less likely to be preemptively waitlisted for a kidney transplant, a delay that often results in worse long-term outcomes and increased reliance on hemodialysis (Reese et al., 2021). The USRDS (2021) data confirms that ESKD disproportionately affects Black Americans, yet the pathways to the gold-standard treatment-transplantation-are hindered by both clinical and structural biases.

Furthermore, the bibliometric review of heart failure trials indicates that leadership and participation remain heavily skewed toward high-income, Western nations. Between 2000 and 2020, while global health burdens shifted, the "center of gravity" for clinical trial leadership did not sufficiently expand to include diverse global collaborators (Zhu et al., 2022). This lack of diversity at the leadership level often correlates with a lack of diversity in the participant pool, creating a self-perpetuating cycle of exclusion.

In terms of physiological results, the analysis of the SPRINT trial provides compelling evidence that genetic ancestry matters. Individuals with higher proportions of West African ancestry exhibited different blood pressure responses to intensive therapy compared to those with lower proportions (Rao et al., 2021). If these individuals are not adequately represented in trials, the resulting clinical guidelines may be inaccurate or even harmful. This is reinforced by the study of APOL1 genetic variants, which are more common in African Americans and are strongly linked to increased ESKD risk (Umeukeje & Young, 2019).

The application of AI in recruitment shows promising, albeit preliminary, results. AI-driven platforms have demonstrated an ability to increase the speed of patient identification by scanning thousands of patient records in seconds, identifying eligible minority participants who might have been missed by traditional "physician-referral" models (Walraven & Demeulemeester, 2021). Additionally, decentralized models using telemedicine have proven effective in maintaining trial continuity and reaching patients in remote or underserved areas, thereby mitigating the "place-based" disparities identified by Golestaneh et al. (2021).

DISCUSSION

The deep interpretation of these results suggests that health disparities are not an inevitable feature of medicine but a design flaw in the research ecosystem. The "convergence of AI and medicine" (Topol, 2023) offers a unique opportunity to redesign this ecosystem. However, we must discuss the nuances of AI implementation. While AI can reduce human bias in recruitment, it can also codify and scale existing biases if the underlying data-historical EHRs or insurance claims-is flawed. Therefore, AI/ML-based strategies must include rigorous "de-biasing" protocols (Abbidi & Sinha, 2026).

A significant point of discussion is the "place-based" nature of disparity. Golestaneh et al. (2021) highlight that for Black men on hemodialysis, the neighborhood and facility location are stronger predictors of outcome than individual biology. This suggests that "decentralization" is not just about convenience; it is a tool for social justice. By leveraging telemedicine (Dorsey & Topol, 2020), researchers can bypass the physical barriers of segregated urban planning and rural isolation. However, the challenge of the "digital divide" remains. If DCTs require high-speed internet and high-tech devices, we risk replacing a geographical barrier with a technological one. Makanga et al. (2023) emphasize that in low-resource settings, DCTs must be adapted to local realities, perhaps using mobile health vans or community hubs rather than pure at-home digital solutions.

The ethical implications of genetic research also require careful scope. The link between West African ancestry and ESKD or hypertension (Rao et al., 2021; Umeukeje & Young, 2019) must be handled with sensitivity to avoid the "racialization" of medicine. The goal is "precision medicine," where treatment is tailored to individual biology, rather than "racial medicine," which uses skin color as a crude proxy for complex genetics. AI is uniquely positioned to handle this complexity, as it can integrate genetic, environmental, and social determinants of health into a single predictive model (Brennen et al., 2022).

Regulatory bodies are becoming increasingly aware of these needs. The European Medicines Agency's (2021) strategic reflection highlights that the future of regulatory science depends on its ability to embrace digital transformation while ensuring patient safety and data integrity. This involves a move toward "real-world evidence" (RWE), where AI analyzes data from the general population post-approval. This can act as a safety net for groups who were under-represented in the pre-approval phase.

Future scope should focus on the "democratization" of trial leadership. As Zhu et al. (2022) suggested, global representation among trial investigators is crucial. When trial leaders come from diverse backgrounds, they are more likely to build the community trust necessary for successful minority recruitment. Moreover, the integration of AI should move beyond recruitment into the actual monitoring of participants, using wearable sensors to detect early signs of drug toxicity or efficacy in real-time across diverse phenotypes.

CONCLUSION

The path forward for clinical research is one of integration: the integration of advanced technology with a renewed commitment to social equity. This research has demonstrated that systemic disparities in mortality, transplantation, and trial participation are deeply entrenched but not insurmountable. The evidence from the VHA and specialized nephrology studies underscores the urgent need for intervention, while genomic research proves that diversity is essential for scientific accuracy.

Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning serve as the engines for this transformation, offering unprecedented efficiency in identifying and enrolling diverse populations. Coupled with decentralized methodologies and telemedicine, these tools can dismantle the geographical and logistical barriers that have historically excluded minority groups. However, the success of these strategies depends on a vigilant approach to data ethics and a concerted effort to bridge the digital divide.

Ultimately, achieving health equity in clinical trials requires a shift in perspective. Diversity must be viewed not as a burden or a regulatory hurdle, but as a primary driver of medical innovation. By ensuring that clinical trials reflect the true diversity of the human population, we ensure that the therapies of tomorrow are safe, effective, and accessible for everyone, regardless of their race, ancestry, or location. The convergence of digital tools and inclusive policy represents the most viable roadmap toward a truly equitable global healthcare system.

REFERENCES

1. Abbidi, S.R., Sinha, D. AI/ML-based strategies for enhancing equity, diversity, and inclusion in randomized clinical trials. Trials (2026). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-026-09537-2

2. Brennen, A., Tidor, B., Choudhury, A. Mapping the landscape of AI in clinical trials: challenges and future directions. J Clin Res Bioeth., 13 (3) (2022), Article 100030, 10.1016/j.jcrbe.2022.100030

3. Dorsey, E.R., Topol, E.J. Telemedicine 2020 and the next decade. Lancet, 395 (10227) (2020), p. 859, 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30424-4

4. European Medicines Agency. Regulatory science to 2025: Strategic reflection. 2021. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/regulatory-procedural-guideline/regulatory-science-2025-strategic-reflection_en.pdf.

5. Golestaneh, L. et al. The role of place in disparities affecting black men receiving hemodialysis. Kidney Int. Rep. 6, 357–365 (2021).

6. Makady, A., van Veelen, A., Jonker, C.M., Goettsch, W.G. Applications of AI across the drug development lifecycle: current trends and future directions. Front. Pharmacol., 13 (2022), Article 842791, 10.3389/fphar.2022.842791

7. Makanga, M., Kumar, V., Janssens, Y. Decentralized clinical trials in low-resource settings: Opportunities and challenges. Contemp. Clin. Trials Commun., 31 (2023), Article 101079, 10.1016/j.conctc.2023.101079

8. Peterson, K., Anderson, J., Boundy, E., Ferguson, L., McCleery, E. & Waldrip, K. Mortality disparities in racial/ethnic minority groups in the Veterans Health Administration: an evidence review and map. Am. J. Public Health 108, e1–e11 (2018).

9. Rao, S. et al. Association of genetic west African ancestry, blood pressure response to therapy, and cardiovascular risk among self-reported black individuals in the systolic blood pressure reduction intervention trial (SPRINT). JAMA Cardiol. 6, 388–398 (2021).

10. Reese, P.P. et al. Racial disparities in preemptive waitlisting and deceased donor kidney transplantation: ethics and solutions. Am. J. Transplant. 21, 958–967 (2021).

11. Topol, E. The convergence of AI and medicine: the future of clinical trials. Nat Digit Med., 6 (2023), p. 45, 10.1038/s41746-023-00800-w

12. United States Renal Data System (USRDS). 2021 USRDS Annual Data Report. 2021.

13. Umeukeje, E.M. & Young, B.A. Genetics and ESKD disparities in African Americans. Am. J. Kidney Dis. 74, 811–821 (2019).

14. Walraven, C., Demeulemeester, J. Leveraging AI to improve patient recruitment in clinical trials. Trials, 22 (2021), p. 672, 10.1186/s13063-021-05693-9

15. World Health Organization (WHO). Health Topics. Health Equity. 2022.

16. Zhu, J.W. et al. Global representation of heart failure clinical trial leaders, collaborators, and enrolled participants: a bibliometric review 2000-2020. Eur. Heart J. Qual. Care Clin. Outcomes. 8, 659–669 (2022).