discrimination in healthcare settings compared to their straight counterparts. Our results underscore the urgent need to foster respectful, inclusive healthcare environments and ensure that healthcare providers are adequately trained to address the unique health needs and experiences of SMPs.

97

Neighborhood level stressors, resilience sources, and other characteristics among sexual minority groups

CHEN ZHANG, Wonkyung Chang, Yu Liu, Yu Yang and Cait Dreisbach
University of Rochester

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Sexual minority populations (SMPs), including lesbian, gay, and bisexual groups, disproportionately encounter discriminatory experiences due to bi/homonegativity and systemic inequities across various social domains. We aim to understand how the neighborhood-level stressors and resilience sources differed across specific groups in SMPs. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Utilizing the NIH All of Us' cloud-based platform, we selected cohorts self-identifying as gay (n = 9,454), bisexual (n = 15,284), lesbian (n = 5267), or straight (n = 349,748). We explored multiple key measures of neighborhood-level stressors (e.g., neighborhood disorder, neighborhood cohesion, and environment index) and resilience sources (e.g., neighbor cohesion, social support), and other factors (e.g., food insecurity, housing insecurity, and housing instability) by their sexual orientations using analysis of variance or Chi-square analyses. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Our sample comprised 60.8% females and 37.5% males identifying as non-binary or transgender, with an average age of 55.6 years (SD = 17.1). The racial composition was 56.0% White, 19.4% Black, 18.7% Hispanic, and 5.9% others (e.g., Asian, multiracial). Compared to straight individuals, SMPs reported high neighborhood stressors (e.g., disorder, worse environment) but lower neighborhood-level resilience sources (e.g., social support, cohesion). In addition, bisexual groups reported highest prevalence of housing insecurity (6.7% vs. 2.3%), housing instability (36.0% vs. 19.6%), and food insecurity (26.57% vs. 12.21%). DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: SMPs, particularly bisexual individuals, face greater neighborhood stressors and fewer resilience sources than their straight counterparts. These findings call for targeted interventions to address these disparities and promote health equity, using large-scale datasets to inform community-based solutions.

99

Investigating BMI-driven variations in cancer immunotherapy treatment effect: An individual patient data meta-analysis (2013–2023)

Pratik Reddy
Tufts University

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: This study looks to investigate the relationship between body mass index (BMI) and the treatment effect of cancer immunotherapies. Specifically, we will assess whether there is a significant difference in survival curves associated with varying BMI levels and track trends in BMI reporting over the last decade. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: An individual patient meta-analysis will be conducted by reanalyzing raw data of phase 3 cancer immunotherapy trials (2013–2023) accessed via the database Vivli. Prior to making a formal data request, an exploratory search will be first done through clinicaltrials.gov to assess viability. Studies that report baseline BMI and treatment efficacy will be included. BMI will be analyzed as a continuous variable, with survival curves compared across different BMI ranges using restricted mean survival time and log-rank tests. Trials will be stratified by drug class and adjusted for race, age, and gender to account for potential sources of confounding/bias. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Results are currently still a work in progress as I am in the process of getting the dataset from Vivli. I anticipate that treatment effects in cancer immunotherapies will vary significantly by BMI. Furthermore, I expect to see significant disparities in survival outcomes between patients assigned to a low and high BMI category. Lastly, trends in the reporting of BMI across immunotherapy trials are expected to be inconsistent which highlights the need for more standardization in clinical trial datasets. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: This study should address critical knowledge gaps in how BMI level is associated with immunotherapy outcomes. These findings could potentially guide personalized treatment strategies and highlight the importance of standardizing the variables clinical trials chose to report.

100

Prevalence of complete sample size justifications in recent publications in top clinical neurology journals

Sreeja Gadepalli and Olivia Hogue
Cleveland Clinic Foundation

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: This study examines prevalence of complete sample size justifications in publications in the top five clinical neurology journals. Secondary goals include comparing study designs and clinical populations to explore whether some may be more likely to include inadequate sample size considerations. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Recent studies (n = 125) in *Lancet Neurology*, *Alzheimer's and Dementia*, *JAMA Neurology*, *Acta Neuropathology*, and *Brain* will be evaluated. For each journal, the 25 most recent empirical articles between 2022 and 2023 will be examined for their inclusion of a justification and reproducible sample size calculation. Inclusion of components of an ideal sample size justification will be evaluated: effect size to be detected (standardized or unstandardized), alpha, power, and from where values were derived. Prevalence and completeness will be compared among study designs, clinical populations, and with regard to journal reporting requirements. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: At the pilot review stage, 17 of 25 included studies had any kind of sample size justification, and only 3 studies had enough information to reproduce their sample size calculations. Retrospective studies included a sample size justification more frequently (81.8% vs. 57.1%), but prospective studies had more complete sample size justifications, when present. We hypothesize that sample size calculations will be more complete in reports of clinical trials and prospective cohort studies, compared to retrospective and cross-sectional designs. Based on our previous research, we do not expect that journal reporting requirements will affect completeness of sample size justifications. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Translational decision-making is informed in part by the robustness of current

https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2024.770 Published online by Cambridge University Press