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Public health genomics raises exciting possibilities for preventing or reducing the occurrence of both rare and common diseases. However, this area of research raises challenging ethical, legal and social issues that should be addressed. One way of addressing these issues is through public involvement in the policy-making process. This GenEdit reviews how international guidelines and policy statements related to public health genomics address the issue of public involvement. Key areas of discussion are the values and goals justifying public involvement, the proposed activities to increase public involvement, who is and who represents ‘the public’, as well as the projected outcomes of such involvement.

An important goal of genomics in public health is to prevent or reduce the occurrence of both rare and common diseases. For example, newborn screening for phenylketonuria is a model for the prevention of treatable, rare genetic disorders. The demonstrable benefit of this programme is often mentioned in the hope that similar benefits may result from the use of population screening strategies. Similarly, in the era of genome-wide association studies, it is hoped that studying the interplay of genes with environmental and lifestyle factors for common diseases such as diabetes, heart disease, and cancer can help drive preventative strategies and reduce the risk of these common diseases.

Despite the optimism associated with newborn screening programs, genome wide association studies and the use of biobanks, the intermingling of genomics with public health raises social, ethical and legal challenges that have the potential to affect the lives of many citizens. An example is Tandem Mass Spectrometry (TMS), which allows simultaneous screening of a number of conditions during the newborn period. In addition, for many conditions detected by TMS, no direct medical benefit is available, thus raising ethical, legal and social concerns about expanding the use of...
newborn screening. Moreover, samples collected for newborn screening could identify carrier status and genetic susceptibility to adult onset diseases (e.g. BRCA1/2 for breast cancer or ApoE for Alzheimer’s Disease) which, if disclosed to parents, may violate the child’s privacy rights. Likewise, public health research using whole-genome genotyping or in the foreseeable future, whole genome sequencing technology for genetic susceptibility testing, raises several concerns, including: what to tell those who participate, whether to inform the extended family, and how samples or data will be used in the future.

The identification of genetic determinants using genome-wide association studies requires large biobanks and their use raises additional ethical concerns regarding data privacy and security, issues of discrimination, stigmatization and social harm, as well as concerns about reinforcing genetic exceptionalism or determinism. In short, as we entertain the potential for genomics to promote public health, questions arise about the appropriateness of, for example, expanded newborn screening programs, the use of genetic susceptibility testing for common diseases, and the use of biobanks.

One safeguard to address these social, ethical and legal issues is public involvement. Involving the public in a debate on emerging scientific developments, such as genomics and public health, is recognized as a timely and fruitful approach to policy making. Seeking public involvement in policy development and decision-making has been recognized as an activity that will help shape the health system, build greater trust in science, strengthen democratic ideals and enhance trust in governments, improve the relevance and translation of research into practice, empower citizens, improve governance, and provide access to unexploited knowledge.

Greater public involvement in policy development has been propelled by a range of factors including public demand for accountability, and as a means to counter public anxieties associated with advances in genomics, as was the case with (GM) food. Moreover, linking genetics to public health rests on the principles of justice, public goods, solidarity, public trust, and respect for cultural, religious, legal, and social diversity.

This paper reviews how international guidelines and policy statements related to public health genomics address the issue of public involvement. We start with a brief overview of various organizations that have a mandate to work toward public involvement in general. Then, we review international policy statements that focus on public health genomics for insight into whether public involvement finds a voice in this sphere. We then focus our discussion on four questions that have been identified through an analysis of the literature on public participation: a) what are the values and guiding principles that justify public involvement? b) what are the proposed activities? c) who is, and who represents the public? and, d) what are the projected outcomes and how will these be evaluated?

Bringing the Public into Public Health Genomics

‘Public involvement’ in this article is used to denote interactions between the public and policy development agencies, and ranges from activities focusing on informing the public to activities that engage the public in research and policy-making.

A number of international organizations have a mandate to promote public involvement and have issued recommendations to guide the process. For example, the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA) created principles for public participation and plays an important role in advancing innovation and communication of ‘best practices’ for professional’s, decision makers, and regulators. Another major organization promoting public involvement is the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), whose role is to help organizations and communities around the world improve their decision-making abilities by involving the people affected by those decisions. Their guidelines invite interested publics into the decision-making process.
and show that public participation can range from informing to consulting, and ultimately, to empowering the public.  

Several other international organizations have developed recommendations promoting public involvement. The *Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters*, by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) stresses the legal obligation of governments to involve all stakeholders (including the public), when addressing environmental issues, in order to build public accountability and transparency.  

Specific mandates concerning public involvement have been incorporated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which calls for public participation in their Constitution and in their Directives. The World Health Organization, which coordinates and leads on international health issues, also plays an important role in this field. The WHO Constitution, at Article 18(h), states that the functions of the World Health Assembly shall be:

> to invite any organization, international or national, governmental or non-governmental, which has responsibilities related to those of the Organization, to appoint representatives to participate, without right of vote, in its meetings or in those of the committees and conferences convened under its authority, on conditions prescribed by the Health Assembly.

At the regional level, the European Commission places emphasis on several approaches to public input, including parliamentary means, consultations with key organizations, and informal interactions with interested parties. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has made substantial commitment to engaging the public in the policy-making process and developed guidance documents for their member countries.

This brief overview broadly demonstrates the commitment of several international organizations to making the public an integral component of policy development and decision-making. This leads us to consider how “public involvement” is realized and defined in the policy statements addressing public health genomics. We searched for French and English documents published since 1995, by international and regional organizations, that included recommendations or statements about public involvement relevant to public health genetics using the following keywords: biobanks, newborn screening, genetic testing and pharmacogenomics. We categorize the results as follows.

**What values and goals justify public involvement?**

For purpose of this article, values are defined as beliefs, goals, or moral or ethical principles that contribute to recommendations. Most international and regional policy documents introduce the topic of public involvement by setting goals or guiding principles. We identified three recurring themes: i) building trust and public confidence, ii) demonstrating transparency and openness, and iii) a range of other goals such as: formulating culturally appropriate policies; promoting solidarity and collaboration; and stimulating democratic renewal and equity.

### i) Trust and Public Confidence

Several policies state that public involvement is important for fostering trust and public confidence. In a report on confidentiality and genetic data, the International Bioethics Committee of UNESCO states the importance of discussing questions about genetic data with the public “…so as to ward off both morbid distrust and blind confidence.” The WHO guideline on genetic databases encourages public debate prior to establishing databases “…to heighten awareness and foster trust in the endeavour…. In the context of pharmacogenomic research, the Human Genome Organization (HUGO), an international organization of scientists involved in genomic research, states that researchers have an obligation to engage the community so as “to earn the trust of the community.” HUGO’s reference to trust is not limited to pharmacogenomics. In the context of gene therapy research, it “urges researchers, professional organisations,
sponsors and governments to listen and respond to public concerns”. The European Commission, in their recommendations on the use of genetic tests, maintains that:

The successful development and use of genetic tests is dependent on the interests and concerns of a wide range of stakeholders being recognized and responded to constructively. Failure to take this into account will result in a loss of confidence by certain stakeholders and could lead to an interruption in the developmental pathway that a diagnostic test follows from innovative scientific idea to clinical utility.

**ii) Openness/Transparency**

Several policy statements call for openness and transparency. In this regard, as early as 1990, the Council for the International Organization of Medical Sciences (CIOMS), a non-governmental organization that plays an important role in the protection of human rights in biomedicine, stated that “…plans for the medical use of genetic findings and techniques will be made openly and responsibly”. The rationale behind this proposal is that public fears about genetics are in part based on misconceptions that open discussions should help redress. In addition, WHO guidelines on the operation of large genetic databases state that this “…should be carried out in an atmosphere of openness, transparency and appropriate ethical scrutiny.” In the same vein, the European Union, in their Resolution on future community action in the field of public health encourages “…that all health-related activities in the Community have a high-degree of visibility and transparency, in order to promote better knowledge and thus enable a larger involvement of citizens”.

**iii) Other goals**

The goals of public involvement are not restricted to building trust and transparency. Some policy statements recognize the need to introduce diverse public perspectives in order to foster “dialogue and cooperation […] to establish and implement genetic services in a manner that is culturally acceptable and maximizes the health benefit to patients.” Others place the focus on health equity, or speak of democratization and the need to “…enable a larger involvement of citizens”, as well as give people a right to be involved in decisions that affect their lives. Based on the “right to equality”, Disabled People International demands to be included in debates involving bioethical issues. Furthermore, the International HapMap Consortium acknowledges that in socially and culturally sensitive environments, the contribution of the public is important and should be integrated into research by allowing the public the “…opportunity to share with investigators their views on the ethical, social and cultural issues…” The International HUGO Statement on Human Genomic Databases states that “[p]ublic engagement is a prerequisite of public responsibility.”

What are the proposed activities to increase public involvement?

It is important to note that terminology for public involvement activities is varied and includes terms such as information, education, communication, consultation, engagement, participation, dialogue, partnership, collaboration and input, which are often used interchangeably. While a comprehensive review of each term is beyond the scope of this paper, public involvement may be loosely grouped into two activities: i) education, and ii) direct or indirect input.

Public education is best characterized as providing information to the public, and is either seen as passive—if experts act on behalf of the public, or active—if there is an exchange of views (questions and answers). Public involvement—direct or indirect—is increasingly recognized as a more meaningful approach to public participation. An indirect approach suggests the one-way flow of information from the public toward policy-making bodies (eg consultation, survey), whereas direct input is described as a two-way exchange between the public and policy making bodies (eg deliberative democracy).
i) Education

Education as a public involvement strategy is supported by numerous organizations. The WHO promotes education as an appropriate way to “improve awareness and understanding of genetics in general, and the medical potential of genomics in particular.”

The World Medical Association, an international organization of physicians, recognizes the important educator role of physicians. Additionally CIOMS, and several international professional associations, recognize the influential voice of professionals in helping the public understand genetics and population health. Other than recognizing the important role of general practitioners, geneticists are reminded that “…they have much to learn from support and advocacy groups representing those with genetic disorders”, that nurses and genetic counselors should educate “the public regarding the expanding role of genetics and genomics as integral components in the promotion of the public’s health and well-being”; that researchers are considered educators, and that public and private research institutes should support public education programs that communicate “correct and full information”. Finally, according to the Council of Europe, the media plays an important role in the dissemination of information about genetics, and are considered key players in promoting “the widest possible participation by citizens in the discussion on the human genome”.

ii) Direct and indirect involvement

Direct or indirect involvement includes organizations, networks and stakeholder groups from patient groups, citizens, and communities. The nature of the involvement will be considered indirect or direct. Indirect involvement is one-way communication, such as using a consultation or a survey. Direct involvement is a two-way communication process and includes citizen workshops, dialogue, and deliberative and consensus conferences. A range of direct and indirect participation tools is outlined in the OECD handbook.

Our review of policy statements indicates that both consulting the public (indirect/one-way) and involving the public in the decision-making process (direct/two-way) are noteworthy for the development of public health policies.

The WHO has a longstanding interest in public involvement and recommends active participation by those interested and affected; building partnerships in decision making, bringing together various cultural and religious perspectives about genetics and inheritance, closer cooperation with patient and parent organizations, public debates on the establishment of new genetic databases, seeking the “voice” of the developing world, and developing networks of collaborating centres. Furthermore, the WHO expects the World Health Assembly to “convene a public, high level meeting with the Director General” to ensure the organization is appropriately informed.

As early as 1996, HUGO supported a participatory model and called for full collaboration between researchers and the community. The policy statement Encourages collaboration, co-operation, and coordination between individuals, populations, industrialized, and developing countries to promote scientific progress and as a source of “present or future benefit of all participants”. To further public participation in research, the suggestion is that “…where possible, representatives of participants in this research” should be involved in the review process.

At the regional level, the Council of Europe creates an obligation for indirect involvement by requiring parties to “see to it that the fundamental questions raised by the developments of biology and medicine are the subject of appropriate public discussion […] and that their possible application is made the subject of appropriate consultation.”

As example of direct involvement from an interest group, Disabled Peoples’ International (DPI), recommends “…the involvement of persons with disabilities at all levels in advice, information, education, and decision making concerning bioethics must be ensured.”
Who is and who represents the public?

The question of who is the public is an important one. There are many different “publics”; for example ordinary citizens, research participants, patients, individuals living in specific neighborhoods, and stakeholder groups representing individuals who may be interested in or affected by public policy. We distinguish two main categories: i) the general public (eg lay public, citizens), and ii) stakeholders representing voices from patient organizations involved in the policy-making process.

i) Several policy statements focus on the general public. For example, the WHO states that “genetic education should target the general public”. UNESCO’s *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights*, and *International Declaration on Human Genetic Data* adopt a broad and diffused approach and point to the need to reach society at large. The International Society of Bioethics notes that the public should comprise a broad representation of “…citizens from different backgrounds”.

ii) More frequently, the role of stakeholders is mentioned in policy statements addressing public health genomics. The heterogeneity of stakeholder groups is vast and includes vulnerable groups, support and advocacy groups, persons and, more specifically, women with disabilities, umbrella organizations, parents, patients and families, consumer groups, public watchdogs, civil societies, and communities characterized by family, geography, ethnicity, or religion. Such diversity of stakeholders makes it difficult to assess who represents the public in the context of public health genomics.

What are the outcomes of public involvement?

A key feature of public involvement must be the consideration of outcomes--in other words, is public involvement doing any good? While this question is increasingly raised, outcome studies are relatively rare. The problem is that to get meaningful evaluations there must be clear and consistent terminology to describe public involvement, to define effectiveness, to develop evaluation designs, and to promote reliable measurement tools.

The importance of outcome evaluation has been addressed in several policy statements. The WHO considers “the need to summarize tested and proven methods of public engagement and explore other innovative ways of promoting public dialogue”. The European Group on Ethics in Science and Technologies mentions that “studies at the community level on the interaction between research and development on the one hand, and of society on the other (dialogue between the scientific community, public perception of research and new technologies, role of the media...) should be strengthened”. HUGO mentions rightly that “without continuing evaluation, the potential for exploitation, duplicity, or abandonment, and abuse by all cannot be ignored. Like competence, continual review is imperative to respecting human dignity in international collaborative genetic research”.

Discussion

Historically, public health policies addressing, for example, newborn screening, predictive genetic testing, pharmacogenetics and genomic research using biobanks have been created by researchers and health professionals, with patients and research participants either left out of the policy development process, or if they were consulted, it appeared as lip service to the principle of public involvement. Increasingly, governments and health professionals recognize the need to strengthen public involvement, and to inform, consult and actively engage the public in policy-making. It is reassuring that there is emphasis at the international level on public contribution to the development of policies in public health genomics. To help untangle the complex issues that underlie public involvement we have addressed four specific questions and noted the following:

First, two predominant values emerge in the document review: public engagement is considered important to build trust and to show openness or transparency. It is important to note some reference to the fact
that public involvement is a prerequisite to public responsibility insofar as it furthers both equity and democracy, especially in the context of culturally sensitive issues.

Second, we distinguish and categorize public participation as two distinct processes: education and participation. We note that most policy statements focus primarily on the need for education. Professional organizations tend to place the emphasis on education whereas non-governmental organizations like the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the European Commission and HUGO tend to promote two-way interactions between professionals and the public.

Third, definitions of “the public” focus on stakeholders and patient groups, however the general public is also mentioned as an important actor. Although both stakeholder groups and the general population are mentioned, they differ in their motivation. Patient groups generally focus on illness experiences, whereas the general population brings more general concerns to the discussion. It will be important to ask who represents patient groups and who represents the general population. In a multicultural society this is not an easy task. Recruiting for public participation should take into account social diversity including varying levels of education, socio-economic status, political affiliation, demographic characteristics such as age, race and ethnicity, disability, gender and sex, and religion. These characteristics and others may influence values, knowledge of the issues, and the applicability of the findings. A broad representation of the population or of stakeholder groups has the potential to produce results that will be widely accepted, as well as enhance respect between diverse groups with varying opinions, and respond to varying needs and concerns.

Fourth, evaluating the impact of public involvement is complex and underdeveloped. A major reason is that in general there is no well defined evaluation process, and thus the effectiveness of public involvement is not well known. Research in this area will be highly relevant.

Conclusion

To conclude, these are the early days of public health genomics. There is growing awareness that the door must be open for patients, patient organizations and the public to participate and explore the ethical, legal and social implications of these new developments. However, the challenges facing the implementation of public involvement are many. This review suggests that the complexity of public involvement, such as: what are the assumptions? who is the public? how, and, to what end? must be addressed. Moreover, an important question remains as to whether the outcome of public involvement is in fact made use of by policy makers.
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