

1 **Title Page**

2 **“Public attitudes to sharing government data with private industry: a systematic scoping**
3 **review.”**

4 **Author(s):**

5 Jackie Street¹, Stacy Carter¹, Belinda Fabrianesi¹, Rebecca Bosward¹, Lucy Carolan^{1*}, Annette
6 Braunack-Mayer¹

7 ¹ University of Wollongong

8 *Corresponding author lengland@uow.edu.au

9

10 **Contribution(s):**

11 JS conceptualised the study, contributed to data collection, analysis and interpretation, drafted and
12 approved the final manuscript.

13 SC contributed to the study concept and design, data analysis and interpretation, drafting the
14 manuscript and approved the final manuscript

15 BF contributed to the study concept and design, data collection, data analysis and interpretation,
16 drafting the manuscript and approved the final manuscript

17 RB contributed to data collection, data analysis and interpretation, drafting the manuscript and
18 approved the final manuscript

19 LC contributed to the study concept and design, data analysis and interpretation, drafting the
20 manuscript and approved the final manuscript

21 ABM conceptualised the study, contributed to data analysis and interpretation, drafting the manuscript
22 and approved the final manuscript. ABM is responsible for obtaining the funding for the project and
23 is the corresponding author.

24

25 **Abstract**

26 **Background:** Linking and analysing large volumes of health data in electronic records, datasets,
27 registries and biobanks can provide detailed insights into the health profiles of individuals,
28 communities, regions and national populations. Good governance for data sharing can be challenging,
29 particularly when private sector organisations are the recipients of public sector data. Many
30 jurisdictions have responded by instituting new regulations and laws related to data protection,
31 responding to calls to promote data sharing and manage associated risks. This review integrates and
32 interprets five years of research on public and patient perspectives on sharing publicly-held health
33 data with private industry for research and development. Our review question was: what are
34 community attitudes towards the use of government administrative health data by private industry
35 organisations for therapeutic development?

36 **Methods:** We developed two logic grids: first, used terms describing citizens or patients, big data,
37 private health sector and views or perspectives, second, used terms describing big data, social licence
38 and public interest. We conducted a systematic literature search using electronic databases; PubMed,
39 Scopus, CINAHL, Web of Science. Searches were conducted using Google Advanced and Google
40 Scholar to identify grey literature

41 **Results:** A total of 6,788 articles were screened based on title and abstract. Full text screening was
42 conducted for 224 articles and a total of 33 publications were identified. Across all studies, support
43 for sharing administrative health data with private sector organisations was low. Background

44 knowledge and lack of trust that data use would lead to public benefit were the most important
45 reasons for low level of support.

46 **Conclusion:** Policymakers, data custodians and companies will need to establish robust safeguards
47 including secure storage, anonymisation, monitoring and independent oversight, and institute and
48 implement sanctions on misuse, if they are to secure legitimacy to share publicly-held health data with
49 private industry for research and development.

50 **Registration** *none available.*

51 **Keywords:** Big Data; Health Information Systems; Health Data; Private Sector; Data Linkage; Public
52 Opinion; Consent; Trust; Public Interest; Social License.

53

54 **'Contributions to the literature'**

- 55 • Research shows governance for data sharing is challenging, particularly when private sector
56 organisations are the recipients of public sector data. Globally jurisdictions have responded by
57 instituting new regulations and laws related to data protection, data sharing and the associated
58 risks.
- 59 • Bringing together research on 'public attitudes towards the use of linked government
60 administrative data by private sector organisations for therapeutic development', this
61 systematic review found that public support for sharing was low.
- 62 • These findings highlight key areas for policymakers, data custodians and companies to
63 address before they can legitimately share publicly-held health data with private industry for
64 research and development.

65

66 **“Public attitudes to sharing government data with private industry: a**
67 **systematic scoping review.”**

68 **Introduction**

69 Data are increasingly central to contemporary life and work, including in the health sector. Linking
70 and analysing the very large volumes of health data in electronic health records, research datasets,
71 registries and biobanks can provide detailed insights into the health profiles of individuals,
72 communities, regions and national populations.

73 It is widely acknowledged that governance for data sharing is important. It is also challenging,
74 particularly when private sector organisations are the recipients of public sector data. (1-3) Concerns
75 about private sector use of public data can, in part, be traced to the profit-driven nature of private
76 sector companies. (4) Private companies are accountable to their shareholders and, at least in
77 countries such as Australia, are required to serve the interests of shareholders (5), potentially
78 conflicting with legislative requirements and public expectations that public sector administrative data
79 are used in the public interest. (6)

80 Many jurisdictions have responded to these challenges by instituting new regulations and laws related
81 to data protection, responding both to calls to promote data sharing (7-14) and to manage the risks
82 associated with sharing data. (1, 2) For example, the European Commission, in 2018, adopted the
83 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) giving individuals control over their personal data and
84 instituting large fines for privacy breaches. Other countries, including the US, (13) Canada (8) and
85 Australia, (9) are adopting legislative changes which will allow greater data sharing with the private
86 sector under supervision, (7-15) acknowledging both the important contribution that the private sector
87 makes to research and development of new pharmaceuticals and medical devices, and also noting the
88 challenge that sharing data with the private sector poses for public trust in government.

89 In light of such proposed changes, it is surprising that so little attention has been paid to public views
90 about sharing administrative health data sets with the private sector. The evidence that is available is

91 scattered across papers that focus primarily on data sharing with other government agencies, with
92 researchers or with non-government organisations, rather than specifically with the private sector. (1)
93 Therefore, this paper brings together, for the first time, qualitative and quantitative research published
94 in the peer reviewed and grey literature on public attitudes towards the use of linked government
95 administrative data by private sector organisations for therapeutic development. Our review question
96 was:

97 What are community attitudes towards the use of government administrative health data by private
98 industry organisations for therapeutic development?

99 *Please refer to Additional file 1 for the PRISMA 2020 checklist/ reporting guidelines*

100

101 **Methods**

102 **Search strategy**

103 In designing and conducting the scoping review, we drew on the work of Arksey and O'Malley (16)
104 and Peters et al. (17) Since we were primarily concerned with the breadth of existing literature in the
105 area, we did not exclude papers based on quality but used a Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (18) to
106 note study limitations.

107 We developed two logic grids (population, concept, context, outcomes) for the study. The first search
108 used terms describing citizens or patients, big data, the private health sector and views or
109 perspectives, with these terms and relevant synonyms included in the searches. The second search
110 used terms describing Big Data, social licence and the public interest, with these terms and relevant
111 synonyms included in the Boolean searches. (For full details see Additional file 2, **Supplementary**
112 **Tables S1 and S2**). Depending on the database, documents were sourced within the time period “last
113 five years” or January 1st 2014 to April 1st 2019. We excluded papers published prior to 2014
114 because literature on sharing public health data with the private sector was limited prior to 2014. (1)
115 Earlier studies would not necessarily reflect current community views and judgements about the

116 public interest. Studies published within the time period, but which reported data prior to 2014, were
117 included.

118 We conducted a systematic literature search using four electronic databases PubMed, Scopus,
119 CINAHL, and Web of Science. In addition, searches were conducted using Google Advanced and
120 Google Scholar, in particular to identify relevant grey literature. These databases were selected for
121 their coverage of research with respect to the use of data analytics in health and, in particular, research
122 on community attitudes to data sharing in health. In Google Advanced and Google Scholar, searches
123 were restricted to the first 1000 hits. Additional ‘pearled’ relevant articles were extracted from the
124 reference lists of included papers. Peer-reviewed and unpublished articles, reports, books and book
125 chapters describing empirical research were included. Editorials or opinion pieces were excluded.
126 There were no limitations on geographical location but only English language articles were included.

127 For the database searches, we iteratively developed a search strategy based on the logic grid. Our final
128 search strategy is shown in Supplementary Tables S1 and S2. (Additional file 2, **Supplementary**
129 **Tables S1-S4**).

130

131 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

132 We screened title and abstract and, in the case of reports, the contents page using the criteria described
133 in Table1. Articles were screened based on title and abstract (by authors JS, BF & RB). Full text
134 screening was conducted by two authors (JS & BF). Where there was disagreement between the
135 reviewers, the final decision for inclusion was made through discussion in the research team.
136 Reference lists of included papers were reviewed and further articles identified.

137 ***TO BE INSERTED HERE**

138 (Additional file 3; **Table 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria for selection of articles**)

139 **Data extraction and analysis**

140 A template for data extraction was used to provide a consistent approach to extraction and reporting
 141 of the findings. Two reviewers (BF & JS) extracted: title, author name, year of publication,
 142 location(s), aim(s), focus, public engaged, specific patient group, sample size, health technology,
 143 methodology, models (consent, data linkage, public interest), case studies, overarching results –
 144 access of private companies to public data, under what circumstances can public data be shared with
 145 private companies, consent, storage, definition of social /social contract, definition of public
 146 interest/public benefits, and bias/limitations which related to the research questions. One reviewer, JS,
 147 inductively coded, without *a priori* codes, the included articles using N-Vivo to extract descriptive
 148 themes and develop analytical themes. A second reviewer, BF, coded two papers and used the
 149 extracted data and the research question to cross-check the coding and extracted themes. Differences
 150 were discussed and resolved.

151 **Table 2: Extracted Terms**

Extracted			
1	title	13	models:
2	author name		- consent
3	year of publication		- data linkage
4	location(s)		- public interest
5	aim(s)	14	overarching results:
6	focus		- access of private companies to public data
7	public engaged		- under what circumstances can public data be shared
8	specific patient group		with private companies, consent
9	sample size		- storage
10	health technology		- definition of social /social contract

11	methodology		- definition of public interest/public benefits
12	case studies		- bias/limitations which related to the research questions.

152

153 **Quality assessment**

154 Study quality was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT). This tool permits
155 appraisal of the studies in mixed methods systematic and scoping reviews. It is designed to appraise
156 the quality of the underpinning rationale and methodology. All studies meeting the inclusion criteria
157 were assessed using seven criteria. The first two criteria established the existence of a clear research
158 question while the second assessed the ability of the data collected to answer the question. The
159 remaining five criteria were related to the study type e.g. qualitative/quantitative. Studies were given a
160 score out of seven depending on how many of the criteria were met (18). Limitations of the studies are
161 discussed.

162

163 **Results**

164 A systematic literature search of the four electronic databases, Google Scholar and Google Advanced
165 generated the following number of articles: PubMed (797), Scopus (1,768), CINAHL (389), and Web
166 of Science (1,844), Google Scholar (1,990) and Google Advanced (293).

167 A total of 6,788 articles were screened based on title and abstract. Full text screening was conducted
168 by two authors (JS & BF) for 224 articles (which included an additional seven peer-reviewed articles) and a
169 total of 35 publications were identified. The flow chart in Figure 1 (see Additional file 4; Figure 1
170 PRISMA Flowchart) summarises the review selection process. Six papers scored below 5 on the
171 MMAT assessment tool with only one scoring less than 3.

172 Of the 35 publications included in the review, 22 were peer-reviewed papers, 10 reports, two
173 conference proceedings and one conference paper. Most papers reported on research conducted in the
174 United Kingdom (n=17) and United States (n=6), with smaller numbers in New Zealand (n=3),

175 Canada (n=2), international (n=3), Europe (n=2), South Korea (n=1) and Thailand (n=1). There were
176 no studies identified from Australia, South America, Central America, Africa, Middle East, Russia or
177 for much of Europe or Asia. Data collection within the included studies occurred during the period
178 2007-2018. A small number of studies did not report their data collection period. Participants
179 included the broader public, affected patient groups, clinical stakeholders and private sector agencies.
180 In this paper, we only report the views of patients, consumers and broader publics.

181 Fourteen of the studies were qualitative or deliberative, using focus groups, citizen juries, workshops,
182 social assembly and interviews. Sixteen of the studies were quantitative using online and in person
183 surveys, and there were three mixed method studies. Two research studies were reported in duplicate
184 reports, the Data Futures study in New Zealand (19, 20) and the Life and Times Survey in Northern
185 Ireland (21, 22). All but one of the studies (23) scored more than 3 in the MMAT quality assessment
186 tool. Scores are shown in Table 3.

187 *TO BE INSERTED HERE

188 (Additional file 5; **Table 3**: A summary of the publications included)

189

190 Public support for sharing administrative health data

191 In general, across all studies, support for sharing administrative health data with private sector
192 organisations was low. Eight quantitative studies specifically asked about sharing health data with
193 private sector organisations (Table 4). Most asked participants to rate how willing they were to share
194 information with a range of individuals and groups; participants were generally less willing to share
195 their non-identified data with private companies than with any other groups. (Table 4) The level of
196 support varied widely, with lower levels of support for sharing identifiable data (15%) (52) and higher
197 levels for a scenario involving the use of deidentified data to develop a cure for Alzheimer's Disease
198 (75%). (21) Similarly, in relevant qualitative studies, participants expressed less support for sharing
199 personal health data with for-profit private sector organisations when compared with other groups

200 involved in health research such as health care professionals, university researchers and non-profit
201 organisations. (20, 25, 26, 33, 35, 42, 43)

202 There were two underlying reasons for a low level of support for data sharing with the private sector:
203 background knowledge, and lack of trust that data use would lead to public benefit. With respect to
204 background knowledge, participants were reportedly often surprised about the extent of data use and
205 the possibility that their data might be shared with private companies. Because participants were not
206 able to draw on existing understandings about drug and device development, and data use and sharing,
207 the studies reported here either assumed familiarity with these issues or needed to include
208 explanations of them (e.g. private and public health sectors, big data, data collection, ownership and
209 sharing, health research governance and data safeguards). (4, 24, 27, 37, 38, 41-43, 47) Studies often
210 reported comments such as:

211 *Is this actually happening today, where they're collecting a lot of data?* General Public,
212 Focus Group 2, Toronto 2017 (43, p.E43)

213 *Private companies have no need to have my medical information.* General Public, Glasgow.
214 2016 (4 p.36)

215 *It says so they can predict what will make you ill or better. How? Are they god? How can they*
216 *work all that out?* General public, Glasgow, 2016 (4, p.34)

217 In general, those studies that provided participants with opportunities to learn about data uses and
218 safeguards reported that participants' willingness to share with private companies increased when
219 their knowledge increased. (4, 26, 42, 49) For example, in deliberative workshops in Scotland,
220 although participants were wary of private industry involvement, they acknowledged their
221 involvement as "a necessary evil". (26, p.5)

222 The second background reason that participants rejected data sharing was a lack of trust that data use
223 would lead to public benefit. (20, 24, 26) Some participants suggested data use can be "a blunt
224 instrument" which may do more harm than good. (20, p.12) Distrust extended to government and
225 universities but was highest for private industry. (20, 21, 24, 26, 42, 43, 47, 51) This lack of trust was
10

226 not a simple relationship but rather was based on a complex web of experiences, beliefs and
227 knowledge described in more detail below.

228 ***TO BE INSERTED HERE**

229 **(Additional file 6; Table 4: Proportion of participants willing to share administrative health data with**
230 **specific groups - all quantitative studies asking this question).**

231

232 Concerns about sharing data with private industry

233 The participants in the included studies were generally concerned about sharing their government
234 health data. Some concerns were extensions of fears they had about sharing their health data with
235 anyone, although their disquiet was intensified if the data sharing involved private industry. There
236 were three main groups of concerns: about privacy, risk of harms, and use of public and personal data
237 for private profits and interests. We discuss each of these in turn; more detail and sample quotes are
238 presented in Supplementary Table S3. **(Additional file 4, Supplementary Tables S1-S4)**

239 Privacy and confidentiality

240 Many participants were concerned about loss of privacy and breaches of confidentiality. (4, 20, 24,
241 27, 33, 35-38, 42, 43, 48) In some studies, the terms ‘privacy’ and ‘confidentiality’ were used
242 interchangeably when describing participants’ views about these matters (1, 38, 48), whilst in other
243 studies only ‘privacy’ or ‘confidentiality’ was used. (27, 33, 36, 43) One paper specifically noted that
244 study participants used the terms interchangeably, although the authors chose to use the term
245 confidentiality because it was the issue they were evaluating in their study (33). This paper
246 suggested that participants viewed maintaining confidentiality as an expression of respect “between
247 two parties exchanging information” and as a form of control, “a way of limiting how data about
248 oneself may be used by others”, (33, p.965) with the former reflecting the duty of confidentiality and
249 the latter the maintenance of privacy.

250 Across studies, loss of privacy and breaches in confidentiality were often related back to inadequate
251 data security. Numerous studies reported concerns about data security, including the potential for

252 leaks and hacking, particularly when sharing data with private industry. (21, 23, 36, 37, 41-43, 47-49,
253 52) Concerns were in some cases related to the security of electronically stored data generally (4,
254 20, 42), but also to the belief that both public and private systems were leaky or unstable. (33, 36, 48)
255 This was based on knowledge of media reports of data breaches, (48) prior personal experience of
256 such breaches, perceptions that hospital record keeping was disorganised, (42) and concerns about the
257 stability of private companies. (36) There were also concerns about potential confidentiality breaches
258 and loss of privacy through on-selling data to other companies, particularly for marketing purposes.
259 (4, 24, 36, 41, 43, 49). The Wellcome Trust report on public attitudes to commercial access indicated
260 that, in their study, participants believed “that no amount of security could ever totally remove the
261 risks involved in sharing data”. (4, p.11)

262 Risk of Harm

263 Concerns about data security were closely related to concerns about data misuse, expressed both in
264 terms of general uneasiness about the use of participants’ data for purposes of which they were
265 unaware and might oppose (48) and, more particularly, the considerable potential for harms to
266 individuals through the use of identifiable health data. The latter included the use of their own data to
267 disadvantage them in employment, insurance cover, and financial and health care services. (4, 20, 27,
268 33-36, 38, 41-43, 47) Participants were also concerned that even aggregate data might be used to
269 stigmatise individuals based on their ethnicity or to segment, exploit or disadvantage vulnerable
270 groups. (4, 27) Some participants saw sharing data as one more sign that “we are heading for a
271 dystopian, surveillance-based society”. (4, p.60) In a study involving older Swiss adults, participants
272 expressed concern about the potential use of data in eugenics:

273 *So, my only concern is, it has once been talked about, that it could be used to create the*
274 *perfect human... or... that everyone would have blue eyes or a standard type or for military*
275 *purposes. Of course, that is a big topic. I would be absolutely against that.* Female, age 69,
276 Switzerland (35, p.8)

277 Participants in this study were also concerned about becoming a “transparent citizen” with personal
278 knowledge about them accessible and available to many and that thereby “people or institutions ...
279 might gain unpredictable powers by it”. (35, p.7).

280 Use of data for private profit and private interests

281 Although many participants acknowledged that there could be a role for commercial organisations in
282 therapeutic development, at the same time they were concerned about the interests held by private
283 industries [23, 29, 38, 45, 55], their lack of accountability (20, 42) and their focus on profit-making.
284 (4, 20, 26, 38, 42, 48) Across studies, the use of publicly held health data for private profit was a
285 common concern for a range of reasons. Some participants simply disliked the idea that private
286 companies were making profit from their data, particularly without some measure of reciprocity:

287 *Business involved changes things a lot for me – I’m unhappy with businesses getting personal*
288 *data as they profit but don’t have to give anything back.* (20, p.13)

289 Others believed that, unlike government organisations, private industry put their own interests ahead
290 of the public good: (20, 26, 35, 42, 52)

291 *Unfortunately, my belief is that when people start making a profit out of it that’s when the*
292 *ethics start getting a little bit less and a little bit less as the profit margin goes up the less*
293 *ethical you are the more money you earn.* Participant 1, person with diabetes, London,
294 UK:2016 (52, p.85)

295 They were concerned that the private sector had less oversight and were less accountable to the
296 public:

297 *I’m fine with all of these organisations except businesses. Government usage is safer because*
298 *there is responsible governance, but there is no corresponding obligation for private*
299 *businesses who want to make a profit.* General public, New Zealand, including First Nations
300 peoples, 2017 (20, p.13)

301 Some participants in Scottish deliberative workshops expressed a belief that private companies had
302 suppressed past ‘cancer cures’ and would suppress results in future research to increase their profits.

303 (26) In several UK studies participants expressed concern that pharmaceutical companies would
304 have access to publicly held health data to develop new drugs which they could then sell back to the
305 National Health Service (24, 41, 42) or on to others for profit. (4, 24, 38, 48, 49)

306 Participants in many studies differentiated between private companies using government health data
307 under regulated conditions for public benefit and unfettered access for generation of profit. (4, 21, 24-
308 27, 31, 35, 41-43) One parent of a child with a rare disease commented:

309 *Big pharma...Are they doing it with my consent, looking at a group to identify, make*
310 *progress, come up with treatments, understand conditions more – I’d be comfortable with*
311 *that. Or are they just given free rein on my daughter’s medical records so they can stabilize*
312 *business, play entrepreneurs, gamble on it – no that not OK. Parent of patient, Sheffield, UK,*
313 *2016 (4, p.57)*

314 Finally, some participants saw the issue as ownership of the data and that industry use of government
315 data for private profit was an inappropriate use of their personal property (48)

316 **Circumstances under which government health data may be shared**

317 The concerns held by participants fed into their discussions about the conditions under which it would
318 be acceptable for governments to share government-held administrative health data. Participants’
319 concerns about the purpose for data sharing led to a requirement that research should produce public
320 benefits; concerns about data security led to requirements for secure data storage and de-
321 identification; and concerns about misuse led to requirements which would restrict access and protect
322 the data.

323 There was substantial agreement across studies about the circumstances under which government
324 health data could be shared. The primary requirements were that:

- 325 • the research should produce public benefits;

- 326 • the data should be secure as possible, particularly that it be de-identified and securely stored;
- 327 • governance structures be in place to monitor and regulate access to data; and
- 328 • that due reciprocity should be considered.

329 There were a range of views about whether informed consent for data use was necessary and the form
330 that consent should take. Here we discuss the principal conditions which participants believed were
331 necessary before data should be shared. A full list of can be found online in Supplementary Table S4.

332 (Additional file 4, **Supplementary Tables S1-S4**).

333 Public benefit

334 Although participants across studies considered it essential that the public should benefit from the
335 sharing of public administrative data with private industry, what constituted benefit varied widely.
336 (Table 5) In many studies (4, 20, 24-28, 31, 33, 41, 42, 51) public benefit was taken to mean
337 something “would (at least probably) ultimately lead to benefits for healthcare” (24, p.716) including
338 “finding cures for diseases and making new drugs available” (26, p.7) and monitoring the safety of
339 new health technologies. Cancer, dementia and mental health and research that improved health and
340 quality of life through preventive measures (see Table 5) were highlighted as important areas. Some
341 participants questioned the need for private industry to be involved: e.g. in a UK study using
342 deliberative workshops, participants valued monitoring for drug safety, but asked why the NHS could
343 not conduct this work itself. (4, p.51)

344 Participants with a history of personal or family illness were more likely to see data sharing, including
345 with private industry, as essential to support development of new treatments. (28, 33, 50)

346 *Patients are key to advancing research by providing data to researchers —the more*
347 *information collected, the more it will promote advancement of research —in a rare disease*
348 *like this, maximum participation is required for effective research. Patients/relatives of*
349 *patients with leukodystrophies. (28, p.7)*

350 But, even here, there were differences of opinion. One participant expressed strong opposition to
351 sharing with private industry stating: “The Pharma industry orients research in their own interests, not
352 in the interests of patients.” (28, p.340)

353 Health benefit was also conceptualised as improving options for those with greatest need. For
354 example, in deliberative workshops, Scottish participants acknowledged the merit in health research
355 targeting “vulnerable groups who would potentially benefit the most” (26, p.7) and that benefits for
356 small numbers of people could “lead to wider benefits for society”. (26, p.7)

357

358

359 **Table 5:** Conceptualisation of benefits through data linkage and use

Concept	References
Disease diagnoses, treatments and cures (including specifically cancer, dementia, mental health and rare diseases) to benefit both individuals and groups	(4, 20, 21, 26, 28, 35, 37, 40-45, 47-53)
Improved population health and wellbeing including through prevention	(26, 35, 38, 41, 42, 48, 49, 52)
Monitoring the long-term safety and efficacy of drugs and treatments	(4, 37, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49)
Improving health services and health outcomes for vulnerable or disadvantaged populations	(4, 20, 24, 26, 37, 38, 52)
Creation and dissemination of new knowledge	[29, 41, 51, 52]
Improved allocation of resources, cost-effective care	(26, 37, 41, 49)
Promoting social good through contributing to research	(26, 41, 45)

Improved health policy	(20, 37)
Giving “children the best start in life”	(4, 26, 35)
Improving the lives of older people	(26)
Improving the natural environment	(26)
Benefits for the environment	(26)
Access to a wider skill set if private industry is involved	(43)
Ability to detect rare health events	(37)

360

361

362 Regulation and safeguards

363 The participants in these studies wanted to see their data anonymised. Many studies did not discuss
364 the potential for reidentification and it may be that many participants were unaware that there was
365 potential for this to occur and, therefore, that they could never be completely anonymous. (20, 21, 23-
366 25, 27, 30, 36, 37, 44, 47, 50, 52) From the participants’ perspective, anonymisation of government
367 health data through removing personal information or aggregation was either a pre-requisite for
368 acceptance of data sharing (4, 25, 27, 33, 36, 44) or greatly increased willingness to share. (20, 24, 35,
369 37, 38, 41, 43, 47, 52) For example, in a large UK survey (n=2017) anonymity was seen as the second
370 most important condition for sharing health data with commercial organisations. (4) In a smaller
371 study, although just under half the participants (patients with diabetes n=404) indicated they would be
372 willing to share their government health data with pharmaceutical companies provided it was
373 anonymised, this fell to 15% if identifiers were retained. (52) In several UK studies, anonymisation
374 of data was seen as particularly important if data was to be shared with private companies:
375 participants were concerned that identifiable information could be misused and it may still be possible
376 to re-identify anonymised data. (4, 33, 48)

377 Most studies reported support for rigorous governance structures to monitor and regulate access to
378 government health data. In many studies participants wanted multiple safeguards to be instituted (4,
379 20, 24, 28, 36, 38) and some participants suggested that private entities might gain trust if they were
380 willing to “subject themselves to regulatory scrutiny”. (4, p.56). In particular, participants called for
381 strict rules prohibiting passing data to third parties, anonymisation for data sharing, sanctions for
382 misuse of data, secure data storage and oversight by an ethics committee. (4) Monitoring of
383 individual access to the data by logging contact episodes was also suggested, the rationale being that
384 this would serve as a deterrent for malpractice.

385 *That would make me feel a bit more comfortable because they would know, if for any reason*
386 *the system had been abused, not that it would be but they would know... There'll be a shortlist*
387 *of people who have accessed, it would be a deterrent of abuse.* General Public, Belfast, UK
388 (4, p.63)

389 Secure storage (4, 20, 21, 33, 36, 43, 48, 49, 52) and independent oversight. (4, 24, 25, 36-38, 43, 48,
390 49) were widely recognised as essential conditions for data sharing. One participant in a European
391 study likened the necessary controls to those found in the banking sector:

392 *I'm just trying to say there is this framework, you know we say that there is a governance*
393 *system in place which will protect the patient and we can look at them like we do the financial*
394 *institutions and we're quite happy with how they exist, well they're quite well developed.*
395 *There's a framework around this and we want some assurance.* Patients/parents of patients
396 with a rare disease, Europe, (36, p.1,045)

397 One individual writing in response to attempts to share public administrative data sets in the UK said:

398 *I want the data to be supervised by an independent forum of individuals whose remit is to*
399 *follow strict published ethical guidelines relating to sharing, selling and profit making by the*
400 *use of my data.* UK, Comment posted to website Care.data, 22.01.14 (48, p.184)

401 Scottish focus group participants suggested members of the public should have a role in an oversight
402 committee “ensuring accountability and protecting public interests”. (24, p.720) Clear explanations
18

403 about how data would be recorded, anonymised and stored was seen to be helpful in building support
404 for data sharing:

405 *He explained to me that basically there's only one location where there's a cross-reference*
406 *between the name of the participant and the identification process they're using on each*
407 *individual patient's, or study participant's, file. So I don't have any issues with that.*
408 ClinSeq#120, NIH genomic research registry participant, USA (33, p.967)

409 Channelling information through trusted entities may increase public acceptance of data sharing but
410 some participants indicated that it could also erode trust in health care providers.

411 *I do not trust the government with my data, and now I cannot trust my doctor o[r] the wider*
412 *NHS.* Comment posted to Care.data website, 05.05.14, (48, p.183)

413 Reciprocity

414 Across studies, many participants called for a level of reciprocity from private companies receiving
415 administrative health data. This included that there be openness and transparency about how data were
416 stored, shared and used (4, 24, 27, 28, 33, 35, 38) as well as public release of the research findings. (4,
417 21, 24, 28, 30, 33, 38, 47) In addition, some participants called for access for research contributors to
418 their own data (28, 52) and for patient participants to any new technologies resulting from the
419 research. (41) Some believed that private industry should pay for data access or, where applicable,
420 deliver some of the ensuing profit back into the public system. (21, 22, 38, 41-43)

421 Consent

422 Consent was an important consideration in many studies but the need for and type of consent was
423 highly contentious. (4, 20, 27-29, 31, 33, 36) Some participants were comfortable with government
424 health data sharing with no consent - particularly where data were anonymised or aggregated and the
425 research of high public benefit - whereas others wanted explicit consent on every occasion. The
426 majority of participants in two deliberative studies that explicitly focused on sharing with private
427 industry started from a position of requiring informed consent but moved to no-consent required for
428 cases with high public benefit where consent was impossible or prohibitively expensive. (4, 49)

429 Participants in one of the studies called for better communication around data use without consent (4)
430 and some participants suggested that their ongoing reservations related to a lack of clarity about the
431 personal implications of sharing their data with private industry. (4, 33) Some members of the NICE
432 Citizens' Council became more concerned following deliberation. One participant reflecting this shift
433 said:

434 "I've completely changed my mind. When I first started [the meeting] I thought 'yeah', but
435 now all I can think of is cons." NICE Citizens Council (41, p.23)

436 **Discussion**

437 This scoping review integrates and interprets five years of research on public and patient perspectives
438 on sharing publicly-held health data with private industry for research and development. Many studies
439 noted that publics and patients have limited opportunities to understand the nature and extent of data
440 use, sharing and protection; researchers consequently provided information to participants as part of
441 the research process in a number of the included studies. Our findings are consistent with other
442 systematic reviews of international perspectives on health data sharing. (1, 54, 55) Our first
443 conclusion is:

444 *1) People support sharing public sector health data for health research in general, but are less*
445 *willing to share with the private sector for research and development.*

446 This conclusion is consistent with research on general public attitudes to sharing, and with research on
447 public attitudes to: sharing genomic data (56)(56), secondary use of clinical trial or public health
448 study data (57), and "broad consent" for data sharing. (2) We thus suggest this central finding is
449 robust, at least within the UK and North American settings (where most research has been conducted).
450 (1, 54, 55) Further research is necessary to understand generalisability to other contexts. Participants
451 expressed concerns regarding perceived *vulnerabilities in data security*, potential for *misuse of data*,
452 and potential for *discrimination* against, or *stigmatisation* of, individuals or groups.

453 Quantified measures of support for sharing health data with private actors ranged from 16% to 75%
454 (i.e. from on-balance rejection to on-balance acceptance). This leads to our second conclusion:

455 2) *Public support for sharing public sector health data with the private sector is possible, but is*
456 *more strongly conditional than support for sharing with public sector and non-profit actors.*

457 Our review suggests that any government, agency or company considering public-private health data
458 sharing needs to develop a social licence, and that this will require providing, negotiating and assuring
459 granular commitments regarding what data are shared, why they are shared, how identification is
460 handled, and the governance and accountability mechanisms in place (Table 4). In particular, publics
461 expect that data sharing should produce *public benefit*, that safeguards including *secure storage*,
462 *anonymisation, monitoring and independent oversight* would be in place, and that *sanctions* would
463 follow misuse. While other reviews have reported similar expectations with respect to sharing in
464 general, (1, 54, 55) this review adds clear evidence that these *expectations become far stronger when*
465 *data are shared with private industry*. These higher expectations for public-private sharing were
466 informed by disquiet about using a public resource for private profit. A profit motive was seen to
467 exacerbate the risks that participants were concerned about: security, misuse, and potential for harm
468 (e.g. via stigmatisation or discrimination). (4, 49) For-profit use was also seen to undermine a non-
469 negotiable and central condition for sharing: that data be used for public benefit or the public good
470 (which could include aggregative benefit to individuals).

471 Similar to other reviews (1, 54, 55), we found public benefit was also highly relevant to consent
472 requirements. This leads to our third conclusion:

473 3) *Preferences regarding consent models reflect judgements regarding two underpinning*
474 *considerations: whether the parties involved can be trusted, and the likely public benefit from*
475 *sharing data.*

476 Generally higher trust and/or higher public benefit allowed acceptance of consent models with lower
477 individual control. However, for some participants, if data sharing involved private industry, explicit
478 consent was essential even if public benefit was high. In systematic reviews of public attitudes

479 towards sharing of genomic data, and secondary use of research data, individual-level consent has
480 been seen as a way to address concerns (e.g., about security, misuse and harm) (56, 57). Note,
481 however, it is generally considered logistically infeasible to obtain individual consent for each act of
482 sharing administrative health data. Also, individual-level consent may make a dataset less
483 representative, or systematically biased, due to uneven non-participation, making findings
484 untrustworthy. If active consent is seen as the *only* way to secure socially acceptable sharing with
485 private industry, such sharing may be impossible. Further research is needed to explore alternative
486 ways to develop the social licence to share data with the private sector. For example, our own
487 research using deliberative methods suggests that informed citizens may be willing to accept sharing
488 their data, including with private industry, provided sharing is tightly regulated and in the public
489 interest (58).

490

491 **Study Limitations**

492 Six of the articles scored less than 5 using the MMAT tool and 3 had a score of less than 4. One
493 paper, reporting a single focus group, had a score of 1 and, although noted, was not included in the
494 findings of the review.

495 **Conclusion**

496 Overall, this review has indicated key areas for policymakers, data custodians and companies to
497 address if they are to secure legitimacy for the sharing of publicly-held health data with private
498 industry for research and development. Each program of data sharing would require carefully
499 negotiated commitments to establish safeguards including secure storage, anonymisation, monitoring
500 and independent oversight, and to institute and implement sanctions on misuse. Patients and publics
501 would require assurance that data use will lead to public benefit, and that all actors and systems
502 involved are trustworthy. These things may be achievable, but two problems currently appear
503 intractable. When data are shared for private profit, publics—quite reasonably—recognise a conflict

504 of interest and are thus less likely to trust safeguards or assurances. Without both trust and assurance
505 of public benefit, public-private data sharing is unlikely to be supported. In situations of lower trust
506 and/or lower public benefit, publics are more likely to expect that they will have an opportunity to
507 provide individual consent for instances of sharing, which is potentially fatal to the data sharing
508 enterprise. More research is required to determine how this conundrum can be addressed.

509

510 **Declarations**

511 • **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

512 Not applicable

513 • **Consent for publication**

514 Not applicable

515 • **Availability of data and materials**

516 Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during
517 the current study.

518 • **Competing interests**

519 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

520 • **Funding**

521 Funded by the Population Health Research Network

522 • **Authors' contributions**

523 JS conceptualised the study, contributed to data collection, analysis and interpretation, drafted
524 and approved the final manuscript.

525 SC contributed to the study concept and design, data analysis and interpretation, drafting the
526 manuscript and approved the final manuscript

527 BF contributed to the study concept and design, data collection, data analysis and
528 interpretation, drafting the manuscript and approved the final manuscript

529 RB contributed to data collection, data analysis and interpretation, drafting the manuscript
530 and approved the final manuscript

531 LC contributed to the study concept and design, data analysis and interpretation, drafting the
532 manuscript and approved the final manuscript

533 ABM conceptualised the study, contributed to data analysis and interpretation, drafting the
534 manuscript and approved the final manuscript. ABM is responsible for obtaining the funding
535 for the project and is the corresponding author.

536

537 • **Acknowledgements**

538 The authors would like to thank the Population Health Research Network for funding the
539 project, The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent the
540 views of the Population Health Research Network.

541 **Authors – additional information**

542 1. Dr Jackie Street, ACHEEV, School of Health and Society, Faculty of the Arts, Social
543 Sciences and Humanities, University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
544 streetj@uow.edu.au

545 ORCID # 0000-0002-1033-4341

546 2. Prof Stacy Carter, ACHEEV, School of Health and Society, Faculty of the Arts, Social
547 Sciences and Humanities, University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
548 stacyc@uow.edu.au

- 549 ORCID # 0000-0003-2617-8694
- 550 3. Belinda Fabrianesi, ACHEEV, School of Health and Society, Faculty of the Arts, Social
- 551 Sciences and Humanities, University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
- 552 belindaf@uow.edu.au
- 553 ORCID # 0000-0001-8134-7900
- 554 4. Rebecca Bosward
- 555 ACHEEV, School of Health and Society, Faculty of the Arts, Social Sciences and
- 556 Humanities, University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
- 557 rbosward@uow.edu.au
- 558 ORCID # 0000-0002-3368-0781
- 559 5. Lucy Carolan, ACHEEV, School of Health and Society, Faculty of the Arts, Social Sciences
- 560 and Humanities, University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
- 561 lengland@uow.edu.au
- 562 ORCID # 0000-0002-8116-4036
- 563 6. Prof Annette Braunack-Mayer, ACHEEV, Australian Centre for Health Engagement,
- 564 Evidence and Values, School of Health and Society, Faculty of the Arts, Social Sciences and
- 565 Humanities, University of Wollongong NSW 2522 Australia
- 566 abmayer@uow.edu.au, (corresponding author)
- 567 ORCID # 0000-0003-4427-0224

568

569

570 **References**

- 571 1. Aitken M, de St Jorre J, Pagliari C, Jepson R, Cunningham-Burley S. Public responses to the
- 572 sharing and linkage of health data for research purposes: a systematic review and thematic synthesis

573 of qualitative studies. BMC Medical Ethics. 2016;17(1):73. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-016-0153->

574 x

575 2. Garrison NA, Sathe NA, Antommaria AH, Holm IA, Sanderson SC, Smith ME, et al. A

576 systematic literature review of individuals' perspectives on broad consent and data sharing in the

577 United States. Genetics in Medicine. 2016;18(7):663-71. <https://doi.org/10.1038/gim.2015.138>

578 3. Hill EM, Turner EL, Martin RM, Donovan JL. "Let's get the best quality research we can":

579 Public awareness and acceptance of consent to use existing data in health research: a systematic

580 review and qualitative study. BMC medical research methodology. 2013;13:72.

581 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-72>

582 4. Ipsos MORI For the Wellcome Trust. The One-Way Mirror: Public attitudes to commercial

583 access to health data. London, UK: Wellcome Trust; 2016. Retrieved from:

584 https://wellcome.figshare.com/articles/The_One_Way_Mirror_Public_attitudes_to_commercial_access_to_health_data/5616448

585 s_to_health_data/5616448

586 5. Commonwealth of Australia,. (2001) Corporations Act Retrieved from:

587 <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2019C00216>

588 6. Laurie G, Stevens L. Developing a Public Interest Mandate for the Governance and Use of

589 Administrative Data in the United Kingdom. Journal of Law and Society. 2016;43(3):360-92.

590 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2016.00759.x>

591 7. Australian Government. 2016 National Research Infrastructure Roadmap. 2017. Retrieved

592 from: [https://www.dese.gov.au/national-research-infrastructure/resources/2016-national-research-](https://www.dese.gov.au/national-research-infrastructure/resources/2016-national-research-infrastructure-roadmap)

593 infrastructure-roadmap

594 8. Canadian Government. *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act*

595 (*PIPEDA*). 2015 (Amended). Retrieved from: [https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/privacy-topics/privacy-laws-](https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/privacy-topics/privacy-laws-in-canada/the-personal-information-protection-and-electronic-documents-act-pipeda/)

596 in-canada/the-personal-information-protection-and-electronic-documents-act-pipeda/

- 597 9. Commonwealth of Australia. Data Availability and Transparency Bill 2020, Exposure Draft.
598 In: House of Representatives, editor. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia; 2020. Retrieved from:
599 https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Bills_Legislation/bd/bd2122a/22bd018
- 600 10. Davidson S, McLean C, Treanor S, Aitken M, Cunningham-Burley S, Laurie G, et al. Public
601 Acceptability of Data Sharing Between the Public, Private and Third Sectors for Research Purposes.
602 In: Scottish Government Retrieved from: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/resource/0043/00435458.pdf>
- 603 11. European Commission. Public-Private Partnership (PPP) for Big Data. 13th October 2014.
604 Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/MEMO_14_583
- 605 12. Scottish Government. Joined up data for better decisions: A strategy for improving data
606 access and analysis. In: Government S, editor. Edinburgh: Scottish Government; 8th November 2012.
607 Retrieved from: [https://www.gov.scot/publications/joined-up-data-better-decisions-strategy-](https://www.gov.scot/publications/joined-up-data-better-decisions-strategy-improving-data-access-analysis/)
608 [improving-data-access-analysis/](https://www.gov.scot/publications/joined-up-data-better-decisions-strategy-improving-data-access-analysis/)
- 609 13. State of California. California Consumer Privacy Act of 2018 (CCPA) 2018. Retrieved from
610 [https://iapp.org/train/ccpa-ready/?gclid=CjwKCAjwjZmTBhB4EiwAynRmD4LKM-](https://iapp.org/train/ccpa-ready/?gclid=CjwKCAjwjZmTBhB4EiwAynRmD4LKM-E6tsyRmK0JZwIywvFyPRsLW20XNLLS5OV5ZPCTfOhS7UiYpRoCc9cQAvD_BwE)
611 [E6tsyRmK0JZwIywvFyPRsLW20XNLLS5OV5ZPCTfOhS7UiYpRoCc9cQAvD_BwE](https://iapp.org/train/ccpa-ready/?gclid=CjwKCAjwjZmTBhB4EiwAynRmD4LKM-E6tsyRmK0JZwIywvFyPRsLW20XNLLS5OV5ZPCTfOhS7UiYpRoCc9cQAvD_BwE)
- 612 14. United Kingdom Government. Guidance, Joined up data in government: the future of data
613 linking methods. Office for National Statistics,; 2020. Retrieved from:
614 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joined-up-data-in-government-the-future-of-data-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joined-up-data-in-government-the-future-of-data-linking-methods/joined-up-data-in-government-the-future-of-data-linkage-methods)
615 [linking-methods/joined-up-data-in-government-the-future-of-data-linkage-methods](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/joined-up-data-in-government-the-future-of-data-linkage-methods)
- 616 15. European Commission. Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on
617 European Data Governance, Data Governance Act. In: Commission E, editor. Document
618 52020PC0767. Brussels: European Commission; 2020. Retrieved from: [https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52020PC0767)
619 [lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52020PC0767](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:52020PC0767)

- 620 16. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International*
621 *Journal Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
622 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- 623 17. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Baldini C. Guidance for
624 conducting systematic scoping reviews. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*.
625 2015;13:141-6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/xeb.0000000000000050>
- 626 18. Hong QN, Pluye P, Fabreugues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al., inventors Mixed
627 methods appraisal tool (MMAT) Version 20182018. Retrieved from: [https://htai.org/wp-](https://htai.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/HTAi2018_VP26_ACriticalAppraisal.pdf)
628 [content/uploads/2018/08/HTAi2018_VP26_ACriticalAppraisal.pdf](https://htai.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/HTAi2018_VP26_ACriticalAppraisal.pdf)
- 629 19. Brown A, Parkin T, Tobin A, Le Bas T. Our Data, Our Way: What New Zealand people
630 expect from guidelines for data use and sharing. Feb/ March 2017. Retrieved from:
631 <https://www.toiaria.org/our-projects/our-data-our-way/>
- 632 20. Data Futures Partnership. A Path to Social Licence: Guidelines for Trusted Data Use. New
633 Zealand August 2017. Retrieved from: [https://trusteddata.co.nz/wp-](https://trusteddata.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Summary-Guidelines.pdf)
634 [content/uploads/2017/08/Summary-Guidelines.pdf](https://trusteddata.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Summary-Guidelines.pdf)
- 635 21. Robinson G, Dolk H. Public attitudes to data sharing in Northern Ireland. Ulster:
636 Administrative Data Research Centre Northern Ireland (ARK); August 2015. Retrieved from:
637 <https://research.hscni.net/sites/default/files/0032-RESEARCH%20UPDATE%20108%20final.pdf>
- 638 22. Robinson G, Dolk H, Dowds L, Given J, Kane F, Nelson E. Public attitudes to data sharing in
639 Northern Ireland: Findings from the 2015 Northern Ireland life and times survey. Ulster:
640 Administrative Data Research Network; Public Health Agency; Ulster University; February 2018.
641 Retrieved from: https://www.ark.ac.uk/pdfs/Researchreports/Data_Sharing_Report.pdf
- 642 23. Satinsky EN, Driessens C, Crepez-Keay D, Kousoulis A. Mental health service users'
643 perceptions of data sharing and data protection: a qualitative report. *Journal of Innovation in Health*
644 *Informatics*. 2018;25(4):239-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14236/jhi.v25i4.1033>

- 645 24. Aitken M, Cunningham-Burley S, Pagliari C. Moving from trust to trustworthiness:
646 Experiences of public engagement in the Scottish Health Informatics Programme. *Science and Public*
647 *Policy*. 2016;43(5):713-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scv075>
- 648 25. Aitken M, McAteer G, Davidson S, Frostick C, Cunningham-Burley S. Public Preferences
649 regarding Data Linkage for Health Research: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *International Journal of*
650 *Population Data Science*. 2018;3(1). <https://dx.doi.org/10.23889%2Fijpds.v3i1.429>
- 651 26. Aitken M, Porteous C, Creamer E, Cunningham-Burley S. Who benefits and how? Public
652 expectations of public benefits from data-intensive health research. *Big Data and Society*.
653 2018;5(2):1-12. . <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2053951718816724>
- 654 27. Cheah PY, Jatupornpimol N, Hanboonkunupakarn B, Khirikoekkong N, Jittamala P,
655 Pukrittayakamee S, et al. Challenges arising when seeking broad consent for health research data
656 sharing: a qualitative study of perspectives in Thailand. *BMC medical ethics*. 2018;19(1):86.
657 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-018-0326-x>
- 658 28. Darquy S, Moutel G, Lapointe A-S, D'audiffret D, Champagnat J, Guerroui S, et al.
659 Patient/family views on data sharing in rare diseases: study in the European LeukoTreat project.
660 *European Journal of Human Genetics*. 2016;24(3):338. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1038%2Fejhg.2015.115>
- 661 29. Davison A, Beetham J, Thomas J, Harding A, Ivory V, Bowie C. Public attitudes to data
662 integration. Lower Hutt, New Zealand: Report prepared by OPUS International Consultants for
663 Statistics New Zealand; 2015. [https://www.stats.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Retirement-of-archive-](https://www.stats.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Retirement-of-archive-website-project-files/Corporate/Public-attitudes-to-data-integration/public-attit-data-integr-2015.pdf)
664 [website-project-files/Corporate/Public-attitudes-to-data-integration/public-attit-data-integr-2015.pdf](https://www.stats.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Retirement-of-archive-website-project-files/Corporate/Public-attitudes-to-data-integration/public-attit-data-integr-2015.pdf)
- 665 30. Goodman D, Johnson CO, Bowen D, Smith M, Wenzel L, Edwards K. De-identified genomic
666 data sharing: the research participant perspective. *Journal of community genetics*. 2017;8(3):173-81.
667 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12687-017-0300-1>

- 668 31. Grande D, Mitra N, Shah A, Wan F, Asch DA. The importance of purpose: Moving beyond
669 consent in the societal use of personal health information. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
670 2014;161(12):855-62. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M14-1118>
- 671 32. Huskison T, Gilby N, Evans H, Stevens J, Tipping S, Ipsos MORI. Wellcome Trust Monitor
672 Wave 3: Chapter 6. Participation in Medical Research. London UK: Wellcome Trust; 2016.
673 <https://doi.org/10.7326/M14-1118>
- 674 33. Jamal L, Sapp JC, Lewis K, Yanes T, Facio FM, Biesecker LG, et al. Research participants'
675 attitudes towards the confidentiality of genomic sequence information. *European Journal of Human*
676 *Genetics*. 2014;22(8):964-8. . <https://doi.org/10.1038/ejhg.2013.276>
- 677 34. Kim TK, Choi M. Older adults' willingness to share their personal and health information
678 when adopting healthcare technology and services. *International Journal of Medical Informatics*.
679 2019;126:86-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2019.03.010>
- 680 35. Mählmann L, Schee Gen Halfmann S, Von Wyl A, Brand A. Attitudes towards personal
681 genomics and sharing of genetic data among older swiss adults: A qualitative study. *Public Health*
682 *Genomics*. 2018;20(5):293-306. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000486588>
- 683 36. McCormack P, Kole A, Gainotti S, Mascalzoni D, Molster C, Lochmüller H, et al. 'You
684 should at least ask'. The expectations, hopes and fears of rare disease patients on large-scale data and
685 biomaterial sharing for genomics research. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2016;24(10):1403-8.
686 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ejhg.2016.30>
- 687 37. McCormick N, Hamilton C, Koehn CL, English K, Stordy A, Li L. Canadians' Views about
688 Using Big Data in Health Research from a National Online Survey: A Partnership of Patient-
689 Consumers and Researchers. *Arthritis & Rheumatology*. 2018;70. Retrieved from:
690 [https://acrabstracts.org/abstract/canadians-views-about-using-big-data-in-health-research-from-a-](https://acrabstracts.org/abstract/canadians-views-about-using-big-data-in-health-research-from-a-national-online-survey-a-partnership-of-patient-consumers-and-researchers/)
691 [national-online-survey-a-partnership-of-patient-consumers-and-researchers/](https://acrabstracts.org/abstract/canadians-views-about-using-big-data-in-health-research-from-a-national-online-survey-a-partnership-of-patient-consumers-and-researchers/)

- 692 38. Mazor KM, Richards A, Gallagher M, Arterburn DE, Raebel MA, Nowell WB, et al.
693 Stakeholders' views on data sharing in multicenter studies. *Future Virology*. 2017;12(9):537-47.
694 <https://doi.org/10.2217/ce-2017-0009>
- 695 39. Moss L, Shaw M, Piper I, Hawthorne C, Kinsella J. Sharing of big data in healthcare: Public
696 opinion, trust and privacy considerations for health informatics researchers. 10th International
697 Conference in Health Informatics; Porto, Portugal2017. Retrieved from:
698 <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/168346/>
- 699 40. Mursaleen LR, Stamford JA, Jones DA, Windle R, Isaacs T. Attitudes Towards Data
700 Collection, Ownership and Sharing Among Patients with Parkinson's Disease. *Journal of Parkinson's*
701 *disease*. 2017;7(3):523-31. <https://doi.org/10.3233/jpd-161045>
- 702 41. Nice Citizens Council. NICE Citizens Council Reports. What Ethical and Practical Issues
703 Need to Be Considered in the Use of Anonymised Information Derived from Personal Care Records
704 as Part of the Evaluation of Treatments and Delivery of Care? London: National Institute for Health
705 and Care Excellence (NICE); 2015. Retrieved from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28230945/>
706
- 707 42. Papoutsi C, Reed JE, Marston C, Lewis R, Majeed A, Bell D, et al. Patient and public views
708 about the security and privacy of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) in the UK: results from a mixed
709 methods study. *BMC Medical Informatics*. 2015;15(1):86. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-015-0202-2>
- 710 43. Paprica PA, de Melo MN, Schull MJ. Social licence and the general public's attitudes toward
711 research based on linked administrative health data: a qualitative study. *CMAJ open*. 2019;7(1):E40.
712 <https://doi.org/10.9778/cmajo.20180099>
- 713 44. Pickard KT, Swan M, editors. Big desire to share big health data: A shift in consumer
714 attitudes toward personal health information. AAAI; 2014; Quebec City. Retrieved from:
715 [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Big-Desire-to-Share-Big-Health-Data%3A-A-Shift-in-](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Big-Desire-to-Share-Big-Health-Data%3A-A-Shift-in-Pickard-Swan/846c3316daa8af7964042bfd29759a8e5589b627)
716 [Pickard-Swan/846c3316daa8af7964042bfd29759a8e5589b627](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Big-Desire-to-Share-Big-Health-Data%3A-A-Shift-in-Pickard-Swan/846c3316daa8af7964042bfd29759a8e5589b627)

- 717 45. Platt J, Bollinger J, Dvoskin R, Kardia SL, Kaufman D. Public preferences regarding
718 informed consent models for participation in population-based genomic research. *Genetics in*
719 *Medicine*. 2014;16(1):11. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1038%2Fgim.2013.59>
- 720 46. Platt JE, Jacobson PD, Kardia SLR. Public Trust in Health Information Sharing: A Measure
721 of System Trust. *Health Serv Res*. 2018;53(2):824-45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12654>
- 722 47. Spencer K, Sanders C, Whitley EA, Lund D, Kaye J, Dixon WG. Patient perspectives on
723 sharing anonymized personal health data using a digital system for dynamic consent and research
724 feedback: a qualitative study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2016;18(4):e66.
725 <https://dx.doi.org/10.2196%2Fjmir.5011>
- 726 48. Sterckx S, Rakic V, Cockbain J, Borry P. “You hoped we would sleep walk into accepting the
727 collection of our data”: controversies surrounding the UK care. data scheme and their wider relevance
728 for biomedical research. *Medicine Health Care and Philosophy*. 2016;19(2):177-90.
729 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11019-015-9661-6>
- 730 49. Tully MP, Bozentko K, Clement S, Hunn A, Hassan L, Norris R, et al. Investigating the
731 extent to which patients should control access to patient records for research: A deliberative process
732 using citizens’ juries. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2018;20(3).
733 <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.7763>
- 734 50. West B, Cumella A. Data sharing and technology: Exploring the attitudes of people with
735 asthma. report London: Asthma UK; 2018. Retrieved from:
736 [https://www.asthma.org.uk/8195030f/globalassets/get-involved/external-affairs-](https://www.asthma.org.uk/8195030f/globalassets/get-involved/external-affairs-campaigns/publications/data-report/data-sharing-and-technology---exploring-the-attitudes-of-people-with-asthma.pdf)
737 [campaigns/publications/data-report/data-sharing-and-technology---exploring-the-attitudes-of-people-](https://www.asthma.org.uk/8195030f/globalassets/get-involved/external-affairs-campaigns/publications/data-report/data-sharing-and-technology---exploring-the-attitudes-of-people-with-asthma.pdf)
738 [with-asthma.pdf](https://www.asthma.org.uk/8195030f/globalassets/get-involved/external-affairs-campaigns/publications/data-report/data-sharing-and-technology---exploring-the-attitudes-of-people-with-asthma.pdf)
- 739 51. United Kingdom Government. Knowledge & Opinion [Internet]. (ODI) ODI, editor. UK
740 2018. Available from: [https://theodi.org/article/odi-survey-reveals-british-consumer-attitudes-to-](https://theodi.org/article/odi-survey-reveals-british-consumer-attitudes-to-sharing-personal-data/)
741 [sharing-personal-data/](https://theodi.org/article/odi-survey-reveals-british-consumer-attitudes-to-sharing-personal-data/).

- 742 52. Zalin A, Papoutsi C, Shotliff K, Majeed A, Marston C, Reed J. The use of information for
743 diabetes research and care: Patient views in West London. *Practical Diabetes*. 2016;33(3):81-6a.
744 <https://doi.org/10.1002/pdi.2008>
- 745 53. Data Futures Partnership. Data Futures Partnership: A Path to Social Licence: Guidelines for
746 Trusted Data Use. In. New Zealand 2017.
- 747 54. Kalkman S, Delden Jv, Banerjee A, Tyl B, Mostert M, Thiel Gv. Patients' and public views
748 and attitudes towards the sharing of health data for research: a narrative review of the empirical
749 evidence. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 2019;Published Online First: 12 November 2019. doi:
750 10.1136/medethics-2019-105651.
- 751 55. Stockdale J, Cassell J, Ford E. "Giving something back": A systematic review and ethical
752 enquiry into public views on the use of patient data for research in the United Kingdom and the
753 Republic of Ireland. *Wellcome open research*. 2019;3:6.
754 <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.13531.2>
- 755 56. Shabani M, Bezuidenhout L, Borry P. Attitudes of research participants and the general
756 public towards genomic data sharing: a systematic literature review. *Expert Review of Molecular*
757 *Diagnosis*. 2014;14(8):1053-65. <https://doi.org/10.1586/14737159.2014.961917>
- 758 57. Howe N, Giles E, Newbury-Birch D, McColl E. Systematic review of participants' attitudes
759 towards data sharing: a thematic synthesis. *Journal of Health Service Research and Policy*.
760 2018;23(2):123-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1355819617751555>
- 761 58. Street J, Fabrianesi B, Adams C, Flack F, Smith M, Carter S, et al. Sharing administrative
762 health data with private industry: A report of two citizens juries. *Health Expectations*. 2021; May
763 <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13268>
- 764 59. N-Vivo Available from <http://qsrinternational.com/nvivo/home>