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Phenotype ➔ Genotype

Targeted counselling and testing
Low chance of uncertain and incidental findings

Genotype ➔ Phenotype

Broad counselling and testing
Increased numbers of uncertain and incidental findings
Not new…

- Medicine: radiology, biochemistry, history taking
- Genetics: karyotyping, mis-attributed paternity, Biobanks

BUT

- Genetic technologies will increase frequency
- Limited research on management of IFs in clinical practice (consent and disclosure)
- Information about risks to others and clinical relevance in the future
- Pre-natal and new born screening
Terminology

Unwanted

Unanticipated

Unexpected

Unsolicited

Secondary Variant

Incidental Findings

Incidentaloma

Not pertinent

‘One size does not fit all’
Abnormalities of potential clinical significance that are unexpectedly discovered during routine testing, unrelated to the original purpose of the investigation.

- Unexpected
- Picked up something else
- Other finding

Clinical ethics and law Southampton: www.soton.ac.uk/cels
Observations

In-depth interviews

Analysis

Survey

Empirical and ethical insight into practice

Dissemination and practice recommendations

Phase 1

Phase 2

Phase 3
Study aim
Investigate lay and professional experiences and views about the ethical and practical issues raised by the discovery of IFs

Research question
With the advent of new technologies how are, and how should, clinically relevant IFs be incorporated into practice, taking into account both practical and ethical considerations?

Cohort
Array CGH testing mainly
Sample

HCP Interviews (32)
- Genetic specialists: 22
- Paediatric specialists: 7
- Adult physician: 1
- Clinical scientist: 2

Family interviews (16)
- Total participants: 16 (13 families)
- Number of families with an IF: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for test</th>
<th>IF discovered</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD aCGH</td>
<td>22qdel including SMARCB1 Schwannomatosis</td>
<td>Regular review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle problems aCGH</td>
<td>FBN2 mutation Marfan’s phenotype</td>
<td>Cardiac screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural and social problems aCGH</td>
<td>Y chromosome deletion (infertility)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD aCGH</td>
<td>Deletion including MSH6</td>
<td>N/A Referral for bowel screening as an adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP Gene panel</td>
<td>Mutation in LRP5 gene Osteoporosis</td>
<td>Bone density screening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Families’ (5) experiences of IFs

- Surprised by IF result
- No regret at receiving IF (interventions/future treatment)
- Would want further IFs
- Desire for information

“...because there was another part of it that was quite relieved, because it’s actually a twist of fate if you like, a bit of luck, that had [son] not had these underlying problems he could have developed... this condition later in life and been unaware of it. So actually the fact that he knows about it, it gives him a kind of ... a lucky break... because he’d got the opportunity to get screened for it regularly...”  FAMINT011b
Findings

Consent (HCPs and families)

• The possibility of an IF is not consistently discussed

• No common practice when IFs are discussed (use of examples, consent forms)

• Consensus that possibility of IFs should be discussed
Disclosure (HCPs and families)

- Currently no exploration of what information families want
- Both groups think it is reasonable to have choices

BUT

- Hypothetical decision-making
- Sustained wishes
- Implementation and ongoing challenges
- What happens to genomic information
Hypothetical decision-making

“I think it’s really difficult and I think for a lot of people they wouldn’t be able to give that [IF choices]. And I think even myself, if somebody asked me that, I think, well it would depend what it is ... and clearly you don’t know what your incidental finding is until you find it, so you can’t counsel somebody and ask them about every single eventuality. I think it’s difficult.”

HCPINT028

“You can get a feeling, a gist of someone’s preference, whether... someone would want to know everything, know nothing or a few gradations in between. That’s probably about as good as you can get.”

FAMINT008b
Ethical considerations

Patient choice ↔ Clinical judgement

Consent process ↔ Utility ↔ Review Responsibility Re-contact

Family led disclosure model ↔ Professional led disclosure model
To consider…

• The place for non-directive counselling?

• What will the consent process look like? (who, mainstreaming, documentation, dynamic, broad, opt-in, opt-out)

• Challenges at the clinical/research/commercial interface
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