Ethical Considerations in Carbamazepine Pharmacogenomics Testing

Madeline Yuzwa, BS[1]; Rachel Conrad Bracken, PhD[2]

[1]Department of Pharmacy, Northeast Ohio Medical University

[2] Department of Family and Community Medicine, College of Medicine, Northeast Ohio Medical University

Abstract: Carbamazepine, a widely used anticonvulsant, exemplifies both the promise and challenges of pharmacogenomics in personalized medicine. This paper critically examines the ethical implications of pharmacogenomic testing for carbamazepine, focusing on the limitations of current FDA guidelines. Through a comprehensive literature review and ethical analysis, we argue that these guidelines inadequately address key ethical concerns, including patient privacy, autonomy, equitable access, and potential genetic discrimination. We propose an updated framework for ethical implementation of pharmacogenomic testing, emphasizing four key areas: ensuring consistent and equitable access to testing, comprehensive patient education and informed consent, robust patient privacy and data management practices, and culturally aware approaches to genetic counseling. Our recommendations call for interdisciplinary collaboration to develop more comprehensive guidelines that balance clinical efficacy with ethical considerations in the rapidly evolving field of pharmacogenomics.

Keywords: pharmacogenomics, carbamazepine, personalized medicine, bioethics, adverse drug reactions, patient autonomy, cultural competence

Introduction

Carbamazepine, approved by the FDA in 1965, has been crucial in treating neurological conditions like trigeminal neuralgia and epilepsy.[1] It manages seizures by calming overactive neuronal membranes and reducing synaptic pain signal transmission.[2] However, carbamazepine is associated with severe adverse drug reactions (ADRs), including Stevens-Johnson syndrome (SJS), toxic epidermal necrolysis (TEN), and drug reaction with eosinophilia and systemic symptoms (DRESS) syndrome.[3] Recent developments in pharmacogenomics necessitate reexamining the ethical implications of pharmacogenomic (PGx) testing, particularly as new genetic markers linked to ADRs are continually identified.[4] The discovery of the Human Leukocyte Antigen (HLA)-B1502 allele in certain Asian populations, for example, has highlighted pharmacogenomics' potential in personalizing therapy.[5] While the FDA's 2021 guidelines for carbamazepine PGx testing recommend testing for HLA-B1502 in patients with Asian ancestry, we argue that these guidelines inadequately address the full spectrum of ethical concerns and practical challenges raised by PGx testing.[6] Specifically, these guidelines fail to fully account for financial barriers to testing, the complexities of integrating genetic information into patient care, and the nuances of informed consent across diverse cultural contexts.[7]

Corresponding Author:
Madeline Yuzwa
Northeast Ohio Medical University
Rootstown, OH
myuzwa@neomed.edu

This commentary examines the ethical implications of carbamazepine PGx testing, focusing on four key areas: ensuring consistent and equitable access to testing, comprehensive patient education and informed consent, patient privacy and data management, and cultural awareness and humility in genetic counseling. By analyzing these aspects, we propose a more comprehensive framework for implementing PGx testing that balances clinical efficacy with ethical considerations.

Ensuring Consistent and Equitable Access to Testing

Whether because it was deliberately undefined at the federal level to enable the development of specific local protocols or because of limited evidence available at the time of drafting, the FDA's 2021 guidance on carbamazepine PGx testing falls short in several key areas, including a lack of clear protocols for determining patient ancestry in diverse populations, insufficient address of ethical implications of ancestry-based screening, and absence of strategies for ensuring equitable access to genetic testing.[6] While federal agencies often provide broad regulatory frameworks rather than prescriptive protocols, particularly in rapidly evolving fields like pharmacogenomics, the lack of clear guidelines for integrating PGx testing into clinical decision-making has resulted in inconsistencies in practice and barriers to access.

In contrast, the Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) provides explicit recommendations regarding PGx testing for carbamazepine. In 2017, CPIC updated its guidelines to recommend HLA-B15:02 and HLA-A31:01 genotyping before initiating carbamazepine therapy, especially in populations where these alleles are prevalent, to reduce the risk of severe cutaneous adverse reactions.[8] The contrast between CPIC's specific, evidence-based recommendations and

DOI: https://doi.org/10.24926/iip.v16i2.6339

the FDA's broader guidance, published four years later, underscores the need for more detailed federal protocols to ensure consistent and equitable implementation of PGx testing.

Despite existing FDA guidelines and known risks associated with specific genetic markers, PGx testing is not universally applied before prescribing carbamazepine. This inconsistency may result from lack of awareness and limited access to PGx testing in addition to the absence of clear FDA guidelines and local protocols for integrating genetic testing results into clinical decisions.[7] To address this, we recommend strengthening infrastructure for routine PGx testing, establishing comprehensive guidelines for integrating PGx information into clinical practice, developing targeted educational programs for healthcare providers, securing funding for widespread access to genetic testing, and addressing health disparities and cost-prohibitive access to PGx testing.[9]

PGx testing for carbamazepine presents a complex interplay of economic, ethical, and clinical considerations. While the cost of testing can range from $50 to $5,000, depending on the test's complexity,[10] the expenses associated with managing severe adverse reactions like SJS or TEN can exceed $120,000 per case.[11] Studies have demonstrated the potential cost-effectiveness of PGx screening for carbamazepine-induced hypersensitivity reactions, suggesting net cost savings and improved quality-adjusted life years.[12,13] However, the accessibility of PGx testing remains a significant concern, with inconsistent insurance coverage creating potential disparities in care. A 2019 survey found that while 79% of health plans cover PGx testing for specific medications, only 4% cover multi-gene panel tests.[14]

Further complicating the implementation of PGx screening are inconsistencies in HLA testing methodologies and the lack of standardized reimbursement policies. Studies have shown that different HLA typing methods, including serological and molecular techniques, can yield discordant results, potentially leading to misclassification of at-risk individuals.[15] Manual data entry errors in HLA testing have also been documented, raising concerns about patient safety and clinical decision-making.[16] Additionally, the high cost of HLA testing remains a barrier to widespread adoption, with HLA antibody solid-phase testing ranked among the most expensive laboratory tests reimbursed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).[17] Despite evidence supporting its clinical utility, reimbursement for HLA testing remains highly variable, with CMS policies often considering these tests part of broader organ acquisition costs rather than standalone pharmacogenomic interventions, limiting accessibility for non-transplant applications.18 These challenges highlight the urgent need for more consistent federal and insurance policies to ensure equitable access to PGx testing and prevent disparities in care.

This situation is further complicated by ethical considerations surrounding ancestry-based risk assessment, as certain genetic variants associated with adverse reactions, such as HLA-B15:02, are more prevalent in specific ancestral groups.[19] The HLA-B15:02 allele is most commonly found in Southeast Asian populations, with particularly high prevalence in Han Chinese, Thai, and Filipino populations, where frequencies range from 5% to over 15%.20 Yet, the presence of the HLA-B*15:02 allele varies widely even within ethnic groups, as seen in the variability between Northern and Southern Han Chinese populations, making it challenging to predict genetic risks based on ancestry alone.[21] In contrast, the allele is rare in individuals of European or African descent, making universal testing a complex issue in populations with diverse genetic backgrounds.[11] The limitations of existing guidelines are particularly apparent when considering the genetic heterogeneity in individuals of mixed ancestry, which complicates testing protocols and the interpretation of genetic testing alike. This variability underscores the need for precise, individualized genetic screening rather than broad ancestry-based testing recommendations. Relying solely on ancestry to assess genetic risk can lead to oversimplifications that overlook individual genetic diversity and reinforce outdated race-based medical models, despite growing recognition of genetic admixture and the limitations of such approaches.[22]

Clinicians must adopt comprehensive genetic screening protocols that account for the full spectrum of genetic diversity. Solely relying on ancestry-based screening risks misclassifying patients, leading to missed diagnoses or inappropriate risk assessments. While targeted screening for HLA-B*15:02 in high-prevalence populations has been cost-effective, evidence suggests that HLA-A*31:01, which is associated with broader hypersensitivity reactions, also warrants consideration, particularly in European and Japanese populations.[11] Given the limitations of ancestry-based approaches, integrating both HLA-B15:02 and HLA-A31:01 screening into PGx guidelines would enhance patient safety and improve risk stratification.[23]

Healthcare institutions, policymakers, and regulatory bodies should work toward developing more comprehensive PGx testing guidelines that address these gaps. While universal PGx screening for all patients prescribed carbamazepine may not be cost-effective in every setting, a precision-medicine approach that incorporates both genetic and clinical risk factors could optimize cost-benefit balance.[12,13] By aligning screening recommendations with evolving evidence and clinical utility, PGx testing can more effectively improve patient outcomes while reducing the healthcare costs associated with severe adverse drug reactions to carbamazepine. Furthermore, disparities in insurance coverage must be addressed to ensure equitable access, as limited reimbursement remains a significant barrier to implementation.[14] Moving forward, it is essential to conduct thorough cost-benefit analyses, advocate

for standardized insurance coverage, and refine PGx testing strategies beyond simplistic ancestral categories.

Comprehensive Patient Education and Informed Consent

Ethical considerations about patient autonomy and informed consent are crucial when prescribing carbamazepine and recommending PGx testing. Healthcare professionals must ensure that patients understand the benefits and limitations of PGx testing, including the risk of adverse drug reactions like SJS and TEN.[24] A key aspect of informed consent should be providing a clear explanation of the predictive power of genetic testing, including the probability that a patient carrying a specific allele, such as HLA-B*15:02, will actually develop SJS/TEN if exposed to carbamazepine. For example, individuals carrying HLA-B*15:02 had nearly 80 times the odds of developing SJS/TEN compared to non-carriers.[25] Similarly, HLA-A*31:01 is associated with a 25% risk of hypersensitivity reactions but a much lower likelihood of SJS/TEN compared to HLA-B*15:02.11 Providing patients with these risk estimates ensures that they can weigh the benefits and risks of carbamazepine therapy more accurately when making treatment decisions. Comprehensive patient education should also cover the possibility of severe adverse effects, the need for monitoring, and the availability of alternative treatments. This approach empowers patients to make informed decisions about their care, respecting their autonomy.[26]

The complexities of informed consent in genetic testing are multifaceted. Patients must understand not only the immediate implications of the test but also potential future ramifications, such as the discovery of incidental findings or the impact on family members.[27] Best practices for ensuring that patients fully comprehend the implications of carbamazepine PGx testing include: providing clear, jargon-free explanations of the test's purpose, process, and potential outcomes; discussing both the benefits and risks associated with testing and treatment; allowing sufficient time for patients to ask questions and consider their options; offering genetic counseling services to help patients interpret results and discuss their implications; and providing information in the patient's preferred language and in culturally appropriate ways.[28]

Some argue that mandating PGx testing for carbamazepine could delay critical treatment for patients with seizure disorders, and contend that the risk of adverse reactions is outweighed by the immediate need to control seizures. This view, however, underestimates the severity of reactions like SJS and TEN, which can be fatal. Moreover, alternative anti-epileptic drugs can be used as a bridge during the brief period required for PGx testing.[29] Prioritizing informed consent and patient safety need not compromise timely treatment.

Patient Privacy and Data Management

Integrating PGx testing into clinical practice requires meticulous data management to ensure patient safety and confidentiality. Managing sensitive genetic information involves safeguarding patient privacy and preventing misuse that could lead to discrimination or stigmatization.[27] The risks of genetic data misuse are not hypothetical. In a 2019 case in the UK, an insurance company denied coverage to a patient based on a genetic predisposition revealed through PGx testing, despite laws prohibiting such discrimination.[30] These incidents underscore the urgent need for robust data protection measures and strict enforcement of non-discrimination laws.

Beyond legal protections, ensuring proper handling of genetic data also requires adequate training for healthcare professionals. As PGx testing becomes more integrated into clinical decision-making, clinicians and healthcare staff must be equipped to manage, interpret, and safeguard genetic information appropriately. While some hospitals have begun incorporating genetic and genomic education into provider training, standardized programs for handling PGx data remain limited.[31] The need for improved education is evident, as a national survey of U.S. physicians found that while 97.6% acknowledged the impact of genetic variations on drug response, only 10.3% felt adequately informed about pharmacogenomic testing, and just 12.9% had ordered a test in the previous six months.[32] Expanding these training efforts within hospital systems could help prevent data mismanagement, strengthen patient privacy protections, and improve confidence in PGx-guided care. By prioritizing both policy enforcement and comprehensive education, healthcare institutions can ensure that PGx implementation is both ethically sound and clinically effective.

Clear regulations, such as the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act in the United States, are essential to protect individuals from genetic discrimination.[26] Similarly, the General Data Protection Regulation in the European Union provides a framework for protecting personal data, including genetic information.[33] Implementation and enforcement of these regulations, however, remain challenging, particularly given the rapid advancements in genetic technology.

To address these challenges, we propose several strategies for safeguarding patient genetic information: implementing robust encryption and anonymization techniques for genetic data storage and transmission; [33] establishing clear protocols for data access, limiting it to authorized personnel only; regularly updating security measures to protect against evolving cyber threats; providing comprehensive training to healthcare staff on data protection and privacy laws; and developing transparent policies on data sharing and use, ensuring patients are fully informed about how their genetic information may be utilized.[27]

Cultural Awareness and Humility in Genetic Counseling

To foster trust and engagement and to accommodate diverse patient populations, educational materials should be available in multiple languages.[28] Providers must also be aware that cultural attitudes toward genetic testing vary widely; some communities are skeptical due to privacy concerns, while others view it as a proactive health strategy.[34] Health literacy, influenced by education, language, and cultural norms, plays a crucial role in how patients make informed decisions. In Japan, for instance, where the concept of "ie" (family lineage) is culturally significant, research has demonstrated that genetic testing raises concerns about familial implications.[35] Japanese patients have been more likely to decline PGx testing due to fears of stigmatizing their family line. Conversely, in Iceland, where a homogeneous population and strong national biobank facilitate genetic research, PGx testing is widely accepted and even expected.[36] These contrasts highlight the need for culturally aware approaches to PGx testing worldwide.

An essential component of culturally aware genetic counseling is the integration of pre-test counseling sessions, which allow patients to make informed choices about PGx testing. These sessions should assess a patient's understanding of genetic testing, clarify the predictive power of specific genetic markers, and provide a realistic explanation of risk. Ensuring that patients fully understand the implications of PGx testing is particularly important given the strong associations between certain genetic variants and severe drug reactions. As noted above, for instance, prior research has demonstrated a strikingly high correlation between HLA-B*15:02 and carbamazepine-induced SJS/TEN, with carriers facing exponentially greater risk than non-carriers.[25] This level of risk stratification underscores the need for clear communication in genetic counseling, ensuring that patients can make informed decisions about alternative treatment options when appropriate. Counseling should also address cultural or ethical concerns, including the potential familial implications of genetic results, privacy considerations, and the psychological impact of testing. Given that trust in medical systems varies across different cultural groups and may be shaped by historical experiences of discrimination, pre-test counseling must be conducted with sensitivity to the patient's background and values.

Community leaders, such as faith leaders or patient advocates, can serve as trusted intermediaries to improve understanding and acceptance of PGx testing, particularly in communities with historical distrust of medical institutions.[34] Additionally, healthcare providers should receive training in cultural humility and genetic counseling to ensure that discussions around PGx testing are respectful, informative, and aligned with patients' concerns and preferences.[23] Cultural humility is a lifelong process of self-reflection and self-critique, in which individuals examine their own beliefs and biases rather than seeking to achieve "competence" in understanding other cultures.[37] Applied to PGx testing protocols, this approach shifts away from one-size-fits-all guidelines and instead emphasizes collaboration, open communication, and patient-centered decision-making.

Recognizing the possibility of culturally diverse interpretations of the risks and benefits of PGx testing and incorporating cultural humility into healthcare practices is essential for ethical patient care.[34] By adopting a practice of cultural humility and integrating pre-counseling sessions as a standard practice, healthcare institutions can enhance patient trust, improve comprehension of genetic risks, and promote ethically sound and culturally sensitive PGx implementation.

Conclusion

The ethical implementation of PGx testing for carbamazepine presents significant challenges in personalized medicine. Our analysis reveals that current FDA guidelines, while valuable, inadequately address the full spectrum of ethical concerns, including equitable access, informed consent, data privacy, and cultural sensitivity in genetic counseling. We propose a comprehensive framework that emphasizes developing infrastructure for consistent access to testing, implementing thorough patient education programs, establishing robust data protection measures, and adopting culturally sensitive counseling approaches.

Addressing these imperatives requires unprecedented collaboration among geneticists, ethicists, healthcare providers, policymakers, and patients. As we advance in genetic discovery, our ethical frameworks must evolve correspondingly. The case of carbamazepine pharmacogenomics exemplifies the broader challenges in implementing personalized medicine. By prioritizing patient autonomy, cultural humility, equitable access, and data security, we can fulfill the promise of pharmacogenomics to enhance patient care, minimize adverse reactions, and usher in an era of precision medicine that benefits all patients equitably.

Conflicts of Interest: None. We declare no conflicts of interest or financial interests that the authors or members of their immediate families have in any product or service discussed in the manuscript, including grants (pending or received), employment, gifts, stock holdings or options, honoraria, consultancies, expert testimony, patents, and royalties.

References

1. Maan JS, Duong TVH, Saadabadi A. Carbamazepine. StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing; 2025.
2. Zubcević S, Gavranović M, Katica V, Brajković D, Catibusić F. [Efficacy and tolerability of carbamazepine as the initial drug used in the treatment of epilepsy]. Med Arh. 2002;56(3 Suppl 1):26-9. Efikasnost i podnosljivost carbamazepina kao primarno uvedenog lijeka u tretmanu epilepsija.

3. Iannaccone T, Sellitto C, Manzo V, et al. Pharmacogenetics of carbamazepine and balproate: Focus on polymorphisms of drug metabolizing enzymes and transporters. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). Mar 1 2021;14(3)doi:10.3390/ph14030204
4. Sadee W, Wang D, Hartmann K, Toland AE. Pharmacogenomics: Driving personalized medicine. Pharmacol Rev. Jul 2023;75(4):789-814. doi:10.1124/pharmrev.122.000810
5. Dean L. Carbamazepine therapy and HLA genotype. In: Pratt VM, Scott SA, Pirmohamed M, Esquivel B, Kattman BL, Malheiro AJ, eds. Medical Genetics Summaries. National Center for Biotechnology Information (US); 2012.
6. U.S. Food & Drug Administration. Table of pharmacogenetic associations. June 9, 2024, https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/precision-medicine/table-pharmacogenetic-associations
7. Franco V, Perucca E. The pharmacogenomics of epilepsy. Expert Rev Neurother. Oct 2015;15(10):1161-70. doi:10.1586/14737175.2015.1083424
8. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC). Guideline for HLA Genotype and use of carbamazepine and oxcarbazepine. 2017;
9. Ma JD, Lee KC, Kuo GM. Clinical application of pharmacogenomics. J Pharm Pract. Aug 2012;25(4):417-27. doi:10.1177/0897190012448309
10. Verbelen M, Weale ME, Lewis CM. Cost-effectiveness of pharmacogenetic-guided treatment: Are we there yet? Pharmacogenomics J. Oct 2017;17(5):395-402. doi:10.1038/tpj.2017.21
11. McCormack M, Alfirevic A, Bourgeois S, et al. HLA-A*3101 and carbamazepine-induced hypersensitivity reactions in Europeans. N Engl J Med. Mar 24 2011;364(12):1134-43. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1013297
12. Plumpton CO, Yip VL, Alfirevic A, Marson AG, Pirmohamed M, Hughes DA. Cost-effectiveness of screening for HLA-A*31:01 prior to initiation of carbamazepine in epilepsy. Epilepsia. Apr 2015;56(4):556-63. doi:10.1111/epi.12937
13. Chen Z, Liew D, Kwan P. Real-world cost-effectiveness of pharmacogenetic screening for epilepsy treatment. Neurology. Mar 22 2016;86(12):1086-94. doi:10.1212/wnl.0000000000002484
14. Personalized Medicine Coalition. Paying for personalized medicine: How alternative payment models could help or hinder the field. 2019.
15. Erlich H. HLA DNA typing: Past, present, and future. Tissue Antigens. Jul 2012;80(1):1-11. doi:10.1111/j.1399-0039.2012.01881.x
16. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network. Policy notice: Modifications to improve patient safety related to HLA typing errors (Policy Notice 19-01). 2019. Accessed February 17, 2025. https://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/media/2791/histo_policynotice_201901.pdf
17. Choi H, Mohit B. Cost-effectiveness of screening for HLA-B*1502 prior to initiation of carbamazepine in epilepsy patients of Asian ancestry in the United States. Epilepsia. Jul 2019;60(7):1472-1481. doi:10.1111/epi.16053
18. Pesce A. Why pharmacogenetic testing should be reimbursed by Medicare and commercial health insurance. J Opioid Manag. Jul-Aug 2024;20(4):267. doi:10.5055/jom.0870
19. Yip VL, Marson AG, Jorgensen AL, Pirmohamed M, Alfirevic A. HLA genotype and carbamazepine-induced cutaneous adverse drug reactions: A systematic review. Clin Pharmacol Ther. Dec 2012;92(6):757-65. doi:10.1038/clpt.2012.189
20. He XJ, Jian LY, He XL, et al. Association between the HLA-B*15:02 allele and carbamazepine-induced Stevens-Johnson syndrome/toxic epidermal necrolysis in Han individuals of northeastern China. Pharmacol Rep. 2013;65(5):1256-62. doi:10.1016/s1734-1140(13)71483-x
21. Kaniwa N, Saito Y. The risk of cutaneous adverse reactions among patients with the HLA-A* 31:01 allele who are given carbamazepine, oxcarbazepine or eslicarbazepine: a perspective review. Ther Adv Drug Saf. Dec 2013;4(6):246-53. doi:10.1177/2042098613499791
22. Mersha TB, Abebe T. Self-reported race/ethnicity in the age of genomic research: Its potential impact on understanding health disparities. Hum Genomics. Jan 7 2015;9(1):1. doi:10.1186/s40246-014-0023-x
23. Sharma S, Mariño-Ramírez L, Jordan IK. Race, ethnicity, and pharmacogenomic variation in the United States and the United Kingdom. Pharmaceutics. Jul 11 2023;15(7)doi:10.3390/pharmaceutics15071923
24. Thong BY, Vultaggio A, Rerkpattanapipat T, Schrijvers R. Prevention of drug hypersensitivity reactions: Prescreening and premedication. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract. Aug 2021;9(8):2958-2966. doi:10.1016/j.jaip.2021.04.006
25. Tangamornsuksan W, Chaiyakunapruk N, Somkrua R, Lohitnavy M, Tassaneeyakul W. Relationship between the HLA-B*1502 allele and carbamazepine-induced Stevens-Johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Dermatol. Sep 2013;149(9):1025-32. doi:10.1001/jamadermatol.2013.4114
26. Chapman CR, Mehta KS, Parent B, Caplan AL. Genetic discrimination: emerging ethical challenges in the context of advancing technology. J Law Biosci. Jan-Dec 2020;7(1):lsz016. doi:10.1093/jlb/lsz016
27. Haga SB, Tindall G, O'Daniel JM. Public perspectives about pharmacogenetic testing and managing ancillary findings. Genet Test Mol Biomarkers. Mar 2012;16(3):193-7. doi:10.1089/gtmb.2011.0118
28. Ortega VE, Meyers DA. Pharmacogenetics: Implications of race and ethnicity on defining genetic profiles for personalized medicine. J Allergy Clin Immunol. Jan 2014;133(1):16-26. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2013.10.040

29. Speicher L, Crosby S, Schuh MJ. Pharmacogenomics testing confirmation of carbamazepine induced DRESS reaction of an HLA-A*31:01 positive polypharmacy patient. Innov Pharm. 2021;12(4)doi:10.24926/iip.v12i4.4341
30. Genetics Society of the UK. Annual report on genetic discrimination cases. 2020.
31. Jenkins J, Calzone KA. Establishing the essential nursing competencies for genetics and genomics. J Nurs Scholarsh. 2007;39(1):10-6. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2007.00137.x
32. Stanek EJ, Sanders CL, Taber KA, et al. Adoption of pharmacogenomic testing by US physicians: Results of a nationwide survey. Clin Pharmacol Ther. Mar 2012;91(3):450-8. doi:10.1038/clpt.2011.306
33. McGraw D, Mandl KD. Privacy protections to encourage use of health-relevant digital data in a learning health system. NPJ Digit Med. Jan 4 2021;4(1):2. doi:10.1038/s41746-020-00362-8
34. Payne PW, Jr. For Asians only? The perils of ancestry-based drug prescribing. J Law Med Ethics. Fall 2008;36(3):585-8. doi:10.1111/j.1748-720X.2008.307.x
35. Fukushima Y, Takada F. Clinical genetics in Japan: Efforts of human genetics societies and related organizations. JMA J. Jan 15 2020;3(1):1-8. doi:10.31662/jmaj.2019-0019
36. Harris TB, Launer LJ, Eiriksdottir G, et al. Age, Gene/Environment Susceptibility-Reykjavik Study: Multidisciplinary applied phenomics. Am J Epidemiol. May 1 2007;165(9):1076-87. doi:10.1093/aje/kwk115
37. Stubbe DE. Practicing cultural competence and cultural humility in the care of diverse patients. Focus (Am Psychiatr Publ). Jan 2020;18(1):49-51. doi:10.1176/appi.focus.20190041