**Background**

The emergence of an online DTC GT market during the last ten years brought with it an ongoing debate about ethical implications, revolving around the right not to know, health literacy, potential harms from knowing personal genetic risk information and the question whether or not access to genetic data is a form of empowerment, among others (Covolo et al 2015).

Laws and regulations vary between different countries. While some European countries have liberal approaches to commercial genetic testing there is a restrictive framework in Germany, regulated by the genetic diagnostics act (GenDG, Borry et al 2012). However, German consumers have access to commercially offered genetic tests via internet, nonetheless.

Knowledge about awareness and perception of DTC GT among the public in some European countries already available (Vayena et al 2012; Mavroidopoulou 2015). Laypeople’s perceptions in Germany are still unexplored, yet highly interesting, since the country has highly developed research and testing facilities and is a potential market for respective companies.

**Aim**

Extent to which laypersons’ views are ethical judgements on commercial offers of medical goods

**Methods**

Focus Groups (n=7) with lay people (Berlin, Frankfurt, Göttingen, Köln), June – November 2016. Lay people = members of the public without academic / professional background in medicine, genetics. Participants (n=43), balanced by sociodemographic factors (3 – 5 per group)

Qualitative Content Analysis (Mayring 2007), coding with Atlas.ti.

**Results**

Lifestyle tests and health-related genetic tests are perceived differently, the latter seen more critically. Companies are not trusted, but most participants oppose general legal restrictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F18S: I would have to do something, absolutely [...].</td>
<td>F19M: I would have respect for that and would think they just want to make money. [...] I can also be the neighbour too, who has some sort of chemistry lab and writes down some data for me that is never really accurate.</td>
<td>F3S: If I had any ease as a complete man yes I want to know it. Then it’s my decision, no one is being forced to order that online. It is just an alternative to choose, it’s just like doctors wouldn’t be allowed to do it anymore, then.</td>
<td>F1S: Would you like to have, most of the time, someone advising you on what to do? With this result you say, I wouldn’t know right away what to do with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1M1: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
<td>F1M1: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
<td>F1M1: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
<td>F1M1: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11M1: I would be interested in [...].</td>
<td>F11M1: I would be interested in [...].</td>
<td>F11M1: I would be interested in [...].</td>
<td>F11M1: I would be interested in [...].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11F: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
<td>F11F: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
<td>F11F: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
<td>F11F: I would do two things, definitely [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18F: I would be interested in what I can do with it.</td>
<td>F18F: I would be interested in what I can do with it.</td>
<td>F18F: I would be interested in what I can do with it.</td>
<td>F18F: I would be interested in what I can do with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle test are being welcomed, health-related tests are seen as an empowering option, providing independence from doctors.</td>
<td>Companies seen as mainly profit-oriented. They are not trusted to be legitimate businesses.</td>
<td>Participants mostly opposed legal restriction of DTC GT in Germany and placed high value on the individual’s right to choose.</td>
<td>Participants prefer provision of genetic testing via doctors and put emphasis on their competence. Genetic risk information appears to be too confusing to handle on their own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

Laypeople in Germany have little to no awareness and of DTC GT as a consumer good. Results show an ambivalent stance:

- The wish for DTC GT as an ‘empowering’ option reflects how participants place a high value in autonomy, yet the understanding of genetic risk information too demanding for laypeople in Germany have little to no awareness and of DTC GT as a consumer good. Results show an ambivalent stance:

- There is a strong distrust in commercial GT companies. Conversely, this shows trust in medical professionals and institutions as their standards, abilities and integrity. Doctor-patient relationship is strongly preferred over consumer-provider relationship when it comes to genetic testing.

The apparent trust gap has ethical implications:

- Consumerist approach to medical goods introduces element of distrust that could affect conventional doctor-patient relationship, as well. Laypeople see how medical-ethical standards of the medical profession work to their advantage by placing their autonomy and well-being first. Thus, upholding these standards reinforces the professional role of medicine. Commercial providers compete with this high standard and have to prove their trustworthiness.
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