

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Perceptions of genomic newborn screening among medical students

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2024-089108
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-May-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Seed, Lydia; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department; University of Cambridge, School of Clinical Medicine Scott, Anna; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department; University of Southampton, School of Medicine Pichini, Amanda; Genomics England Limited Peter, Michelle; Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, NHS North Thames Genomic Laboratory Hub; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Genetics and Genomic Medicine Tadros, Shereen; Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, North East Thames Regional Genetics Service; University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Sortica da Costa, Cristine; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department; Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Hill, Melissa; Great Ormond Street Hospital For Children NHS Foundation Trust, North Thames Regional Genetics Service; UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health Library, Genetic and Genomic Medicine
Keywords:	GENETICS, PUBLIC HEALTH, PAEDIATRICS, NEONATOLOGY





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



Perceptions of genomic newborn screening among medical students

Lydia Seed^{1,2,3}, Anna Scott^{1,2,4}, Amanda Pichini⁵, Michelle Peter^{6,7}, Shereen Tadros^{8,9,10}, Cristine Sortica da Costa^{1,2,11}, Melissa Hill^{6,7}

1. Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK

2. Postgraduate Medical Education (PGME) Department, Great Ormond Street Hospital for

Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

3. School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

4. School of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

5. Genomics England, London, UK

6. NHS North Thames Genomic Laboratory Hub, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children

NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

7. Genetics and Genomic Medicine, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health,

London, UK

8. North East Thames Regional Genetics Service, Great Ormond Street Hospital, London UK

9. North Thames Genomic Medicine Service Alliance, London, UK

10. University College London Hospital NHS Trust, London, UK

11. Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS

Foundation Trust, London, UK

* Joint principal investigators

Conflict of interest: AP is an employee of Genomics England, a company wholly owned by the United Kingdom Department of Health and Social Care and funded to deliver the Generation Study.

Acknowledgements:

We are very grateful to all of the medical students who took part in the survey. Thank you to Marissa Willock, Postgraduate Medical Education Department at Great Ormond Street Hospital for supporting medical student research and facilitating medical students to join research placements at Great Ormond Street Hospital. MP and MH are partially funded by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Great Ormond Street Hospital. All research at Great Ormond Street Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health is made possible by the NIHR Great Ormond Street Hospital Biomedical Research Centre. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS ,the NIHR, or the UK Department of Health.

Abstract

Background

With the potential to identify a vast number of rare diseases soon after birth, genomic newborn screening (gNBS) could facilitate earlier interventions and improve health outcomes. Designing a gNBS programme will involve balancing stakeholders' opinions and addressing concerns. The views of medical students – future clinicians who would deliver gNBS – have not yet been explored.

Methods

We conducted a nationwide survey of UK medical students, using multiple-choice and free-text questions.

Results

In total, 116 medical students across 16 universities participated. Overall, 45% supported gNBS, with a positively skewed mean support score of 3.24, and 55% felt it relevant to their future practice. Almost all agreed that infant-onset and childhood-onset diseases and conditions with effective treatments should be included. Most felt that earlier interventions and personalised care would be the most important benefit of gNBS. Others included earlier diagnoses, diagnosing more patients, and enabling research for new treatments. However, several challenges were highlighted: risk of genomic discrimination, incidental or uncertain findings, data security, and breaching children's future autonomy. Students expressed conflicting opinions on the psychological impact on families, but most were concerned about a lack of support due to current resource limitations in health services. Students frequently reported having insufficient knowledge to form an opinion, which may reflect gaps in genomics education at medical school and the current lack of evidence base for gNBS.

Conclusion

Although some support for gNBS was demonstrated, ethicolegal and social challenges were raised, emphasising a need for ongoing discussions about the implications of gNBS.

 Keywords: newborn screening, whole genome sequencing, rare diseases, public health, ethics, medical students

to occurrence of the second

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Summary box

What is already known on this topic

Genomic newborn screening (gNBS) could identify a large number of rare diseases soon after birth, facilitating earlier interventions and improving health outcomes. Large-scale research studies employing gNBS are currently underway. The public, parents and healthcare professionals are generally supportive of gNBS, but each group of stakeholders has raised important and different concerns.

What this study adds

Medical students expressed some support for gNBS, identified many potential benefits of gNBS and think it will be relevant to their future practice. However, among other ethicolegal challenges, they were particularly concerned about the current lack of resources in the NHS to support families and the risk of potential future genomic discrimination.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy

The views of medical students – future doctors who would deliver a gNBS programme – that have been expressed in this study are important to consider when designing future policy around the implementation of gNBS. Many medical students expressed a lack of knowledge to form an opinion on several aspects surrounding gNBS, which emphasises both the importance of robust genomics education at medical school, to equip future doctors with the relevant skills to practice genomic medicine, as well as the importance of ongoing large-scale research studies to generate evidence that can inform opinions and future policy.

Introduction

The aim of newborn screening is to identify infants with an inherited or congenital condition before symptoms manifest and enable earlier management, improving health outcomes and quality of life for patients and families. Newborn screening typically includes a blood spot test that screens for a small number of rare conditions in which early identification and treatment have proven to be beneficial (1). The conditions screened vary between countries – several US states screen for over 50 conditions (2), numerous countries in the European Union screen for around 30 (3), whereas the UK screens for only nine (1). Over the last decade, healthcare professionals (HCPs) and members of the rare disease community have been calling for newborn screening programmes to expand (4).

As the cost of DNA sequencing has fallen and the diagnostic power of whole genome sequencing (WGS) in rare disease has been demonstrated in recent years (5), interest in employing genomic newborn screening (gNBS) has grown. With the potential to identify a vast number of rare diseases soon after birth, gNBS could facilitate earlier intervention and improve health outcomes in a larger number of cases than current newborn screening programmes and may ultimately alleviate the significant population health and economic burdens rare diseases exert collectively (6). Indeed, the first research studies employing gNBS have already been performed in several high-income countries – the BabySeq project in the US and Baby Beyond Hearing project in Australia have both utilised exome sequencing (7, 8). Other large-scale gNBS projects are being launched worldwide (9), including the UK-based Generation Study, which aims to perform WGS for 100,000 newborns (10).

In addition to demonstrating clinical benefits, an effective screening programme hinges on its acceptability to a range of stakeholders, including parents, the public and HCPs (11); designing an effective gNBS programme will involve balancing stakeholders' views and addressing their concerns (12). A public dialogue commissioned by the UK National Screening Committee, Genomics England and the UK Research and Innovation's Sciencewise programme recently found high levels of support

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Page 8 of 37

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

among the public on the use of WGS in routine newborn screening (13). Parents and expectant parents in North America and Australia have also expressed support for gNBS, particularly regarding receiving information on actionable childhood conditions (14-19), whereas HCPs tend to be more reserved in their support for gNBS compared to parents. Parents have raised concerns regarding the accuracy of results, the need for accessible information for them to make informed decisions (16, 17), and the importance of extensive consent processes (19). HCPs have expressed ethicolegal concerns surrounding genetic discrimination and preserving children's autonomy (14), as well as practical concerns like data privacy and storage costs, the burden of variants of uncertain significance and diseases with variable penetrance (12). In addition, there is a lack of consensus among both parents and HCPs on which conditions should be included in gNBS (12). These concerns and associated differences in support for gNBS emphasise the need to generate high-quality evidence in large-scale research studies, as well as for continued discussions with diverse stakeholders, to inform public health decisions regarding implementation of a gNBS programme (9).

One stakeholder group whose opinions on gNBS have not yet been explored is medical students, who will constitute the future medical workforce that may deliver gNBS as part of standard care. Here, we aim to explore the opinions of UK medical students on the proposed use of WGS in newborn screening.

Methods

We conducted a cross-sectional survey study, targeting UK medical students in the final two years of study.

Survey design

The survey design has previously been reported (20). In brief, the survey was developed by a multidisciplinary research group (comprising medical students, a social scientist, a clinical geneticist and a neonatologist), reviewed by the Clinical Director of Health Education England's Genomics

Survey dissemination

BMJ Open

Education Programme and the Clinical Lead for Genetic Counselling at Genomics England, and piloted through ten cognitive 'Think Aloud' interviews (21). Patients or the public were not involved in the design of this study.

The final survey was organised into three sections: Demographic information, genomics educational experience and knowledge, and views on newborn screening programmes (Supplementary Material 1). Findings from the genomics educational experience and knowledge section are published elsewhere (20). The newborn screening programme section consisted of 43 questions. Participants were first asked whether they were aware of the proposed study employing WGS in newborn screening (Generation Study). Using 5-point Likert scales, participants were asked to rate: their level of agreement with ten statements about newborn screening (ranging from "Completely disagree" (1) to "Completely agree" (4) with an option of "Not enough knowledge"); whether six categories of diseases should be included in gNBS (ranging from "Completely disagree" (1), "Neutral" (3) to "Completely agree" (5)); and the importance of seven potential benefits and ten potential drawbacks of gNBS (ranging from "Not important" (1) to "Very important" (5)). Participants were also asked to identify the most important potential benefit and drawback from the list of options and had the opportunity to provide free-text responses to describe any additional potential benefits or drawbacks. In a multiple-choice question where participants could tick all options that applied and leave a freetext response, they were asked which groups of people should have access to the raw data generated by gNBS. Using visual analogue scales, participants were asked whether overall they supported the introduction of WGS into newborn screening and how relevant they thought a potential gNBS programme would be to their future medical practice. Participants were given the opportunity to leave a free-text response explaining their answer to these questions or to leave any final thoughts on the subject.

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

The survey was hosted on the web-based platform, REDCap (22, 23). Invitations to complete the survey via an anonymous link were emailed to all UK medical schools on 14th November 2022 and the Medical Schools Council disseminated the survey on 6th January 2023. The survey was also shared via the Great Ormond Street Hospital Postgraduate Medical Education Department's social media platform and the mailing lists of several university paediatrics societies. The survey was closed on 24th February 2023.

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed in RStudio (24). The responses from the 5-point rating scales were combined into "Disagree" or "Not important" (1-2) and "Important" or "Agree" (3-4 or 4-5). All responses to free text questions were aggregated and analysed collectively. Common themes within the text were identified and coded in an iterative process using summative thematic analysis (25). Exemplar quotes for the identified themes are reported.

Ethical approval

Approval was obtained from UCL Research Ethics Committee [Project ID: 23129.001] and the Clinical Research Adoptions Committee, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health.

Results

Participant characteristics

A total of 116 complete responses, 75 of which included responses to free-text questions, were received from medical students at 16 different UK medical schools, the demographic details of which are given in Table 1. Only 16% (n = 18) of students were aware of the proposed newborn WGS study (Generation Study) prior to participating in this study.

Page 11 of 37

BMJ Open

Characteristic	N = 116
Gender	
Female	73 (63%)
Male	38 (33%)
Non-binary	4 (3%)
Prefer not to say	1 (1%)
Age	
21-25	94 (81%)
Over 25	22 (19%)
Expected graduation year	Q.
2023	42 (36%)
2024	74 (64%)
Additional genomics experience	(
Yes	46 (40%)
Intercalation	31
Student selected component	9
Project	10
No	70 (60%)

 Table 1. Participant characteristics.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Opinions on newborn screening

Just over half (54%) did not think the current newborn blood spot screening programme was sufficient to detect all early-onset childhood conditions that medical professionals need to know about, and even more (81%) agreed that the introduction of gNBS could identify important conditions that the current screening programme does not (Figure 1). However, while 77% of respondents agreed that gNBS could be reassuring for parents, 86% thought that it could increase unnecessary anxiety among new parents regarding their child's health. Approximately one-third (34%) of participants agreed with the statement that gNBS "would cause more harm than good".

Figure 1. Distribution of medical students' level of agreement with statements about newborn screening.

Scope of gNBS and data access

The majority of participants agreed that diseases that typically manifest during the first year of life (94%) or in childhood (86%) should be included in gNBS; diseases with later onset garnered less support (Figure 2a). The availability of effective treatments for a disease also influenced support for inclusion - almost all participants (95%) agreed that diseases for which there is an effective treatment available should be included, whereas only 42% supported the inclusion of diseases for which treatment is limited and supportive care is the primary option.

Most respondents thought that clinicians directly involved in the patient's care (97%) should have access to data generated from gNBS (Figure 2b). Three-quarters of participants (75%) thought that NHS-affiliated research groups should have data access, compared to only 18% who thought that the data should be made available to external research groups, such as those affiliated with pharmaceutical companies (Figure 2b).

Potential benefits and drawbacks of gNBS

Nearly all respondents agreed that being able to diagnose conditions earlier (95%) and to provide earlier interventions and personalised care (95%) were important potential benefits of gNBS (Figure 3a), with 70% of participants identifying the latter as the most important potential benefit (Figure 3b). Being able to diagnose more patients (84%) and facilitating research into new treatments (89%) were also seen as important potential benefits by most (Figure 3a). In contrast, only 20% regarded the ability to create a lifetime genomic record for patients important (Figure 3a).

The free-text responses relating to the additional potential benefits of gNBS fell under four subthemes (Table 2). Several participants noted opportunities for basic research in genetic disease, with one participant commenting that performing research with gNBS data may provide a *"greater understanding of pathogenesis of diseases, not just about treatment"* (Participant 102). Benefits for the family unit were also identified – parental acceptance of diagnosis and providing important information for allowing family planning decisions.

The vast majority of respondents felt the lack of resources in the NHS to support families (94%) and the potential for future discrimination based on genomic information (93%) were important potential drawbacks of gNBS (Figure 3c). Almost one-third (30%) of participants identified the latter as the most important potential drawback (Figure 3d), and this concern was echoed in the free-text responses where many respondents described concerns of potential discrimination. A large proportion of

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

respondents also found the risk of incidental or uncertain findings (87%) and the risk of false reassurance (70%) "important" potential drawbacks.

Many respondents expressed apprehension surrounding the privacy and security of genomic data - *"information from WGS has the potential to end up in unintended places. That risk is worth avoiding in the first place"* (Participant 20) and *"The risk of a security breach is too high"* (Participant 45) – and 85% rated it an "important" potential drawback of gNBS (Figure 3c).

Despite nearly half (47%) rating the potential for gNBS to interfere with the early bonding process as "not important", over three-quarters (78%) felt the emotional impact on parents/carers in receiving an early genetic diagnosis in a child who otherwise appears healthy was an important concern (Figure 3c). Themes surrounding the negative psychological impact on both the parents and the child frequently emerged in free-text responses, with participants raising concerns that the impact on the parent-infant relationship may be so significant as to result in parental neglect (Table 2).

Parents consenting to WGS on behalf of their newborn was seen as an important drawback by 69% of participants. Qualitative responses falling under the theme of removal of patient autonomy (Table 2) argued that gNBS constitutes "a breach of the child's future autonomy... there is potential to do psychological and autonomous harm" (Participant 76).

Figure 3. Importance ratings for potential benefits (a) and drawbacks (c) of a gNBS programme and medical students' perception of the single most important benefit (b) and drawback (d) of a gNBS programme.

Themes	Illustrative quotations
Potential benefits of gNBS	
Greater opportunities for	"Enables more research to take place and hopefully allows futur
basic research into genetic	<i>treatment to be discovered."</i> (Participant 5)
diseases	
Parental acceptance of	"As someone affected by this, it allows better preparation for 'shock
diagnosis	diagnosis." (Participant 110)
Earlier support	"Allows for personalisation of care from the very beginning, and wi
	allow patient to concentrate more on prophylaxis." (Participant 63)
Allowing for family planning	"Can promote genetic testing in parents if a pathogenic copy is foun
	as it affects family planning." (Participant 31)
Potential drawbacks of gNBS	
Negative psychological	<i>"It could ruin parents time with their baby before the disease sets in.</i>
impact on the parents	(Participant 2)
	<i>"I do not see the point in screening for conditions you cannot help, a</i>
	all it would add is extra anxiety to the family." (Participant 61)
Negative psychological	<i>"I think it would change the way children will view themselves in th</i>
impact on the child as they	future." (Participant 103)
age	

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

2
3
1
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
21
24
25
26
27
28
29
20
20
31
32
33
34
35
36
27
57
38
39
40
41
42
43
11
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
57
58
59

60

	"I can see a world in which patients develop complexes over their
	WGS results and obsess over them throughout their lives."
	(Participant 104)
Risk of parental neglect	"Parents might be otherwise dismayed at their child's diagnosis and
	so provide substandard parental care" (Participant 65)
	"My major concern would be that parents may not always have their
0	child's best interests at heart or may reject the child at finding a
	<i>clinically insignificant genetic abnormality."</i> (Participant 56)
Removal of the child's	"Not something for your parents to decide for you as a newborn.
autonomy	Once sequenced there is no going back." (Participant 103)
	"They will have this information burdened on them for the rest of
	their life and it needs to be the individual child's choice." (Participant
	2)
Use of data for monetary	"The data would be so valuable that it would be a prime target for
gain	cyberattacks." (Participant 38)
Over-medicalisation of	"This is unnecessary over-medicalisation and intervention where
children	there needn't be." (Participant 103)
Concerns that the current	"With current NHS wait times and lack of support it would create
NHS could not support	more problems than it would solve." (Participant 95)
families	

Table 2. Themes identified in qualitative responses to questions regarding gNBS. Participants were asked to describe potential benefits and drawbacks, in addition to those that had been explicitly asked about elsewhere in the survey which are not included here.

Overall gNBS support and relevance to future practice

Overall, 45% supported the introduction of gNBS to the current newborn screening programme and the distribution of support scores was skewed to the right, with a mean score of 3.24 (SD 1.26, range: 1.0-5.0) (Supplementary Figure). Many participants reported that they were unable to reach a conclusion about supporting gNBS because of a lack of knowledge, with one participant writing *"I do not have enough information about this to decide whether or not I would support"* (Participant 10). Just over half (55%) felt that gNBS will be relevant to their future medical practice, with a mean overall rating of 3.7 (SD 2.87, range: 1.0-5.0). The median rating was 4.0, which was selected by 20% of participants, and 35% selected the maximum relevance rating of 5.0 (Supplementary Figure).

Discussion

This study provides the first insight into UK medical students' attitudes towards gNBS. Medical students were positive about the potential benefits of gNBS, but also raised concerns. Overall, just under half explicitly supported its introduction to newborn screening and just over half felt it will be relevant to their future practice. This echoes the general cautious stance of HCPs (14, 26-28) – a recent study of Australian HCPs revealed that although most had reservations about the use of gNBS currently, the majority foresee its use by 2026 (19), and US doctors also expect gNBS to be more useful 5 years from now (14). Some of the ambivalence towards gNBS expressed by medical students herein may be explained by a lack of knowledge – many students indicated that they did not have enough knowledge to decide whether they agreed with various statements about gNBS and this issue was raised by several students in their free-text responses qualifying their level of gNBS support (Figure 1).

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

This may be a reflection of the low levels of confidence in genomics knowledge that was also revealed among these participants, where we concluded that robust genomics education through undergraduate medical curricula is necessary to equip the future workforce to deliver genomic medicine (20). The medical students' apprehension may also be borne out of the lack of evidence currently available about the clinical benefits of gNBS, as large-scale research evaluating gNBS is in its infancy. This emphasises the importance of the large prospective gNBS studies that are launching across Europe, North America and Australia to generate robust evidence that can inform decisions regarding implementation of gNBS programmes in the near future (9).

The most important benefits purported by medical students were its potential to facilitate earlier diagnoses and interventions in more patients, with 82% agreeing that gNBS would speed up diagnoses. Similar views were shared by numerous participants in a recent qualitative study of Australian HCPs with clinical or policy experience in newborn screening or genomic sequencing (28). Furthermore, most students felt that current newborn screening is insufficient at detecting clinically important, early-onset childhood conditions and even more agreed that gNBS could deliver where current screening does not. Although numbers with a diagnosis were small, the results from the US BabySeq project, a randomised study that tested for around 1,000 childhood-onset conditions and 5 adult-onset cancer predisposition syndromes, support this view (29). Of the 15 infants that were identified as at-risk of childhood-onset disease and the 3 at-risk of adult-onset disease, only 2 infants were diagnosed through standard newborn screening and not exome sequencing, whereas 15 infants were diagnosed through exome sequencing and not standard newborn screening, thus demonstrating the potential value of gNBS (30).

Despite expressing some support for gNBS, medical students revealed several concerns consistent with those reported among HCPs and parents in the literature: privacy and data security; uncertainty of results and incidental findings; and discrimination on the basis of genomic information (14, 15, 17,

BMJ Open

19, 28). In the free-text responses, medical students frequently elaborated their concerns around security of genomic data, and Cao *et al.* reported HCPs frequently sharing anecdotes of parental concerns about storage of dried bloodspot cards that they anticipate will increase with storage of genomic data (28). Indeed, 13% of parents who declined recruitment into the BabySeq project did so due to concerns of privacy and discrimination (31). This indicates a level of distrust in the institutions responsible for protecting genomic data from unauthorised access that is consistent among medical students, HCPs and parents across different countries with different healthcare systems that needs addressing. Furthermore, with almost one-third of medical students identifying the risk of genomic discrimination as the most important potential drawback, robust international legislation to safeguard against the misuse of genetic information is required, as recently highlighted by HCPs (19), for the future implementation of any screening programme employing genomic sequencing modalities.

Medical students expressed conflicting views on the psychological impact of an early diagnosis on the family, and this theme frequently emerged in free-text responses. Over three-quarters of medical students felt that gNBS could be reassuring, a view shared by parents in another study (16). However, over three-quarters of medical students were also concerned about the emotional impact on parents receiving an early diagnosis in a child who otherwise appears healthy and felt that gNBS could increase unnecessary anxiety. Many shared concerns pertaining to the impact on the parent-infant relationship and risk of parental neglect or abandonment. Potential for psychological distress is a frequently raised concern around gNBS among HCPs and parents in the literature (14) – in a recent survey, Slovenian peripartum mothers shared that their attitude towards their family and their relationship with their partner would suffer if they knew their child was a carrier of an incurable genetic condition (32). However, evidence from two of the few studies that have employed gNBS to date suggests these concerns may not materialise among those who are willing to undergo gNBS – the BabySeq Project reported no persistent negative psychosocial effects among families who received gNBS (33), and the Baby Beyond Hearing Project found no evidence that offering different levels of genomic information

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> to parents has a negative psychological impact (8). Further evaluation in larger prospective studies, involving a diverse population of parents from a range of backgrounds and who receive a range of different results, are warranted to better elucidate the psychosocial impact of gNBS. Of note, the UK public dialogue found support for gNBS, provided that mental health services are available to provide emotional and psychological support for those who receive a diagnosis (13). With almost all medical students in our study highlighting the current lack of resources in the NHS to support families as an important potential drawback of gNBS, this is a very important consideration that needs to be addressed with multi-disciplinary input in the design of possible future services.

> There is currently no consensus in the literature on the scope of conditions to be tested for using gNBS. The vast majority of medical students supported screening for childhood-onset conditions, as do most HCPs and parents in recent studies (15, 16, 18, 19, 28). Consistent with the views of HCPs (19), few medical students supported screening for adult-onset conditions, unlike those of most parents who have still supported screening for such conditions (15). Much like HCPs in recent studies (14, 19), many medical students raised concerns about gNBS breaching the child's future autonomy to decide whether this information is wanted as an adult and most saw parents consenting to WGS on behalf of their newborn as an important potential drawback of gNBS. Indeed, to mitigate some of these risks, it has been proposed that gNBS warrants a more extensive consent process compared to current newborn screening programmes (19, 26), and parents have raised concerns about receiving accessible information to make an informed decision (16). However, this consideration will need to be balanced with the availability and associated financial costs of providing the trained professionals required to perform this at scale (15, 19, 34), which may limit the screening programme's efficiency, and with the risk of reducing participation rates (31), which may compromise the screening programme's effectiveness. Digital decision aids may alleviate some of this additional workload without compromising quality or worsening existing disparities (35) and a tablet-based decision aid was

BMJ Open

implemented in the recent North Carolina Newborn Exome Sequencing for Universal Screening randomised control trial and will be evaluated soon (36, 37).

Furthermore, contrary to most parents in several recent studies who also supported screening for conditions that cannot be prevented, treated or cured (15, 16, 18), fewer than half of the medical students in this study supported screening for conditions with only supportive care options. The interplay of age of onset with actionability appears to determine HCPs' opinions - 68% supported screening for childhood-onset non-actionable conditions compared to 31% for adult-onset nonactionable conditions in a recent study (19). Screening for conditions with limited actionability presents a potential conflict with one of Wilson & Junger's classical principles for population screening - an accepted treatment should be available for a condition screened (11). 'Treatment' in the context of monogenic conditions can include a wide range of interventions, beyond direct management of the condition in the index patient. This was exemplified in Green et al's analysis of the actionability of pathogenic and likely pathogenic variants identified in the BabySeq project – identification of these variants directly prompted a specialty referral, surveillance or treatment in two-thirds of infants and their first-degree family members (38). Indeed, frameworks for evaluating genomic testing in population screening, based on modified Wilson and Junger criteria, have been developed to guide the development of such programmes (34, 39-41). Continual assessment in the context of the availability and accessibility of healthcare in the country implementing gNBS will be required, especially as targeted treatments for rare diseases advance.

Our results should be regarded within the limitations of this study. With two-fifths of respondents having additional genomics experience beyond the core undergraduate medical curriculum, the demographics of participants may not be representative of the UK medical student population and those with more experience in the field may have a greater awareness of some of the complex issues surrounding gNBS. The design of this study is also a limitation – even with free-text response

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

> questions, it was not possible to comprehensively capture all nuances to medical students' views or explore reasons that inform such views in an online survey. Future research could consider qualitative interviews to gather a more in-depth understanding of medical students' views.

> As future clinicians, medical students' views on gNBS are important to inform the future design of such programmes. This is the first study to explore medical students' opinions on gNBS. Students expressed positive views on gNBS, emphasising its potential to facilitate faster diagnoses and treatments in more patients. However, important ethical, legal and social challenges were raised, namely data security, uncertainty of results, genomic discrimination and the psychological impact on families, as echoed by HCPs in the literature. Medical students also highlighted a lack of knowledge to form opinions on various aspects of gNBS, emphasising the need for sufficient education on genomics during medical school as well as good quality evidence from large prospective gNBS studies that are currently reliez oni underway.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

References

1.	NHS.	Newborn	screening	2021	[Available	from:
<u>https</u>	://www.nhs	.uk/conditions/bab	y/newborn-screen	ing/overview	<u>v/</u> .	

2. Botkin JR, Lewis MH, Watson MS, Swoboda KJ, Anderson R, Berry SA, et al. Parental permission for pilot newborn screening research: guidelines from the NBSTRN. Pediatrics. 2014;133(2):e410-7.

3. Loeber JG, Burgard P, Cornel MC, Rigter T, Weinreich SS, Rupp K, et al. Newborn screening programmes in Europe; arguments and efforts regarding harmonization. Part 1. From blood spot to screening result. J Inherit Metab Dis. 2012;35(4):603-11.

4. UK GA. Fixing the present, building for the future: Newborn screening for rare conditions. 49-51 East Road

London

N1 6AH; 2019.

5. Smedley D, Smith KR, Martin A, Thomas EA, McDonagh EM, Cipriani V, et al. 100,000 Genomes Pilot on Rare-Disease Diagnosis in Health Care - Preliminary Report. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(20):1868-80.

6. Gonzaludo N, Belmont JW, Gainullin VG, Taft RJ. Estimating the burden and economic impact of pediatric genetic disease. Genet Med. 2019;21(8):1781-9.

7. Holm IA, Agrawal PB, Ceyhan-Birsoy O, Christensen KD, Fayer S, Frankel LA, et al. The BabySeq project: implementing genomic sequencing in newborns. BMC Pediatr. 2018;18(1):225.

8. Downie L, Halliday J, Lewis S, Lunke S, Lynch E, Martyn M, et al. Exome sequencing in newborns with congenital deafness as a model for genomic newborn screening: the Baby Beyond Hearing project. Genet Med. 2020;22(5):937-44.

9. Stark Z, Scott RH. Genomic newborn screening for rare diseases. Nat Rev Genet. 2023;24(11):755-66.

10. Alice Tuff-Lacey HE, Amanda Pichini, David Bick, Dasha Deen, Sally Donovan, Kate Harvey, Dalia Kasperaviciute, Mathilde Leblond, Geraldine Nash, Will Navaie, Aditi Satija, Sally Shillaker, Afshan Siddiq, Katrina Stone, Chantal Wood, Joanna Ziff, Richard H Scott. The Generation Study Protocol. 2023.

11. Wilson JMG JG. Principles and practice of screening for disease. Geneva: WHO; 1968.

12. Downie L, Halliday J, Lewis S, Amor DJ. Principles of Genomic Newborn Screening Programs: A Systematic Review. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(7):e2114336.

13. Hopkins H KS, Evans G. Implications of whole genome sequencing for newborn screening: A public dialogue. 2021.

14. Pereira S, Robinson JO, Gutierrez AM, Petersen DK, Hsu RL, Lee CH, et al. Perceived Benefits, Risks, and Utility of Newborn Genomic Sequencing in the BabySeq Project. Pediatrics. 2019;143(Suppl 1):S6-s13.

15. Armstrong B, Christensen KD, Genetti CA, Parad RB, Robinson JO, Blout Zawatsky CL, et al. Parental Attitudes Toward Standard Newborn Screening and Newborn Genomic Sequencing: Findings From the BabySeq Study. Front Genet. 2022;13:867371.

16. Timmins GT, Wynn J, Saami AM, Espinal A, Chung WK. Diverse Parental Perspectives of the Social and Educational Needs for Expanding Newborn Screening through Genomic Sequencing. Public Health Genomics. 2022:1-8.

17. Wang H, Page R, Lopez D, Arkatkar S, Young C, Martinez D, et al. Pregnant Latinas' views of adopting exome sequencing into newborn screening: A qualitative study. Genet Med. 2022;24(8):1644-52.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

18. Liang NSY, Watts-Dickens A, Chitayat D, Babul-Hirji R, Chakraborty P, Hayeems RZ. Parental Preferences for Expanded Newborn Screening: What Are the Limits? Children (Basel). 2023;10(8).

 BMJ Open

19. White S, Mossfield T, Fleming J, Barlow-Stewart K, Ghedia S, Dickson R, et al. Expanding the Australian Newborn Blood Spot Screening Program using genomic sequencing: do we want it and are we ready? Eur J Hum Genet. 2023;31(6):703-11.

20. Seed L, Scott A, Peter M, Tadros S, Hill M, da Costa CS. Preparing tomorrow's doctors for the genomics era: a nationwide survey of UK medical students. Future Healthcare Journal. 2024:100133.

21. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: an overview of cognitive methods. Qual Life Res. 2003;12(3):229-38.

22. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009;42(2):377-81.

23. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. J Biomed Inform. 2019;95:103208.

24. Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computin. 4.2.3 ed. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2023.

25. Hsieh HF, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qual Health Res. 2005;15(9):1277-88.

26. Ulm E, Feero WG, Dineen R, Charrow J, Wicklund C. Genetics professionals' opinions of whole-genome sequencing in the newborn period. J Genet Couns. 2015;24(3):452-63.

27. Iskrov G, Ivanov S, Wrenn S, Stefanov R. Whole-Genome Sequencing in Newborn Screening-Attitudes and Opinions of Bulgarian Pediatricians and Geneticists. Front Public Health. 2017;5:308.

28. Cao M, Notini L, Ayres S, Vears DF. Australian healthcare professionals' perspectives on the ethical and practical issues associated with genomic newborn screening. J Genet Couns. 2023;32(2):376-86.

29. Ceyhan-Birsoy O, Murry JB, Machini K, Lebo MS, Yu TW, Fayer S, et al. Interpretation of Genomic Sequencing Results in Healthy and Ill Newborns: Results from the BabySeq Project. Am J Hum Genet. 2019;104(1):76-93.

30. Wojcik MH, Zhang T, Ceyhan-Birsoy O, Genetti CA, Lebo MS, Yu TW, et al. Discordant results between conventional newborn screening and genomic sequencing in the BabySeq Project. Genet Med. 2021;23(7):1372-5.

31. Genetti CA, Schwartz TS, Robinson JO, VanNoy GE, Petersen D, Pereira S, et al. Parental interest in genomic sequencing of newborns: enrollment experience from the BabySeq Project. Genet Med. 2019;21(3):622-30.

32. Prosenc B, Cizek Sajko M, Kavsek G, Herzog M, Peterlin B. Perception of genomic newborn screening among peripartum mothers. Eur J Hum Genet. 2024;32(2):163-70.

33. Pereira S, Smith HS, Frankel LA, Christensen KD, Islam R, Robinson JO, et al. Psychosocial Effect of Newborn Genomic Sequencing on Families in the BabySeq Project: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Pediatr. 2021;175(11):1132-41.

34. Andermann A, Blancquaert I, Beauchamp S, Déry V. Revisiting Wilson and Jungner in the genomic age: a review of screening criteria over the past 40 years. Bull World Health Organ. 2008;86(4):317-9.

35. Bombard Y, Hayeems RZ. How digital tools can advance quality and equity in genomic medicine. Nat Rev Genet. 2020;21(9):505-6.

36. Lewis MA, Paquin RS, Roche MI, Furberg RD, Rini C, Berg JS, et al. Supporting Parental Decisions About Genomic Sequencing for Newborn Screening: The NC NEXUS Decision Aid. Pediatrics. 2016;137 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S16-23.

37. Roman TS, Crowley SB, Roche MI, Foreman AKM, O'Daniel JM, Seifert BA, et al. Genomic Sequencing for Newborn Screening: Results of the NC NEXUS Project. Am J Hum Genet. 2020;107(4):596-611.

38. Green RC, Shah N, Genetti CA, Yu T, Zettler B, Uveges MK, et al. Actionability of unanticipated monogenic disease risks in newborn genomic screening: Findings from the BabySeq Project. Am J Hum Genet. 2023;110(7):1034-45.

39. Becker F, van El CG, Ibarreta D, Zika E, Hogarth S, Borry P, et al. Genetic testing and common disorders in a public health framework: how to assess relevance and possibilities. European Journal of Human Genetics. 2011;19(1):S6-S44.

40. Petros M. Revisiting the Wilson-Jungner criteria: how can supplemental criteria guide public health in the era of genetic screening? Genet Med. 2012;14(1):129-34.

41. King JR, Notarangelo LD, Hammarström L. An appraisal of the Wilson & Jungner criteria in the context of genomic-based newborn screening for inborn errors of immunity. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2021;147(2):428-38.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

BMJ Open



Figure 1. Distribution of medical students' level of agreement with statements about newborn screening.

267x161mm (144 x 144 DPI)



BMJ Open



Figure 3. Importance ratings for potential benefits (a) and drawbacks (c) of a gNBS programme and medical students' perception of the single most important benefit (b) and drawback (d) of a gNBS programme.

276x174mm (330 x 330 DPI)

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2024-089108 on 24 September 2024. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 8, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I
 Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .
 Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.
 Page



Supplementary Figure. Overall rating of support for gNBS (a) and its perceived relevance towards

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

future careers (b).

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Newborn WGS Survey

1	
4 5	
6	(
7	-
8	
9	
10	-
11	
12	•
13	1
14	(
16	-
17	
18	
19	(
20	(
21	
22	
25 24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31 32	į
33	
34	_
35	
36	
37	
38	
39 40	,
40 41	
42	i
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48 40	
49 50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	

Please read the following information and complete the survey below.

Consent Form

1

2 2

> This survey is part of the study exploring UK medical student's opinions on employing whole genome sequencing in newborn screening and is intended for clinical medical students in their final two years of study.

The survey should take 10-20 minutes to complete.

The aim of the survey is to help us understand your views on offering whole genome sequencing to all newborns within the NHS, the potential risks and benefits and your educational experience and training needs in genomics. You do not need to have any experience in genomics to take part.

To maintain anonymity of participants, the survey findings will be grouped for analysis and reporting.

Please read the participant information sheet below, which includes detailed information on how we protect your data. If you have any queries, please get in touch with Dr Cristine Sortica da Costa at Cristine.sorticadacosta@gosh.nhs.uk

If you are happy to take part in the survey, please tick each box below to give your consent to take part in the survey.

[Attachment: "Participant information sheet.pdf"]

16			
20 27 28 29	I confirm that I have read and understood the participant information sheet for this survey.	☐ Yes	
30 31 32 33	I understand that completing the survey is my choice and that I am free to stop at any time without submitting a completed survey.	□ Yes	
34 35 36 37	I understand that the survey is anonymous and that it will not be possible to withdraw my survey answers after the survey has been submitted.	□ Yes	
38 39 40 41 42 42	I understand that certain phrases or sentences that I write in the survey may be quoted in future reports or publications but that my name will not be included and any possible identifying comments will be removed.	□ Yes	
43 44 45	I consent to taking part in this survey.	🗆 Yes	

58



Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Demographics	
attend?	 Oniversity of Aberdeen Anglia Ruskin University Aston University Barts and the London School of Medicine Brighton and Sussex Medical School University of Bristol University of Cambridge Cardiff University University of Cambridge Cardiff University University of Edinburgh University of Edinburgh University of Glasgow Hull York Medical School Imperial College London Keele University University of Leicester University of Leicester University of Manchester University of Sast Anglia University of Plymouth Queen's University Belfast University of Southampton St George's, University of London Swansea University University of Warwick
Which of the following best describes the main form of teaching at your medical school?	 Integrated Problem-Based Learning Traditional
In what year do you expect to graduate?	 ○ 2023 ○ 2024
How old are you?	 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25
What is your gender?	 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say



Genomics Educatio	onal Experience			
Approximately how mu A during your medical de genomics?	ich teaching have you received egree on the basic sciences of	None	Some (Place a mark on the	Lots scale above)
 Approximately how mu during your medical de clinical application of g 	ich teaching have you received gree on genomic medicine (the enomics)?	None	Some	Lots
13 14 15 Have you had any add 16 your core medical school 17 (Tick all that apply) 19 (Tick all that apply) 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 56 57 58 59 60	itional genomics experience beyond	 ☐ Intercalation ☐ Student selee ☐ Research proprojects) ☐ Graduate dee ☐ Other ☐ None 	(Place a mark on the or other undergraduate cted component of your ject outside of a degree gree (e.g. MSc, MPhil, P	scale above) e degree r medical degree e (e.g. summer hD)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



	Not at all confident	Somewhat confident	Neutral	Confident	Very confider
The difference between DNA, genes and chromosomes	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
ldentifying inheritance patterns from family pedigrees e.g. autosomal dominant, X-linked, mitochondrial	0	0	0	0	0
The difference between copy number and sequence variants	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0
The difference between loss-of-function and gain-of-function variants	0	0	0	0	0
The difference between synonymous and missense variants	0	0	0	0	0
The difference between somatic and germline variants	0	0	0	\bigcirc	0
The concept of mosaicism	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
The difference between clinically used genomic tests, such as microarray, single gene test, gene panel, whole exome sequencing, whole genome sequencing	0	0	0	0	0
The concept of genetic contributions to common complex diseases such as type 2 diabetes	0	0	0	0	0
How you might approach interpretation of variants eg identifying whether a variant is more likely to be pathogenic or benign	0	0	0	0	0

BMJ Open

Page 4



Newborn Screening Programme

1

6 7

8

9

Were you aware of the proposed pilot for expanding
newborn screening to include whole genome sequencing
before this survey?

\bigcirc	Yes
\bigcirc	No

Based on your current understanding, how much do you agree with the following statements about newborn whole genome sequencing (WGS):

10 If you feel unable to either agree or disagree due to a lack of knowledge on the subject, please select "Not enough 11 knowledge".

2	Completely disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Completely agree	Not enough knowledge
 The current newborn screening programme identifies all early-onset conditions that we need to know about in childhood. 	0	0	0	0	0
 Newborn WGS could identify important childhood-onset conditions that the current programme does not 	0	0	0	0	0
 Newborn WGS could cause an increase in unnecessary anxiety amongst parents 	0	0	0	0	0
 Newborn WGS could be reassuring for parents 	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS could speed up diagnosis of childhood illnesses	\bigcirc	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS could improve long term outcomes of individual paediatric patients	0	0	2	0	0
Newborn WGS could lead to over-medicalisation of children	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0
Newborn WGS could provide useful data for paediatric research e.g. clinical trials	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS will cost too much to the NHS; the money is better off being spent elsewhere	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS would cause more harm than good	0	0	0	0	0
2					

Do you agree or disagree that the following categories of disease should be included in newborn WGS screening:

56 57 58

54

55

- 59
- 60

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml




e 35 of 37		BMJ Open			Paga
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during infancy (0-1 years)	Completely dis@ree	Somewhat dis@ree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Completely agree
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during childhood (2-12 years)	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during adolescence (12-17 years)	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during adulthood (18 years+)	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases for which there are effective treatments available	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases for which there are currently no effective treatments available, only supportive care	0	0	0	0	0
(Tick all that apply)			care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health b Other	ups in the NHS or affi ups in the pharmaced podies	liated utical industry
lf you have selected "Other", plea answer.	se specify your	C	200		



	Benefits	of	newborn	WGS
--	----------	----	---------	-----

3 4

5

What do you think are some of the main potential benefits of introducing routine WGS in newborn screening?

Please rate the importance of the following potential benefits of newborn WGS:

	(Not important)	2	(Neutral) 3	4	(Very important)
Earlier diagnosis	0	0	0	0	0
Enabling a diagnosis to be reached in more patients	0	0	0	0	0
Earlier interventions and personalised care	0	0	0	0	0
Enabling research into new treatments	0	0	0	0	0
Lifetime genomic record for t patient	he O	0	0	0	0
Increased awareness of gene conditions among the public a healthcare professionals	tic O and	0	0	0	0
Long-term cost-effectiveness the NHS	to O	0	0	0	0
Please describe any other pot newborn WGS.	cential benefits of		the public and hea	althcare prof fectiveness	tessionals to the NHS
Please describe any other pot newborn WGS.	tential benefits of	(O Long-term cost-ef	fectiveness	to the NHS



S				
e main potential dra	wbacks of ir	troducing routine W	GS in newbo	rn screening?
following potential	drawbacks o	f newborn WGS:		
(Not important)	2	(Neutral) 3	4	(Very important)
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
0	0	0	0	0
0	○	0	0	0
0	0	0	\bigcirc	0
0	0	0	0	0
\bigcirc	0	6	0	\bigcirc
0	0	0	0	0
\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0
0	0	0	0	0
	s e main potential dra following potential (Not important) 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	s e main potential drawbacks of in following potential drawbacks of (Not important) 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	S e main potential drawbacks of introducing routine WGS: (Not important) 2 (Neutral) 3 0 0 0	s e main potential drawbacks of newborn WGS: (Not important) 2 (Neutral) 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



Which potential drawback do you believe would be the most significant?	 Screening for so soon after be bonding proce Emotional impearly genetic of healthy Upskilling the Parents conse has the potent point througho Risk that pare normal report Risk of incider Identifying contreatments are Lack of resour (e.g. counsellii) Potential for fuof genomic infimplications) Privacy and se Cost-effective 	a wider range of o birth could interfers act on parents/ca diagnosis who oth workforce nting to obtaining tial to impact the but their lifetime nts are falsely rea tal or uncertain f nditions for which en't available ce in the NHS to so ng) uture discrimination ormation (e.g. ins occurity of data ness	conditions with WGS re with the early arers in receiving an arerwise appears a information that newborn at any assured by a indings effective support families on on the basis surance
Please describe any other potential drawbacks of newborn WGS.			
Overall, do you support the introduction of WGS to the newborn screening programme?	Definitely not	Neutral	Definitely yes
		(Place a mark o	on the scale above)
How relevant do you see the newborn WGS programme to your future medical practice?	Not at all relevant	Neutral	Extremely relevant
		(Place a mark o	on the scale above)
Please explain your answer to the previous two questions.	0		
If you have any final comments or thoughts regarding the introduction of WGS to the newborn screening programme, please write them here.	2		



BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Perceptions of genomic newborn screening: A crosssectional survey conducted with UK medical students

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2024-089108.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Aug-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Seed, Lydia; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department; University of Cambridge, School of Clinical Medicine Scott, Anna; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department; University of Southampton, School of Medicine Pichini, Amanda; Genomics England Limited Peter, Michelle; Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, NHS North Thames Genomic Laboratory Hub; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Genetics and Genomic Medicine Tadros, Shereen; Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, North East Thames Regional Genetics Service; University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Sortica da Costa, Cristine; University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department; Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust, Neonatal Intensive Care Unit Hill, Melissa; Great Ormond Street Hospital For Children NHS Foundation Trust, North Thames Regional Genetics Service; UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, Library, Genetic and Genomic Medicine
Primary Subject Heading :	Genetics and genomics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics, Public health, Ethics, Evidence based practice
Keywords:	GENETICS, PUBLIC HEALTH, PAEDIATRICS, NEONATOLOGY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



2		
3 4 5	1	Perceptions of genomic newborn screening: A cross-sectional survey conducted with UK
5 6 7	2	medical students
, 8 9	3	
10 11	4	Lydia Seed ^{1,2,3} , Anna Scott ^{1,2,4} , Amanda Pichini ⁵ , Michelle Peter ^{6,7} , Shereen Tadros ^{8,9,10} , Cristine Sortica
12 13	5	da Costa ^{*1,2,11} , Melissa Hill ^{*6,7}
14 15 16	6	
17 18	7	1. Infection, Immunity and Inflammation Department, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of
19 20	8	Child Health, London, UK
21 22 23	9	2. Postgraduate Medical Education (PGME) Department, Great Ormond Street Hospital for
24 25	10	Children NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
26 27 28	11	3. School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
29 30	12	4. School of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
31 32 33	13	5. Genomics England, London, UK
34 35	14	6. NHS North Thames Genomic Laboratory Hub, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children
36 37 38	15	NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
39 40	16	7. Genetics and Genomic Medicine, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health,
41 42 42	17	London, UK
45 44 45	18	8. North East Thames Regional Genetics Service, Great Ormond Street Hospital, London UK
46 47	19	9. North Thames Genomic Medicine Service Alliance, London, UK
48 49 50	20	10. University College London Hospital NHS Trust, London, UK
51 52	21	11. Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS
53 54 55	22	Foundation Trust, London, UK
56 57	23	* Joint principal investigators
58 59 60	24	

1		
2 3 4	1	Corresponding author:
5	2	Lydia Seed
7 8 0	3	lms211@cam.ac.uk
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51	2 3 4	Lydia Seed Ims211@cam.ac.uk
48 49 50		
48 49 50 51		
51 52 53 54		
55 56 57 58		
59 60		

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3 ⊿	
4 5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34 25	
35	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43 11	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52 53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

1 Abstract

1 2

2 Background

With the potential to identify a vast number of rare diseases soon after birth, genomic newborn screening (gNBS) could facilitate earlier interventions and improve health outcomes. Designing a gNBS programme will involve balancing stakeholders' opinions and addressing concerns. The views of medical students – future clinicians who would deliver gNBS – have not yet been explored.

7 Methods

8 We conducted a nationwide online survey of UK medical students via the REDCap platform. 9 Perceptions of gNBS, including scope of testing and potential benefits and drawbacks, were explored 10 using a mix of multiple-choice questions, Likert scales, visual analogue scales and free-text questions.

11 Results

12 In total, 116 medical students across 16 universities participated. Overall, 45% supported gNBS, with 13 a positively skewed mean support score of 3.24 (SD 1.26, range: 1.0-5.0), and 55% felt it relevant to 14 their future practice. Almost all agreed that infant-onset and childhood-onset diseases and conditions 15 with effective treatments should be included. Most felt that earlier interventions and personalised 16 care would be the most important benefit of gNBS. Other perceived benefits included earlier 17 diagnoses, diagnosing more patients, and enabling research for new treatments. However, several perceived challenges were highlighted: risk of genomic discrimination, incidental or uncertain findings, 18 19 data security, and breaching children's future autonomy. Students expressed conflicting opinions on 20 the psychological impact on families, but most were concerned about a lack of support due to current 21 resource limitations in health services. Students frequently reported having insufficient knowledge to 22 form an opinion, which may reflect gaps in genomics education at medical school and the current lack 23 of evidence base for gNBS.

24 Conclusion

Although some support for gNBS was demonstrated, ethicolegal and social challenges were raised,
 emphasising a need for ongoing discussions about the implications of gNBS.

1 2	_	
3 4 5	1	
6 7	2	Keywords: newborn screening, whole genome sequencing, rare diseases, public health, ethics,
8 9	3	medical students
10 11		
12 13		
15 16		
17 18		
19 20		
21 22 23		
24 25		
26 27		
28 29 20		
31 32		
33 34		
35 36 37		
38 39		
40 41		
42 43 44		
45 46		
47 48		
49 50 51		
52 53		
54 55		
56 57		
58 59 60		
00		

BMJ Open

1 ว		
2 3 4	1	Strengths and limitations of this study
5 6	2	• Our study design used an anonymous online survey, which enabled participants to freely share
7 8	3	their honest opinions on genomic newborn screening
9 10 11	4	• Survey respondents were a representative sample of 116 participants from 16 different
12 13	5	medical schools
14 15	6	• Medical students with more experience in the field of genomics or an interest in paediatrics
16 17 19	7	may have been more likely to participate in this study
19 20	8	• As this was an anonymous survey study, we were unable to ask participants follow-up
21 22	9	questions to further explore nuances to their views or individual reasons that inform their
23 24	10	opinions
$\begin{array}{c} 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\\ 60\\ \end{array}$	11	

Introduction

The aim of newborn screening is to identify infants with an inherited or congenital condition before symptoms manifest and enable earlier management, improving health outcomes and quality of life for patients and families. Newborn screening typically includes a blood spot test that screens for a small number of rare conditions in which early identification and treatment have proven to be beneficial (1). The conditions screened vary between countries – several US states screen for over 50 conditions (2), numerous countries in the European Union screen for around 30 (3), whereas the UK screens for only nine (1). Over the last decade, healthcare professionals (HCPs) and members of the rare disease community have been calling for newborn screening programmes to expand (4).

As the cost of DNA sequencing has fallen and the diagnostic power of whole genome sequencing (WGS) in rare disease has been demonstrated in recent years (5), interest in employing genomic newborn screening (gNBS) has grown. With the potential to identify a vast number of rare diseases soon after birth, gNBS could facilitate earlier intervention and improve health outcomes in a larger number of cases than current newborn screening programmes and may ultimately alleviate the significant population health and economic burdens rare diseases exert collectively (6). Indeed, the first research studies employing gNBS have already been performed in several high-income countries - the BabySeq project in the US and Baby Beyond Hearing project in Australia have both utilised exome sequencing (7, 8). Other large-scale gNBS projects are being launched worldwide (9), including the UK-based Generation Study, which aims to perform WGS for 100,000 newborns (10).

In addition to demonstrating clinical benefits, an effective screening programme hinges on its acceptability to a range of stakeholders, including parents, the public and HCPs (11); designing an effective gNBS programme will involve balancing stakeholders' views and addressing their concerns (12). A public dialogue commissioned by the UK National Screening Committee, Genomics England and the UK Research and Innovation's Sciencewise programme recently found high levels of support Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Page 8 of 39

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> among the UK public on the use of WGS in routine newborn screening (13). Similarly, the Australian public are generally supportive of introducing genomic sequencing into newborn screening (14). Parents and expectant parents in North America and Australia have also expressed support for gNBS, particularly regarding receiving information on actionable childhood conditions (15-20), whereas HCPs tend to be more reserved in their support for gNBS compared to parents. Parents have raised concerns regarding the accuracy of results, the need for accessible information for them to make informed decisions (17, 18), and the importance of extensive consent processes (20). HCPs have expressed ethicolegal concerns surrounding genetic discrimination and preserving children's autonomy (15), as well as practical concerns like data privacy and storage costs, the burden of variants of uncertain significance and diseases with variable penetrance (12). In addition, there is a lack of consensus among both parents and HCPs on which conditions should be included in gNBS (12). These concerns and associated differences in support for gNBS emphasise the need to generate high-quality evidence in large-scale research studies, as well as for continued discussions with diverse stakeholders, to inform public health decisions regarding implementation of a gNBS programme (9).

16 One stakeholder group whose opinions on gNBS have not yet been explored is medical students, who 17 will constitute the future medical workforce that may deliver gNBS as part of standard care. Here, we 18 aim to explore the opinions of UK medical students on the proposed use of WGS in newborn screening.

20 Methods

We conducted a cross-sectional study, by disseminating an online survey to UK medical students in
 the final two years of study.

24 Survey design

The survey design has previously been reported (21). In brief, the survey was developed by a
 multidisciplinary research group (comprising medical students, a social scientist, a clinical geneticist

BMJ Open

and a neonatologist), reviewed by the Clinical Director of Health Education England's Genomics Education Programme and the Clinical Lead for Genetic Counselling at Genomics England, and piloted through ten cognitive 'Think Aloud' interviews (22).

The final survey was organised into three sections: Demographic information, genomics educational experience and knowledge, and views on newborn screening programmes (Supplementary Material 1). Findings from the genomics educational experience and knowledge section are published elsewhere (21). The newborn screening programme section consisted of 43 questions. Participants were first asked whether they were aware of the proposed study employing WGS in newborn screening (Generation Study). Using 5-point Likert scales, participants were asked to rate: their level of agreement with ten statements about newborn screening (ranging from "Completely disagree" (1) to "Completely agree" (4) with an option of "Not enough knowledge"); whether six categories of diseases should be included in gNBS (ranging from "Completely disagree" (1), "Neutral" (3) to "Completely agree" (5)); and the importance of seven potential benefits and ten potential drawbacks of gNBS (ranging from "Not important" (1) to "Very important" (5)). Participants were also asked to identify the most important potential benefit and drawback from the list of options and had the opportunity to provide free-text responses to describe any additional potential benefits or drawbacks. In a multiple-choice question where participants could tick all options that applied and leave a free-text response, they were asked which groups of people should have access to the raw data generated by gNBS. Using visual analogue scales, participants were asked whether overall they supported the introduction of WGS into newborn screening and how relevant they thought a potential gNBS programme would be to their future medical practice. Participants were given the opportunity to leave a free-text response explaining their answer to these questions or to leave any final thoughts on the subject.

Survey dissemination Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

The survey was hosted on the web-based platform, REDCap (23, 24). Invitations to complete the survey via an anonymous link were emailed to all UK medical schools on 14th November 2022 and the Medical Schools Council disseminated the survey on 6th January 2023. The survey was also shared via the Great Ormond Street Hospital Postgraduate Medical Education Department's social media platform and the mailing lists of several university paediatrics societies. The survey was closed on 24th February 2023.

8 Data analysis

9 Data analysis was performed in RStudio (25). The responses from the 5-point rating scales were 10 combined into "Disagree" or "Not important" (1-2) and "Important" or "Agree" (3-4 or 4-5). All 11 responses to free text questions were aggregated and analysed collectively. Common themes within 12 the text were identified and coded in an iterative process using summative thematic analysis (26). 13 Exemplar quotes for the identified themes are reported.

15 Ethical approval

16 Approval was obtained from UCL Research Ethics Committee [Project ID: 23129.001] and the Clinical

17 Research Adoptions Committee, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health.

- 19 Patient and public involvement
- 20 None.

3 21

- 22 Results
- 23 Participant characteristics

A total of 116 complete responses, 75 of which included responses to free-text questions, were received from medical students at 16 different UK medical schools, the demographic details of which

- 1 are given in Table 1. Only 16% (n = 18) of students were aware of the proposed newborn WGS study
 - 2 (Generation Study) prior to participating in this study.

Characteristic	N = 116
Gender	
Female	73 (63%)
Male	38 (33%)
Non-binary	4 (3%)
Prefer not to say	1 (1%)
Age	1
21-25	94 (81%)
Over 25	22 (19%)
Expected graduation year	2
2023	42 (36%)
2024	74 (64%)
Additional genomics experience	
Yes	46 (40%)
Intercalation	31

Student selected component

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
1/	
15	
16	
10	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
<u>⊿</u> ว	
⊿२	
ΔΛ	
44 15	
45	
40	
47	
48	
49 50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1 2

1

2

Project

10

No

70 (60%)

Table 1. Participant characteristics.

3 Opinions on newborn screening

Just over half (54%) did not think the current newborn blood spot screening programme was sufficient to detect all early-onset childhood conditions that medical professionals need to know about, and even more (81%) agreed that the introduction of gNBS could identify important conditions that the current screening programme does not (Figure 1). However, while 77% of respondents agreed that gNBS could be reassuring for parents, 86% thought that it could increase unnecessary anxiety among new parents regarding their child's health. Approximately one-third (34%) of participants agreed with the statement that gNBS "would cause more harm than good".

11

Figure 1. Distribution of medical students' level of agreement with statements about newbornscreening.

14

15 Scope of gNBS and data access

The majority of participants agreed that diseases that typically manifest during the first year of life (94%) or in childhood (86%) should be included in gNBS; diseases with later onset garnered less support (Figure 2a). The availability of effective treatments for a disease also influenced support for inclusion - almost all participants (95%) agreed that diseases for which there is an effective treatment available should be included, whereas only 42% supported the inclusion of diseases for which treatment is limited and supportive care is the primary option.

BMJ Open

Most respondents thought that clinicians directly involved in the patient's care (97%) should have access to data generated from gNBS (Figure 2b). Three-guarters of participants (75%) thought that NHS-affiliated research groups should have data access, compared to only 18% who thought that the data should be made available to external research groups, such as those affiliated with pharmaceutical companies (Figure 2b).

Figure 2. Respondents' agreement with the inclusion of different categories of disease in a newborn WGS screening programme (a) and opinions on which groups should have access to data generated by a newborn WGS screening programme (b).

Potential benefits and drawbacks of gNBS

Nearly all respondents agreed that being able to diagnose conditions earlier (95%) and to provide earlier interventions and personalised care (95%) were important potential benefits of gNBS (Figure 3a), with 70% of participants identifying the latter as the most important potential benefit (Figure 3b). Being able to diagnose more patients (84%) and facilitating research into new treatments (89%) were also seen as important potential benefits by most (Figure 3a). In contrast, only 20% regarded the ability to create a lifetime genomic record for patients important (Figure 3a).

The free-text responses relating to the additional potential benefits of gNBS fell under four sub-themes (Table 2). Several participants noted opportunities for basic research in genetic disease, with one participant commenting that performing research with gNBS data may provide a "greater understanding of pathogenesis of diseases, not just about treatment" (Participant 102). Benefits for the family unit were also identified – parental acceptance of diagnosis and providing important information for allowing family planning decisions.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

The vast majority of respondents felt the lack of resources in the NHS to support families (94%) and the potential for future discrimination based on genomic information (93%) were important potential drawbacks of gNBS (Figure 3c). Almost one-third (30%) of participants identified the latter as the most important potential drawback (Figure 3d), and this concern was echoed in the free-text responses where many respondents described concerns of potential discrimination. A large proportion of respondents also found the risk of incidental or uncertain findings (87%) and the risk of false reassurance (70%) "important" potential drawbacks.

Many respondents expressed apprehension surrounding the privacy and security of genomic data -"information from WGS has the potential to end up in unintended places. That risk is worth avoiding in the first place" (Participant 20) and "The risk of a security breach is too high" (Participant 45) – and 85% rated it an "important" potential drawback of gNBS (Figure 3c).

Despite nearly half (47%) rating the potential for gNBS to interfere with the early bonding process as "not important", over three-quarters (78%) felt the emotional impact on parents/carers in receiving an early genetic diagnosis in a child who otherwise appears healthy was an important concern (Figure 3c). Themes surrounding the negative psychological impact on both the parents and the child frequently emerged in free-text responses, with participants raising concerns that the impact on the parent-infant relationship may be so significant as to result in parental neglect (Table 2).

Parents consenting to WGS on behalf of their newborn was seen as an important drawback by 69% of participants. Qualitative responses falling under the theme of removal of patient autonomy (Table 2) argued that gNBS constitutes "a breach of the child's future autonomy... there is potential to do psychological and autonomous harm" (Participant 76).

Figure 3. Importance ratings for potential benefits (a) and drawbacks (c) of a gNBS programme and
 medical students' perception of the single most important benefit (b) and drawback (d) of a gNBS
 programme.

Themes	Illustrative quotations
Potential benefits of gNBS	
Greater opportunities for	"Enables more research to take place and hopefully allows future
basic research into genetic	treatment to be discovered." (Participant 5)
diseases	CC
Parental acceptance of	"As someone affected by this, it allows better preparation for 'shock'
diagnosis	diagnosis." (Participant 110)
Earlier support	"Allows for personalisation of care from the very beginning, and will
	allow patient to concentrate more on prophylaxis." (Participant 63)
Allowing for family planning	"Can promote genetic testing in parents if a pathogenic copy is found
	as it affects family planning." (Participant 31)
Potential drawbacks of gNBS	
Negative psychological	<i>"It could ruin parents time with their baby before the disease sets in."</i>
impact on the parents	(Participant 2)
	<i>"I do not see the point in screening for conditions you cannot help, as</i>
	all it would add is extra anxiety to the family." (Participant 61)

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
12
17
14
15
10
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
37
22 22
27
24 25
35
36
3/
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
51
52 52
ک ۲
54
55
56
57
58
59

60

Negative psychological	<i>"I think it would change the way children will view themselves in the</i>
impact on the child as they	future." (Participant 103)
age	
	"I can see a world in which patients develop complexes over their
	WGS results and obsess over them throughout their lives."
	(Participant 104)
Risk of parental neglect	"Parents might be otherwise dismayed at their child's diagnosis and
	so provide substandard parental care" (Participant 65)
	6
	"My major concern would be that parents may not always have their
	child's best interests at heart or may reject the child at finding a
	clinically insignificant genetic abnormality." (Participant 56)
Removal of the child's	"Not something for your parents to decide for you as a newborn.
autonomy	Once sequenced there is no going back." (Participant 103)
	"They will have this information burdened on them for the rest of
	their life and it needs to be the individual child's choice " (Participant
	2)
Use of data for monetary	"The data would be so valuable that it would be a prime target for
gain	<i>cyberattacks."</i> (Participant 38)
Over-medicalisation of	"This is unnecessary over-medicalisation and intervention where
children	there needn't be." (Participant 103)

3
4
5
6
7
8
0
9 10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
10
20
20 ⊃1
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
21
22
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
12
-⊤∠ ⁄10
45
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
52
55
54 55
55
56
57
58
59

60

	Concerns that the current "With	h current NHS wait times and lack of support it would create
	NHS could not support more	e problems than it would solve." (Participant 95)
	families	
1		
2		
3	Table 2. Themes identified in qualitation	ative responses to questions regarding gNBS. Participants were
4	asked to describe potential benefits a	nd drawbacks, in addition to those that had been explicitly asked
5	about elsewhere in the survey which	are not included here.
6		
7	Overall gNBS support and relevance	to future practice
8	Overall, 45% supported the introduc	tion of gNBS to the current newborn screening programme and
9	the distribution of support scores wa	s skewed to the right, with a mean score of 3.24 (SD 1.26, range:
10	1.0-5.0) (Supplementary Figure). M	any participants reported that they were unable to reach a
11	conclusion about supporting gNBS be	ecause of a lack of knowledge, with one participant writing "I do
12	not have enough information about	this to decide whether or not I would support" (Participant 10).
13	Just over half (55%) felt that gNBS wil	I be relevant to their future medical practice, with a mean overall
14	rating of 3.7 (SD 2.87, range: 1.0-5.	0). The median rating was 4.0, which was selected by 20% of
15	participants, and 35% selected the m	aximum relevance rating of 5.0 (Supplementary Figure).
16		
17	Discussion	
18	This study provides the first insigh	t into UK medical students' attitudes towards gNBS. Medical
19	students were positive about the po	tential benefits of gNBS, but also raised concerns. Overall, just
20	under half explicitly supported its int	roduction to newborn screening and just over half felt it will be
21	relevant to their future practice. This	echoes the general cautious stance of HCPs (15, 27-29) – a recent
22	study of Australian HCPs revealed	that although most had reservations about the use of gNBS

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> currently, the majority foresee its use by 2026 (20), and US doctors also expect gNBS to be more useful 5 years from now (15). Some of the ambivalence towards gNBS expressed by medical students herein may be explained by a lack of knowledge – many students indicated that they did not have enough knowledge to decide whether they agreed with various statements about gNBS and this issue was raised by several students in their free-text responses qualifying their level of gNBS support (Figure 1). This may be a reflection of the low levels of confidence in genomics knowledge that was also revealed among these participants, where we concluded that robust genomics education through undergraduate medical curricula is necessary to equip the future workforce to deliver genomic medicine (21). The medical students' apprehension may also be borne out of the lack of evidence currently available about the clinical benefits of gNBS, as large-scale research evaluating gNBS is in its infancy. This emphasises the importance of the large prospective gNBS studies that are launching across Europe, North America and Australia to generate robust evidence that can inform decisions regarding implementation of gNBS programmes in the near future (9).

The most important benefits purported by medical students were its potential to facilitate earlier diagnoses and interventions in more patients, with 82% agreeing that gNBS would speed up diagnoses. Similar views were shared by numerous participants in a recent qualitative study of Australian HCPs with clinical or policy experience in newborn screening or genomic sequencing (29). Furthermore, most students felt that current newborn screening is insufficient at detecting clinically important, early-onset childhood conditions and even more agreed that gNBS could deliver where current screening does not. Although numbers with a diagnosis were small, the results from the US BabySeq project, a randomised study that tested for around 1,000 childhood-onset conditions and 5 adult-onset cancer predisposition syndromes, support this view (30). Of the 15 infants that were identified as at-risk of childhood-onset disease and the 3 at-risk of adult-onset disease, only 2 infants were diagnosed through standard newborn screening and not exome sequencing, whereas 15 infants were

BMJ Open

diagnosed through exome sequencing and not standard newborn screening, thus demonstrating the potential value of gNBS (31).

Despite expressing some support for gNBS, medical students revealed several concerns consistent with those reported among HCPs and parents in the literature: privacy and data security; uncertainty of results and incidental findings; and discrimination on the basis of genomic information (15, 16, 18, 20, 29). In the free-text responses, medical students frequently elaborated their concerns around security of genomic data, and Cao et al. reported HCPs frequently sharing anecdotes of parental concerns about storage of dried bloodspot cards that they anticipate will increase with storage of genomic data (29). Indeed, 13% of parents who declined recruitment into the BabySeq project did so due to concerns of privacy and discrimination (32). This indicates a level of distrust in the institutions responsible for protecting genomic data from unauthorised access that is consistent among medical students, HCPs and parents across different countries with different healthcare systems that needs addressing. Furthermore, with almost one-third of medical students identifying the risk of genomic discrimination as the most important potential drawback, robust international legislation to safeguard against the misuse of genetic information is required, as recently highlighted by HCPs (20), for the future implementation of any screening programme employing genomic sequencing modalities.

Medical students expressed conflicting views on the psychological impact of an early diagnosis on the family, and this theme frequently emerged in free-text responses. Over three-quarters of medical students felt that gNBS could be reassuring, a view shared by parents in another study (17). However, over three-quarters of medical students were also concerned about the emotional impact on parents receiving an early diagnosis in a child who otherwise appears healthy and felt that gNBS could increase unnecessary anxiety. Many shared concerns pertaining to the impact on the parent-infant relationship and risk of parental neglect or abandonment. Potential for psychological distress is a frequently raised concern around gNBS among HCPs and parents in the literature (15) - in a recent survey, Slovenian Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Page 20 of 39

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> peripartum mothers shared that their attitude towards their family and their relationship with their partner would suffer if they knew their child was a carrier of an incurable genetic condition (33). However, evidence from two of the few studies that have employed gNBS to date suggests these concerns may not materialise among those who are willing to undergo gNBS – the BabySeg Project reported no persistent negative psychosocial effects among families who received gNBS (34), and the Baby Beyond Hearing Project found no evidence that offering different levels of genomic information to parents has a negative psychological impact (8). Further evaluation in larger prospective studies, involving a diverse population of parents from a range of backgrounds and who receive a range of different results, are warranted to better elucidate the psychosocial impact of gNBS. Of note, the UK public dialogue found support for gNBS, provided that mental health services are available to provide emotional and psychological support for those who receive a diagnosis (35). With almost all medical students in our study highlighting the current lack of resources in the NHS to support families as an important potential drawback of gNBS, this is a very important consideration that needs to be addressed with multi-disciplinary input in the design of possible future services.

There is currently no consensus in the literature on the scope of conditions to be tested for using gNBS. The vast majority of medical students supported screening for childhood-onset conditions, as do most HCPs and parents in recent studies (16, 17, 19, 20, 29). Consistent with the views of HCPs (20), few medical students supported screening for adult-onset conditions, unlike those of most parents who have still supported screening for such conditions (16). Much like HCPs in recent studies (15, 20), many medical students raised concerns about gNBS breaching the child's future autonomy to decide whether this information is wanted as an adult and most saw parents consenting to WGS on behalf of their newborn as an important potential drawback of gNBS. Indeed, to mitigate some of these risks, it has been proposed that gNBS warrants a more extensive consent process compared to current newborn screening programmes (20, 27), and parents have raised concerns about receiving accessible information to make an informed decision (17). However, this consideration will need to be balanced

BMJ Open

with the availability and associated financial costs of providing the trained professionals required to perform this at scale (16, 20, 36), which may limit the screening programme's efficiency, and with the risk of reducing participation rates (32), which may compromise the screening programme's effectiveness. Digital decision aids may alleviate some of this additional workload without compromising quality or worsening existing disparities (37) and a tablet-based decision aid was implemented in the recent North Carolina Newborn Exome Sequencing for Universal Screening randomised control trial and will be evaluated soon (38, 39).

Furthermore, contrary to most parents in several recent studies who also supported screening for conditions that cannot be prevented, treated or cured (16, 17, 19), fewer than half of the medical students in this study supported screening for conditions with only supportive care options. The interplay of age of onset with actionability appears to determine HCPs' opinions - 68% supported screening for childhood-onset non-actionable conditions compared to 31% for adult-onset non-actionable conditions in a recent study (20). Screening for conditions with limited actionability presents a potential conflict with one of Wilson & Junger's classical principles for population screening – an accepted treatment should be available for a condition screened (11). 'Treatment' in the context of monogenic conditions can include a wide range of interventions, beyond direct management of the condition in the index patient. This was exemplified in Green et al's analysis of the actionability of pathogenic and likely pathogenic variants identified in the BabySeq project - identification of these variants directly prompted a specialty referral, surveillance or treatment in two-thirds of infants and their first-degree family members (40). Indeed, frameworks for evaluating genomic testing in population screening, based on modified Wilson and Junger criteria, have been developed to guide the development of such programmes (36, 41-43). Continual assessment in the context of the availability and accessibility of healthcare in the country implementing gNBS will be required, especially as targeted treatments for rare diseases advance.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> Our results should be regarded within the limitations of this study. With two-fifths of respondents having additional genomics experience beyond the core undergraduate medical curriculum, the demographics of participants may not be representative of the UK medical student population and those with more experience in the field may have a greater awareness of some of the complex issues surrounding gNBS. The design of this study is also a limitation – even with free-text response questions, it was not possible to comprehensively capture all nuances to medical students' views or explore reasons that inform such views in an online survey. Future research could consider qualitative interviews to gather a more in-depth understanding of medical students' views.

As future clinicians, medical students' views on gNBS are important to inform the future design of such programmes. This is the first study to explore medical students' opinions on gNBS. Students expressed positive views on gNBS, emphasising its potential to facilitate faster diagnoses and treatments in more patients. However, important ethical, legal and social challenges were raised, namely data security, uncertainty of results, genomic discrimination and the psychological impact on families, as echoed by HCPs in the literature. Medical students also highlighted a lack of knowledge to form opinions on various aspects of gNBS, emphasising the need for sufficient education on genomics during medical school as well as good quality evidence from large prospective gNBS studies that are currently underway.

10 unuer

1 Funding statement

2 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-3 profit sectors.

Conflict of interest

AP is an employee of Genomics England, a company wholly owned by the United Kingdom
Department of Health and Social Care and funded to deliver the Generation Study.

9 Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to all of the medical students who took part in the survey. Thank you to Marissa Willock, Postgraduate Medical Education Department at Great Ormond Street Hospital for supporting medical student research and facilitating medical students to join research placements at Great Ormond Street Hospital. MP and MH are partially funded by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at Great Ormond Street Hospital. All research at Great Ormond Street Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health is made possible by the NIHR Great Ormond Street Hospital Biomedical Research Centre. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the UK Department of Health.

19 Ethical approval

Approval was obtained from UCL Research Ethics Committee [Project ID: 23129.001] and the Clinical
 Research Adoptions Committee, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health.

Contributorship statement

LS is the guarantor of the study; accepts full responsibility for the finished work and/or the conduct of the study, had access to the data, and controlled the decision to publish. LS devised the concept for the study. All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study. AS and MP performed Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

statistical analysis. AS, CS and MH performed thematic analysis. LS wrote the manuscript. AS

contributed to the manuscript. AP, MP, ST, CS and MH reviewed and revised the manuscript critically.

All authors collaborated on manuscript revision and read and approved the submitted version.

Data sharing statement

.dv .de available . All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information.

Raw data files can be made available upon reasonable request.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1		
2	1	Deferences
4	1	keierences
5	2	1 NHS Newborn screening 2021 [Available from:
6	23	https://www.phs.uk/conditions/baby/newborn-screening/overview/
7	5 1	2 Botkin IR Lewis MH Watson MS Swoboda KL Anderson R Berry SA et al Parental
ð Q	- -	2. Dotkin JR, Lewis Will, Watson WS, Swoodda RJ, Anderson R, Delly SA, et al. I archital permission for pilot newborn screening research: guidelines from the NBSTRN Pediatrics
10	5	permission for phot newborn screening research, guidennes from the NDSTRN. Fediatres. $2014 \cdot 122(2) \cdot 2410.7$
11	07	2014,155(2).5410-7. 2 Joshar IG, Burgard P, Cornal MC, Pigtar T, Wainraigh SS, Bunn K, et al. Newhorn
12	/ 0	5. Loeber JO, Burgaru F, Comer MC, Rigter T, Wennetch SS, Rupp K, et al. Newborn
13	0	blood anot to gargening result. Unbarit Match Dig. 2012;25(4):602-11
14	9	Just 2012,55(4).005-11.
15	10	4. UK OK. Fixing the present, building for the future. Newdorn screening for fate
16 17	11	London
17	12	London N1 CALL 2010
19	13	NI OAH, 2019.
20	14	5. Smedley D, Smith KR, Martin A, Thomas EA, McDonagn EM, Cipriani V, et al.
21	15	100,000 Genomes Pilot on Rare-Disease Diagnosis in Health Care - Preliminary Report. N
22	10	Engl J Med. 2021;385(20):1868-80.
23	1/	6. Gonzaludo N, Belmont JW, Gainullin VG, Taft RJ. Estimating the burden and
24	18	economic impact of pediatric genetic disease. Genet Med. 2019;21(8):1/81-9.
25 26	19	7. Holm IA, Agrawal PB, Ceyhan-Birsoy O, Christensen KD, Fayer S, Frankel LA, et al.
20	20	The BabySeq project: implementing genomic sequencing in newborns. BMC Pediatr.
28	21	2018;18(1):225.
29	22	8. Downie L, Halliday J, Lewis S, Lunke S, Lynch E, Martyn M, et al. Exome sequencing
30	23	in newborns with congenital deatness as a model for genomic newborn screening: the Baby
31	24	Beyond Hearing project. Genet Med. 2020;22(5):937-44.
32	25	9. Stark Z, Scott RH. Genomic newborn screening for rare diseases. Nat Rev Genet.
33 24	26	2023;24(11):755-66.
35	27	10. Alice Tuff-Lacey HE, Amanda Pichini, David Bick, Dasha Deen, Sally Donovan, Kate
36	28	Harvey, Dalia Kasperaviciute, Mathilde Leblond, Geraldine Nash, Will Navaie, Aditi Satija,
37	29	Sally Shillaker, Afshan Siddiq, Katrina Stone, Chantal Wood, Joanna Ziff, Richard H Scott.
38	30	The Generation Study Protocol. 2023.
39	31	11. Wilson JMG JG. Principles and practice of screening for disease. Geneva: WHO; 1968.
40	32	12. Downie L, Halliday J, Lewis S, Amor DJ. Principles of Genomic Newborn Screening
41 42	33	Programs: A Systematic Review. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(7):e2114336.
43	34	13. Hopkins H, Kinsella S, Evans G. Implications of whole genome sequencing for
44	35	newborn screening: A public dialogue. London; 2021.
45	36	14. Lynch F, Best S, Gaff C, Downie L, Archibald AD, Gyngell C, et al. Australian Public
46	37	Perspectives on Genomic Newborn Screening: Risks, Benefits, and Preferences for
47	38	Implementation. Int J Neonatal Screen. 2024;10(1).
48	39	15. Pereira S, Robinson JO, Gutierrez AM, Petersen DK, Hsu RL, Lee CH, et al. Perceived
49 50	40	Benefits, Risks, and Utility of Newborn Genomic Sequencing in the BabySeq Project.
50	41	Pediatrics. 2019;143(Suppl 1):S6-s13.
52	42	16. Armstrong B, Christensen KD, Genetti CA, Parad RB, Robinson JO, Blout Zawatsky
53	43	CL, et al. Parental Attitudes Toward Standard Newborn Screening and Newborn Genomic
54	44	Sequencing: Findings From the BabySeq Study. Front Genet. 2022;13:867371.
55	45	17. Timmins GT, Wynn J, Saami AM, Espinal A, Chung WK. Diverse Parental
56	46	Perspectives of the Social and Educational Needs for Expanding Newborn Screening through
57 58	47	Genomic Sequencing. Public Health Genomics. 2022:1-8.
59		
60		

Wang H, Page R, Lopez D, Arkatkar S, Young C, Martinez D, et al. Pregnant Latinas' 18. views of adopting exome sequencing into newborn screening: A qualitative study. Genet Med. 2022;24(8):1644-52. 19. Liang NSY, Watts-Dickens A, Chitayat D, Babul-Hirji R, Chakraborty P, Hayeems RZ. Parental Preferences for Expanded Newborn Screening: What Are the Limits? Children (Basel). 2023;10(8). 20. White S. Mossfield T. Fleming J. Barlow-Stewart K. Ghedia S. Dickson R. et al. Expanding the Australian Newborn Blood Spot Screening Program using genomic sequencing: do we want it and are we ready? Eur J Hum Genet. 2023;31(6):703-11. Seed L, Scott A, Peter M, Tadros S, Hill M, da Costa CS. Preparing tomorrow's doctors 21. for the genomics era: a nationwide survey of UK medical students. Future Healthcare Journal. 2024:100133. 22. Collins D. Pretesting survey instruments: an overview of cognitive methods. Qual Life Res. 2003;12(3):229-38. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic 23. data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform. 2009;42(2):377-81. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap 24. consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. J Biomed Inform. 2019;95:103208. Team RC. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computin. 4.2.3 ed. Vienna, 25. Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2023. Hsieh HF, Shannon SE. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qual Health 26. Res. 2005;15(9):1277-88. 27. Ulm E, Feero WG, Dineen R, Charrow J, Wicklund C. Genetics professionals' opinions of whole-genome sequencing in the newborn period. J Genet Couns. 2015;24(3):452-63. Iskrov G, Ivanov S, Wrenn S, Stefanov R. Whole-Genome Sequencing in Newborn 28. Screening-Attitudes and Opinions of Bulgarian Pediatricians and Geneticists. Front Public Health. 2017;5:308. Cao M, Notini L, Ayres S, Vears DF. Australian healthcare professionals' perspectives 29. on the ethical and practical issues associated with genomic newborn screening. J Genet Couns. 2023;32(2):376-86. Cevhan-Birsoy O, Murry JB, Machini K, Lebo MS, Yu TW, Fayer S, et al. 30. Interpretation of Genomic Sequencing Results in Healthy and Ill Newborns: Results from the BabySeq Project. Am J Hum Genet. 2019;104(1):76-93. 31. Wojcik MH, Zhang T, Ceyhan-Birsoy O, Genetti CA, Lebo MS, Yu TW, et al. Discordant results between conventional newborn screening and genomic sequencing in the BabySeq Project. Genet Med. 2021;23(7):1372-5. Genetti CA, Schwartz TS, Robinson JO, VanNoy GE, Petersen D, Pereira S, et al. 32. Parental interest in genomic sequencing of newborns: enrollment experience from the BabySeq Project. Genet Med. 2019;21(3):622-30. 33. Prosenc B, Cizek Sajko M, Kavsek G, Herzog M, Peterlin B. Perception of genomic newborn screening among peripartum mothers. Eur J Hum Genet. 2024;32(2):163-70. Pereira S, Smith HS, Frankel LA, Christensen KD, Islam R, Robinson JO, et al. 34. Psychosocial Effect of Newborn Genomic Sequencing on Families in the BabySeq Project: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Pediatr. 2021;175(11):1132-41. 35. Hopkins H KS, Evans G. Implications of whole genome sequencing for newborn screening: A public dialogue. 2021.

BMJ Open

reliez oni

- 36. Andermann A, Blancquaert I, Beauchamp S, Déry V. Revisiting Wilson and Jungner in the genomic age: a review of screening criteria over the past 40 years. Bull World Health Organ. 2008;86(4):317-9. 37. Bombard Y, Haveems RZ. How digital tools can advance quality and equity in genomic medicine. Nat Rev Genet. 2020;21(9):505-6. Lewis MA, Paquin RS, Roche MI, Furberg RD, Rini C, Berg JS, et al. Supporting 38. Parental Decisions About Genomic Sequencing for Newborn Screening: The NC NEXUS Decision Aid. Pediatrics. 2016;137 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S16-23. Roman TS, Crowley SB, Roche MI, Foreman AKM, O'Daniel JM, Seifert BA, et al. 39. Genomic Sequencing for Newborn Screening: Results of the NC NEXUS Project. Am J Hum Genet. 2020;107(4):596-611. Green RC, Shah N, Genetti CA, Yu T, Zettler B, Uveges MK, et al. Actionability of 40. unanticipated monogenic disease risks in newborn genomic screening: Findings from the BabySeg Project. Am J Hum Genet. 2023;110(7):1034-45. Becker F, van El CG, Ibarreta D, Zika E, Hogarth S, Borry P, et al. Genetic testing and 41. common disorders in a public health framework: how to assess relevance and possibilities. European Journal of Human Genetics. 2011;19(1):S6-S44. Petros M. Revisiting the Wilson-Jungner criteria: how can supplemental criteria guide 42. public health in the era of genetic screening? Genet Med. 2012;14(1):129-34. 43. King JR, Notarangelo LD, Hammarström L. An appraisal of the Wilson & Jungner
- criteria in the context of genomic-based newborn screening for inborn errors of immunity. J
- Allergy Clin Immunol. 2021;147(2):428-38.

BMJ Open



Figure 1. Distribution of medical students' level of agreement with statements about newborn screening.

267x161mm (144 x 144 DPI)







Figure 3. Importance ratings for potential benefits (a) and drawbacks (c) of a gNBS programme and medical students' perception of the single most important benefit (b) and drawback (d) of a gNBS programme.

276x174mm (330 x 330 DPI)

Page 31 of 39 Newborn WGS Survey

1 2 3	Please read the following information and complete the survey below.
4 5 6	Consent Form
7	This survey is part of the study exploring UK medical student's enjoiens on employing whole geneme sequencing in
8 9	newborn screening and is intended for clinical medical students in their final two years of study.
10 11	The survey should take 10-20 minutes to complete.
12 13 14 15	The aim of the survey is to help us understand your views on offering whole genome sequencing to all newborns within the NHS, the potential risks and benefits and your educational experience and training needs in genomics. You do not need to have any experience in genomics to take part.
16 17	To maintain anonymity of participants, the survey findings will be grouped for analysis and reporting.
18 19 20	Please read the participant information sheet below, which includes detailed information on how we protect your data. If you have any queries, please get in touch with Dr Cristine Sortica da Costa at Cristine.sorticadacosta@gosh.nhs.uk
21 22 23	If you are happy to take part in the survey, please tick each box below to give your consent to take part in the survey.
24 25	[Attachment: "Participant information sheet.pdf"]
26 27 28 29	I confirm that I have read and understood the Service Yes Service Yes
30 31 32 33	I understand that completing the survey is my choice and that I am free to stop at any time without submitting a completed survey.
34 35 36 37	I understand that the survey is anonymous and that it will not be possible to withdraw my survey answers after the survey has been submitted.
38 39 40 41 42	I understand that certain phrases or sentences that I write in the survey may be quoted in future reports or publications but that my name will not be included and any possible identifying comments will be removed.
 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 	I consent to taking part in this survey.


Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Which university/medical school do you currently	University of Aberdeen
attena?	
	O Aston University
	Barts and the London School of Medicine Brighten and Guessey Medical School
	Brighton and Sussex Medical School
	O University of Dundee
	\bigcirc University of Exeler
	\bigcirc King's College London
	\bigcirc Lancaster University
	\bigcirc University of Leeds
	\bigcirc University of Leeds
	\bigcirc University of Liverpool
	\bigcirc University of Manchester
	\bigcirc University of Newcastle
	\bigcirc University of East Anglia
	\bigcirc University of Oxford
	\bigcirc University of Plymouth
	\bigcirc Oueen's University Belfast
	O University of Sheffield
	 University of Southampton
	🚫 St George's, University of London
	🔿 Swansea University
	O University College London
	O University of Warwick
Which of the following best describes the main form of	
eaching at your medical school?	O Problem-Based Learning
caching at your mealear school.	
	○ 2023
n what year do you expect to graduate?	0
n what year do you expect to graduate?	Ö 2024
h what year do you expect to graduate?	
low old are you?	 ○ 2024 ○ 21 ○ 22
low old are you?	 ○ 2024 ○ 21 ○ 22 ○ 23
low old are you?	 ○ 2024 ○ 21 ○ 22 ○ 23 ○ 24
low old are you?	 ○ 2024 ○ 21 ○ 22 ○ 23 ○ 24 ○ 25
low old are you?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25
h what year do you expect to graduate? How old are you?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25
h what year do you expect to graduate? How old are you? What is your gender?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25
h what year do you expect to graduate? How old are you? What is your gender?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25
h what year do you expect to graduate? How old are you? What is your gender?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say
h what year do you expect to graduate? How old are you? What is your gender?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say
h what year do you expect to graduate? 	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say
h what year do you expect to graduate? 	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say
low old are you? Vhat is your gender?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say
h what year do you expect to graduate? How old are you? What is your gender?	 2024 21 22 23 24 25 Over 25 Male Female Non-binary Prefer not to say



60



Genomics Educational Experience			
Approximately how much teaching have you received during your medical degree on the basic sciences of			
jenomics?	None	Some	
		(Place a mark on the	e scale above)
pproximately how much teaching have you received			
linical application of genomics)?	None	Some	Lots
		(Place a mark on the	e scale above)
ve you had any additional genomics experience beyond Ir core medical school curriculum?	☐ Intercalation ☐ Student sele ☐ Research pr	n or other undergraduat acted component of you oject outside of a degre	te degree Ir medical degree ee (e.g. summe
all that apply)	projects) Graduate de Other None	egree (e.g. MSc, MPhil, F	PhD)



Genomics Knowledge

How confident do you feel i	n your unders	tanding of the	e tollowing:	-	
	Not at all confident	Somewhat confident	Neutral	Confident	Very confident
 The difference between DNA, genes and chromosomes 	0	0	0	\bigcirc	0
 Identifying inheritance patterns from family pedigrees e.g. autosomal dominant, X-linked, mitochondrial 	0	0	0	0	0
 The difference between copy number and sequence variants 	0	0	0	0	0
 The difference between loss-of-function and gain-of-function variants 	0	0	0	0	0
 The difference between synonymous and missense variants 	0	0	0	0	0
 The difference between somatic and germline variants 	0	0	0	0	0
¹ The concept of mosaicism	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
 The difference between clinically used genomic tests, such as microarray, single gene test, gene panel, whole exome sequencing, whole genome sequencing 	0	0	0	0	0
 The concept of genetic contributions to common complex diseases such as type 2 diabetes 	0	0	0	0	0
 How you might approach interpretation of variants eg identifying whether a variant is more likely to be pathogenic or benign 	0	0	0	0	0



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

before this survey?	e genome seque				
Based on your current understandir genome sequencing (WGS):	ng, how much d	o you agree wit	h the following stat	ements about n	ewborn whole
f you feel unable to either agree or nowledge".	disagree due to	o a lack of know	ledge on the subje	ct, please select	"Not enough
	Completely disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Completely agree	Not enough knowledge
The current newborn screening programme identifies all early-onset conditions that we need to know about in childhood.	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS could identify mportant childhood-onset conditions that the current programme does not	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS could cause an ncrease in unnecessary anxiety amongst parents	00	0	0	0	0
lewborn WGS could be eassuring for parents	0	0	0	0	0
lewborn WGS could speed up liagnosis of childhood illnesses	0	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
Newborn WGS could improve ong term outcomes of individual paediatric patients	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS could lead to over-medicalisation of children	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	0
lewborn WGS could provide Iseful data for paediatric esearch e.g. clinical trials	0	0	0	0	0
Newborn WGS will cost too much o the NHS; the money is better off being spent elsewhere	0	0	0	0	0
Jewborn WGS would cause more arm than good	0	0	0	0	0
Do you agree or disagree that the f	ollowing catego	ries of disease s	should be included	in newborn WGS	5 screening:



		Divid Open			Page 36 Page 6
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during infancy (0-1 years)	Completely dis@ree	Somewhat dis@ree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Completely agree
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during childhood (2-12 years)	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during adolescence (12-17 years)	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases where symptoms or treatment would start during adulthood (18 years+)	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases for which there are effective treatments available	0	0	0	0	0
Diseases for which there are currently no effective treatments available, only supportive care	0	0	0	0	0
(Tick all that apply)			care Parents Research grou	ns in the NUS or offi	liated
(Tick all that apply)			care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health b Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaced podies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply) 	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health b Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaced podies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply)	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health b Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaced podies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply) If you have selected "Other", pleas answer.	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health t Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaced oodies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply) If you have selected "Other", pleas answer.	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health k Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaceu oodies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply) If you have selected "Other", pleas answer.	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health b Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaceu oodies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply) If you have selected "Other", pleas answer.	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health b Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaced oodies	liated utical industry
(Tick all that apply) If you have selected "Other", pleas answer.	se specify your		care Parents Research grou universities Research grou Public health t Other	ps in the NHS or affi ps in the pharmaced oodies	liated utical industry

REDCap

Benefits of newborn WGS					
What do you think are some of the	e main potential be	nefits of intro	oducing routine WGS	in newborn	screening?
Please rate the importance of the	following potential	benefits of n	ewborn WGS:		
	(Not important) 1	2	(Neutral) 3	4	(Very important 5
Earlier diagnosis	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0
Enabling a diagnosis to be reached in more patients	0	0	0	0	0
Earlier interventions and personalised care	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0
Enabling research into new treatments	0	0	0	0	0
Lifetime genomic record for the patient	0	0	0	0	\bigcirc
Increased awareness of genetic conditions among the public and healthcare professionals	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term cost-effectiveness to the NHS	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0
		(the public and hea	althcare prof fectiveness	essionals to the NHS
Please describe any other potenti newborn WGS.	al benefits of		2		
			— O		

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



What do you think are some of t	ne main potential dra	wbacks of in	troducing routine W	GS in newbo	rn screening?	
Please rate the importance of the following potential drawbacks of newborn WGS:						
	(Not important)	2	(Neutral) 3	4	(Very important)	
Screening for a wider range of conditions with WGS so soon after birth could interfere with the early bonding process	0	0	0	0	0	
Emotional impact on parents/carers in receiving an early genetic diagnosis who otherwise appears healthy	0	0	0	0	0	
Upskilling the workforce	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	
Parents consenting to obtaining information that has the potential to impact the newborn at any point throughout their lifetime		0	0	0	0	
Risk that parents are falsely reassured by a normal report	0	О С	0	0	0	
Risk of incidental or uncertain findings	0	0	0	\bigcirc	0	
Identifying conditions for which effective treatments aren't available	0	0	0	0	0	
Lack of resource in the NHS to support families (e.g.	0	0	40	0	0	
counselling) Potential for future discrimination on the basis of genomic information (e.g. insurance implications)	0	0	0	0	0	
Privacy and security of data	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	\bigcirc	
Cost effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	



 Screening for so soon after I bonding proce Emotional imp early genetic of healthy Upskilling the Parents conse has the potent point throughd Risk that pare normal report Risk of incider Identifying con treatments and Lack of resour (e.g. counselli Potential for fu of genomic infi implications) Privacy and se Cost-effective 	a wider range of c birth could interferences bact on parents/ca diagnosis who oth workforce nting to obtaining tial to impact the but their lifetime nts are falsely rea ntal or uncertain finditions for which en't available ice in the NHS to sing) uture discriminatio formation (e.g. ins ecurity of data ness	onditions with WGS re with the early rers in receiving an erwise appears information that newborn at any ssured by a ndings effective upport families on on the basis urance
Definitely not	Neutral	Definitely yes
	(Place a mark o	n the scale above)
Not at all relevant	Neutral	Extremely relevant
	(Place a mark o	n the scale above)
20		
	 Screening for so soon after I bonding proce Emotional impearly genetic of healthy Upskilling the Parents conserent has the potent point through Risk that pare normal report Risk of incider Identifying contreatments and Lack of resour (e.g. counselli Potential for further of genomic infimplications) Privacy and see Cost-effective 	 Screening for a wider range of c so soon after birth could interfere bonding process Emotional impact on parents/ca early genetic diagnosis who oth healthy Upskilling the workforce Parents consenting to obtaining has the potential to impact the point throughout their lifetime Risk that parents are falsely reanormal report Risk of incidental or uncertain fi Identifying conditions for which treatments aren't available Lack of resource in the NHS to s (e.g. counselling) Potential for future discriminatic of genomic information (e.g. insimplications) Privacy and security of data Cost-effectiveness

REDCap







future careers (b).