

Title: Who defines the “personal utility” of genetic and genomic testing? A systematic review

Authors: Emily G. Miller, BA¹, Jennifer L. Young, PhD^{1,2}, Anoushka Rao¹, Eliana Ward-Lev, BA¹ and Meghan C. Halley, PhD¹

¹Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA, USA

²Center for Genetic Medicine, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

Corresponding Author:

Meghan C. Halley

mhalley@stanford.edu

650-721-2364

Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics
Edwards Research Building
300 Pasteur Drive
2nd Floor, Room R2DCIR
Stanford, CA 94305-5417
USA

Key Points

Question: What are the demographic characteristics of participants contributing to a definition of personal utility in genetic and genomic testing?

Findings: This systematic review included 53 studies and 13,315 total participants. Demographic characteristics on gender were provided for 95.6% of participants, race and/or ethnicity for 83.0% of participants, educational attainment for 82.6% of participants, and income for 66.5% of participants. Participants were 61.5% female, 82.2% White, 71.2% had a bachelor's degree or higher, and 66% reported income above the U.S. median.

Meaning: Our understanding of the utility of genetics and genomics lacks the perspectives of people with diverse sociodemographic characteristics.

Manuscript Text Word Count: 1172

Abstract

Importance: Expansion in the clinical use of genetic and genomic testing has led to a recognition that these tests provide personal as well as clinical utility to patients and families. It is essential to ensure that members of diverse sociodemographic backgrounds are included in defining and measuring personal utility.

Objective: To determine the demographics of participants contributing to the development of a definition of personal utility for genetic and genomic testing.

Evidence Review: We searched PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Embase for peer-reviewed literature published between 2003 and January 2022 on the personal utility of genetic or genomic sequencing. Our review included both qualitative and quantitative studies with samples that included patients, their family members, or the general public. Eligible studies could examine any clinical genetic or genomic test and required the use of the term “utility.” Authors extracted and reviewed study and participant characteristics including number of participants, study location (U.S. or international), primary methodology (qualitative or quantitative), race and ethnicity, gender, income and education data.

Findings: Our final review included 53 studies and 13,315 total participants. Gender was provided for 95.6% of participants (n=12,724), of whom 61.5% were female (n=7,823). Race and/or ethnicity was provided for 83.0% of participants (n=11,048), of whom 82.2% (n=9,083) were White. The remaining participants were identified as Hispanic/Latinx (5.5%, n=607), Asian American and Pacific Islander (3.8%, n=421), Black (3.5%, n=387), multiracial (0.2%, n=27), and various other racial or ethnic categories (3.7%, n=412). Educational attainment was reported for 82.6% of participants. Among these participants, 71.2% (n=7,830) had a bachelor’s degree or higher. Income was reported for 66.5% of participants (n=8,857), and 66% of these participants (n=5,831) reported income above the U.S. median.

Conclusions and Relevance: Our results suggest that the concept of personal utility in genetic and genomic testing in the U.S. is disproportionately defined by the perspectives a narrow subset of the population – specifically non-Hispanic White, well-educated women with above-average household incomes. If we are to provide equitable care in the areas of genomics and genetics, we will need to expand research to include more diverse and representative samples.

Manuscript Text

Introduction

As clinical use of genetic and genomic testing grows, clinicians and researchers are increasingly recognizing that, beyond clinical utility, these tests provide substantial personal utility to patients and families.¹ In response, researchers have employed diverse methods to define and measure the broad range of subjective outcomes associated with personal utility in this context. Key dimensions of personal utility have captured psychosocial benefits, facilitated social support, improved care coordination, and information for reproductive and other healthcare decision-making.^{1,2}

It is essential to ensure that the voices of patients, caregivers from diverse sociodemographic backgrounds are included in defining and measuring personal utility. While the need to diversify genomic datasets has been widely recognized,³ the parallel need to include diverse perspectives when defining the value of genomic data for patients and families remains unexplored. Recent systematic reviews on this topic have not reported the sociodemographic makeup of participants included in the reviewed studies.^{1,2} To address this gap, we conducted a systematic review of peer-reviewed research focused on defining and measuring the personal utility of genetic and genomic testing to determine the underlying sociodemographic characteristics of study participants.

Materials and Methods

Our systematic review utilized and updated a widely-cited 2017 systematic review by Kohler et al on the personal utility of genetic and genomic testing.¹ We updated Kohler et al's original search string to account for changing terminology over time (e.g., including "perceived" as well as "personal" utility) and conducted a new search for studies subsequently published in the same databases. Additional methodological information and the full details of our search string are provided in **Supplementary Appendix 1**.

Studies identified were screened for eligibility by two independent reviewers. Eligibility criteria included:

1. Focused on perspectives of patients, their family members, or the general public;
2. Focused on any clinical genetic or genomic test;
3. Provided empirical data on participants' perspectives of the "utility" of genetic or genomic tests;
4. Published between August 2016 (the date of Kohler et al's final search) and January 2022;
5. Published in English in a full-text form;
6. Conducted in the United States.

Data Extraction and Analysis

Three authors extracted and reviewed study and participant characteristics including: number of participants, study location (U.S. or international), primary

methodology (qualitative or quantitative), race and ethnicity, gender, income, and education data. Methods for harmonizing sociodemographic categories are provided in **Supplementary Appendix 1**, and the complete data dictionary is provided in **Supplementary Appendix 2**. We consolidated individual-level data across all studies for descriptive analyses and used a Pearson's chi-squared test to compare demographic characteristics by study methodology, with a threshold of $p < 0.05$ for statistical significance. The complete analytic dataset is provided in **Supplementary Appendix 3**.

Results

Our final review included 53 eligible studies with 13,315 total participants (**Figure 1**). Of these, 32 studies (60.4%) used primarily qualitative methodology, although these accounted for only 14.1% ($n=1,877$) of all participants. A descriptive overview is provided in **Figure 2**, and a summary of comparisons in **Table 1**. Additional descriptive details are provided in **Supplementary Appendix 4**.

Gender. Gender was the most frequently reported demographic variable, provided for 95.6% of participants ($n=12,724$). Only two studies included participants reporting a gender other than male or female ($n=3$ participants), and 11 studies reported only one gender, implying binary gender categories. Women made up 61.5% ($n=7,823$) of all participants, and only slightly less (59.7%) when the seven studies of only women were excluded. A greater proportion of qualitative study participants were women (69.7%, $n=1,229$) compared to quantitative study participants (60.2%, $n=6,573$), a difference that was statistically significant ($X^2 = 57.2, p < 0.0001$).

Race and Ethnicity. Race and/or ethnicity were provided for 80.1% of participants ($n=10,663$). Six studies allowed participants to choose more than one category, therefore percentages sum to more than 100%. The vast majority (85.2%, $n=9,083$) identified as White. The remaining participants included Hispanic/Latinx (5.7%, $n=607$), Asian American and Pacific Islander (3.9%, $n=421$), Black (3.6%, $n=387$), multiracial (0.3%, $n=27$), and various other racial or ethnic categories (3.9%, $n=412$). The percentage of participants identifying as White was higher in quantitative studies (84.2%, $n=7,950$) than in qualitative studies (70.9%, $n=1,109$), a difference which was statistically significant ($X^2 = 162.2, p < 0.0001$).

Education. Educational attainment was reported for 82.6% of participants ($n=10,999$). Among these participants, 71.2% ($n=7,830$) had at least a bachelor's degree, compared to 28.8% ($n=3,169$) without. Further, among the 2,333 participants who specified their level of college degree, 61.7% ($n=1,440$) had a graduate degree (**Supplementary Appendix 4**). The proportion of participants reporting any college degree in qualitative and quantitative studies was not statistically significant.

Income. Income was reported for 66.5% of participants ($n=8,857$). Of these, 65.8% ($n=5,831$) reported income above the U.S. median, while 34.2% ($n=3,026$) reported an income below the median. An even greater proportion of qualitative study participants reported income above the median (71.8%, $n=653$) compared to quantitative study participants (65.0%, $n=5,144$), a difference that was statistically significant ($X^2 = 16.7, p < 0.0001$).

Discussion

Our results suggest that the literature on the personal utility of genetic and genomic testing in the United States has disproportionately captured the perspectives of a narrow subset of the population – specifically White, well-educated women with above-average household incomes. These findings are particularly concerning given recent research suggesting important differences in the perceived utility of genetic and genomic tests across participants with diverse backgrounds.⁵ These data also are not representative of the U.S. population. In the U.S., only 37.9% of adults have a Bachelor’s degree, only 61% identify as White, approximately half are women and, of course, 50% are below the median income.

In terms of gender and income, these trends appear even more pronounced in qualitative studies of utility, which is concerning given the foundational role these types of studies play in defining the concept of personal utility. In addition, our review identified only 274 Black participants in any eligible quantitative study of utility, compared to 7,950 non-Hispanic White participants, and nearly half (n=41) of all Black participants in qualitative studies came from a single study specifically focused the perspectives of Black patients.⁶ Interestingly, although many other studies reviewed include all or nearly all White participants, these studies don’t state an explicit focus on understanding the perspectives of White patients. Such patterns only serve to normalize and reinforce narratives prioritizing White perspectives.

Further, information on education and income are either not reported or missing for up to 35% of all study participants. Given the potential for such sociodemographic characteristics to influence the personal utility of genetics and genomics, future studies should ensure robust and systematic collection of participants’ sociodemographic characteristics.

Conclusion

The results of our systematic review suggest that our understanding of the utility of genetics and genomics is disproportionately based on the perspectives of White women with high income and education. In order to achieve the National Human Genome Research Institute’s goal of “equitable use of genomics in healthcare that avoids exacerbating and strives towards reducing health disparities,”⁷ we need not only to collect diverse genomic data but also to understand perspectives on the value of these data for diverse patients and families.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Charis Tang for her assistance in manuscript preparation.

Disclosures: The authors report no relevant conflicts of interest. M.C.H is supported by a grant from National Human Genome Research Institute K01HG011341. J.L.Y is supported by American Heart Association grant number 19SFRN34830054.

References

1. Kohler JN, Turbitt E, Biesecker BB. Personal utility in genomic testing: a systematic literature review. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2017;25(6):662-668. doi:10.1038/ejhg.2017.10
2. Hayeems RZ, Luca S, Assamad D, Bhatt A, Ungar WJ. Utility of Genetic Testing from the Perspective of Parents/Caregivers: A Scoping Review. *Children (Basel).* 2021;8(4):259. doi:10.3390/children8040259
3. Popejoy AB, Fullerton SM. Genomics is failing on diversity. *Nature.* 2016;538(7624):161-164. doi:10.1038/538161a
4. Smith HS, Brothers KB, Knight SJ, et al. Conceptualization of utility in translational clinical genomics research. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2021;108(11):2027-2036. doi:10.1016/j.ajhg.2021.08.013
5. Halley MC, Young JL, Fernandez L, et al. Perceived utility and disutility of genomic sequencing for pediatric patients: Perspectives from parents with diverse sociodemographic characteristics. *Am J Med Genet A.* 2022;188(4):1088-1101. doi:10.1002/ajmg.a.62619
6. Yu JH, Crouch J, Jamal SM, Tabor HK, Bamshad MJ. Attitudes of African Americans toward return of results from exome and whole genome sequencing. *Am J Med Genet A.* 2013;161A(5):1064-1072. doi:10.1002/ajmg.a.35914
7. Green ED, Gunter C, Biesecker LG, et al. Strategic vision for improving human health at The Forefront of Genomics. *Nature.* 2020;586(7831):683-692. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2817-4

Table 1: Comparison of demographics in primarily quantitative versus primarily qualitative studies

	All eligible n(%)	Quantitative n(%)	Qualitative n(%)	Chi-Squared Test X ² (df), p-value
Gender				
Women	7,823 (61.5%)	6,573 (60.2%)	1,229 (69.7%)	X ² (1)=57.2 p<0.0001***
Men	4,898 (38.5%)	4,341 (39.8%)	535 (30.3%)	
Total reported*	12,724 (100%)	10,917 (100%)	1,764 (100%)	
Race & Ethnicity**				
White	9,083(85.2%)	7,950(87.7%)	1,109(71.0%)	X ² (1)=162.2 p<0.0001***
Any Other Race/Ethnicity	1,965(18.4%)	1,494(16.5%)	455(29.1%)	
Total reported	10,663(100%)	9,061(100%)	1,562(100%)	
Education				
College degree or more	7,830 (71.2%)	6,977 (71.4%)	826 (69.9%)	X ² (1)=1.0 p=0.311
No college degree	3,169 (28.8%)	2,801 (28.6%)	355 (30.1%)	
Total reported	10,999 (100%)	9,778 (100%)	1,181 (100%)	
Income				
Below Median	3,026 (34.2%)	2,764 (35.0%)	256 (28.2%)	X ² (1)=16.7 p<0.0001***
Above Median	5,831 (65.8%)	5,144 (65.0%)	653 (71.8%)	
Total reported	8,857 (100%)	7,908 (100%)	909 (100%)	

*Also includes 3 nonbinary respondents

**Participants could select more than one category; numbers in each category exceed count for total reported

***Significant at p<0.05

Figure 1: PRISMA Diagram





Figure 2: Comparison of demographics and reporting across studies



Supplementary Appendix 3: Data Dictionary

Variable Name	Variable Type	Definition	Codes
UPI	Text	Assigned unique identifier	
DOI	Text	DOI from PubMed	
Title	Text	Study Title	
Journal	Text	Journal Name or Abbreviation	
Year	Text	Year of Publication	
N_Study	Numeric	Total number of all types of participants in the study.	
N_Patient	Numeric	Total number of individuals identified as patients in the study.	
N_Family	Numeric	Total number of individuals identified as family members of patients or caregivers in the study. Include here "advocates" or other individuals whose opinions are collected as a proxy for patients. Do not include individuals recruited as members of the general public who happen to be parents.	
N_Public	Numeric	Total number of individuals identified as members of the general public.	
N_Ineligible	Numeric	Total number of individuals in the study who are not eligible (e.g., physicians, policymakers)	
N_Eligible	Numeric	Total number of patients, family members, or public from whom data on utility was collected in the study.	
Method_Type	Categorical	Indicates whether the paper primarily reporting on a quantitative or a qualitative method. Qualitative papers tend to be exploratory, small samples and involve interviews, focus groups, or case studies. Quantitative papers tend to use surveys and have larger sample sizes. If both methods were used, primary method determined by consensus. For example, a study that includes a sample where all are interviewed and participants also complete a survey is characterized as qualitative. If all participants complete a survey and only a small subset are interviewed, then it is characterized as a survey.	Qual = Qualitative; Quant = Quantitative
US_Int	Categorical	Indicates whether the participants in the study from the United States only or including (or only) international participants.	US Only vs. International
Edu_Rep	Binary	Indicates whether the paper presents data on educational attainment for eligible participants.	Yes/No
N_HS_OrLess	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as having completed a high school degree or less. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Some_College	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as having completing education beyond highschool but not completed a four-year college degree. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_LessThan_CollegeDeg	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as having not completed a four-year college degree. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details. Only use if data not disaggregated by N_HS_OrLess and N_Some_College.	

N_CollegeDeg_OrMore	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as having completed a four-year college degree or more education. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details. Only use if data not disaggregated by N_Bachelor_Deg and Graduate_Deg.	
N_Bachelor_Deg	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as having completed a four-year college degree. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details.	
N_Graduate_Deg	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as having completed a graduate degree. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details.	
N_Edu_Miss	Numeric	Number of participants for whom education data is missing, even though study does report education in general. Includes missing, not reported, or declined. Also includes undefined "other" category if used.	
N_Edu_Rep_Total	Numeric	Total number of individuals with reported education data (does not include those with missing data).	
N_Inc_Rep	Binary	Indicates whether the paper reports data on income for eligible participants.	Yes/No
N_Inc_Miss	Numeric	Number of participants for whom income data is missing, even though study does report income in general. Includes missing, not reported, or declined.	
N_Inc_BelowMedian	Numeric	Number of participants with income below the U.S. median. Calculated using US population income distribution. See Supplementary Appendix 1 for details	
N_Inc_AboveMedian	Numeric	Number of participants with income below the U.S. median. Calculated using US population income distribution. See Supplementary Appendix 1 for details	
N_Inc_Rep	Numeric	Total number of participants for with income data reported (does not include those with missing data).	
Gen_Rep	Binary	Indicates whether the paper reports data on gender for eligible participants.	Yes/No
Gen_Women_Only	Binary	Indicates whether the paper focuses on (and only recruit) women.	Yes/No
N_Women	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as women. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Men	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as men. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Gen_Other	Numeric	Number of participants self-reporting a gender other than man or woman. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Gen_Miss	Numeric	Number of participants for whom gender data is missing. Includes missing, not reported, or declined.	
N_Gen_Rep_Total	Numeric	Total number of individuals with reported gender data (does not include those with missing data).	
Race_Rep	Binary	Indicates whether the paper reports race and/or ethnicity data. Do not treat country of origin as race/ethnicity if this is the only information provided. If race or ethnicity is only reported for a portion of the sample (e.g., only reports % White) note in Race_Rep_Notes.	Yes/No
Race_Rep_Notes	Text	If race and/or ethnicity are only reported for some only some categories, please explain here.	

Race_Focus	Binary	Indicates whether the study explicitly states a focus (and only recruit) individuals from a particular race or ethnicity.	Yes/No
N_NHWhite	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as non-Hispanic White. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Black	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as Black. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_HispLatx	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as Hispanic or Latinx. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_AAPI	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as Asian-American or Pacific Islander. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Native_Indig	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as Native American or another indigenous group. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Multiracial	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as multiracial. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Race_Other	Numeric	Number of participants categorized as another race or ethnicity. See Supplementary Appendix 2 for details	
N_Race_Miss	Numeric	Number of participants for whom race and ethnicity data is reported as missing, even though study does report this information in general. Includes missing, not reported, or declined.	
N_Race_Rep_Total	Numeric	Total number of individuals with reported race and/or ethnicity data (does not include those with missing data).	
Race_Discrete	Binary	Indicates a study in which individuals were allowed to select multiple options for race and/or ethnicity.	Yes/No