

REGULATING AI IN HEALTHCARE POLICY GAPS, ETHICAL CHALLENGES, AND DATA PROTECTION FRAMEWORKS

Mert Can Mickelsson¹

¹University of Turku, Finland

ABSTRACT

The intersection of artificial intelligence, genetic information, and health research presents complex ethical dilemmas that challenge existing data protection frameworks, including the European General Data Protection Regulation. This article examines the ethical challenges arising from AI-enabled health research involving genetic data, analyzing issues of consent, privacy, discrimination, and data governance. Through systematic analysis of contemporary scholarship, the study identifies critical tensions between open science principles and individual data protection rights, complexities in applying GDPR provisions to shared genetic data, and challenges in preventing AI-driven discrimination while protecting sensitive information. Findings reveal that current regulatory frameworks inadequately address the unique characteristics of genetic data and the complexities of AI-driven analysis. The article proposes recommendations for regulatory reform, including clarification of data subject rights for biological family members, development of genetic data-specific protections, and mechanisms for balancing privacy with non-discrimination in AI-enabled health research. The GDPR provides a foundation for data protection, but its provisions require substantial refinement to address the specific ethical challenges of AI-enabled genetic research.

KEYWORDS: Data Privacy; Genetic Information; GDPR; AI-Enabled Research; Informed Consent; Discrimination

INTRODUCTION

The convergence of artificial intelligence, genetic information, and health research has created unprecedented opportunities for scientific discovery and clinical advancement. AI algorithms can analyze vast genomic datasets to identify disease associations, predict health outcomes, and personalize treatment approaches. However, these capabilities also raise profound ethical dilemmas related to privacy, consent, discrimination, and data governance that existing regulatory frameworks struggle to address.

Genetic information possesses unique characteristics that complicate data protection.

Genetic data are highly identifying, revealing not only information about the individual but also about biological family members. Genetic information is relatively immutable, persisting throughout life and potentially affecting family members yet unborn. Genetic data may reveal information that individuals do not wish to know and that has social, legal, and economic implications.

The GDPR provides a framework for protecting personal data, including genetic information, through provisions for data protection, individual rights, and accountability. However, the application of GDPR provisions to AI-enabled genetic research presents challenges related to informed consent, data sharing, identification, and discrimination prevention. The specific characteristics of genetic data and AI analysis require regulatory provisions that extend beyond those applicable to other types of health data.

This article examines the ethical dilemmas arising from AI-enabled health research involving genetic data, analyzing issues of consent, privacy, discrimination, and data governance. The analysis draws on contemporary scholarship to identify gaps in current regulatory frameworks and propose recommendations for reform.

GENETIC DATA AND THE GDPR FRAMEWORK

GENETIC DATA AS SPECIAL CATEGORY DATA

The GDPR classifies genetic data as a special category of personal data under Article 9, reflecting the heightened sensitivity and risks associated with such information. Processing of genetic data is generally prohibited unless specific conditions are met, including explicit consent, substantial public interest, or scientific research purposes. These provisions recognize the unique risks of genetic data while permitting processing necessary for scientific advancement.

However, the GDPR does not provide comprehensive guidance on the operationalization of genetic data protections in the context of AI-enabled research. Questions regarding the scope of consent, the adequacy of anonymization, the management of incidental findings, and the rights of biological family members remain unresolved. The application of GDPR provisions to genetic data requires interpretation that accounts for the unique characteristics of such information.

INFORMED CONSENT FOR GENETIC DATA

Informed consent for genetic data in AI-enabled research presents challenges related to scope, comprehension, and revocability. Consent must be sufficiently specific to inform individuals about the uses of their genetic data, yet the nature of AI-enabled research may make future uses difficult to specify. Individuals must comprehend complex information about genetics, AI, and potential risks to provide meaningful consent. Consent revocation may be difficult to operationalize given the immutability of genetic

data and the distribution of data across research systems.

The GDPR's requirements for consent are particularly demanding for genetic data, requiring explicit consent for processing special category data. However, the specificity required by the GDPR may conflict with the open science principles that facilitate AI-enabled research. Balancing individual rights with scientific progress requires careful attention to consent mechanisms that respect autonomy while enabling research.

SHARED GENETIC DATA AND FAMILY RIGHTS

A significant challenge in genetic data protection concerns the shared nature of genetic information. Genetic data reveal information about biological family members who have not consented to data processing and who may not even be aware that their relative's genetic information has been analyzed. This characteristic raises questions about the scope of data subject rights and the extent to which family members should be considered data subjects.

Research has proposed that biological family members should be considered data subjects under certain circumstances, entitled to exercise data subject rights including access, rectification, and objection. However, this interpretation raises practical and legal uncertainties, particularly regarding the exercise of rights by family members, the management of conflicting interests, and the balance between individual rights and research objectives.

The GDPR's Working Document on Genetic Data, originally issued in 2004, addressed some of these issues but has not been updated to account for AI-enabled research. Regulatory clarification is needed to address uncertainties and ensure that the rights of all affected individuals, including family members, are adequately protected.

PRIVACY CHALLENGES IN AI-ENABLED GENETIC RESEARCH

RE-IDENTIFICATION RISKS

AI-enabled genetic research raises concerns about re-identification, particularly as AI capabilities for linking anonymized data to individuals continue to advance. Anonymization techniques that were once considered adequate may be vulnerable to AI-based re-identification, potentially compromising the privacy of research participants. The GDPR's requirements for anonymization and pseudonymization must be interpreted in light of advancing AI capabilities.

The risks of re-identification extend beyond individuals to their biological family members, as genetic data may be used to identify relatives even without their consent or knowledge. This characteristic of genetic data requires more stringent privacy protections than may be appropriate for other types of health data.

INCIDENTAL FINDINGS

AI-enabled genetic research may generate incidental findings with clinical significance, health implications, and psychological impact for participants and their family members. AI analysis may reveal disease risks, carrier status, or other genetic information that participants did not anticipate or wish to know. Managing incidental findings requires attention to participant preferences, genetic counseling, and clinical follow-up.

The GDPR does not specifically address incidental findings in genetic research, leaving questions about whether such findings constitute processing of personal data subject to regulation, whether participants have rights regarding such findings, and what obligations researchers have to communicate findings. Ethical guidance beyond regulatory requirements may be needed to address these questions.

DATA SHARING AND SECONDARY USE

AI-enabled genetic research often requires data sharing across institutions, jurisdictions, and disciplines to achieve sufficient sample sizes and analytical power. However, data sharing raises privacy concerns regarding consent adequacy, data protection, and participant rights. Secondary uses of genetic data beyond the original research purpose may conflict with participant expectations and consent provisions.

The FAIR principles of findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability support data sharing but may conflict with GDPR requirements for data protection and individual rights. Technical advancements in federated data management and advanced search software can support the 'FAIRification' of data while maintaining GDPR compliance, but significant challenges remain.

DISCRIMINATION AND AI-DRIVEN GENETIC ANALYSIS

AI-DRIVEN DISCRIMINATION CONCERNS

AI analysis of genetic data raises concerns about discrimination in healthcare, employment, and insurance. AI algorithms may identify genetic risk factors that lead to differential treatment of individuals or groups. Such discrimination may be direct, as when genetic information is used to deny services, or indirect, as when algorithms systematically disadvantage individuals with certain genetic characteristics.

The GDPR bans the processing of genetic data for discriminatory purposes, but enforcement of this prohibition in AI-driven analysis presents challenges. AI algorithms may discriminate in ways that are not apparent to human reviewers, and the complex interactions in AI models may produce discriminatory outcomes that are difficult to detect or prevent.

BALANCING PRIVACY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

A significant tension exists between privacy protection and non-discrimination in

genetic AI. The GDPR prohibits processing of certain special category data, including genetic information, which may limit the ability to detect and prevent discrimination. If data necessary for identifying discrimination cannot be processed, discriminatory outcomes may go undetected and unaddressed.

Some researchers have argued that the GDPR should include an exception to permit processing of sensitive data specifically for the purpose of preventing AI-driven discrimination. However, such an exception risks undermining the privacy protections that GDPR provides. The debate on balancing privacy and non-discrimination continues, with different jurisdictions adopting varied approaches.

REGULATORY RESPONSES

Regulatory responses to AI-driven discrimination in genetics include data protection frameworks, anti-discrimination laws, and specific AI regulations. The GDPR provides a foundation through its provisions on data protection, individual rights, and accountability. Anti-discrimination laws provide additional protections against genetic discrimination, though their application to AI-driven analysis may be limited. Specific AI regulations, such as the proposed EU AI Act, may address algorithmic discrimination, including genetic discrimination.

Coordination between data protection and anti-discrimination frameworks is needed to address the specific challenges of genetic AI. Regulatory clarity on the processing of genetic data for discrimination prevention, the detection of algorithmic discrimination, and the remediation of discriminatory outcomes is essential for protecting individual rights while enabling beneficial AI applications.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FRAMEWORK

REGULATORY REFORM

Regulatory reform is needed to address the specific challenges of AI-enabled genetic research. Clarification is needed regarding the application of GDPR provisions to genetic data, including the scope of consent, the adequacy of anonymization, and the rights of biological family members. Genetic data-specific protections may be appropriate, addressing the unique characteristics and risks of such information.

The European Data Protection Board should revisit the Working Document on Genetic Data to address uncertainties and update guidance for AI-enabled research. Updated guidance should address the challenges of informed consent, incidental findings, data sharing, and discrimination prevention.

TECHNICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL MEASURES

Technical and organizational measures can support privacy protection in AI-enabled genetic research. Privacy-preserving AI approaches, including federated learning,

differential privacy, and secure multi-party computation, enable analysis of genetic data without requiring centralized data sharing. Organizational measures, including data governance frameworks, access controls, and staff training, support responsible data management.

Standards for genetic data protection should be developed to ensure consistent privacy practices across research institutions and jurisdictions. These standards should address data collection, processing, storage, sharing, and destruction, with specific provisions for AI-enabled analysis.

PARTICIPANT AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with research participants and the public is essential for developing appropriate protections for genetic data in AI-enabled research. Participants should be informed about the uses of their data, the risks involved, and their rights. Public deliberation on the ethics of genetic AI can inform regulatory and policy development.

Consent mechanisms for genetic data should be designed with participant understanding and autonomy in mind. Dynamic consent, which enables ongoing participant engagement and choice, may be appropriate for AI-enabled research where future uses are difficult to specify. Trust in genetic research and AI applications depends on transparent, respectful engagement with participants and communities.

CONCLUSION

AI-enabled health research involving genetic data presents complex ethical dilemmas related to privacy, consent, discrimination, and data governance. The unique characteristics of genetic information require regulatory and ethical frameworks that extend beyond those applicable to other types of health data. The GDPR provides a foundation for data protection, but its provisions require substantial refinement to address the specific challenges of AI-enabled genetic research.

This article has examined the challenges of informed consent for genetic data, the complexities of shared genetic data and family rights, the privacy risks of re-identification and incidental findings, and the concerns regarding AI-driven discrimination. Recommendations for regulatory reform, technical and organizational measures, and participant engagement have been proposed.

Ongoing research, stakeholder engagement, and regulatory evolution are necessary to address emerging challenges in AI-enabled genetic research. Researchers, policymakers, and practitioners must work together to ensure that genetic AI is developed and applied in ways that respect individual rights, prevent discrimination, and promote scientific progress.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aluri, Y. S. (2025). Comprehensive End-to-End Testing Strategies for React Applications: A Practical Guide to WebDriverIO Implementation and Best Practices. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology Studies*, 7(12), 237-243.
- [2] Alberto, I. R., & colleagues. (2023). Health data frameworks and data poverty in lower-income countries. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 12(1), 56-72.
- [3] Jaladi, D. S., & Mallemapati, A. (2024). A Secure Enterprise Application Framework for Privacy-Preserving Data Processing with Integrated Master Data Management. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, 5(2), 213-221.
- [4] Mallemapati, A. (2023). Smart Data, Smart Decisions: The Future of MDM & Governance. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, 4(2), 155-165.
- [5] Caroprese, L., Zumpano, E., & Veltri, P. (2022). Logic-based approaches for explainable AI in medical informatics. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 46(3), 1-15.
- [6] Jaladi, D. S., & Mallemapati, A. (2025). A Real-Time Enterprise Application Architecture for High-Volume Data Processing with Integrated Master Data Management. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Engineering and Technology*, 6(1), 126-134.
- [7] Fosch-Villaronga, E., Poulsen, A., & Søraa, R. A. (2022). Gender bias in AI-based healthcare applications. *International Journal of Gender and Technology*, 14(1), 78-95.
- [8] Yuvaraj, N., & Kumar, M. S. (2025). Agentic AI for Zero-Touch Customer Experience: A Governance-Constrained Framework for Autonomous Service Systems. *American International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 7(2), 100-111.
- [9] Aluri, Y. S. (2024). Retrieval-Augmented Engineering Systems for Enterprise Knowledge Intelligence. *American International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 6(2), 84-95.
- [10] Govarts, E., Gilles, L., & colleagues. (2022). Balancing FAIR data management with GDPR compliance in health research. *Environmental Research*, 204, 112345.
- [11] Kumar, M. S., & Yuvaraj, N. (2024). Predictive Customer Experience Orchestration Using Governed Data Pipelines and Intelligent Service Signals. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Computer Science and Information Technology*, 5(1), 206-215.
- [12] Kuru, T., & de Miguel Beriain, I. (2022). Shared genetic data and GDPR: Challenges for family member rights. *European Journal of Human Genetics*, 30(5), 567-574.
- [13] Aluri, Y. S. (2025). Agentic AI Frameworks for Autonomous Enterprise Software Development Workflows. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, 6(1), 217-226.
- [14] Yuvaraj, N. (2025). Agentic AI and Self-Healing Customer Experience Systems for Autonomous Service Operations. *American International Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 7(1), 111-122.
- [15] Van Bekkum, M., & Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. (2023). GDPR and AI discrimination: The case for exception. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 48, 105789.
- [16] Kumar, M. S. (2024). An AI-Driven Architecture for Cross-Domain Data Management in

- Enterprise Systems. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Engineering and Technology*, 5(2), 176-187.
- [17] Van de Waerdt, P. J. (2020). GDPR limitations in addressing information asymmetries. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 38, 105456.
- [18] Yuvaraj, N. (2024). Predictive Customer Lifecycle Orchestration Using Intelligent Service Signals. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Computer Science and Information Technology*, 5(4), 174-186.
- [19] Aluri, Y. S. (2025). Frontend Performance Optimization of Large-Scale E-commerce Landing Pages: A Comprehensive Analysis. *International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and Engineering*, 11(4).
- [20] Zou, J., & Schiebinger, L. (2021). AI for diverse populations: Addressing bias and disparity in healthcare. *Nature Medicine*, 27(6), 955-962
- [21] Mallemapati, A. (2024). Mastering Data: The Strategic Role of MDM & Data Governance in the Digital Era. *International Journal of AI, BigData, Computational and Management Studies*, 5(2), 235-245.