GOP Lawmakers Push FDA on Clinical Trial Diversity

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 15 July 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

> The efficacy and safety of new medicines hinge on robust clinical trials, but these studies have historically failed to reflect the demographic reality of the populations they aim to serve. This persistent lack of diversity in trial enrolment has led to significant gaps in understanding how treatments perform across different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups. Now, Republican lawmakers are pushing the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to take more assertive steps to ensure clinical trials better represent the patients who will ultimately use these therapies.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Congressional pressure is mounting on the FDA to enforce existing diversity mandates for clinical trials, moving beyond mere guidance.
- The Data: While no specific trial data is cited, the underlying issue is the historical underrepresentation of minority groups, often less than 5% of participants in many pivotal trials.
- The Action: Clinicians should remain aware that efficacy and safety data for many approved drugs may not fully reflect their diverse patient populations, necessitating careful individualised treatment decisions.

The persistent underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minority groups in clinical trials has long been a critical concern within medical research and public health. This issue is not merely one of equitable access or social justice; it carries direct implications for patient safety and treatment efficacy. Drugs often exhibit different pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic profiles across diverse populations due to genetic variations, environmental factors, and socioeconomic determinants of health. When trials fail to include a representative sample, clinicians are left with incomplete data, making it difficult to predict how a drug will perform in all patients, particularly those from underrepresented backgrounds.

For decades, the FDA has acknowledged this problem, issuing guidance documents and recommendations aimed at improving diversity. The agency's 2020 guidance, for example, urged sponsors to develop Race and Ethnicity Diversity Plans for late-phase trials, outlining strategies for recruitment and retention. But these have largely remained recommendations, lacking the force of regulation. This is the crux of the current congressional push: a demand for the FDA to move beyond encouragement and implement concrete, enforceable measures to ensure trial populations mirror the diversity of the US population. The argument from lawmakers is that without such enforcement, health disparities will only widen, and the promise of precision medicine will remain unfulfilled for many.

The push for enforceable diversity

The recent congressional inquiry, spearheaded by Republican members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, specifically targets the FDA's implementation of Section 3601 of the Food and Drug Omnibus Reform Act of 2022 (FDORA). This legislation, signed into law in December 2022, mandates that sponsors of Phase III and other pivotal clinical trials submit a diversity action plan to the FDA. The plan must include specific goals for enrolment of underrepresented populations, a rationale for those goals, and a strategy for achieving them. Crucially, FDORA also grants the FDA the authority to require amendments to these plans if they are deemed insufficient. This is a significant shift from previous guidance, providing the agency with a statutory lever to demand action.

Lawmakers are now pressing the FDA to articulate how it plans to use this new authority. They want to know what metrics the agency will employ to assess the adequacy of diversity plans, what constitutes an 'insufficient' plan, and what consequences sponsors will face if they fail to meet their diversity goals. The concern is that without clear enforcement mechanisms and transparent reporting, the new legislation could become another set of well-intentioned but ultimately ineffective guidelines. The letter from Congress highlights the need for the FDA to establish clear benchmarks for what constitutes 'adequate' representation, moving beyond vague aspirations to quantifiable targets for racial, ethnic, age, and sex diversity.

The historical data on trial diversity paints a stark picture. A review of pivotal trials supporting new drug approvals between 2007 and 2017 revealed that while Black or African American individuals constitute approximately 13% of the US population, they represented only 5% of trial participants. Hispanic or Latino individuals, comprising about 18% of the population, made up only 11% of trial participants. These disparities are even more pronounced in specific disease areas, such as oncology and cardiology, where certain minority groups bear a disproportionate disease burden. For example, Black patients experience higher rates of hypertension and heart failure, yet their representation in cardiovascular trials often lags. This means that when a new antihypertensive drug is approved, the data on its efficacy and safety in a significant portion of the patient population may be limited, forcing clinicians to extrapolate from less representative cohorts.

The challenges to achieving diversity are complex and multifaceted. They include historical mistrust of the medical establishment within certain communities, socioeconomic barriers such as lack of transportation or time off work, and systemic biases in recruitment practices. Clinical trial sites are often located in academic medical centres that may not be easily accessible to diverse populations. Furthermore, trial protocols can be overly restrictive, excluding patients with common comorbidities or those on multiple medications, which disproportionately affects older adults and minority groups. The congressional push implicitly acknowledges these systemic issues, demanding that the FDA not only review diversity plans but also actively work with sponsors to dismantle these barriers.

One proposed solution involves leveraging real-world data and decentralised trial designs. Real-world data, derived from electronic health records, insurance claims, and patient registries, can provide insights into drug performance in broader, more diverse populations post-approval. While not a substitute for prospective trial data, it can help identify disparities that were missed in the initial trials. Decentralised trials, which use remote monitoring, telemedicine, and local healthcare providers, can reduce the burden on participants, making it easier for individuals from underserved areas to enrol. The FDA has encouraged these approaches, but their widespread adoption and integration into diversity strategies remain inconsistent across the industry.

The FDA's response to the congressional inquiry will be critical. The agency must demonstrate a clear strategy for

operationalising FDORA's mandates, including how it will review diversity plans, what criteria it will use for requiring amendments, and how it will track progress. Transparency in reporting diversity metrics across approved drugs will also be essential. Without public accountability, the risk remains that diversity plans become a bureaucratic checkbox rather than a genuine commitment to equitable research. The agency has a delicate balance to strike: enforcing diversity without unduly delaying drug development, a concern often raised by pharmaceutical companies. But the argument from public health advocates and now, increasingly, from lawmakers, is that the cost of inadequate diversity in terms of patient outcomes and health equity is simply too high to ignore.

The implications extend beyond drug approvals. Medical devices, diagnostics, and even digital health tools also require diverse testing to ensure their safety and effectiveness across all users. A pulse oximeter, for instance, may perform differently on individuals with darker skin tones, a disparity that became particularly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic. If the FDA's enforcement of diversity plans for drug trials proves effective, it could set a precedent for other regulated medical products, pushing the entire healthcare innovation ecosystem towards greater inclusivity. This is not just about meeting a quota; it is about generating scientifically sound data that serves all patients, ensuring that medical progress benefits everyone, not just a select few. The onus is now on the FDA to translate legislative intent into tangible, measurable improvements in clinical trial diversity.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The congressional push for greater clinical trial diversity is long overdue and carries significant weight for prescribing clinicians. For too long, we have operated with an implicit understanding that efficacy and safety data, particularly for newer therapies, may not fully translate to all patient populations, especially those from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups. This legislative pressure on the FDA means that, in theory, future drug approvals should come with more robust data on how a therapy performs across a broader demographic spectrum.

But the immediate impact on clinical practice will be gradual. Clinicians must continue to exercise caution and individualised judgment, particularly when prescribing novel agents to patients whose demographic profile was underrepresented in pivotal trials. We still lack comprehensive, easily accessible data on how many currently marketed drugs perform across diverse populations, a gap that will take years of post-market surveillance and more inclusive future trials to fill. The FDA's challenge will be to ensure that diversity plans are not merely aspirational but are rigorously enforced, with clear consequences for sponsors who fail to meet their commitments.

The pharmaceutical industry, for its part, faces a mandate to fundamentally rethink its trial recruitment strategies. This means moving beyond traditional academic centres and engaging with community health organisations, leveraging decentralised trial models, and building trust within historically marginalised communities. The investment required is substantial, but the long-term benefit of generating more generalisable and equitable data is undeniable. Ultimately, this initiative aims to provide clinicians with a more complete picture of a drug's performance, reducing the guesswork and improving outcomes for all patients.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Kim J, et al. Clinical Trial Diversity in Oncology: FDA Takes Action with Post-Marketing Requirements or Commitments. Oncologist. 2022;27(12):993-997. doi:10.1093/oncolo/oyac228

2. 2. Collins G, et al. An Evaluation of Novel Oncology Approvals with a PMR/C for Assessing Data in Racial and Ethnic Populations Underrepresented in Premarket Clinical Trials. Clin Cancer Res. 2024;30(16):3388-3394. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-24-0852

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com