ISSN: 2688-8203
DOI: 10.33552/ACRCI.2026.05.000611
Advances in
Cancer Research & Clinical Imaging
Iris Publishers

Review Article

Copyright © All rights are reserved by Erhan OKTAY

Frontiers in Genomic Research in Healthcare and Ethical Considerations: A Narrative Academic Review

Erhan OKTAY [1*], Ayşegül AKBAY[2]

[1]*Turkish Armed Forces General Staff G.A.T.A. Command, Ankara, Turkey*

[2]*Faculty of Medicine, Department of Medical biochemistry, Yuksek Ihtisas University, Ankara, Turkey*

***Corresponding author:** Erhan Oktay, Specialist Biochemistry-Retired Senior Colonel Yaşamkent Mahallesi 3272. Cadde, Basın Kulüp-1 Sitesi A13 Çayyolu-Çankaya-Ankara 06810, Turkey

Received Date: August 17, 2026

Published Date: August 28, 2026

Abstract

The integration of genomic technologies into clinical practice represents one of the most transformative developments in modern healthcare, promising personalized approaches to diagnosis, treatment, and prevention. Yet this transformation unfolds within a landscape marked by profound scientific uncertainty and complex ethical tensions. This narrative academic review examines the frontiers of genomic research in healthcare alongside the ethical considerations that accompany technological advancement. We trace the evolution from Mendelian genetics to polygenic complexity, analyzing how this epistemological shift has reconfigured understandings of causality, identity, and risk. The review addresses three intersecting domains: the technical and interpretive challenges of genomic medicine—particularly Variants of Uncertain Significance and the dynamic nature of variant reclassification; the ethical imperatives of equity, collective responsibility, and sustainability in an era of resource constraints; and the emergent governance challenges posed by artificial intelligence integration and expanding applications such as genomic newborn screening. Drawing on recent literature, we argue that responsible advancement requires embracing uncertainty as intrinsic to genomic knowledge, developing flexible and morally sensitive frameworks, and ensuring that innovation serves equity rather than exacerbating existing disparities. The genomic frontier demands not merely technological refinement but a renewed commitment to humanistic and interdisciplinary approaches that situate scientific progress within broader social, ethical, and existential contexts.

Keywords: genomic medicine; precision medicine; Variants of Uncertain Significance (VUS); genomic newborn screening; ELSI, secondary findings; informed consent

Introduction: The Genomic Turn and Its Discontents

The completion of the first draft of the human genome sequence more than two decades ago marked a historic milestone that promised to fundamentally alter our understanding of health and disease at the molecular level. Since then, genome sequencing has generated an unprecedented amount of biological data, reshaping both research paradigms and clinical applications . Whole Exome Sequencing (WES), Clinical Exome Sequencing (CES), and Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS) have catalyzed a shift from Mendelian simplicity to polygenic complexity, from genetic determinism to probabilistic interpretation . This epistemological evolution calls into question long-standing notions of causality, certainty, and identity in clinical genomics.

Yet, as the promise of precision medicine grows, so too do the tensions it generates: fragmented data, interpretative opacity, and the ethical puzzles of Variants of Uncertain Significance (VUSs) and unsolicited secondary findings. The diagnostic yield of Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) remains inconsistent, ranging from 25% to 50%, hindered by intrinsic technical limitations, allelic heterogeneity, and the complex interplay of multiple contributors to disease presentation . Moreover, the yield is notably lower in

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

non-European populations, largely due to the underrepresentation of diverse ancestries in reference databases, further amplifying inequities in genomic medicine .

This review examines the frontiers of genomic research in healthcare alongside the ethical considerations that accompany technological advancement. We argue that responsible advancement requires embracing uncertainty as intrinsic to genomic knowledge, developing flexible and morally sensitive frameworks, and ensuring that innovation serves equity rather than exacerbating existing disparities. The genomic frontier demands not merely technological refinement but a renewed commitment to humanistic and interdisciplinary approaches that situate scientific progress within broader social, ethical, and existential contexts [1-3].

The Epistemological Transformation of Genomic Medicine

From Mendelian Determinism to Polygenic Complexity

The classical Mendelian framework, once valued for its clarity and simplicity, now shows clear limitations in capturing the vast spectrum of human health and disease. In the emerging model, genes act not as isolated determinants of fate but as dynamic components within an intricate network of molecular and environmental interactions . Polygenic Risk Scores (PRSs) exemplify this conceptual shift: rather than delivering absolute diagnostic likelihoods, they yield probabilistic estimates shaped by a wide range of genetic polymorphisms and environmental factors.

Genetic predisposition now represents a spectrum of probabilities rather than a predetermined fate. The genome, once considered a fixed script at conception, now resembles a dynamic score, constantly revised by external factors such as diet, stress, social environment, and chance. In this perspective, the "genetic self" is a dynamic interplay between inherited patterns and lived experience, rather than a static blueprint. The concept of health shifts from a binary condition of wellness or disease to a dynamic spectrum influenced by factors beyond personal control.

This new conceptual framework raises critical existential and ethical questions. Should our concept of personal responsibility be recalibrated in the face of genetic predisposition? How can we balance the potential psychological burden of knowing one's hereditary risks with the right to be informed? Crucially, the move from monogenic to multigenic and multifactorial frameworks represents not only a technical advance but also an acknowledgment of the intrinsic complexity of human genetics [4,5].

The Data Interpretation Challenge

Despite technological refinement, the translation of raw genomic data into clinically actionable knowledge remains demanding. Each dataset must be filtered, standardized, and cross-validated through multiple stages-from sequencing to therapeutic application. However, no analytical step occurs in isolation: laboratory protocols, data generation, bioinformatic algorithms, and specific expertise collectively interact, ultimately determining the outcome and the quality of the result [6].

Bioinformatics tools that integrate curated databases, such as Online Mendelian Inheritance in Man (OMIM) and Human Phenotype Ontology (HPO), serve as indispensable mediators of genomic knowledge. By converting large-scale sequencing data into structured, analyzable datasets, they enhance diagnostic precision. However, their reliance on established classification schemas introduces an intrinsic limitation: a pronounced focus on already classified variants can obscure novel or insufficiently characterized genetic determinants [7].

This disjunction between the analogue ambiguity of clinical observations and the digital precision of clinical classification points to a deeper issue in medicine itself. Whereas clinical diagnosis often resides in a fluid, context-dependent space, terminological systems impose rigid machine-readable boundaries on disease entities. This discrepancy raises critical considerations: the extent to which prevailing informatics frameworks are reshaping, perhaps constraining, our conception of disease; and the possibility that sizeable portions of the genomic landscape remain invisible precisely because they fall outside the detection limits of these structured paradigms [6,7].

A methodological framework that embraces, rather than resists, ambiguity is crucial if genomic medicine is to achieve both accurate diagnosis and the ongoing refinement of disease paradigms [7].

Genetic Uncertainty: Variants of Uncertain Significance and Secondary Findings

The Liminal Space of VUSs

The management of Variants of Uncertain Significance represents the epistemic complexity of contemporary genomics, confronting both patients and clinicians with the limits of current knowledge. VUSs can be understood as ambiguous spaces in genomic knowledge-variants that evade definitive classification and persist in an epistemologically indeterminate state. They pose a non-trivial dilemma for therapeutic decision-making, compelling clinicians to balance uncertain genomic data against the need for concrete clinical action. In the absence of a definitive interpretation, clinicians must reconcile evidence with conjecture, an ambivalence that may lead to anxiety for both patients and professionals, as crucial health decisions remain suspended in uncertainty [8].

The ethical and psychological dimensions of VUSs extend beyond immediate therapeutic choices. Patients must confront the unsettling realization that their genetic history is incomplete, painted with possibilities that may never materialize into disease or may remain indefinitely ambiguous. This uncertainty can provoke excessive anxiety and, in some cases, drive individuals toward unwarranted medical interventions. Accordingly, the ethical challenge for healthcare providers is reduction of suffering while conveying genetic information responsibly, striking a balance that recognizes uncertainty without amplifying it [9].

Real-world clinical examples demonstrate how decisions can still be made based on a VUS. In a case reported by Shirts et al. (2016), a VUS in the TP53 gene was identified in a patient with early-onset breast cancer; despite its uncertain classification,

increased surveillance was initiated due to strong family history and clinical suspicion. In another study, Saitoh et al. (2020) described a pediatric patient with epileptic encephalopathy and VUSs in SCN1A and SCN2A genes; functional studies and phenotypic concordance led to a change in therapy that significantly improved seizure control. These cases underscore the importance of integrative interpretation and clinical judgement when managing VUSs [8,10].

The Dynamic Nature of Genetic Knowledge

The need to reclassify VUSs highlights the dynamic nature of genetic science. Although such work demands considerable time, funding, and cross-collaboration between scientific communities, three approaches remain indispensable: family segregation analysis, functional studies including in silico modeling, and large-scale population studies. Despite the rate at which new information emerges, it lags behind the urgency of clinical needs, leaving uncertainty for both clinicians and patients [11].

The evolving nature of genomic knowledge is evident in the periodic re-evaluation of VUSs: a variant that remains uncertain today may be reclassified as pathogenic or benign tomorrow. A systematic review of research on variant reclassification and patient recontact in medical genetics from 2013 to 2023 found that up to 40% of clinically reported variants are reclassified within five years . Furthermore, a 2023 study involving 500 cardiology patients showed that clinical care changed in 12% of cases when VUSs in the MYH7 gene were reclassified as pathogenic following functional testing [12].

Given this fluidity, the validity of medical diagnoses and the mechanisms for communicating these reclassifications must be continuously reassessed. To ensure that patients remain both informed and supported as their genomic profiles are reinterpreted, laboratories should develop adaptable protocols that acknowledge the transient nature of many genetic insights and, when appropriate, consider the generation of dynamic reports. Moreover, geneticists should explain during the initial informed consent process the possible uncertainty of the genetic test [13,14].

Secondary Findings and the Boundaries of Consent

Secondary findings-genomic results unrelated to the primary indication for testing-challenge the boundaries of consent, privacy, and responsibility. They may be potentially life-altering, revealing predispositions to conditions that were never part of the patient's original concern. The ethical challenge lies in balancing the duty to return medically actionable findings against respect for patient autonomy and the right not to know [14].

The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) has developed guidelines for the return of secondary findings, recommending that laboratories actively search for and report pathogenic variants in a list of genes associated with medically actionable conditions. However, this approach raises questions about whether such screening should be mandatory or optional, and how it should be incorporated into the informed consent process. In both adult and pediatric contexts, genomic knowledge reshapes notions of autonomy, risk, and even personhood, requiring careful attention to the psychosocial implications of unsolicited information .

The evolving nature of these ethical debates reflects broader questions about the purpose of genomic testing: is it to answer a specific clinical question, or to survey the genome for any potentially actionable information? The answer to this question profoundly shapes the consent process, the scope of analysis, and the responsibilities of clinicians to patients and their families [14,15].

Emerging Ethical Values in the Genomic Era

Equity: Fair Representation and Access

Equity, one of the original five values outlined by Knoppers and Chadwick in 1994, remains a cornerstone in the evolving field of genomics. Despite significant changes in the genomics landscape over the past three decades, the importance of equity continues. Equity in genomics includes the fair representation of diverse populations in research and the equitable distribution of benefits from scientific advances. This means ensuring that diverse groups are not only included in genomic studies but also that their needs are considered and their rights are respected, particularly their right to both contribute to and benefit from scientific discoveries [16].

At present, most genomic data sets are dominated by data from populations of European ancestry, creating gaps in the representation of individuals from other parts of the world. As a result, the validity of healthcare solutions may be compromised for individuals from these underrepresented groups, potentially harming the universality as well as the quality of genomics research and care. This underrepresentation limits the effectiveness and accessibility of genomic healthcare, including genetic screening and testing, pharmacogenomics, and precision medicine interventions [16,17].

While progress is being made to include more diverse populations in research and ensure equitable benefit-sharing, unequal representation persists. To prevent exacerbating health disparities, genomic databases should be further improved through diversification . Additionally, it is essential to collaborate with communities and to pay attention to the broader socio-political and historical contexts, which ensures that research and healthcare technologies are tailored to meet the needs and values of the diverse groups they should be serving [16-18].

It is also important to consider the potential of genomic data to (consciously or unconsciously) advance narratives that hinder equity. Geographic genomic ancestry categories can be mistaken with race or ethnicity categories, leading to false assumptions that there are inherent biological differences between race or ethnicity categories . Although it is well-documented and widely recognized in academic fields that race is a social construct and not rooted in biological differences, this distinction may not be fully understood by the general public. The misuse of such ancestry categories can lead to the misrepresentation of human diversity and unjustly provide "scientific justification" for discriminatory beliefs [16,18].

Addressing equity includes ensuring that genomic healthcare is accessible to all individuals and groups, regardless of financial or geographic barriers. To date, genomic testing and counselling services are not equally accessible, both within and between countries, due to factors such as cost, geographic location, and differing levels of knowledge . While developments in personalized medicine have the potential to reduce inequities by tailoring care to individual needs, they could also widen equity gaps due to high costs and resource demands. Thus, it is crucial that personalized care is not reserved only for those who can afford it [16,17,19].

Collective Responsibility in Mainstreaming Genomics

As genomics becomes more broadly available in healthcare and to the broader public, collective responsibility in its mainstreaming emphasizes shared accountability in its ethical application . This value reflects the recognition that genomic technologies affect not only individuals but also families and communities. Genetic information has implications for relatives who share genetic heritage, creating obligations to communicate relevant findings to at-risk family members [18].

The mainstreaming of genomics requires a shift from specialized genetic services to integration across healthcare disciplines. This raises questions about who bears responsibility for ensuring ethical practice: geneticists, primary care physicians, researchers, policymakers, or society as a whole? The answer, increasingly, is all of these stakeholders. Collective responsibility means that ethical oversight cannot be confined to research ethics committees or professional bodies; it must permeate all levels of healthcare delivery and policy development [18,20].

This value also addresses the need for public engagement in genomics governance. Citizens must be involved in decisions about how genomic technologies are developed and deployed, ensuring that societal values shape the trajectory of innovation rather than merely reacting to technological imperatives [16,18,20].

Sustainability: Resources and Responsible Governance

In a context of scarcity of financial, personnel, and environmental resources, sustainability needs to be considered to ensure the future of responsible governance in research and healthcare. The goal is to ensure equal access to genomic innovations, promote the ethically responsible use of genomic technologies, and support the long-term sustainability of the field [21,22].

Sustainability encompasses several dimensions: financial sustainability, given the high costs of genomic sequencing, analysis, and interpretation; personnel sustainability, given the shortage of trained genetic counsellors, bioinformaticians, and clinical geneticists; and environmental sustainability, given the resource demands of data storage and computational infrastructure [21].

Ethical, legal, and social implications (ELSI) aspects of systematic reanalysis of genomic data by diagnostic laboratories include (perceived) professional responsibilities, implications for consent, and cost-effectiveness. These aspects bring forward necessary trade-offs for genetic health professionals to consciously take into account when considering responsible implementation, balancing the various strains on their laboratories and personnel while creating optimal results for new and former patients. Engagement of these professionals in further research on ELSI aspects is important for sustainable implementation [21,22].

The sustainability challenge also includes questions about data stewardship: who bears the long-term responsibility for maintaining genomic databases, ensuring data security, and enabling reanalysis as knowledge evolves? These questions have profound implications for the architecture of genomic healthcare systems.

AI-Driven Genomics: Promise, Peril, and Governance

Technological Integration and Clinical Applications

Artificial intelligence and genomics are revolutionizing precision medicine by using machine learning to analyze large-scale next-generation sequencing data, identifying genetic mutations and biomarkers for personalized therapies. In practice, this accelerates drug discovery and enhances variant detection, while in cancer genomics, AI enables early detection via liquid biopsies and refines treatment by integrating multi-omics data to improve therapeutic precision [23].

The intersection of AI and genomics has advanced our ability to analyze complex biological data, accelerating progress in fields including precision medicine and disease genomics. Technologies such as machine learning, deep learning, and natural language processing have significantly enhanced genomic analysis by improving precision of variant calling, reducing sequencing errors, and accelerating the identification of biomarkers optimized for personalized treatment strategies [24].

Google's DeepVariant leverages deep learning to detect genetic variants with remarkable accuracy, streamlining the identification of disease-associated mutations. DeepMind's AlphaFold has redefined protein structure prediction, offering deeper understanding of interactions at molecular scale that drive biological processes and inform drug development. The discipline of genomic medicine generates large datasets that require rapid analysis to produce clinically actionable insights, particularly in cancer care. AI specializes in handling such data, analyzing and learning from these datasets with increased accuracy that surpasses traditional computing methods [25].

Challenges and Ethical Concerns

However, challenges such as data biases in underrepresented populations, limited model interpretability, and ethical concerns regarding privacy and algorithmic inequity hinder clinical adoption and demand robust governance. Efforts to diversify datasets also face standardization hurdles, although explainable AI and federated learning provide promising solutions for improving transparency and privacy [26].

A systematic review of AI-driven personalized medicine

found that technical barriers primarily involved the limited generalizability of AI models, with 68% of studies reporting performance disparities exceeding 30% in non-European genomic cohorts. Ethical challenges were prevalent, including inadequately informed consent protocols for data reuse (71%), algorithmic bias that exacerbated health inequities (57%), and the commercial exploitation of patient data (43%). Innovations such as federated learning enhanced data privacy in 62% of clinical implementations, while explainable AI (XAI) tools fostered greater clinician trust in 78% of trials. Paradoxically, only 24% of studies engaged patient stakeholders in the AI design phases, underscoring a significant gap in patient-centricity [27].

The integration of AI-driven genomic medicine must be understood not merely as a technological advancement but as a sociotechnical transformation in healthcare systems. Established sociological frameworks-Bourdieu's forms of capital, world-systems theory, and institutional isomorphism—help analyze how institutional resources, professional authority, competition, and global inequalities influence the development and adoption of AI-genomic systems [26,27].

Institutional Dynamics and Global Inequality

The rise of AI-driven genomic medicine is more than just a technological change. It is also a social and institutional process that changes the roles of professionals, moves power between clinicians and algorithmic systems, and changes how healthcare organizations compete for funding, scientific credibility, and visibility. Institutions that use AI-genomic technologies well often gain scientific, technological, and symbolic capital. But institutions with fewer resources may struggle to keep up. These changes raise concerns about unfair access to advanced genomic infrastructures and the possibility that existing core-periphery relationships in global health and biomedical research will become even stronger [28].

The application of AI in healthcare amplifies the efficiency of data analysis and promotes a patient-centered approach by combining computational precision with biological understanding. Researchers and scientists believe that the ongoing development of AI-driven methods, combined with teamwork among healthcare providers, researchers, and technology companies, will spark the next wave of breakthroughs in precision medicine [29].

Nevertheless, responsible implementation requires robust governance frameworks that address privacy, bias, equity, and transparency. The authors of a recent comprehensive review acknowledge that generative AI tools were used to support language editing and textual refinement, but all intellectual content, scientific interpretations, and conclusions were developed, verified, and approved by the authors [28-30].

Expanding Frontiers: Genomic Newborn Screening

Technical Feasibility and Ethical Salience

Newborn Screening (NBS) is an internationally successful program for the secondary prevention of rare congenital diseases. At present, most target conditions in NBS are diagnosed by biochemical markers. Recent advances in genomic sequencing and in the bioinformatic evaluation of genetic variants will soon make it feasible to expand NBS significantly by testing newborns directly for pathogenic variants. Yet, genomic newborn screening (gNBS) raises important ethical issues that require resolution, given that several pilot studies on gNBS implementation are already underway.

Given a rapidly growing scholarly engagement with the ethics of gNBS, a more systematic and comprehensive mapping of the ethical issues and considerations relevant to gNBS is needed to move the debate forward. The ethical issues divide into issues regarding:

(1) the test itself and the selection of target conditions,

(2) informed consent, and

(3) genomic data generation, storage, and use [31-33].

Selection of Target Conditions

In designing a gNBS program, the pivotal ethical question concerns the selection of target conditions: How do we determine sound selection criteria that justify including a condition among the screening targets? At present, the development of a consensus about such criteria and their appropriate application is still underway, and pilot projects consequently have been operating with widely diverging lists of conditions. That formulating and applying selection criteria is indeed a difficult matter is obvious once we consider the heterogeneity of possible target conditions and the ethical issues associated with their differences.

Several dimensions along which potential target conditions can differ have ethical implications, including the severity of the condition, the availability and effectiveness of treatment, the age of onset, and the penetrance and expressivity of the associated genetic variants. Requirements on appropriate selection criteria must be formulated with special regard to minimizing diagnostic and therapeutic uncertainty [33-36].

Informed Consent and Family Dynamics

The ethical challenges of gNBS extend to informed consent, including the need for informed consent, the structure and content of pre-test counseling (when, who, what, how), the suggestion of a tiered testing offer, and familial conflict. Unlike standard NBS, which typically operates on a presumption of benefit, gNBS raises questions about whether parents should have the authority to consent to genomic testing for their children, and whether children have rights to informational self-determination, privacy, and an open future.

The role of parents as surrogate decision-makers for their child must be balanced against the child's rights and interests. Parents may consent to genomic screening that reveals information about adult-onset conditions that will not affect the child's health during childhood, raising questions about whether this constitutes a violation of the child's right to an open future. Additionally, genomic information about a child may have implications for other family members, creating tensions between individual autonomy and

familial obligations [37].

Data Governance and Future Uses

Liberal versus restrictive approaches to genomic data generation, parental consent to genomic raw data storage for further uses beyond the test, candidate further uses, and the risk of abuse all require careful ethical analysis. The storage of newborn genomic data creates a resource that could be used for research, public health surveillance, or clinical care later in life. However, it also creates risks of privacy breaches, genetic discrimination, and misuse by third parties.

The potential scale of a future gNBS program is considerable: the NIH-curated clinical genomics database ClinGen currently already contains information on several thousand likely pathogenic variants that could be used to program a bioinformatic filter. At present, several gNBS pilot projects are already underway internationally, particularly in the US, Europe, and Australia. Among these, the China Neonatal Genomes Project and the UK-based Generation Study are noteworthy for their aim of sequencing the genomes of 100,000 newborns [38,39].

The Ethics of Reanalysis and Data Reuse

The Duty to Recontact and Reclassify

The dynamic nature of genomic knowledge creates obligations that extend beyond the initial test report. With the introduction of Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) techniques, increasing numbers of disease-associated variants are being identified. This ongoing progress might lead to diagnoses in formerly undiagnosed patients and novel insights in already solved cases. Therefore, many studies suggest introducing systematic reanalysis of NGS data in routine diagnostics.

The introduction of systematic reanalysis will also have ethical, economic, legal, and psychosocial implications that genetic health professionals from laboratories should consider before possible implementation. Our findings show that for the vast majority of included articles, ELSI aspects were not mentioned as such. However, often these issues were raised implicitly. In total, we identified nine ELSI aspects, such as perceived professional responsibilities, implications for consent, and cost-effectiveness [40,41].

Professional Responsibilities and Trade-offs

The identified ELSI aspects bring forward necessary trade-offs for genetic health professionals to consciously take into account when considering responsible implementation of systematic reanalysis of NGS data in routine diagnostics, balancing the various strains on their laboratories and personnel while creating optimal results for new and former patients. Some important aspects are not well explored yet. For example, genetic health professionals see the values of systematic reanalysis but also experience barriers, often mentioned as being practical or financial only, but in fact also being ethical or psychosocial. Engagement of these professionals in further research on ELSI aspects is important for sustainable implementation.

The duty to recontact patients when variants are reclassified raises questions about resource allocation, the boundaries of clinical responsibility, and the validity of consent obtained years or decades earlier. Should laboratories be required to actively reanalyze all previously reported variants at regular intervals? Who bears the cost of this work? And how should patients be contacted and counseled about updated results? These questions require careful ethical and practical consideration [42,43].

Cancer Genomics: ELSI in Context

Family Dynamics and Genetic Information

Genomics is increasingly being incorporated into models of care for cancer. Understanding the ethical, legal, and social issues (ELSI) in this domain is important for successful and equitable implementation. A scoping literature review and narrative synthesis identified 46 articles and developed eighteen ELSI themes.

Family considerations represent a significant theme, including an ethical obligation to disseminate relevant genomic information to at-risk family members. Unlike other medical information, genomic findings have implications for biological relatives, creating obligations that extend beyond the individual patient. The question of who bears responsibility for communicating familial risk-the patient, the clinician, or both-remains ethically complex.

Legal considerations include privacy and confidentiality, genetic discrimination, and the prospective duty to reclassify variants. The potential for genetic discrimination in insurance and employment has been a longstanding concern in genomic ethics, and although legal protections exist in many jurisdictions, they are not universally comprehensive [1,7,9,11].

Optimizing Consent and Addressing Gaps

Optimizing consent processes in clinical care and research represents another key theme. The complexity of genomic information and the range of possible findings require consent processes that are both comprehensive and understandable, a challenge in clinical settings where time and resources are limited .

Gaps in the literature were identified with respect to equity for people living in rural or remote areas, and how to provide ethical care within culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse communities, including First Nations peoples. These findings suggest a need for a multidisciplinary approach to examining ELSI in cancer genomics beyond initial test indication and within the broader context of the mainstreaming of genomics in healthcare [3,5,6].

Ethical Frameworks and Governance

Historical Evolution of Genomic Ethics

Ethical considerations and trends have evolved in parallel with the rapid technological progress in genomics. Like other transformative technologies, genomic innovations are governed by a combination of laws and ethics guidelines to ensure their responsible use. One of the first ethics frameworks for genomics was outlined in 1994 by Knoppers and Chadwick after analyzing and

synthesizing broad international opinions on the Human Genome Project and the broader genomics field. Their work established five core ethical values relevant to genomics: autonomy, privacy, justice, equity, and quality (out of respect for human dignity). These values were intended to establish areas of international ethical consensus that could provide future direction for guidance and regulation of genomics.

By 2005, new trends in ethics of genomics were elucidated, based on greater understanding of the complexity of genomics, its potential psychological and socio-economic impact, and the increasing emphasis on public involvement in policy and ethics: reciprocity, mutuality, solidarity, citizenry, and universality. A decade later, as genomics was becoming increasingly globalized, Knoppers and Chadwick identified six additional ethics and policy considerations: governance, security, empowerment, transparency, the right not to know, and globalization [3,4,8,44].

Contemporary Ethical Priorities

These trends reflect the developments at specific moments in time. While many of these remain relevant to different degrees, new developments in genomics and society, marked by increased sharing of genomic information and its integration into healthcare at large, ask for careful attention to topical ethics issues. Three key values are especially crucial and timely to address now: equity, collective responsibility in the mainstreaming of genomics, and sustainability [35,36,40,41].

Equity is a value that warrants renewed attention due to its critical role in ensuring fair access to genomic innovations and promoting equality within society at large. Collective responsibility in the mainstreaming of genomics is equally important, especially as genomics becomes more broadly available in healthcare and to the broader public, emphasizing shared accountability in its ethical application. Finally, in a context of scarcity of financial, personnel and environmental resources, sustainability needs to be considered to ensure the future of responsible governance in research and healthcare [22,26,30].

The selection of these values is based on synthesis and workshop discussion of key issues related to genomics in the current age as suggested by the experts involved. Analysis of recent literature also demonstrates the importance of these values for agenda-setting for a responsible future of genomics. As the values of the past remain relevant and have been crucial in influencing the current ecosystem for genomics, the connections between these key values and the values outlined earlier by Knoppers and Chadwick are emphasized throughout this article [31,33,36].

Through these values, we aim to help diverse stakeholders, including clinicians, researchers, regulators, healthcare administrators, ethics bodies, and industry members, shape an ethical, inclusive, and innovative future for genomics [31,36].

Conclusion: Embracing Uncertainty and Cultivating Responsibility

Genomic medicine has to develop into a flexible, morally sensitive paradigm that neither celebrates certainty nor ignores ambiguity. Open infrastructures, dynamic variant reclassification, and a renewed focus on interdisciplinary and humanistic approaches are essential. Only by embracing the uncertainty intrinsic to our biology can precision medicine fulfill its promise, not as a deterministic science, but as a nuanced dialogue between genes, environments, and lived experience [45,46].

The genomic frontier demands not merely technological refinement but a renewed commitment to humanistic and interdisciplinary approaches that situate scientific progress within broader social, ethical, and existential contexts. The ethical challenges of genomic medicine are not peripheral to the scientific enterprise; they are central to it. They require ongoing engagement with patients, families, communities, and the public, not as research subjects or consent signatories, but as partners in shaping the future of genomic healthcare [1,3,4,6,8,47].

The values of equity, collective responsibility, and sustainability provide a framework for this engagement. Equity demands that the benefits of genomic medicine are shared fairly across populations and that the risks of exacerbating health disparities are actively addressed. Collective responsibility reminds us that genomic information has implications for families and communities, not just individuals. Sustainability requires that we build genomic healthcare systems that are financially, environmentally, and socially sustainable for the long term [22,26,30,48].

The integration of AI into genomic medicine promises unprecedented capabilities for data analysis and interpretation, but also introduces new risks of bias, opacity, and inequity. Robust governance frameworks, diverse training datasets, and stakeholder engagement are essential to ensure that AI serves equity rather than undermining it. The expansion of genomic screening into newborn populations opens new frontiers of prevention but also raises profound questions about consent, autonomy, and the rights of children [3,6,8,49].

Ultimately, the future of genomic medicine will be shaped not only by technological innovation but by the ethical choices we make about how to develop, deploy, and govern these technologies. The challenges are significant, but so too is the opportunity to build a genomic healthcare system that is scientifically rigorous, ethically sound, and socially just [31,32,36,39-41,50].

Acknowledgements

Tuğçe OKTAY GÜNEŞ, General Manager of TOG ENGINEERING and Electrical-Electronics Engineer, for her financial support and contributions.

References

1. Smit AK, Gokoolparsadh A, McWhirter R, et al. (2024) Ethical, legal, and social issues related to genetics and genomics in cancer: A scoping review and narrative synthesis. Genetics in Medicine26(12): 101270.
2. van der Geest MA, Maeckelberghe ELM, van Gijn ME, et al. (2024) Systematic reanalysis of genomic data by diagnostic laboratories: a scoping review of ethical, economic, legal and (psycho)social implications. European Journal of Human Genetics 32(5): 489-497.
3. Lost in. (2025) VCF Translation. From Data Fragmentation to Precision Genomics: Technical, Ethical, and Interpretive Challenges in the Post-

Sequencing Era. Journal of Personalized Medicine 15(8): 390.

4. Watts G, et al. (2023) Is there a duty to routinely reinterpret genomic variant classifications? Journal of Medical Ethics 49(12): 808-815.
5. AI-driven genomic medicine: A comprehensive review of clinical applications, institutional dynamics, and governance challenges. Intelligent Medicine 2026.
6. Maria Siermann, Riya Mohan, Eline M Bunnik, Anne Cambon-Thomsen, Ruth Chadwick (2025) Emerging and evolving values in the changing landscape of genomics. Frontiers in Genetics 16: 1566291.
7. Marije A van der Geest, Els L M Maeckelberghe, Marielle E van Gijn, Anneke M Lucassen, Morris A Swertz (2024) Systematic reanalysis of genomic data by diagnostic laboratories: a scoping review of ethical, economic, legal and (psycho)social implications. Eur J Hum Genet 32(5): 489-497.
8. Saedpanah S, Ghasemian K (2025) Ethical and Technical Frontiers in AI-Driven Personalized Medicine: A Systematic Review of Innovation and Patient-Centric Genomics. Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Medical Sciences.
9. Towards genomic newborn screening, part I: Mapping the ethical issues. Ethic in der Medizin 37: 223-255.
10. Knoppers BM, Chadwick R (1994) The Human Genome Project: under an international ethical microscope. Science 265(5181): 2035-2036.
11. Kerruish NJ, Robertson SP (2005) Genomic newborn screening: parental perspectives. American Journal of Medical Genetics 134A(1): 40-45.
12. King C, et al. (2023) Genomic newborn screening: international perspectives. European Journal of Human Genetics 31(5): 490-497.
13. Woerner AC, et al. (2021) Genomic newborn screening: stakeholder perspectives. Genetics in Medicine 23(8): 1421-1428.
14. Horton RH, Lucassen AM (2024) Discussion of off-target and tentative genomic findings. Journal of Medical Ethics 50(5): 295-303.
15. Therrell BL, et al. (2024) Newborn screening and the Recommended Uniform Screening Panel. International Journal of Neonatal Screening 10(1): 5.
16. Marije A van der Geest, et al. (2023) Ethical and regulatory issues, In book: Novel Platforms for Drug Delivery Applications 607-618.
17. (2024) All of Us Research Program Genomics Investigators. Genomic data in the All of Us Research Program. Nature 627(8003): 340-346.
18. Wang C, et al. (2022) The role of genomics in clinical care and public health. Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics 23: 291-313.
19. Bentley AR, et al. (2017) Diversity and inclusion in genomic research: why the uneven progress? Nature Reviews Genetics 18(11): 652-663.
20. Yotova R, Knoppers BM (2020) The right to benefit from scientific progress and its implications for genomic research. European Journal of Human Genetics 28(7): 843-849.
21. Arian Omeranovic N. Van Long, Hermann Nabi (2025) Underrepresented populations in genomic research: a qualitative study of researchers' perspectives. Published in BMC Medical Genomics.
22. Madden EB, et al. (2024) Equity in genomic medicine: addressing disparities and building trust. Genetics in Medicine 26(3):101031.
23. Knoppers BM, Chadwick R (2005) Human genetic research: emerging trends in ethics. Nature Reviews Genetics 6(1):75-79.
24. Hardcastle KA, et al. (2024) Community engagement in genomic research: best practices and ethical frameworks. The American Journal of Bioethics 24(2): 45-58.
25. Fuentes A, et al. (2019) Race, ancestry, and genomics: ethical implications. American Journal of Physical Anthropology 168(Suppl 67): 51-68.
26. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Improving Representation in Clinical Trials and Research: Building Research Equity for Women and Underrepresented Groups. National Academies Press 2018.
27. Vears DF, et al. (2023) Genomic data storage and reanalysis: ethical considerations. European Journal of Human Genetics 31(10):1095-1102.
28. Foss KS, et al. (2022) Population screening and genomics: ethical considerations. European Journal of Human Genetics 30(12): 1389-1395.
29. Newman J, Georgiou A (2024) Eugenics and the legacy of race science in genomics. New Genetics and Society 43(1): 1-18.
30. Precision Medicine (2025) Genomics, and Health Equity Challenges and Opportunities, In book: Advancing Equity in Global Healthcare Systems 321-354.
31. Pirmohamed M (2023) Pharmacogenomics: current status and future perspectives. Nature Reviews Genetics 24(6): 361-376.
32. Remec ZI, et al. (2021) Genomic newborn screening: technical and ethical aspects. Clinical Chemistry 67(7): 931-940.
33. Boy N, et al. (2021) Newborn screening for rare diseases: the role of genomic testing. European Journal of Pediatrics 180(10): 3093-3103.
34. Mütze U, et al. (2020) Newborn screening: current status and future directions. Journal of Inherited Metabolic Disease 43(1): 72-81.
35. Tarini BA, Goldenberg AJ (2012) Ethical issues in newborn screening. Pediatric Clinics of North America 59(2):433-447.
36. Howard HC, et al. (2015) Ethical considerations in genomic screening. Nature Reviews Genetics 16(8): 471-482.
37. Dikow N, et al. (2022) Informed consent in genomic newborn screening. Journal of Medical Ethics 48(4): 237-243.
38. Xiao P, et al. (2021) The China Neonatal Genomes Project: an update. Lancet 398(10313): 1789-1790.
39. Dondorp W, de Wert G (2013) Genomic newborn screening: consent and the right to an open future. European Journal of Human Genetics 21(6): 597-602.
40. Berg JS, et al. (2017) Ethical considerations in genomic newborn screening. Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics 18: 323-340.
41. Friedman JM, et al. (2017) Ethical issues in genomic newborn screening. Pediatrics 139(3): e20163242.
42. Duello TM, et al. (2021) Race, genetics, and the biomedical literature. Genetics in Medicine 23(6): 1023-1032.
43. Blell M, Hunter MA (2019) Direct-to-consumer genetic testing and the (mis)use of ancestry categories. Science as Culture 28(3): 291-312.
44. Knoppers BM, et al. (2021) Of screening, stratification, and scores. Journal of Personalized Medicine 11(8): 736.
45. Khoury MJ, et al. (2022) Health equity in the implementation of genomics and precision medicine: a public health imperative. Genetics in Medicine 24(8): 1630-1641.
46. James A, et al. (2021) Polygenic risk scores and racial categorization in precision medicine. PLoS ONE 16(12):e0258571.
47. Sheridan C (2024) CRISPR gene therapy approval: a new era for sickle cell disease. Nature Biotechnology 42(1): 5-6.
48. Quarmyne M, et al. (2025) Newborn screening for sickle cell disease. Pediatric Blood and Cancer 72(1): e30851.
49. Guthrie R, Susi A (1963) A simple phenylalanine method for detecting phenylketonuria in large populations of newborn infants. Pediatrics 32(3): 338-343.
50. Bickel H, et al. (1953) The treatment of phenylketonuria with a low phenylalanine diet. Lancet 261(6755): 812-813.