

1 *Title: “Holy cow, where do I sign up?” Attitudes of Military Veterans toward Epigenomic*
2 *Biomarker Toxic Exposure Testing*

3

4 *Authors: Stacey Pereira¹, Calvin Apodaca^{2,3}, Kyle Slominski¹, Rachele K. Lipsky^{2,4,5}, Cristian*
5 *Coarfa^{6,7}, Cheryl L. Walker^{6,7}, Amy L. McGuire¹, Lea Steele^{4,6}, Drew A. Helmer^{1,2,3,6}*

6

7 ¹Center for Medical Ethics and Health Policy, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, USA

8 ²Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center, Houston, TX, USA

9 ³Department of Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, USA

10 ⁴Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX,
11 USA

12 ⁵Duke University School of Nursing, Durham, NC

13 ⁶Gulf Coast Center for Precision Environmental Health, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston,
14 TX, USA

15 ⁷Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, USA

16

17 *Running Title: Veterans’ Attitudes toward Epigenomic Exposure Testing*

18

19 *Corresponding Author:*
20 *Stacey Pereira, PhD*
21 *Baylor College of Medicine*
22 *One Baylor Plaza, Suite 310D*
23 *Houston, TX 77030*
24 *spereira@bcm.edu*

25

26 *Keywords: Veterans, Epigenetics, Epigenomics, Toxicity, Adverse Effects, Agent Orange*

27

28 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

29 The authors declare they have nothing to disclose.

30 ABSTRACT

31 **Background:** With the signing of the PACT Act in 2022, there is great interest and investment
32 in studying toxic exposures encountered during military service. One way to address this is
33 through the identification of epigenomic biomarkers associated with exposures. There is
34 increasing evidence suggesting that exposure to toxic substances may result in alterations to
35 DNA methylation and resultant gene expression. These epigenomic changes may lead to
36 adverse health effects for exposed individuals and their offspring. While the development of
37 epigenomic biomarkers for exposures could facilitate understanding of these exposure-related
38 health effects, such testing could also provide unwanted information.

39 **Objectives:** Explore Veterans' attitudes toward epigenomic biomarker research and the
40 potential to test for past exposures that could pose intergenerational risk.

41 **Methods:** Semi-structured interviews with Veterans (n=22) who experienced potentially harmful
42 exposures during their military service.

43 **Results:** Twenty Veterans said they would hypothetically want to receive epigenomic
44 information related to their toxic exposures and potential health impacts as part of a research
45 study. Veterans identified nine potential benefits of this research, including promoting insights
46 concerning intergenerational health, identification of early health interventions to mitigate the
47 impact of exposures, and additional knowledge or explanation for their experiences. At the
48 same time, 16 participants noted potential risks, including psychological distress in response to
49 results, concerns about receiving non-actionable, uncertain, or inaccurate results, and issues
50 related to privacy and discrimination. Ten participants also identified at least one condition in
51 their children that they thought could be related to their exposure and most said they would be
52 interested in receiving research results related to their children's and grandchildren's risk of
53 developing a health condition associated with their exposure.

54 **Discussion:** Results suggest that Veterans might welcome benefits of epigenomic research
55 related to military exposures yet have some concerns about potential negative impacts.

56 INTRODUCTION

57 Several generations of U.S. military Veterans have faced exposure to a variety of toxic
58 substances and environments during their time in service, and these exposures are often
59 associated with poor health outcomes. For example, Vietnam era Veterans who were exposed
60 to chemicals such as Agent Orange experience elevated rates of chronic respiratory conditions,
61 heart disease, hypertension, and other ailments.¹ Between 25-32% of Gulf War Veterans suffer
62 from Gulf War Illness, a condition marked by a number of symptoms that are closely linked with
63 chemical exposure.² Veterans of the Global War on Terrorism who were exposed to hazards
64 including burn pits and improvised explosive devices in Iraq and Afghanistan show an elevated
65 risk for conditions such as chronic respiratory diseases.³ Under the Biden administration with
66 the signing of the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring Our Promise to Address
67 Comprehensive Toxics (PACT) Act of 2022, there is great interest and investment in studying
68 these exposures and their health impacts.

69 One potential way to address this is through the identification of epigenomic biomarkers
70 associated with exposures. There is a growing body of literature suggesting that toxic exposures
71 such as those encountered during military service may result in epigenomic changes and those
72 changes may be linked to adverse health effects for the exposed individual and their offspring.⁴
73 Alterations in DNA methylation have been associated with a number of environmental factors,
74 including chemical exposure and air pollution.⁵ One study of reproductive health among female
75 Gulf War Veterans indicated that 38% percent of participants reported developmental disorders
76 in their children, and the use of pesticide cream during deployment was associated with higher
77 odds of these disorders being present.⁶

78 The development of epigenomic biomarkers of exposures could enable studies on the
79 associated health effects that could lead to earlier and more accurate detection of disease,
80 prediction of future health impacts, preventive and risk mitigation measures, and specific
81 treatments through the identification of causal factors of disease.⁷ Clinical trials in oncology
82 have shown that epigenomic biomarkers have both prognostic and predictive value, and
83 epigenomic modifications can be used to assess the effectiveness of therapeutic interventions.⁸
84 Additionally, epigenomic biomarkers may allow for diagnosis and targeted therapy to occur
85 simultaneously.⁹ The results of epigenomic testing, however, may also provide information that
86 is distressing or burdensome to some individuals, particularly in the form of incidental, non-
87 actionable, or heritable results.¹⁰ These concerns may affect both the exposed individual and
88 possibly their offspring. Increased concerns over privacy and discrimination when compared to
89 traditional genetic testing may also be present, as it is uncertain whether genetic non-
90 discrimination laws apply to epigenomic data.¹¹

91 To develop epigenomic biomarkers for toxic exposures experienced in military settings,
92 Veterans would need to be willing to participate in this research. While it is currently unknown
93 what Veterans think about research on epigenomic biomarkers, several studies have shown that
94 the Veteran population exhibits a high degree of willingness to participate in health research,
95 especially when the research has the potential to help other Veterans.¹²⁻¹⁴ Veterans have also
96 been found to generally have a positive attitude toward genetic research. One study of Veterans
97 Affairs patients found that 83% of respondents believed that a database of genetic information
98 and medical records for research purposes should be established, and 71% said they would
99 definitely or probably participate.¹⁴ A separate study examining attitudes toward receiving
100 genetic research results found that over 90% of Veterans would like to receive results, and there

101 was no difference in attitudes between Veterans and non-Veterans.¹⁵ However, there is a
102 paucity of research specifically regarding attitudes toward epigenomic research, and the data
103 that does exist suggests that the general public has a limited understanding of the field.¹⁶

104 To better understand Veterans' attitudes toward research on epigenomic biomarkers for
105 exposures, we conducted qualitative interviews with Veterans who experienced potentially
106 harmful toxic exposures during their military service. Here we report their interest in and
107 anticipated benefits and risks of epigenomic research and testing, as well as their attitudes
108 toward intergenerational risk testing.

109

110 METHODS

111 *Participant Recruitment*

112 Veterans who sought medical attention for military exposure-related concerns through
113 formal Department of Veterans Affairs' registry examinations (Agent Orange, Gulf War, Airborne
114 Hazards and Open Burn Pit (AHOBP) registries) were identified from medical records and
115 eligibility and contact information was abstracted in accordance with a partial waiver of informed
116 consent and HIPAA. Each registry has specified eligibility criteria primarily related to military
117 deployment location and time period (Agent Orange- Vietnam 1962-1975; Gulf War- Persian
118 Gulf region and Southwest Asia 1990-present; AHOBP Southwest Asia or Djibouti 1990-present
119 or Afghanistan 2001-present). The registries are voluntary, and Veterans generally must seek
120 out a registry examination, i.e., they were not often referred by a treating clinician.¹⁷ Veterans
121 who completed a clinical encounter for one these registries at a single, large VA medical center
122 between 2020 and 2021 were mailed an invitation letter to participate in the interview study and
123 instructions on how to opt out of an invitation phone call. Ten business days after mailing the
124 letter, a trained research coordinator phoned the Veteran at the phone number listed in the
125 medical record and explained the study, confirmed eligibility, and invited the Veteran to
126 participate. Three phone attempts were made. Interested Veterans were scheduled for a semi-
127 structured interview.

128

129 *Interviews*

130 Semi-structured interviews were conducted in late 2021 with Veterans via phone or
131 video conference by a trained qualitative researcher (SP or CA). Interviews began with verbal
132 informed consent as approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The interviewer explored
133 the Veteran's experience with toxic exposures during their military service and the perceived
134 impact on them and their families. The interviewer then elicited Veterans' views toward
135 hypothetical research and testing for epigenomic biomarkers for past toxic exposures.
136 Interviewees were told that researchers would like to conduct studies to learn if a blood test
137 could be developed to determine whether they had experienced a toxic exposure and identify
138 what health risks they and their offspring might have due to that exposure. They were then
139 asked what they thought the benefits and risks of such research would be and whether they
140 would be interested in receiving results from such research for themselves and for their children
141 and grandchildren. See supplementary materials for interview questions. Interviews were
142 recorded and transcribed verbatim. Interviewees were invited until we reached thematic

143 saturation¹⁸ on anticipated benefits and risks of epigenomic testing for toxic exposures.
144 Demographic characteristics were self-reported and included to characterize the sample.

145

146 *Analysis*

147 All transcripts were analyzed by two authors (SP and CA) aided by MAXQDA (VERBI
148 Software, Berlin) to identify salient themes in the data.¹⁹ The initial broad deductive approach
149 focused on participants' perception of the impact of their exposure, their interest in hypothetical
150 testing for epigenomic biomarkers for themselves and their families, and their perceived benefits
151 and risks of such testing. The second step used an inductive approach to abstract salient
152 themes within the broader codes.²⁰ Any discrepancies in codes or abstractions were identified
153 and discussed until consensus was reached. Illustrative quotes include participant number and
154 cohort (i.e., Agent Orange, Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit, or Gulf War).

155 The research was approved by IRB and other oversight committees at Michael E.
156 DeBakey VA Medical Center and Baylor College of Medicine (protocol H-49702).

157

158 RESULTS

159 *Participants*

160 One hundred and twenty Veterans who sought medical attention for military exposure-
161 related concerns were mailed an invitation letter to participate in an interview. Twenty-two
162 Veterans were interviewed (Table 1) and 15 additional Veterans were reached by phone and
163 either declined to participate or were unresponsive to scheduling attempts after the initial phone
164 contact. Twenty of 22 Veterans said they would hypothetically want to receive epigenomic
165 information related to their toxic exposures and potential health impacts. As one Veteran
166 described,

167 Why anybody would not want to know that, because it could give you such peace
168 of mind. In my opinion, it could give you such peace of mind at knowing what's
169 going on with you, what possibly contributed to it, and whether or not it's
170 something that is going to be passed down to your kids. I would love to know that
171 information and if I could get that from a single blood test. Holy cow, where do I
172 sign up? (*7BP, Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit*)

173

174 Their reasons for wanting this information are captured in the anticipated benefits below.
175 For the two Veterans who indicated they would not want to receive epigenomic information, one
176 felt he could not handle any additional information and noted that he did not want to know about
177 his risk for any future health problems: "Hopefully [...] all my health problems are stopped. I
178 don't want to know of more new ones coming down the road," (*8AO, Agent Orange*). The other
179 was unsure and explained that his concern was that the information would not be actionable.

180

181 *Anticipated Benefits*

182 Veterans anticipated several benefits of research on epigenomic biomarkers for
183 military exposures. We identified nine distinct benefits, and most were related to the
184 potential for return of individual research results. Most commonly, Veterans noted the
185 potential of such information to **promote intergenerational health** (n=12). One Veteran
186 explained why he would want to receive information about intergenerational health risks
187 associated with his military exposures, "Yeah, because I'd like to tell my daughter [...],
188 hey, I've had this problem. I've been exposed to this. This might be an issue for you
189 later," (6BP, *Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit*). Another Veteran explained that
190 knowing how his exposures could impact his children would be helpful:

191 Well, because I would want to know how would it impact them, what kind
192 of lifestyle are they going to have if they going to have one at all, are they
193 going to be crippled, blind or some kind of physical defect, how is this
194 going to affect them? So yeah, I would want to know in advance. Maybe if
195 something can be done before that ever happens, maybe they can fix it.
196 (1AO, *Agent Orange*)

197
198 The second most commonly anticipated benefit of this research was the potential to
199 provide important information that could lead to **early health interventions to mitigate the**
200 **impact of exposures**, "I think the main thing of knowing information like that would be doing
201 screening you might not otherwise be doing. I mean, if I knew something might be cancer
202 causing on down the line, then I certainly would want them to be able to catch that early," (1GW,
203 *Gulf War*). Another Veteran explained:

204 Well, like with Agent Orange, sometimes it was 20 or 30 years before the
205 effects of it, they got the cancer or something. So, if they had the blood
206 test, then they could see maybe there are treatments or medications or
207 stuff that might help, might delay... I don't know, I'm not a doctor, but it
208 seems like that would be real good. (7AO, *Agent Orange*)

209
210 Seven Veterans felt that information pertaining to epigenomic effects of military
211 exposure would be beneficial simply for the sake of having **additional knowledge or an**
212 **explanation** for their experiences, even if it didn't lead to a specific intervention, "I think
213 the information, if we look at it the right way, would be helpful and I would want to know.
214 Even if it wasn't anything that was life threatening, at least it would maybe help me to
215 understand why I'm dealing with some of the things I'm dealing with," (2GW, *Gulf War*).

216 Similar to the Veterans who felt that epigenomic risk information could lead to
217 early health interventions, some (n=6) felt that such information could **inform treatment**
218 for their current health concerns and symptoms:

219 If you could fix what's going on with me having to all of a sudden now in
220 my forties and fifties carrying an inhaler because all of a sudden I'm
221 asthmatic during allergy season... Yeah, so I don't have lung infections
222 and all those fun things. Yeah, I would think if it improved my health,

223 because we could do something about it, I would be happy. (3BP,
224 *Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit*)

225

226 Five Veterans explained that predictive health risk information could help them
227 with **life planning**:

228 How would I use [predictive health risk information]? I would use that
229 information to plan for the eventuality of, all right, if I'm at risk for this, my
230 life expectancy could be this. I will know that at this point, if I haven't had
231 these things done by then, I need to get them done at this point before
232 the end comes along. It would help me to prepare for my life ending and
233 my family, or at least my son being able to continue with his life and move
234 forward and not have to be so much of a burden. It's better to know what
235 you may go from, in my opinion, than not knowing because then you can't
236 really prepare for it. (7BP, *Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit*)

237

238 Only a few Veterans (n=3) noted that epigenomic research results could prove
239 that they had experienced a toxic exposure and thus **facilitate obtaining disability**
240 **benefits** related to that exposure, "It would all be good for my benefits and
241 compensation from the Gulf War area, yeah," (3GW, *Gulf War*). And two of those three
242 noted specifically that it could help their children or grandchildren obtain benefits if they
243 were impacted by their exposure:

244 Well, I mean, let's say they got the perfect solution, and they said, "Yep.
245 This is what we found. And it's proven based off of all of these data
246 points." Then what it provides is, you can't deny it. If it's a positive test...
247 Like a COVID test, if it's a positive test, you got it. There's no denying it.
248 So, if you can find a test that actively says, "Yes, you were exposed to
249 these hazards because of your deployment operations, and it will cause
250 these issues for your health, your kids' health, your family's health,
251 throughout the line, 100%," then the VA has no way around it. They have
252 to say, "Yep. You've got it. Here's your disability. We'll continue to provide
253 medical support for the rest of your life," or for however long they
254 determine it's necessary. (5BP, *Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit*)

255

256 Finally, there were three benefits noted by one Veteran each: that such a test
257 could **provide peace of mind**, that knowing about intergenerational health risks caused
258 by a parent's exposure could **reduce self-blame** by letting children know their health
259 conditions are not their fault, and that **participating in research** was a benefit in and of
260 itself.

261

262 *Anticipated Risks*

263 When asked about what risks might be associated with research on epigenomic
264 biomarkers for military exposures, six Veterans noted they perceived **no risk**, “Oh, I just
265 don't see why anybody would object to it if it's something that's going to maybe let them
266 know if they have a potential health problem or a future health problem. What would be
267 the drawback to it?” (7AO, *Agent Orange*). Four of the six Veterans who felt there were
268 no risks were from the Agent Orange cohort, while the other two were from the Burn Pit
269 and Gulf War cohorts.

270 The remaining 16 Veterans named 13 different risks they thought could be
271 associated with research on epigenomic biomarkers. Again, most anticipated risks were
272 related to the receipt of individual research results. The most commonly cited risk was
273 the potential for **psychological distress** (n=7). Veterans discussed how learning
274 predictive health information associated with their exposure could cause stress, anxiety,
275 fear, and depression, “Well, [learning health risk] could throw someone into a spiral,”
276 (5GW, *Gulf War*). And yet, many Veterans also noted that although they recognized this
277 as a risk of learning the information, they felt they themselves could handle it, and that
278 the potential benefit of this information outweighed this risk:

279 If you take me and you stand me up next to an average civilian 50-year-
280 old, I think I'm in way better health, but if you take a guy like that and you
281 go, oh, well, you've been exposed to this and you might have this problem
282 and this problem and this problem, mentally that might affect people.
283 There could be some negative things to that [...] people might kind of take
284 it as a prophecy [...] “Hey, you were exposed to depleted uranium and it
285 shows in your blood work and these are the symptoms for it.” Now that's
286 going to be in the back of my head forever. Oh, when am I going to get
287 sick from this or... but I think knowing what you've been exposed to and
288 knowing the symptoms of it or what could possibly happen is better than
289 not knowing. (6BP, *Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit*)

290

291 The remaining 12 risks were noted by only one or two Veterans each. Several of
292 these anticipated risks stemmed from perceptions of the types of results one could
293 receive as part of the research study or concerns about the accuracy of those results.
294 These risks included the potential to receive **non-actionable information** (n=2) or
295 **uncertain results** (n=1), the risk of **misdiagnosis** (n=2), and the potential for
296 **overreliance on testing** (n=1) to the exclusion of other relevant information.

297 Another group of risks described centered around privacy and potential for
298 discrimination. Veterans named concerns about **confidentiality risks** (n=1), as well as
299 the risk of **insurance discrimination** (n=2) or **employment discrimination** (n=1):

300 I'm probably willing to do that now, for example. But when I got right out of
301 the service and I'm trying to get a job and I got to have my flight physical
302 and I got to have all that and this might show a marker where, “Oh, you've
303 been exposed to this, which might lead to that,” and as a result, what is
304 that going to do to my insurance? I'm not opposed to it, but I wouldn't be a
305 volunteer when I was flying. (3AO, *Agent Orange*).

306

307 Of note, this Veteran went on to talk about how he would have felt comfortable
308 getting such testing while in the military given the protections in place, but thought the
309 risk of employment discrimination was higher in the civilian context:

310 If I was in the military at the time and that would have happened
311 [epigenomic testing offered], I would more than likely would've taken the
312 test. It's just that when I got out of the military, now you're in a whole
313 different environment. The civilians are not like the military. Once you're in
314 there, the military understands the environment that you're in and stuff
315 like that, so I would hope at that point in time that adaptations would be
316 made and they would understand, so I would not be against it. Now, go
317 out into the civilian world, which is totally different than the military. Then,
318 in some ways I think the civilian world is more cutthroat than the military.
319 (3AO, *Agent Orange*)

320

321 Other Veterans noted lifestyle or family-related risks, including a risk of this
322 epigenomic risk information leading to **poor lifestyle choices** if they thought that the
323 health condition they were at risk for was inevitable (n=1), having a **negative impact on**
324 **an exposed Veteran's child** (n=1), or the potential for this information to **deter**
325 **exposed Veterans from having children** (n=2) they might otherwise have wanted,
326 "Well, you can't have kids, man, because you're going to cause them to have all these
327 problems," (5GW, *Gulf War*).

328 Finally, three Veterans described two risks specifically related to the military
329 service context. First, two Veterans noted that this information could be used to **block a**
330 **Veteran from accessing benefits** (n=2) to which they might otherwise be entitled, "No
331 [cannot think of any risks], I mean, unless somebody's maybe putting in a claim for
332 something saying they were exposed to something, but then the blood test proves they
333 weren't, then they don't get compensated," (2GW, *Gulf War*). One other Veteran
334 suggested that linking toxic exposures in military service to health problems could **deter**
335 **military service** (n=1), "If anything will come up, and if so, come up out in that risk, then
336 my kids ain't going nowhere when I finish, ain't let them go to the military at all. [...] I
337 can't see any other [risk], besides that it'd be lack of military personnel," (6GW, *Gulf*
338 *War*).

339

340 *Perception of Intergenerational Impact and Attitudes toward Testing*

341 We also discussed Veterans' perspectives toward epigenomic research that
342 could inform them about health risks to future generations stemming from their
343 exposures. When asked whether they had any concerns about their exposures
344 impacting their children or grandchildren, 10 participants identified at least one health
345 condition in their children they thought could be associated with their exposures.
346 Veterans named conditions including premature birth, learning disabilities, neurological
347 symptoms including seizures and sleepwalking, heart and lung defects, bipolar disorder,

348 and type 1 and type 2 diabetes. According to the interviewees none of these conditions
349 had been formally linked with the Veteran's exposure. When asked if they would be
350 interested in learning their children's and grandchildren's risk of developing a health
351 condition associated with their exposure, 19 participants reported they were interested,
352 and one was unsure. Of the remaining two participants, one did not have children and
353 the other had children who were born before the Veteran's service and exposure.
354 Veterans' anticipated benefits and risks of testing for intergenerational risk are included
355 in the sections above, as many themes of risk and benefit were discussed together and
356 not necessarily distinguishable between attitudes toward learning risks for themselves
357 versus their offspring.

358

359 DISCUSSION

360 Epigenomic biomarkers could identify past toxic exposures and predict future
361 health impacts for exposed Veterans and their offspring. Yet, such testing could also
362 provide unwanted information or have negative effects on those who have experienced
363 exposures and their offspring. Our results suggest that Veterans who have experienced
364 potentially toxic exposures during their military service are generally in favor of this
365 hypothetical research and anticipate benefits, especially benefits associated with
366 individual results. Even though most Veterans noted some concerns about the possibility
367 of unintended negative impacts, nearly all Veterans indicated they would be interested in
368 receiving epigenomic information about themselves and their children and grandchildren.

369 Like other studies of Veterans' perspectives toward research participation, we
370 found a wide range of reasons why Veterans may choose to participate. Other studies
371 have also found that Veterans are motivated to participate in research by the potential to
372 learn about the causes of their health issues,^{13-15,21,22} but this is not always the primary
373 motivation.^{13,14} One study of Iraq- and Afghanistan-deployed US Veterans found that
374 main motivations to participate in health-related research were adequate compensation,
375 desire to help other Veterans, and the perceived significance of the research.¹³ It is
376 possible that the potential to help other Veterans was less commonly cited as an
377 anticipated benefit in our work because our interviewees focused on the potential to
378 receive research results about their individual epigenomic risk profile. Given our
379 interviewees' attitudes toward helping other Veterans in other sections of the interview
380 (e.g., when discussing desired reparations for toxic exposures, these data analyzed and
381 reported separately), it is possible that we would find similar motivations to help other
382 Veterans if we had described in more detail the potential for gaining scientific knowledge
383 and group benefits.

384 Our findings about Veterans' anticipated risks of participating in this hypothetical
385 epigenomic research also echo findings in the literature. The potential for psychological
386 harm in response to learning health risk information, the most common theme of risk we
387 found, has long been a concern about genetic testing and genetic research across many
388 contexts.²³⁻²⁷ The remaining themes of anticipated risks identified by our participants
389 were not frequently cited, but paralleled the types of barriers to participating in health
390 research identified by Veterans in other studies. These included concerns about privacy
391 and confidentiality, and distrust with federal institutions.^{13,22} Our findings, overall, suggest

392 that Veterans' attitudes toward epigenomic research are similar to their attitudes toward
393 other types of health and genetic research.

394 It is important to interpret our results within the context of our study. First, our
395 study reports on the perspectives of Veterans who have experienced potentially toxic
396 exposures. It is possible that Veterans who have not experienced such exposures and
397 subsequent negative health effects would be less positive toward this research and
398 perceive a different risk to benefit ratio. Whereas almost all of our participants reported
399 they would want to receive epigenomic information related to their exposures because
400 they felt the potential benefits outweighed those risks, those who have not experienced
401 exposures may feel those risks outweigh the potential benefits. One study, however, did
402 find that exposure to hazards during one's service was not associated with willingness to
403 hypothetically participate in a large database of genetic information and medical records
404 for research purposes,¹⁴ though the hypothetical research described in that study did not
405 focus specifically on exposures. Second, to discuss epigenomic research in lay terms,
406 we described it as research to develop a blood test that could tell whether someone had
407 been exposed to certain chemicals, whether someone might develop health problems
408 from those exposures, and whether that risk could be passed on to children or
409 grandchildren of people who were exposed. As such, it is possible that some of our
410 participants were imagining a truly diagnostic test that could determine exposures and
411 health risks with certainty instead of a test that could identify probabilistic risk. Given our
412 interviewees' focus on the potential to receive individual results, research in this area
413 should be careful to avoid therapeutic misconception. Finally, like all qualitative
414 research, our findings are not meant to be generalizable, but rather transferable to
415 similar contexts.²⁸ The participants in this study were all users of the Veterans Health
416 Administration (VHA) and had participated in an established registry examination;
417 approximately half of all living Veterans have ever used VHA services and a smaller
418 fraction of eligible Veterans participate in these registries.

419 Given the recent investments via the PACT Act in addressing toxic exposures
420 experienced during military service, there is great interest in research that could identify
421 biomarkers associated with exposures and resulting health impacts. Our qualitative
422 study demonstrates that Veterans who have experienced potentially toxic exposures
423 during their military service are generally positive toward research on epigenomic
424 biomarkers for exposures, especially if their concerns about unintended consequences
425 can be addressed. These findings can be used to design research studies that anticipate
426 the hopes and concerns of Veterans who may be asked to participate in such research,
427 which can reduce barriers to enrollment, but also help set realistic expectations for
428 participating.

429

430 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

431 We thank Asha Richards and Saurendro Ghosh for their research assistance on this
432 project.

433

434 FUNDING

435 Funding for this research was provided by the Gulf Coast Center for Precision
436 Environmental Health (NIH P30 ES030285) through a National Institute of Environmental
437 Health Sciences Center Pilot Project grant. This research was also supported in part by
438 the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Health
439 Services Research and Development Services at the Center for Innovations in Quality,
440 Effectiveness and Safety (IQuES; CIN 13–413), Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical
441 Center, Houston, TX.

442

443 **References**

- 444 1. Kang HK, Dalager NA, Needham LL, et al. Health status of Army Chemical Corps
445 Vietnam veterans who sprayed defoliant in Vietnam [published correction
446 appears in *Am J Ind Med.* 2018 Apr;61(4):358]. *Am J Ind Med.* 2006;49(11):875-
447 884. doi:10.1002/ajim.20385 PMID: 17006952
- 448 2. White RF, Steele L, O'Callaghan JP, et al. Recent research on Gulf War illness
449 and other health problems in veterans of the 1991 Gulf War: Effects of toxicant
450 exposures during deployment. *Cortex.* 2016;74:449-475.
451 doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2015.08.022 PMID: 26493934
- 452 3. Olsen T, Caruana D, Cheslack-Postava K, et al. Iraq/Afghanistan war lung injury
453 reflects burn pits exposure [published correction appears in *Sci Rep.* 2022 Dec
454 22;12(1):22136]. *Sci Rep.* 2022;12(1):14671. Published 2022 Aug 29.
455 doi:10.1038/s41598-022-18252-2 PMID: 36038588
- 456 4. Soubry A, Hoyo C, Jirtle RL, Murphy SK. A paternal environmental legacy:
457 evidence for epigenetic inheritance through the male germ line. *Bioessays.*
458 2014;36(4):359-371. doi:10.1002/bies.201300113 PMID: 24431278
- 459 5. Martin EM, Fry RC. Environmental Influences on the Epigenome: Exposure-
460 Associated DNA Methylation in Human Populations. *Annu Rev Public Health.*
461 2018;39:309-333. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-014629 PMID:
462 29328878
- 463 6. Friedman A, Janulewicz Lloyd PA, Carlson J, et al. Preliminary Findings from the
464 Gulf War Women's Cohort: Reproductive and Children's Health Outcomes
465 among Women Veterans. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19(14):8483.
466 Published 2022 Jul 11. doi:10.3390/ijerph19148483 PMID: 35886335
- 467 7. Dupras C, Knoppers T, Palmour N, et al. Researcher perspectives on ethics
468 considerations in epigenetics: an international survey. *Clin Epigenetics.* 2022;14(1):110.
469 Published 2022 Sep 2. doi:10.1186/s13148-022-01322-7 PMID: 36056446
- 470 8. Kamińska K, Nalejska E, Kubiak M, et al. Prognostic and Predictive Epigenetic
471 Biomarkers in Oncology. *Mol Diagn Ther.* 2019;23(1):83-95. doi:10.1007/s40291-
472 018-0371-7 PMID: 30523565
- 473 9. García-Giménez JL, Seco-Cervera M, Tollefsbol TO, et al. Epigenetic
474 biomarkers: Current strategies and future challenges for their use in the clinical
475 laboratory. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.* 2017;54(7-8):529-550.
476 doi:10.1080/10408363.2017.1410520 PMID: 29226748
- 477 10. Santaló J, Berdasco M. Ethical implications of epigenetics in the era of
478 personalized medicine. *Clin Epigenetics.* 2022;14(1):44. Published 2022 Mar 25.
479 doi:10.1186/s13148-022-01263-1 PMID: 35337378
- 480 11. Dyke SOM, Saulnier KM, Dupras C, et al. Points-to-consider on the return of
481 results in epigenetic research. *Genome Med.* 2019;11(1):31. Published 2019
482 May 23. doi:10.1186/s13073-019-0646-6 PMID: 31122281
- 483 12. Hillyer GC, Park YA, Rosenberg TH, Mundi P, Patel I, Bates SE. Positive
484 attitudes toward clinical trials among military veterans leaves unanswered
485 questions about poor trial accrual. *Semin Oncol.* 2021;48(2):130-140.
486 doi:10.1053/j.seminoncol.2021.04.001 PMID: 34088517
- 487 13. Littman AJ, True G, Ashmore E, Wellens T, Smith NL. How can we get Iraq- and
488 Afghanistan-deployed US Veterans to participate in health-related research?

- 489 Findings from a national focus group study. *BMC Med Res Methodol*.
490 2018;18(1):88. Published 2018 Aug 29. doi:10.1186/s12874-018-0546-2 PMID:
491 30157766
- 492 14. Kaufman D, Murphy J, Erby L, Hudson K, Scott J. Veterans' attitudes regarding a
493 database for genomic research. *Genet Med*. 2009;11(5):329-337.
494 doi:10.1097/GIM.0b013e31819994f8 PMID: 19346960
- 495 15. Arar N, Seo J, Lee S, et al. Preferences regarding genetic research results:
496 comparing veterans and nonveterans responses. *Public Health Genomics*.
497 2010;13(7-8):431-439. doi:10.1159/000317099 PMID: 20829581
- 498 16. Lynch F, Lewis S, Macciocca I, Craig JM. Public knowledge and opinion of
499 epigenetics and epigenetic concepts. *J Dev Orig Health Dis*. 2022;13(4):431-440.
500 doi:10.1017/S2040174421000520 PMID: 34503601
- 501 17. U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs. Environmental Health Registry Evaluation for
502 Veterans. U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs. Accessed December 14, 2023.
503 <https://www.publichealth.va.gov/exposures/benefits/registry-evaluation.asp>
- 504 18. Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T, et al. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its
505 conceptualization and operationalization. *Qual Quant*. 2018;52(4):1893-1907.
506 doi:10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8 PMID: 29937585
- 507 19. Bernard HR. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative*
508 *Approaches*. Rowman Altamira; 2011.
- 509 20. Schilling J. On the pragmatics of qualitative assessment: designing the process
510 for content analysis. *Eur J Psychol Assess*. 2006;22(1):28–37.
- 511 21. Lent MR, Hoffman SN, Kirchner HL, Urosevich TG, Boscarino JJ, Boscarino JA.
512 Attitudes about Future Genetic Testing for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and
513 Addiction among Community-Based Veterans. *Front Psychiatry*. 2017;8:76.
514 Published 2017 May 15. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2017.00076 PMID: 28555114
- 515 22. Grewe ME, Khalil L, Felder K, et al. Gulf War Era Veterans' perspectives on
516 research: a qualitative study. *Life Sci*. 2021;287:120113.
517 doi:10.1016/j.lfs.2021.120113 PMID: 34728229
- 518 23. Rew L, Kaur M, McMillan A, Mackert M, Bonevac D. Systematic review of psychosocial
519 benefits and harms of genetic testing. *Issues Ment Health Nurs*. 2010;31(10):631-645.
520 doi:10.3109/01612840.2010.510618 PMID: 20854036
- 521 24. Roberts JS, Ostergren J. Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing and Personal
522 Genomics Services: A Review of Recent Empirical Studies. *Curr Genet Med*
523 *Rep*. 2013;1(3):182-200. doi:10.1007/s40142-013-0018-2 PMID: 24058877
- 524 25. Parens E, Appelbaum PS. On What We Have Learned and Still Need to Learn
525 about the Psychosocial Impacts of Genetic Testing. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 2019;49
526 *Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S2-S9*. doi:10.1002/hast.1011 PMID: 31268574
- 527 26. Robinson JO, Wynn J, Biesecker B, et al. Psychological outcomes related to
528 exome and genome sequencing result disclosure: a meta-analysis of seven
529 Clinical Sequencing Exploratory Research (CSER) Consortium studies. *Genet*
530 *Med*. 2019;21(12):2781-2790. doi:10.1038/s41436-019-0565-3 PMID: 31189963
- 531 27. Crozier S, Robertson N, Dale M. The psychological impact of predictive genetic
532 testing for Huntington's disease: a systematic review of the literature. *J Genet*
533 *Couns*. 2015;24(1):29-39. doi:10.1007/s10897-014-9755-y PMID: 25236481

534 28. Firestone, W. A. Alternative Arguments for Generalizing From Data as Applied to
535 Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher*. 1993; 22(4), 16–23.
536 <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X022004016>

537

Table 1. Participant Characteristics by military cohort/registry participation.

	Agent Orange (n=8)	Gulf War (n=7)	Airborne Hazards & Open Burn Pit (n=7)	Overall (n=22)
Age (years)	70.4 ± 7.3	55.6 ± 7.4	43 ± 7.8	55.7±13.5
Gender				
Male	8 (100%)	6 (86%)	6 (86%)	20 (91%)
Female	0	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	2 (9%)
Race/Ethnicity				
White	5 (63%)	3 (43%)	6 (86%)	14 (64%)
Black or African American	3 (37%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	7 (32%)
Multiple	0	1 (14%)	0	1 (4%)
Education				
High School	3 (37%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	8 (36%)
Some College	1 (13%)	4 (57%)	0	5 (23%)
Bachelor's Degree or Higher	4 (50%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	9 (41%)
Biological Children				
Yes	8 (100%)	6 (86%)	7 (100%)	21 (96%)
No	0	1 (14%)	0	1 (4%)
Grandchildren				
Yes	3 (37%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	6 (27%)
No	5 (63%)	6 (86%)	5 (71%)	16 (73%)