

Protocol

# Role of Shame and Concealment in Patient-Provider Communication Among Individuals With Low Health Literacy: Protocol for a Scoping Review

Tsuyoshi Okuhara<sup>1</sup>, MPH, PhD; Hiroko Okada<sup>1</sup>, MPH, PhD; Rie Yokota<sup>2</sup>, MPH, PhD

<sup>1</sup>Department of Health Communication, School of Public Health, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Department of Medical Communication, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Hoshi University, Tokyo, Japan

## Corresponding Author:

Tsuyoshi Okuhara, MPH, PhD  
Department of Health Communication  
School of Public Health, The University of Tokyo  
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku  
Tokyo  
Japan  
Phone: 81 1-3-5800-6549  
Email: [okuhara-ctr@umin.ac.jp](mailto:okuhara-ctr@umin.ac.jp)

## Abstract

**Background:** Health literacy, defined as the ability to obtain, understand, evaluate, and use health information, influences health behaviors and outcomes. Low health literacy (LHL) is associated with misunderstandings of treatment instructions, poor adherence, and inadequate preventive behaviors, all of which contribute to health disparities. Although universal precautions such as plain language and the teach-back method are recommended, recent studies indicate that these measures alone cannot fully address the challenges faced by patients with LHL. Previous qualitative studies have examined psychosocial processes through which shame and concealment shape patient-provider communication; however, these findings remain fragmented across settings and disciplines, and no scoping or systematic review has yet synthesized this evidence.

**Objective:** This review aims to map how patients with LHL experience shame and concealment, how health care providers' behaviors and communication influence these experiences, and how these processes affect patient-provider communication and care. It also seeks to identify strategies to reduce the impact of shame and concealment in clinical practice.

**Methods:** This review will be conducted and reported in accordance with the PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews) guidelines. PubMed, MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycInfo, Web of Science, and Academic Search Complete will be searched using terms related to health literacy, patient-provider communication, and qualitative research. Qualitative and mixed methods studies with qualitative findings will be included, and quantitative-only studies will be excluded. The participants may include patients, health care providers, or both. Data extraction will include specific manifestations of shame (eg, embarrassment, fear of judgment, and self-blame), concealment behaviors (eg, silence, avoidance, and impression management), provider communication behaviors (eg, time pressure, use of jargon, dismissiveness, and validation), and key findings. The accuracy of the data will be verified by multiple reviewers. Data will be synthesized using thematic synthesis, with the findings presented in tables; narrative synthesis; and a conceptual model depicting the interactions among shame, concealment, and provider communication. The findings will describe how shame and concealment are conceptualized, how they shape communication and care, and strategies suggested to reduce their effects. A conceptual diagram will illustrate these dynamics.

**Results:** This study was funded in April 2025. Database searching is scheduled for October 2025, with study selection and data extraction planned for November 2025. As of September 2025, no data extraction has been completed. Data synthesis is expected to be finalized by December 2025, and results are planned for publication between June and August 2026.

**Conclusions:** This will be the first scoping review to systematically map the roles of shame and concealment in health care communication among patients with LHL. Synthesizing qualitative evidence will provide insights into relational dynamics, inform professional education and training, and guide organizational- and policy-level strategies to promote equitable and patient-centered health care communication.

**International Registered Report Identifier (IRRID):** PRR1-10.2196/83451

*JMIR Res Protoc* 2026;15:e83451; doi: [10.2196/83451](https://doi.org/10.2196/83451)

**Keywords:** health literacy; low health literacy; communication; professional-patient relations; shame; concealment; qualitative research; scoping review

## Introduction

Health literacy is defined as the ability to obtain, understand, evaluate, and use health information and has been recognized as a crucial factor influencing health behaviors and outcomes [1-3]. Low health literacy (LHL) has been associated with problems such as misunderstanding medication instructions, poor treatment adherence, and inadequate engagement in preventive behaviors [4-6] and has been identified as a risk factor contributing to health disparities and failures in chronic disease management [7-9]. Recent systematic and scoping reviews continue to demonstrate that health literacy is strongly associated with self-management, medication adherence, quality of life, and clinical outcomes across a wide range of chronic conditions [4-6,10]. To address these challenges, “universal precautions” in health literacy have been recommended, including the use of plain language and the teach-back method, to ensure understanding regardless of patients’ literacy levels [11].

However, studies have highlighted the limitations of explaining the difficulties of patients with LHL solely in terms of “deficits in information-processing skills.” Particular attention has been paid to the psychosocial mechanisms underlying shame and concealment. Parikh et al [12] reported in their seminal study that 42.6% of patients had inadequate or marginal health literacy, nearly 40% of those acknowledging reading difficulties felt ashamed, 19% never disclosed their difficulties to anyone, and over 60% avoided seeking help. In their subsequent study, 47.8% of patients with the lowest literacy level reported shame compared to only 6.5% at higher levels. Although most patients (83.7%) agreed that documenting literacy difficulties in medical records was useful, those with lower literacy levels were significantly more likely to experience embarrassment, which hindered open communication with providers [13]. These findings have since been interpreted through broader stigma frameworks, which conceptualize shame not merely as an individual emotion but as a socially produced response to anticipated devaluation and power asymmetries in health care interactions [14-16].

Qualitative studies have confirmed that shame and concealment profoundly affect health care communication. Easton et al [17] described how patients with low literacy and fear might be perceived as ignorant, avoid asking questions, and leave consultations without sufficient understanding. Other qualitative studies have also revealed that several patients feel inferior when interacting with those who possess medical expertise, leading them to hesitate to ask questions or express disagreement [18,19]. Recent studies have highlighted the broader social and systemic contexts in which these experiences occur. For example, Stormacq

et al [20] observed that socioeconomically disadvantaged adults experience health literacy as an “obstacle course,” where financial insecurity heightens their need for information but simultaneously restricts access to physicians, leading many to depend on less reliable sources such as the internet or relatives. In this context, difficulties in understanding or evaluating health information are often accompanied by feelings of shame and a tendency toward concealment, which discourage patients from asking questions or disclosing their struggles [20].

In parallel, a growing body of qualitative literature has examined how health care providers’ behaviors and communication styles may unintentionally reinforce these psychosocial dynamics. For example, Shaw et al [21] reported that patients with LHL often felt reluctant to ask questions due to physicians’ short consultation times, insufficient information provided, and complex terminology used, which ultimately resulted in patient silence or concealment. Similarly, Jensen et al [22] showed that patients with lower literacy were more likely to feel that their voices were not respected by health care providers and that health care providers did not listen adequately, which contributed to lower satisfaction and inhibited patients’ willingness to speak up. Recent studies in primary care, physiotherapy, cardiovascular prevention, and palliative care have further demonstrated that providers often struggle to accurately identify LHL and consistently apply communication strategies tailored to patients’ needs despite strong normative support for health literacy-friendly practices [23-26].

Taken together, these findings indicate that shame and concealment are not isolated individual reactions but relational processes shaped by social context, stigma, and the communicative practices of health care professionals. If left unaddressed, these processes reinforce silence, misunderstanding, and inequities in care. Nevertheless, despite a growing body of qualitative literature, existing research remains highly fragmented across clinical domains (eg, primary care, chronic disease management, rehabilitation, and palliative care), populations (eg, older adults, socioeconomically disadvantaged groups, and culturally diverse communities), and conceptual frameworks. Some studies foreground shame without explicitly examining concealment behaviors [17,18], others focus on provider communication without directly theorizing emotional processes [23,26], and still others examine stigma at a general level without anchoring it to health literacy-specific interactions [16].

To date, no scoping or systematic review has synthesized this heterogeneous qualitative evidence to clarify how shame and concealment operate as dynamic psychosocial mechanisms within health care communication for patients with LHL. As a result, it remains unclear how these

processes unfold across settings, how they are shaped by provider communication styles, and which strategies are most promising for reducing their harmful effects.

This scoping review will focus exclusively on the findings of qualitative and mixed methods studies. This is because phenomena such as shame and concealment are deeply rooted in patients' subjective experiences and emotions and cannot be adequately captured through quantitative measures alone. Importantly, the rationale for excluding quantitative-only studies is not based on a denial of the value of quantitative emotion research. Rather, this review specifically aims to elucidate how shame and concealment are experienced, negotiated, and managed within patient-provider interactions as social and relational processes. These dynamic meaning-making processes are best accessed through qualitative data such as narratives, interviews, and observational accounts. Recent conceptual work on epistemic humility and epistemic justice further underscores the importance of examining how patients' voices are validated or silenced in clinical interactions, particularly in contexts marked by informational and power asymmetries [27,28]. By synthesizing qualitative research, this review seeks to comprehensively illustrate how patients experience shame, how concealment behaviors arise, and how these behaviors are shaped by social and cultural factors as well as interactions with health care providers.

Existing studies on this topic remain heterogeneous and fragmented, encompassing diverse populations, including adults, older people, low-income groups, and those from various cultural backgrounds. Therefore, this study aims to map the range of relevant research and organize the conceptual and theoretical frameworks. Therefore, a scoping review approach is more appropriate than a systematic review approach.

The following research questions will guide this review:

- How do patients with LHL experience shame and concealment?
- How do health care providers' behaviors (eg, impression-based judgments and labeling) influence patients' experiences of shame and concealment?

- How do the processes of shame and concealment affect patient-provider communication and quality of care?
- What strategies have been proposed to mitigate the effects of shame and concealment in clinical practice?

## Methods

### Overview

This scoping review will be conducted following the PRISMA-ScR (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews) guidelines [29]. A completed PRISMA-ScR checklist will be provided as a supplementary file upon manuscript submission. The methodological framework is guided by the seminal work by Arksey and O'Malley [30] on scoping studies, further refined by the work by Levac et al [31] and updated with methodological guidance for conducting scoping reviews [32]. We plan to initiate the database search in October 2025, complete study selection and data extraction by November 2025, and finalize data synthesis by December 2025. In accordance with the primary objective of this scoping review—to map the range, nature, and conceptualization of qualitative evidence rather than evaluate intervention effectiveness or methodological rigor—we will not conduct a formal critical appraisal of individual studies. This approach is consistent with established scoping review methodology and PRISMA-ScR recommendations [29].

### Literature Search

We will search the following databases: PubMed, MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycInfo, Web of Science, and Academic Search Complete. The search strategy will combine MeSH (Medical Subject Headings) and free-text terms related to health literacy and patient-provider communication. [Textbox 1](#) shows the combination of keywords that will be used in our search. We will not filter our searches based on the year of publication. The reference lists of eligible articles and relevant reviews will also be screened for additional information.

#### Textbox 1. Search terms.

##### PubMed

- (doctor\*[Title/Abstract] OR physician\*[Title/Abstract] OR nurs\*[Title/Abstract] OR clinician\*[Title/Abstract] OR professional\*[Title/Abstract] OR provider\*[Title/Abstract] OR expert\*[Title/Abstract] OR patient\*[Title/Abstract] OR adult\*[Title/Abstract] OR "lay person"[Title/Abstract] OR laypeople[Title/Abstract] OR Physicians[MeSH Terms] OR Patients[MeSH Terms] OR Adult[MeSH Terms] OR "Health Personnel"[MeSH Terms]) AND ("health literacy"[Title/Abstract] OR literacy[Title/Abstract] OR "Health Literacy"[MeSH Terms]) AND (qualitative[Title/Abstract] OR interview\*[Title/Abstract] OR "focus group"[Title/Abstract] OR "Qualitative Research"[MeSH Terms])

##### MEDLINE

- XB("doctor\*" OR "physician\*" OR nurs\*[Title/Abstract] OR "clinician\*" OR "professional\*" OR "provider\*" OR "expert\*" OR "patient\*" OR "adult\*" OR "lay person" OR "laypeople") AND
- XB("health literacy" OR literacy) AND XB("qualitative" OR "interview\*" OR "focus group")

##### CINAHL

- XB(“doctor\*” OR “physician\*” OR nurs\*[Title/Abstract] OR “clinician\*” OR “professional\*” OR “provider\*” OR “expert\*” OR “patient\*” OR “adult\*” OR “lay person” OR “laypeople”) AND XB(“health literacy” OR literacy) AND XB(“qualitative” OR “interview\*” OR “focus group”)

#### PsycInfo

- XB(“doctor\*” OR “physician\*” OR nurs\*[Title/Abstract] OR “clinician\*” OR “professional\*” OR “provider\*” OR “expert\*” OR “patient\*” OR “adult\*” OR “lay person” OR “laypeople”) AND XB(“health literacy” OR literacy) AND XB(“qualitative” OR “interview\*” OR “focus group”)

#### Academic Search Complete

- XB(“doctor\*” OR “physician\*” OR nurs\*[Title/Abstract] OR “clinician\*” OR “professional\*” OR “provider\*” OR “expert\*” OR “patient\*” OR “adult\*” OR “lay person” OR “laypeople”) AND XB(“health literacy” OR literacy) AND XB(“qualitative” OR “interview\*” OR “focus group”)

#### Web of Science

- TS=(“doctor\*” OR “physician\*” OR nurs\*[Title/Abstract] OR “clinician\*” OR “professional\*” OR “provider\*” OR “expert\*” OR “patient\*” OR “adult\*” OR “lay person” OR “laypeople”) AND TS=(“health literacy” OR literacy) AND TS=(“qualitative” OR “interview\*” OR “focus group”)

## Eligibility Criteria

Textbox 2 shows the inclusion and exclusion criteria for this study.

### Textbox 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria.

#### Inclusion criteria

- Studies involving health care providers, patients, or both
- Studies focusing on patients with low health literacy and their experiences of shame, concealment, or related psychosocial processes in health care contexts
- Studies examining the role of health care providers' communication or behavior in relation to patient shame and concealment
- Qualitative or mixed methods studies including qualitative findings relevant to shame or concealment
- Studies involving participants of any age, sex, ethnicity, or country
- Peer-reviewed articles and gray literature (eg, theses and conference proceedings) providing sufficient methodological details
- Papers written in English
- Studies published in any year

#### Exclusion criteria

- Quantitative studies that only measure health literacy levels
- Quantitative-only studies that do not include qualitative data capable of supporting thematic synthesis of shame, concealment, or interactional processes
- Studies exclusively focusing on general stigma unrelated to health literacy
- Unavailable full texts or articles not written in English

## Study Selection

We will use the Rayyan software (Qatar Computing Research Institute) [33] to manage and screen the citations. Duplicates will be removed automatically. Two reviewers (TO and HO) will independently screen the titles and abstracts against the inclusion criteria. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion, and if a consensus cannot be reached, a third reviewer (RY) will be consulted. The same process will be applied to the full-text screening. The selection process will be documented using a PRISMA-ScR flow diagram.

## Data Extraction

One reviewer (TO) will extract the data using a standardized form developed in Microsoft Excel. The following data will be extracted:

- Bibliographic details (author, year, country, and journal)
- Study design and methodology
- Participant characteristics (sample size, demographics, and clinical setting)
- Specific emotional expressions of shame (eg, embarrassment, humiliation, and fear of negative evaluation), concealment behaviors (eg, silence, pretending to understand, avoidance of questions, and impression management)
- Specific provider communication and behavioral features (eg, consultation time constraints, use of medical jargon, dismissive responses, validation, and teach-back method use)
- Key findings (themes, categories, and representative quotations)
- Implications for clinical practice, education, and policy



To ensure accuracy, the second (HO) and third (RY) reviewers will verify the extracted data for omissions or errors.

## Data Synthesis

The initial data synthesis will be conducted by the first reviewer (TO) using thematic synthesis [34]. This approach, endorsed by The Cochrane Collaboration as a rigorous strategy for integrating qualitative evidence [35], involves several stages. In the first stage, TO, who has a background in qualitative methodology and extensive experience in conducting qualitative research, will perform open, line-by-line coding of the findings and quotations presented in the results sections of the included articles. In the second stage, both the first (TO) and second (HO) reviewers will independently cluster the codes that emerged from the initial coding into descriptive themes that will be data driven. Any discrepancies will be resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (RY). In the third stage, TO will generate analytical themes by interpreting and extending the descriptive themes from the previous step. These analytical themes will aim to provide insights beyond the findings of individual studies. The development of these themes will be discussed collaboratively among TO, HO, and RY, and all codes and themes will be created inductively through this iterative synthesis process. In addition, study characteristics (eg, setting, population, country, and clinical context) and intervention-related information will be summarized using descriptive numerical analysis and structured tables. These multiple layers of synthesis will be integrated to construct a conceptual model that visually represents the relational pathways linking health literacy, shame, concealment, provider behaviors, and communication outcomes.

## Dissemination

We will present the findings in both a summary table and conceptual diagram and elaborate on them through descriptive and narrative synthesis. A conceptual model will be constructed to depict the interplay between patients' experiences of shame and concealment and the behaviors and communication of health care providers. Following completion of data synthesis, the findings will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal and disseminated at international conferences.

## Results

This study was funded in April 2025. Database searching is scheduled for October 2025, with study selection and data extraction planned for November 2025. As of September 3, 2025, no data extraction has been completed. Data synthesis is expected to be finalized by December 2025, and results are planned for publication between June and August 2026.

## Discussion

### Anticipated Findings

This scoping review will be the first to systematically map how shame and concealment are experienced by patients with LHL and how health care providers' behaviors may exacerbate or mitigate these experiences. By synthesizing evidence from qualitative and mixed methods studies with qualitative findings, our review will provide a more comprehensive understanding of this psychosocial phenomenon.

Shame and concealment are not isolated experiences but relational processes shaped by clinical encounters and broader social contexts. Previous studies have shown that patients with LHL often hide their reading or comprehension difficulties out of fear of being judged, which prevents them from accessing the necessary support [18,19]. Such concealment can act as a coping mechanism, protecting patients from embarrassment while simultaneously restricting their ability to obtain information and engage fully in care [13]. Our review will highlight how these dynamics contribute to health inequities, particularly among populations already disadvantaged by socioeconomic or cultural factors.

These findings will have implications for both clinical practice and professional training. Health care providers may unintentionally reinforce shame through hurried communication, the use of jargon, or assumptions about patients' abilities [21]. For example, patients often report that rush consultations and lack of plain language increase their reluctance to ask questions [22]. By mapping the available evidence, this review will identify strategies that can reduce these risks, such as adopting plain language, using the teach-back method, and creating safe spaces for patient questions.

### Limitations

This study may have some limitations. First, because we will restrict our inclusion to studies published in English, relevant evidence reported in other languages may be overlooked. This limitation is particularly important given that health literacy and the associated experiences of shame and concealment are strongly influenced by cultural and linguistic contexts. Second, although we will attempt to identify gray literature, some relevant reports, theses, or conference proceedings may not be retrieved because of limited indexing. Third, in accordance with the objectives of this scoping review, we will not quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions. Consequently, our findings will not provide pooled estimates or definitive conclusions regarding intervention outcomes. Despite these limitations, the scoping review approach is well suited to our aims as it enables us to capture a broad and heterogeneous body of evidence, clarify conceptual boundaries, and identify important gaps in future research.

## Conclusions

To the best of our knowledge, this will be the first scoping review to systematically map how shame and concealment are experienced by patients with LHL in the context

of health care communication. By synthesizing evidence from qualitative and mixed methods studies with qualitative findings, this review will provide a comprehensive overview of how these psychosocial processes influence patient-provider interactions.

The insights generated will contribute to a deeper understanding of the relational dynamics that shape health communication and highlight how shame and concealment may reinforce existing inequities in care. These findings can

inform the design of targeted interventions, guide professional education and training for health care providers, and support the development of organizational- and policy-level strategies to foster more equitable communication practices.

Ultimately, this review aims to provide a foundation for future empirical research and practical initiatives that seek to reduce the hidden barriers posed by shame and concealment, thereby promoting more inclusive, patient-centered, and effective health care communication.

## Funding

This work was supported by a Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (25K13483).

## Data Availability

Data sharing is not applicable to this paper as no datasets were generated or analyzed during this study.

## Authors' Contributions

Conceptualization: TO

Funding acquisition: TO

Methodology: TO

Writing—original draft: TO

Writing—review and editing: TO, HO, and RY

## Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

## References

1. Nutbeam D, Lloyd JE. Understanding and responding to health literacy as a social determinant of health. *Annu Rev Public Health*. Apr 1, 2021;42:159-173. [doi: [10.1146/annurev-publhealth-090419-102529](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-090419-102529)] [Medline: [33035427](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33035427/)]
2. Nutbeam D. Health literacy as a public health goal: a challenge for contemporary health education and communication strategies into the 21st century. *Health Promot Int*. Sep 2000;15(3):259-267. [doi: [10.1093/heapro/15.3.259](https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/15.3.259)]
3. Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, et al. Health literacy and public health: a systematic review and integration of definitions and models. *BMC Public Health*. Jan 25, 2012;12:80. [doi: [10.1186/1471-2458-12-80](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-12-80)] [Medline: [22276600](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22276600/)]
4. Hyvert S, Yailian AL, Haesebaert J, et al. Association between health literacy and medication adherence in chronic diseases: a recent systematic review. *Int J Clin Pharm*. Feb 2023;45(1):38-51. [doi: [10.1007/s11096-022-01470-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-022-01470-z)] [Medline: [36369411](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36369411/)]
5. van der Gaag M, Heijmans M, Spoiala C, Rademakers J. The importance of health literacy for self-management: a scoping review of reviews. *Chronic Illn*. Jun 2022;18(2):234-254. [doi: [10.1177/17423953211035472](https://doi.org/10.1177/17423953211035472)] [Medline: [34402309](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34402309/)]
6. Lee H, La IS. Association between health literacy and self-management among middle-aged women: a systematic review. *Patient Educ Couns*. Jun 2024;123:108188. [doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2024.108188](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2024.108188)] [Medline: [38354431](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38354431/)]
7. Paasche-Orlow MK, Wolf MS. The causal pathways linking health literacy to health outcomes. *Am J Health Behav*. 2007;31 Suppl 1:S19-S26. [doi: [10.5555/ajhb.2007.31.supp.S19](https://doi.org/10.5555/ajhb.2007.31.supp.S19)] [Medline: [17931132](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17931132/)]
8. Svendsen MT, Bak CK, Sørensen K, et al. Associations of health literacy with socioeconomic position, health risk behavior, and health status: a large national population-based survey among Danish adults. *BMC Public Health*. Apr 28, 2020;20(1):565. [doi: [10.1186/s12889-020-08498-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08498-8)] [Medline: [32345275](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32345275/)]
9. Schillinger D. Social determinants, health literacy, and disparities: intersections and controversies. *Health Lit Res Pract*. Jul 2021;5(3):e234-e243. [doi: [10.3928/24748307-20210712-01](https://doi.org/10.3928/24748307-20210712-01)] [Medline: [34379549](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34379549/)]
10. Marshall N, Butler M, Lambert V, Timon CM, Joyce D, Warters A. Health literacy interventions and health literacy-related outcomes for older adults: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. Feb 26, 2025;25(1):319. [doi: [10.1186/s12913-025-12457-7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12457-7)] [Medline: [40011860](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40011860/)]
11. Brach C, editor. AHRQ Health Literacy Universal Precautions Toolkit. 3rd ed. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2024.
12. Parikh NS, Parker RM, Nurss JR, Baker DW, Williams MV. Shame and health literacy: the unspoken connection. *Patient Educ Couns*. Jan 1996;27(1):33-39. [doi: [10.1016/0738-3991\(95\)00787-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0738-3991(95)00787-3)] [Medline: [8788747](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8788747/)]
13. Wolf MS, Williams MV, Parker RM, Parikh NS, Nowlan AW, Baker DW. Patients' shame and attitudes toward discussing the results of literacy screening. *J Health Commun*. Dec 2007;12(8):721-732. [doi: [10.1080/10810730701672173](https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730701672173)] [Medline: [18030638](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18030638/)]

14. Goffman E. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice-Hall; 1963.
15. Link BG, Phelan JC. Conceptualizing stigma. *Annu Rev Sociol*. 2001;27:363-385. [doi: [10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.363](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.363)]
16. Stangl AL, Earnshaw VA, Logie CH, et al. The Health Stigma and Discrimination Framework: a global, crosscutting framework to inform research, intervention development, and policy on health-related stigmas. *BMC Med*. Feb 15, 2019;17(1):31. [doi: [10.1186/s12916-019-1271-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1271-3)] [Medline: [30764826](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30764826/)]
17. Easton P, Entwistle VA, Williams B. How the stigma of low literacy can impair patient-professional spoken interactions and affect health: insights from a qualitative investigation. *BMC Health Serv Res*. Aug 16, 2013;13:319. [doi: [10.1186/1472-6963-13-319](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-319)] [Medline: [23958036](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23958036/)]
18. Pio FH, Nosa V. Health literacy of Samoan mothers and their experiences with health professionals. *J Prim Health Care*. Mar 2020;12(1):57-63. [doi: [10.1071/HC19026](https://doi.org/10.1071/HC19026)] [Medline: [32223851](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32223851/)]
19. Sadeghi S, Brooks D, Goldstein RS. Patients' and providers' perceptions of the impact of health literacy on communication in pulmonary rehabilitation. *Chron Respir Dis*. May 2013;10(2):65-76. [doi: [10.1177/1479972312471548](https://doi.org/10.1177/1479972312471548)] [Medline: [23364288](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23364288/)]
20. Stormacq C, Oulevey Bachmann A, Van den Broucke S, Bodenmann P. How socioeconomically disadvantaged people access, understand, appraise, and apply health information: a qualitative study exploring health literacy skills. *PLoS ONE*. Aug 9, 2023;18(8):e0288381. [doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0288381](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0288381)] [Medline: [37556436](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37556436/)]
21. Shaw A, Ibrahim S, Reid F, Ussher M, Rowlands G. Patients' perspectives of the doctor-patient relationship and information giving across a range of literacy levels. *Patient Educ Couns*. Apr 2009;75(1):114-120. [doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2008.09.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2008.09.026)] [Medline: [19041210](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19041210/)]
22. Jensen JD, King AJ, Guntzviller LM, Davis LS. Patient-provider communication and low-income adults: age, race, literacy, and optimism predict communication satisfaction. *Patient Educ Couns*. Apr 2010;79(1):30-35. [doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2009.09.041](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2009.09.041)] [Medline: [19879093](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19879093/)]
23. van der Scheer-Horst E, Rutten G, Stortenbeker I, et al. Limited health literacy in primary care physiotherapy: does a physiotherapist use techniques to improve communication? *Patient Educ Couns*. Apr 2023;109:107624. [doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2023.107624](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2023.107624)] [Medline: [36657334](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36657334/)]
24. Roodbeen R, Vreke A, Boland G, et al. Communication and shared decision-making with patients with limited health literacy; helpful strategies, barriers and suggestions for improvement reported by hospital-based palliative care providers. *PLoS ONE*. Jun 19, 2020;15(6):e0234926. [doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0234926](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234926)] [Medline: [32559237](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32559237/)]
25. Perrin A, Damiolini E, Schott AM, et al. Considering health literacy in cardiovascular disease management: a qualitative study on healthcare professionals' and patients' perspectives. *BMC Health Serv Res*. Sep 5, 2022;22(1):1121. [doi: [10.1186/s12913-022-08455-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08455-8)] [Medline: [36064395](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36064395/)]
26. McKinn S, Chapman N, Sharman JE, et al. How do general practitioners manage patient health literacy differences in cardiovascular disease prevention consultations? An interview study. *Patient Educ Couns*. Aug 2024;125:108299. [doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2024.108299](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2024.108299)] [Medline: [38657560](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38657560/)]
27. Muyskens K, Ang C, Kerr ET. Relational epistemic humility in the clinical encounter. *J Med Ethics*. Feb 17, 2025;jme-2024-110241. [doi: [10.1136/jme-2024-110241](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme-2024-110241)] [Medline: [39922693](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39922693/)]
28. Galasiński D, Ziółkowska J, Elwyn G. Epistemic justice is the basis of shared decision making. *Patient Educ Couns*. Jun 2023;111:107681. [doi: [10.1016/j.pec.2023.107681](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2023.107681)] [Medline: [36871402](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36871402/)]
29. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. Oct 2, 2018;169(7):467-473. [doi: [10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850)] [Medline: [30178033](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30178033/)]
30. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol*. 2005;8(1):19-32. [doi: [10.1080/1364557032000119616](https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616)]
31. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implement Sci*. Sep 20, 2010;5:69. [doi: [10.1186/1748-5908-5-69](https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69)] [Medline: [20854677](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20854677/)]
32. Peters MD, Marnie C, Tricco AC, et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIM Evid Synth*. Oct 2020;18(10):2119-2126. [doi: [10.1112/JBIES-20-00167](https://doi.org/10.1112/JBIES-20-00167)] [Medline: [33038124](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33038124/)]
33. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. Dec 5, 2016;5(1):210. [doi: [10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4)] [Medline: [27919275](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27919275/)]
34. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. Jul 10, 2008;8:45. [doi: [10.1186/1471-2288-8-45](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45)] [Medline: [18616818](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18616818/)]
35. Harden A, Thomas J. Thematic synthesis. Presented at: Proceedings of the ESRC Research Methods Festival; Jun 30 to Jul 3, 2008; Oxford, UK. URL: <https://uel-repository.worktribe.com/output/443812/thematic-synthesis> [Accessed 2026-01-20]

---

**Abbreviations**

**LHL:** low health literacy

**MeSH:** Medical Subject Headings

**PRISMA-ScR:** Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews

---

*Edited by Amy Schwartz; peer-reviewed by Kathleen Culhane-Pera; submitted 03.Sep.2025; final revised version received 09.Dec.2025; accepted 30.Dec.2025; published 30.Jan.2026*

*Please cite as:*

Okuhara T, Okada H, Yokota R

*Role of Shame and Concealment in Patient-Provider Communication Among Individuals With Low Health Literacy: Protocol for a Scoping Review*

*JMIR Res Protoc* 2026;15:e83451

URL: <https://www.researchprotocols.org/2026/1/e83451>

doi: [10.2196/83451](https://doi.org/10.2196/83451)

© Tsuyoshi Okuhara, Hiroko Okada, Rie Yokota. Originally published in JMIR Research Protocols (<https://www.researchprotocols.org>), 30.Jan.2026. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work, first published in JMIR Research Protocols, is properly cited. The complete bibliographic information, a link to the original publication on <https://www.researchprotocols.org>, as well as this copyright and license information must be included.