

# 1 Title Page

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

## 4 Author(s):

5 Jackie Street<sup>1</sup>, Stacy Carter<sup>1</sup>, Belinda Fabrianesi<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca Bosward<sup>1</sup>, Lucy Carolan<sup>1\*</sup>, Annette  
6 Braunack-Mayer<sup>1</sup>

7 <sup>1</sup> University of Wollongong

8 \*Corresponding author [lengland@uow.edu.au](mailto: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

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

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

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

100

## 101 **Methods**

### 102 **Search strategy**

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

We developed two logic grids (population, concept, context, outcomes) for the study. The first search used terms describing citizens or patients, big data, the private health sector and views or perspectives, with these terms and relevant synonyms included in the searches. The second search used terms describing Big Data, social licence and the public interest, with these terms and relevant synonyms included in the Boolean searches. (For full details see Additional file 2, **Supplementary**

**Tables S1 and S2**). Depending on the database, documents were sourced within the time period “last five years” or January 1st 2014 to April 1st 2019. We excluded papers published prior to 2014 because literature on sharing public health data with the private sector was limited prior to 2014. (1) Earlier studies would not necessarily reflect current community views and judgements about the

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

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

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

### **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

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

**\*TO BE INSERTED HERE**

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

### **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 pearled 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),  
8



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

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

**\*TO BE INSERTED HERE**

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

### Public support for sharing administrative health data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**\*TO BE INSERTED HERE**

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

# Concerns about sharing data with private industry

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

# Privacy and confidentiality

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

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

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

### Risk of Harm

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

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

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

#### Use of data for private profit and private interests

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- the research should produce public benefits;

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

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

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

### Public benefit

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

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

*Patients are key to advancing research by providing data to researchers —the more information collected, the more it will promote advancement of research —in a rare disease like this, maximum participation is required for effective research.* Patients/relatives of 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Reciprocity

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

### Consent

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

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

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

## Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Study Limitations

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

## Conclusion

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

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

## Declarations

- **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Not applicable

- **Consent for publication**

Not applicable

- **Availability of data and materials**

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

- **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

- **Funding**

Funded by the Population Health Research Network

- **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\\_acces](https://wellcome.figshare.com/articles/The_One_Way_Mirror_Public_attitudes_to_commercial_access_to_health_data/5616448)  
585 [s\\_to\\_health\\_data/5616448](https://wellcome.figshare.com/articles/The_One_Way_Mirror_Public_attitudes_to_commercial_access_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](https://www.dese.gov.au/national-research-infrastructure/resources/2016-national-research-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/](https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/privacy-topics/privacy-laws-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](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](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., inventorsMixed  
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](https://www.ark.ac.uk/pdfs/Researchreports/Data_Sharing_Report.pdf)
- 642 23. Satinsky EN, Driessens C, Crepaz-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, Khirikoekong 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/)

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

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