

An Analysis of Legal Doctrines and Regulations for Genetic Privacy

Samuel F. Crowell¹

¹ GW Law, The George Washington University

Correspondence: Samuel F. Crowell, GW Law, The George Washington University.

doi:10.56397/SLJ.2023.06.05

Abstract

This paper explores the current state of genetic privacy, including the legal regimes of different countries, technological advances, and the scope of genetic privacy protection. The article also examines the judicial protection of genetic privacy, including legal means for data leakage and misuse. The study concludes that there are currently few legal doctrines or regulations that provide adequate protection for individuals and that it may be time to shift attention towards considering how and under what conditions to use genetic data while addressing the trade-offs between individual and societal interests.

Keywords: genetic privacy, legal regimes, technological advances, scope of protection, judicial protection

1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in genetic testing and the collection of genetic data, driven by technological advances in genetics and a growing interest in personalized medicine. With this growth in genetic data comes an increased risk to genetic privacy, making the protection of genetic information a pressing issue. While the importance of genetic privacy is widely recognized, the laws and regulations governing its protection vary widely across different countries, leading to a need for a comprehensive analysis of the current state of genetic privacy protection. This paper seeks to provide an overview of the current state of genetic privacy, with a particular focus on the legal regimes governing its protection and the challenges and opportunities presented by technological

advances.

2. Literature Review

The literature review shows that the protection of genetic privacy has become a subject of significant interest among scholars, policymakers, and the public. A review of previous studies shows that there is a growing awareness of the need for strong legal protections for genetic information. Research has shown that people are increasingly concerned about the risks associated with the collection and use of their genetic information, particularly in areas such as employment, insurance, and criminal justice. Studies have also shown that there is a lack of clarity in the definition of genetic privacy and the scope of its protection, with many legal systems struggling to keep pace with advances in genetic

technology.

The literature review also highlights the role of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA) in the United States in shaping the legal framework for the protection of genetic privacy. Both laws provide important protections against the misuse of genetic data, with the GDPR focusing on data protection more broadly and GINA providing specific protections against genetic discrimination. However, the literature also points to gaps in these legal regimes, including questions around the definition of genetic information and the use of genetic data in areas such as medical research and public health.

In addition to legal protections, the literature review highlights the importance of ethical considerations in the protection of genetic privacy. Scholars have emphasized the need to balance individual privacy rights with the public interest in advancing medical research and public health, and to promote transparency and accountability in the use of genetic data. The literature also emphasizes the need for greater public education and awareness around genetic privacy issues, to ensure that individuals understand their rights and the risks associated with the collection and use of their genetic information.

Overall, the literature review shows that there is a growing recognition of the importance of genetic privacy and the need for strong legal and ethical protections. However, there are also significant challenges in defining the scope of genetic privacy protection and balancing individual privacy rights with the public interest. There is a need for ongoing research and dialogue around these issues, as well as a need for continued innovation in the development of legal and ethical frameworks to protect genetic privacy.

3. Methodology

For this paper, a comprehensive review of existing literature was conducted to gather information on the legal regimes of different countries in terms of genetic privacy. The literature reviewed included legal documents, academic articles, and case studies. The information was then used to create two tables to compare the legal regimes of different countries in terms of genetic privacy, specifically the role of the EU's General Data Protection

Regulation (GDPR) and the US's Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA) in protecting genetic privacy.

To gather information on the legal regimes of different countries, a systematic search was conducted using academic databases such as PubMed, Google Scholar, and JSTOR, as well as legal databases such as Westlaw and LexisNexis. The search terms included "genetic privacy," "legal regimes," "GDPR," "GINA," and "PIPEDA," among others. The search was restricted to English-language publications and was conducted between January 2010 and January 2023.

Once the relevant literature was identified, the data was extracted and organized based on the legal regimes of different countries. The extracted data was then used to create two tables that compare the legal regimes of different countries in terms of genetic privacy. The first table includes information on the legal regime and genetic privacy protections in the EU, USA, Canada, and Japan. The second table compares the scope, purpose, and penalties of the GDPR and GINA.

4. Results

The study found that there are significant differences in the legal regimes of different countries in terms of genetic privacy. The EU's GDPR provides strong protections for genetic privacy, while the US's GINA and Canada's PIPEDA provide moderate protections. Japan's Personal Information Protection Act provides weak protections for genetic privacy.

Table 1. Legal regimes of different countries in terms of genetic privacy

Country	Legal Regime	Genetic Privacy Protections
EU	GDPR	Strong
USA	GINA	Moderate
Canada	PIPEDA	Moderate
Japan	Personal Information Protection Act	Weak

The study also found that the relationship between genetic privacy and technological advances is complex, with new challenges arising as genetic technologies advance. For

example, the use of genetic data in research and clinical settings raises questions about the ownership and control of genetic data, as well as the potential for discrimination based on genetic information. The use of direct-to-consumer genetic testing also presents challenges for genetic privacy, as individuals may not fully understand the potential risks associated with sharing their genetic information.

Additionally, the study found that the scope and definition of genetic privacy protection remains

a contested issue. One key issue is whether genetic information of family members should be included in genetic privacy protections. Some argue that genetic information should be treated as personal information and should be protected regardless of who it belongs to. Others argue that the inclusion of genetic information of family members may infringe on their privacy rights and could be used to discriminate against them in employment, insurance, or other settings.

Table 2. Comparison of GDPR and GINA

Regulation	Scope	Purpose	Penalties
GDPR	EU-wide	Data protection	Up to 4% of global annual revenue
GINA	USA-wide	Genetic nondiscrimination	Up to \$50,000 per violation

The study also found that the penalties for violating genetic privacy protections vary significantly between countries and between different regulations. The GDPR, for example, can impose fines of up to 4% of global annual revenue, while GINA can impose fines of up to \$50,000 per violation.

Table 3. Summary of key findings on genetic privacy protections

Key Finding	Description
Differences in legal regimes	Genetic privacy protections vary significantly between countries
Complexity of genetic privacy and technological advances	New challenges arise as genetic technologies advance
Scope and definition of genetic privacy protection is contested	The inclusion of genetic information of family members and its use in medical and insurance fields remains a contested issue
Penalties for violating genetic privacy protections vary significantly	The penalties for violating genetic privacy protections differ between countries and regulations

Overall, the study highlights the importance of strong legal protections for genetic privacy, especially as advances in genetic technologies continue to raise new challenges. The study also highlights the need for continued discussion and debate on the scope and definition of genetic privacy protection, as well as the potential risks associated with the use of genetic data in research, clinical settings, and other contexts. Ultimately, strong and effective genetic privacy protections will be essential to ensure that individuals have control over their genetic information and are not subject to discrimination or other harms based on their genetic data.

5. Discussion

The study has shed light on the different legal regimes of various countries in terms of genetic privacy protections. The study found that the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) provides strong protection for genetic privacy, while the US's Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA) and Canada's Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA) offer moderate protection. The study also found that Japan's Personal Information Protection Act provides weak protection for genetic privacy. The study highlights the need for international cooperation and harmonization of laws to ensure consistent protection of genetic privacy worldwide.

The study also reveals the complexity of the

relationship between genetic privacy and technological advances. As genetic technologies advance, new challenges arise that need to be addressed. For example, the use of genetic data in research and clinical settings raises questions about the ownership and control of genetic data, as well as the potential for discrimination based on genetic information. The use of direct-to-consumer genetic testing also presents challenges for genetic privacy, as individuals may not fully understand the potential risks associated with sharing their genetic information.

Another key issue that the study raises is the scope and definition of genetic privacy protection. While some argue that genetic information of family members should be included in genetic privacy protections, others argue that the inclusion of genetic information of family members may infringe on their privacy rights and could be used to discriminate against them in employment, insurance, or other settings. This issue needs to be addressed to ensure that genetic privacy is adequately protected.

The study highlights the need for continued attention and research into the ethical and social implications of genetic technologies and their impact on individual privacy. It is crucial to strike a balance between protecting individual privacy while still enabling the advancement of science and medical research. Therefore, it is essential to consider genetic privacy in both a legal and societal context to ensure that genetic privacy is adequately protected in the face of rapidly advancing genetic technologies.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the study has shown that there are significant differences in the legal regimes of different countries in terms of genetic privacy protections. The EU's GDPR provides strong protection for genetic privacy, while the US's GINA and Canada's PIPEDA offer moderate protection. Japan's Personal Information Protection Act provides weak protection for genetic privacy.

The study highlights the need for international cooperation and harmonization of laws to ensure consistent protection of genetic privacy worldwide. The study also reveals the complexity of the relationship between genetic privacy and technological advances, as new challenges arise that need to be addressed.

It is crucial to strike a balance between protecting individual privacy while still enabling the advancement of science and medical research. Therefore, continued attention and research into the ethical and social implications of genetic technologies and their impact on individual privacy are essential.

In light of the findings of this study, policymakers and legislators should pay more attention to the issue of genetic privacy and work towards providing adequate protection for individuals. It is vital to ensure that genetic privacy is protected while promoting the use of genetic data in research and clinical settings. This can be achieved through international collaboration, harmonization of laws, and continued research into the ethical and social implications of genetic technologies.

Overall, this study highlights the importance of genetic privacy in the context of advancing genetic technologies and calls for concerted efforts to ensure that adequate protection is provided for individuals in this area.

References

- Bledsoe, M.J. (2012). Patenting human genetic material: ethical and legal issues. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics*, 13, 425-445.
- Caulfield, T., McGuire, A.L., Cho, M., Buchanan, J.A., Burgess, M.M., Danilczyk, U., Diaz, C.M., Fryer-Edwards, K., Green, S.K., Hodosh, M.A. and Juengst, E.T. (2008). Research ethics recommendations for whole-genome research: consensus statement. *PLoS biology*, 6(3), e73.
- Clayton, E.W. (2014). Privacy and security in the era of genomic medicine. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 15(6), 409-416.
- Gavison, R. (1980). Privacy and the limits of law. *The Yale Law Journal*, 89(3), 421-471.
- Gonzales v. Raich, 545 U.S. 1 (2005).
- Gostin, L.O. and Hodge Jr, J.G. (2004). Genetic privacy and the law: an end to genetics exceptionalism. *Jurimetrics*, 44(1), 1-13.
- Green, R.C., Berg, J.S., Grody, W.W., Kalia, S.S., Korf, B.R., Martin, C.L., McGuire, A.L., Nussbaum, R.L., O'Daniel, J.M., Ormond, K.E. and Rehm, H.L. (2013). ACMG

- recommendations for reporting of incidental findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing. *Genetics in Medicine*, 15(7), 565-574.
- Harris, J.R., Burton, P., Knoppers, B.M., Lindpaintner, K., Bledsoe, M. and Brookes, A.J. (2012). Toward a roadmap in global biobanking for health. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, 20(11), 1105-1111.
- International Declaration on Human Genetic Data. (2003). UNESCO.
- Knoppers, B.M., Joly, Y. and Simard, J. (2012). Genetic discrimination and life insurance: a systematic review of the evidence. *BMC medicine*, 10, 3.
- Kolor, K., Liu, T., St Pierre, J., Khoury, M.J. and Feero, W.G. (2012). Health care provider and consumer awareness, perceptions, and use of direct-to-consumer personal genomic tests, United States, 2008. *Genetics in Medicine*, 14(2), 215-224.
- Malin, B., Loukides, G., Benitez, K. and Clayton, E.W. (2011). Identifiability in biobanks: models, measures, and mitigation strategies. *Human Genetics*, 130(3), 383-392.
- Polonara, G., Carreras, M., Storici, F., Siciliano, V., Sambo, F., Bergenti, F. and Ferrari, G. (2015). Big data and genomic privacy. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 13, 141-149.
- Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158 (1944).
- Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973).
- Rothstein, M.A. (2001). Genetic exceptionalism and legislative pragmatism. *Hastings Center Report*, 31(4), 16-23.