

3. Kaufman D, Murphy J, Scott J, et al. Subjects matter: a survey of public opinions about a large genetic cohort study. *Genet Med*. 2008;10(11):831-9. doi: 10.1097/GIM.0b013e31818bb3ab.
4. Sanderson SC, Diefenbach MA, Zinberg R, et al. Willingness to participate in genomics research and desire for personal results among underrepresented minority patients: a structured interview study. *Journal of Community Genetics*. 2013;4(4):469-82. doi: 10.1007/s12687-013-0154-0.
5. Green RC, Berg JS, Grody WW, et al. ACMG recommendations for reporting of incidental findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing. *Genet Med*. 2013;15(7):565-74. doi: 10.1038/gim.2013.73.
6. Kalia SS, Adelman K, Bale SJ, et al. Recommendations for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing, 2016 update (ACMG SF v2.0): a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. *Genetics In Medicine*. 2016;19:249. doi: 10.1038/gim.2016.190.
7. ACMG Board of Directors. The use of ACMG secondary findings recommendations for general population screening: a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genetics in Medicine*. 2019;21(7):1467-8. doi: 10.1038/s41436-019-0502-5.
8. Nussbaum RL, Haverfield E, Esplin ED, et al. Response to “The use of ACMG secondary findings recommendations for general population screening: a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG)”. *Genetics in Medicine*. 2019. doi: 10.1038/s41436-019-0572-4.
9. ACMG Board of Directors. ACMG response to Nussbaum et al. letter on ACMG policy statement: the use of secondary findings recommendations for general population screening: a policy statement of the ACMG. *Genetics in Medicine*. 2019. doi: 10.1038/s41436-019-0573-3.
10. Jarvik GP, Amendola LM, Berg JS, et al. Return of Genomic Results to Research Participants: The Floor, the Ceiling, and the Choices In Between. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*. 2014;94(6):818-26.
11. Crawford DC, Cooke Bailey JN, Briggs FBS. Mind the gap: resources required to receive, process and interpret research-returned whole genome data. *Human Genetics*. 2019;138(7):691-701. doi: 10.1007/s00439-019-02033-5.
12. Collins FS, Varmus H. A New Initiative on Precision Medicine. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372(9):793-5. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1500523.
13. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, et al. The UK Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature*. 2018;562(7726):203-9. doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z.
14. Kaiser J. NIH says its 1-million-person health study is off to a good start. *Science* 2019 [cited 07/25/2019]. Available from: <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/05/nih-says-its-1-million-person-health-study-good-start>.
15. Karow J. All of Us Program plans to return disease variants, PGx results, primary genomic data GenomeWeb; 2018 [updated 06/05/2018; cited 01/02/2019]. Available from: https://allofus.nih.gov/sites/default/files/all_of_us_program_plans_to_return_disease_variants_pgx_results_primary_genomic_data.pdf.
16. Rizk C. All of Us research program to test options for returning results GenomeWeb; 2019 [updated -3/15/2019; cited 07/27/2019]. Available from: <https://www.genomeweb.com/sequencing/all-us-research-program-test-options-returning-results#.XTxlTHt7mUk>.

