

Context and sample

A non-random convenience sample was used. The inclusion criteria were adults residing in Portugal. From a total of 1408 respondents, 374 were excluded (19 non-residents and 355 with incomplete questionnaire). The final sample

comprised 1034 participants (response rate: 78.68%) (Table 1).

Instrument

Sociodemographic variables included gender, age, level

Table 1 – Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample (n = 1034)

Variables	n (%)
Gender	
Man	244 (23.6)
Woman	780 (75.4)
Non-binary	9 (0.9)
Other	1 (0.1)
Marital status	
Single	496 (48.0)
Married/cohabiting	446 (43.1)
Divorced/separated	79 (7.6)
Widowed	13 (1.3)
Area of residence	
Urban	840 (81.2)
Rural	194 (18.8)
Residential territorial unit	
North	479 (46.3)
Centre	236 (22.8)
Lisbon Metropolitan Area	226 (21.9)
Alentejo	35 (3.4)
Algarve	15 (1.5)
Azores Autonomous Region	23 (2.2)
Madeira Autonomous Region	20 (1.9)
Formal education	
None	1 (0.1)
5 to 6 years	19 (1.8)
7 to 9 years	17 (1.6)
Secondary (10 to 12 years)	228 (22.1)
Higher	769 (74.4)
Children	
Yes	460 (44.5)
No	574 (55.5)
Medical appointment for a hereditary disease	
Yes	210 (20.3)
No	709 (68.6)
I do not know	115 (11.1)
M (SD; Min - Max)	
Age (years)	38.58 (14.91; 18 - 81)
Number of children	0.78 (0.995; 0 - 5)

n: sample size; %: percentage; M: mean; SD: standard deviation; Min: observed minimum; Max: observed maximum.

of education, marital status, number of children, area of residence, and history of medical appointments related to a hereditary disease. A questionnaire was adapted from a previous study,⁸ consisting of eight statements where participants indicated their level of agreement on a five-point Likert scale (from 1 = “completely disagree” to 5 = “completely agree”). It included questions on i) genetic testing, the receipt of information about genetic risks and the sharing of such information with family members, and ii) practice and policy approaches related to genetic risk disclosure. Here we focus on the latter.

Data collection

Data collection occurred from December 2023 to March 2024. The study was advertised through social media (via link, poster, and QR code) and in public places in Aveiro, Porto and Lisbon (flyers with QR code). The questionnaire was self-completed using the LimeSurvey platform. Access to the questionnaire was granted only after participants provided informed consent, following a review of study information, including research team contacts and a link to access the study results.

Data analysis

Frequencies and percentages describe categorical variables (gender, area of residence, education, marital status, number of children, and medical appointments for hereditary diseases). Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) describe age and number of children (discrete variables). Since normality was not confirmed by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis) were used. Correlations between variables were tested using Spearman's correlation coefficient. Data were analyzed using SPSS statistical software 28.0 (SPSS Inc., USA).

Participants

The 1034 participants had a mean age of 38.58 (SD = 14.91) years (range: 18 - 81 years); 75.4% were women, 48% were single, and 43.1% were married or cohabiting. The majority resided in urban areas (81.2%), had completed higher education (74.4%), and were childless (55.5%). Respondents lived mainly in the North (46.3%), Centre (22.8%) or in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area (21.9%) (Table 1).

Receiving information about genetic risk

The highest mean preference was for being informed by a doctor rather than not being informed ($M = 4.75$; $SD = 0.67$), followed by a preference for being informed by a distant relative rather than not being told ($M = 4.31$; $SD = 1.06$), and for being informed first by a doctor rather than by

a distant relative ($M = 4.21$; $SD = 1.06$). The lowest mean preference was for being informed first by a close relative ($M = 3.94$; $SD = 1.11$) (Table 2). No significant differences or associations were observed across sociodemographic variables.

Policies on genetic risk disclosure

The highest mean preference was for supporting a law allowing HPs to contact patients' relatives directly, even if relatives choose not to inform them ($M = 4.47$; $SD = 0.87$). This was followed by support for authorizing HPs to access personal data from population registers ($M = 4.40$; $SD = 0.90$) and contact details ($M = 4.28$; $SD = 1.01$) to inform individuals of genetic risks (Table 2). The lowest mean preference was for supporting a law obligating patients to inform their direct relatives of their risk ($M = 3.88$; $SD = 1.27$).

Significant differences were observed based on gender, marital status, formal education, and having had a medical appointment for a hereditary disease. Specifically, the preference for authorizing HPs to obtain personal data from population registers was significantly higher among women than men ($U = 87,649.0$; $p = 0.032$), divorced participants compared to singles [Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction, $H(2) = 6.899$; $p = 0.032$; $\epsilon^2 = 0.005$], participants with less than nine years of formal education compared to those with secondary and higher education [Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction, $H(2) = 9.450$; $p = 0.009$; $\epsilon^2 = 0.010$], and those with children compared to those without ($U = 120,181.5$; $p = 0.004$).

Women also showed significantly higher support than men for authorizing HPs to access personal contact details to inform them of genetic risks ($U = 85,446.0$; $p = 0.007$). Support for a law obligating patients to inform direct relatives was significantly higher among divorced participants compared to singles [Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction, $H(2) = 6.120$; $p = 0.047$; $\epsilon^2 = 0.040$]. Participants who had not had a medical appointment for a hereditary disease showed significantly higher preferences than those who answered “I do not know” [Mann-Whitney test with Bonferroni correction, $H(2) = 10.045$; $p = 0.007$; $\epsilon^2 = 0.007$] (Table 2).

This study is the first to explore public attitudes toward genetic risk disclosure in Portugal. The main findings suggest that the sample of Portuguese people prefers being informed of genetic risks directly by a HP rather than by a family member, support policies that facilitate dissemination of genetic risk information by HPs, and is less supportive of policies that legally require patients to inform relatives of increased genetic risk. A previous study with people living with hereditary diseases in Portugal similarly reported widespread acceptance of HP-mediated direct approaches.⁹ These findings are consistent with

Table 2 – Receiving information about genetic risk and policies on genetic risk disclosure, and sociodemographic variables (significant differences only)

	M (SD)	Statistical result	M (SD)	Statistical result	M (SD)	Statistical result	M (SD)	Statistical result
I would prefer:								
	To be informed by a doctor rather than not be informed.		To be informed by a distant relative rather than not be told.		The first communication to be made by a close relative.		The first communication to be made by a doctor rather than a distant relative.	
	4.75 (0.67)		4.31 (1.06)		3.94 (1.11)		4.21 (1.06)	
I would support/authorize:								
	Healthcare professionals to access my data from population registers to inform me.		Sharing my personal contact details to enable me to be informed		A law that would allow health professionals to contact me, even if my relatives didn't wish to inform me.		A law that would require patients to inform their direct family members.	
	4.40 (0.90)		4.28 (1.01)		4.47 (0.87)		3.88 (1.27)	
Gender ^a								
Men (244)	4.32 (0.91)	$U = 87649$ $p = 0.032$	4.14 (1.08)	$U = 85446.0$ $p = 0.007$				
Women (780)	4.42 (0.90)		4.33 (0.98)					
Marital status ^b								
Single (496)	4.40 (0.83)	$H(2) = 6.899$ $p = 0.032$					3.87 (1.23)	$H(2) = 6.12$ $p = 0.047$
Married (446)	4.37 (0.97)						3.82 (1.32)	
Divorced (79)	4.56 (0.93)						4.20 (1.23)	
Formal education ^c								
Up to 9 (36)	4.83 (0.46)	$H(2) = 9.45$ $p = 0.009$						
Secondary (228)	4.64 (0.85)							
Superior (769)	4.38 (0.91)							
Children								
Yes (460)	4.45 (0.92)	$U = 120181.5$ $p = 0.004$						
No (574)	4.36 (0.88)							
Have had a medical appointment about a hereditary disease								
Yes (210)							3.90 (1.23)	$H(2) = 10.045$ $p = 0.007$
No (709)							3.91 (1.30)	
I do not know (115)							3.72 (1.28)	

^a: non-binary gender not considered, n = 9;

^b: Widowers not considered, n = 13;

^c: No schooling not considered, n = 1;

M: mean; SD: standard-deviation; U: Mann-Whitney test; H: Kruskal-Wallis test.

Spearman's correlation between all the statements and age and number of children were all weak ($r_s < 0.1$), and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). In all the statements, the minimum and maximum observed values were 1 and 5.

international public opinion.⁶⁻⁸ The limitations of this study include the use of a convenience sample, leading to an overrepresentation of women, individuals with higher education, and those living in urban areas. The recruitment method also introduced a bias towards individuals more engaged with online platforms and social media. Future research should include additional questions and aim to collect a representative sample. Our findings suggest that the Portuguese public favors a more proactive approach from the healthcare system in notifying patient's relatives of genetic risks, compared to current practice. Broader discus-

sions are needed on how to appropriately cascade genetic risk information, involving all relevant stakeholders.^{1,9,10}

PREVIOUS AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

Ribeiro I, Tavares J, Freixo JP, Sousa L, Mendes A. Disclosure of genetic risk in the family: Attitudes of the general Portuguese population. Hybrid poster presentation from the 56th European Society of Human Genetics (ESHG) Conference; 2024 Jun 1 - 4; Berlin, Germany.

Ribeiro I, Tavares J, Sousa L, Mendes A. Portuguese public attitudes towards genetic risk disclosure support

direct contact by healthcare professionals with family members. Poster presentation from the 28th Portuguese Society of Human Genetics (SPGH) Meeting; 2024 Dec 5 - 7; Porto, Portugal.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

IR: Data collection, writing of the manuscript.

JT: Data analysis.

LS, AM: Study design, critical review of the manuscript.

All authors approved the final version to be published.

PROTECTION OF HUMANS AND ANIMALS

The authors declare that the procedures were followed according to the regulations established by the Clinical Research and Ethics Committee and to the Helsinki Declaration of the World Medical Association updated in October 2024.

DATA CONFIDENTIALITY

The authors declare having followed the protocols in

use at their working center regarding patients' data publication.

COMPETING INTERESTS

AM acknowledges support from FCT through the research contract CEECIND/02615/2017.

All the other authors declare no competing interests.

FUNDING SOURCES

This work was supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology. I.P. (FCT) in the scope of the project DECIDE, within the CINTESIS R&D Unit (UIDB/4255/2020 and UIDP/4255/2020) and within the scope of the project RISE (LA/P/0053/2020) (<https://sciproj.ptcris.pt/en/175847PRJ>). Part of this work has also been financed by European Fund for Economic and Regional Development (FEDER) (COMPETE 2020 - POCI, Portugal 2020) and by FCT in the framework of the project “Instituto de Investigação e Inovação em Saúde” (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-007274).

REFERENCES

1. Lucassen A, Clarke A. In the family: access to, and communication of, familial information in clinical practice. *Hum Genet.* 2022;141:1053-8.
2. Ahsan MD, Levi SR, Webster EM, Bergeron H, Lin J, Narayan P, et al. Do people with hereditary cancer syndromes inform their at-risk relatives? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PEC Innov.* 2023;17:100138.
3. Portugal. Law no. 12/2005. Official Gazette, I Series, no. 18 (2005/01/23). p. 606-11.
4. Menko FH, van der Velden SL, Griffioen DN, Moha DA, Jeanson KN, Hogervorst FB, et al. Does a proactive procedure lead to a higher uptake of predictive testing in families with a pathogenic BRCA1/BRCA2 variant? A family cancer clinic evaluation. *J Genet Couns.* 2024;33:615-22.
5. Van Haecke DD, de Montgolfier S. Genetic diseases and information to relatives: practical and ethical issues for professionals after introduction of a legal framework in France. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2018;26:786-95.
6. Andersson A, Hawranek C, Öfverholm A, Ehrencrona H, Grill K, Hajdarevic S, et al. Public support for healthcare-mediated disclosure of hereditary cancer risk information: results from a population-based survey in Sweden. *Hered Cancer Clin Pract.* 2020;18:18.
7. Tiller JM, Stott A, Finlay K, Boughtwood T, Madelli EO, Horton A, et al. Direct notification by health professionals of relatives at-risk of genetic conditions (with patient consent): views of the Australian public. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2023;32:98-108.
8. Phillips A, Dewitte I, Debruyne B, Vears D, Borry P. Disclosure of genetic risk in the family: a survey of the Flemish general population. *Eur J Med Genet.* 2023;66.
9. Pinto M, Freixo JP, Júlio F, Milagre TH, Sousa L, Sousa L, et al. Preferences of people with inherited genetic conditions and family members in Portugal toward informing at-risk relatives of genetic risk. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2024;32:S3-90.
10. Mendes Á, Paneque M, Sequeiros J. Disclosure of genetic risk to family members: a qualitative study on healthcare professionals' perceived roles and responsibilities. *Eur J Med Genet.* 2024;68:104931.