

REVIEW ARTICLE OPEN



ERN GENTURIS guideline on counselling on reproductive options for individuals with a cancer predisposition syndrome (including genturis)

Said C. Farschtschi¹✉, Candy Kumps², Tamara Hussong Milagre³, Periklis Makrythanasis^{4,5,6}, Ariane Van Tongerloo², Ellen Denayer⁷, Mariëtte van Kouwen⁸, Estela Carrasco López⁹, Anna Sophie Berghoff¹⁰, Salvo Testa¹¹, Claudia Cesaretti¹², Eva Trevisson¹³, Renata d' Oliveira¹⁴, Francesca Fianchi¹⁵, Claas Röhl¹⁶, Diana Salinas-Chaparro¹⁷, Ileen Slegers¹⁸, Marianne Geilswijk¹⁹, Manon Suerink²⁰, Irene Spinelli¹⁵, Sandra Janssens², Sarah Pugh²¹ and Laura Kirstine Sønderberg Roos²²

© The Author(s) 2026

Cancer predisposition syndromes (CPSs), including genetic tumour risk syndromes (genturis), are a heterogeneous group of genetic disorders characterised by an increased risk of developing tumours compared to the general population. CPSs raise reproductive issues for affected individuals because of the risk of passing the disease-causing genetic alterations on to offspring. The demand for reproductive counselling is often unmet due to the lack of sufficient healthcare professionals with the specialised knowledge, experience and skill. Based on a comprehensive literature review of 851 publications and expert consensus (multidisciplinary medical experts and patient representatives), the European Reference Network on genetic tumour risk syndromes (ERN GENTURIS) developed a guideline providing 16 recommendations for reproductive counselling in CPSs. The central recommendation is to offer reproductive counselling proactively to all individuals with a CPS and their relevant family members, together with psychological support and in multidisciplinary collaborations. This guideline aims to standardize the offer of reproductive counselling for individuals with a CPS across Europe, empowers healthcare professionals for their specific tasks, and helps patients dealing with their own challenges.

European Journal of Human Genetics; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-025-02007-4>

INTRODUCTION

Cancer predisposition syndromes (CPSs) (including genetic tumour risk syndromes (genturis; CPSs included in the European Reference Network on Genetic Tumour Risk Syndromes (ERN GENTURIS [1])), e.g., hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, Li-Fraumeni syndrome, neurofibromatosis type 1, schwannomatosis and Lynch syndrome ([2, 3], www.genturis.eu/l=eng/thematic-disease-groups.html), affect up to 10% of cancer patients [4]. CPSs often present with early-onset tumours and have risk of transmission of the genetic predisposition. Individuals face dual burdens: personal cancer risks and concerns about transmitting the condition to offspring. Moreover, in syndromic conditions, non-tumorous symptoms that may influence the perception of the disease are common. For instance, neuropsychological conditions can impede genetic counselling and vice versa, genetic counselling may impact psychological issues in these conditions.

For the majority of the CPSs, the inheritance pattern is autosomal dominant, following Mendelian rules, meaning that the risk for a descendent to inherit the condition is usually 50% from each parent. Additionally, mosaicism is known for some CPSs, for which the risk of inheritance mostly is reduced (below 50%). It is important to note that while carriers of a CPS may not develop a cancer, they remain at significantly elevated risk over the course of their lifetime. The likelihood of a cancer can be influenced by variable penetrance, modifier genes, and environmental factors, underscoring that the presence of a CPS is not equivalent to certainty [4]. CPSs with a X-linked or autosomal recessive inheritance have also been reported, but they are rare, and instances arising de novo are particularly rare [5]. Individuals with a CPS who wish to have a child may have several reproductive options available to them, including prenatal diagnosis (PND), and preimplantation genetic testing for

¹University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany. ²University Hospital Ghent, Ghent, Belgium. ³EVITA Association – Hereditary Cancer (Associação EVITA – Cancro Hereditário, Lisbon, Portugal. ⁴Laboratory of Medical Genetics, 'Aghia Sophia' Children's Hospital, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece. ⁵Department of Genetic Medicine and Development, Medical School, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland. ⁶Biomedical Research Foundation of the Academy of Athens, Athens, Greece. ⁷Center for Human Genetics, University Hospitals Leuven, University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. ⁸Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands. ⁹Vall d'Hebron University Hospital, Barcelona, Spain. ¹⁰Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. ¹¹Fondazione Mutagens (hereditary syndromes carriers), Milano, Italy. ¹²Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda, Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy. ¹³Department of Women's and Children's Health, University of Padua, University Hospital of Padua, Padua, Italy. ¹⁴Unidade Local de Saúde (ULS) São João, Porto, Portugal. ¹⁵Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy. ¹⁶NF Kinder/ NF Patients Unites, Vienna, Austria. ¹⁷Hospital Sant Joan de Deu, Barcelona, Spain. ¹⁸UZ Brussel, Brussel, Belgium. ¹⁹Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus, Denmark. ²⁰Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands. ²¹Manchester Centre for Genomic Medicine, Manchester University Foundation NHS trust, Manchester, UK. ²²Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark. ✉email: s.farschtschi@uke.de

Received: 22 October 2025 Revised: 3 December 2025 Accepted: 15 December 2025

Published online: 13 January 2026

monogenic diseases (PGT-M). Some individuals with a CPS may consider not to have biological children because of the risk of passing the condition on to a child. Other options include adoption, surrogacy and gamete or embryo donation. Reproductive decision making for individuals with a CPS is inherently complex and nuanced, encompassing emotional, ethical, and practical challenges. These challenges can be further conditioned by sociocultural, legal, and health-economic contexts, which differ across countries. Despite this complex situation and the request for help from affected individuals, the availability and awareness of specialized, adequate reproductive counselling remains limited [6]. ERN GENTURIS (European Reference Network for patients with a rare and/or complex genturis) therefore developed a guideline with the aim to highlight disparities, establish standards, empower healthcare professionals and help patients in upholding their autonomy across diverse healthcare systems and social environments in Europe. Health questions addressed in this guideline are:

- What content should counselling regarding reproductive options have for individuals with a CPS?
- How can healthcare professionals aid individuals with a CPS to make informed choices?
- Under what circumstances and at what time in the person's life should healthcare providers refer individuals with a CPS for counselling regarding reproductive options?
- In what context should counselling for reproductive options be provided to individuals with a CPS?
- Who should perform counselling for reproductive options for individuals with a CPS?
- How should reproductive counselling be performed for individuals with a CPS?

METHODS

The ERN GENTURIS guideline group for counselling on reproductive options for individuals with a CPS, including genturis (ERN GENTURIS counselling on reproductive options guideline group), was established by 20 experts in reproductive counselling from 10 countries and 3 patient representatives (Supplementary Table 1). The core working group of this guideline group existed of 5 medical professionals and 1 patient representative. The core working group met online on a regular basis over 18 months and drafted the initial guideline scope, clinical questions, recommendations and a guideline document, and obtained feedback from the guideline group. The recommendations were finalised in a modified Delphi approach in which all members of the ERN GENTURIS counselling on reproductive options guideline group and 41 additional experts participated. The guideline was based on an initial review (title, abstract) on 851 publications extracted from PubMed in April/May 2024 (literature search included in supplement). Of these papers, 245 had a full paper review as they could potentially answer the health questions addressed in this guideline. In the end, 85 publications formed the basis of the 24 recommendations that entered the Delphi survey. The full details of the guideline, including literature search, reference list and Delphi process, can be found at:

<https://www.genturis.eu/!-eng/Guidelines-and-pathways/Clinical-practice-guidelines.html>.

The Delphi survey consisted of two rounds. Participants of this Delphi process (listed in Supplementary Table 2) assessed recommendations by a four-point Likert scale (totally disagree, disagree, agree, totally agree). Consensus was defined when >60% of participants responded "agree" or "totally agree". However, even if consensus was met, recommendations were further modified if a higher consensus was thought to be achievable from the written responses that accompanied the ratings. All 16

recommendations included in this manuscript reached over 90% of agreement.

To balance the weight of published evidence and quantify the wealth of expert experience and knowledge, we graded the recommendations according to a three-point scale: Strong = expert consensus AND consistent evidence; Moderate = expert consensus WITH inconsistent evidence AND/OR new evidence likely to support the recommendation; Weak = Expert majority decision WITHOUT consistent evidence.

RESULTS

General considerations (supplementary Table 3)

For counselling. Personal philosophies, religion, cultural values, and individual preferences concerning family and reproduction significantly influence attitudes towards prenatal diagnosis (PND) and preimplantation genetic testing (PGT). Counsellors should be sensitive to and understand these perspectives, ensuring non-judgemental, personalised, and non-directive support.

For healthcare professionals. Access to necessary information should always respect the individual's autonomy and personal readiness. Information should be provided in a timely manner and tailored to the individual's needs and circumstances, considering all personal and healthcare system factors. Genetic counselling should be oriented to up-to-date and evidence-based information, while also recognising that clinical screening strategies, treatment guidelines, diagnostic criteria, nomenclature, reproductive methods, and genetic techniques may change over time.

For healthcare centres providing counselling on reproductive options. Reproductive counselling should take place prospectively and should include realistic information on the process of all the available reproductive options, including natural conception and risk-assumption, PND, PGT, gamete donation, adoption, and postnatal predictive testing of the child. Benefits, drawbacks, limitations and challenges should be explained, such as the medical procedure, possible psychological impact, success rates, and the possibility of obtaining only affected embryos. Also, the reproductive window, waiting times and delays (due to technicalities in PGT) should be discussed. Furthermore, fertility preservation options, such as oocyte/sperm cryopreservation, can be relevant to include in reproductive counselling, especially in situations with a high risk of infertility due to cancer treatment. During counselling, realistic expectations and informed decision-making should be aimed at, tailored to the patient's reproductive potential, before initiating any procedures. For example, a 38-year-old woman may have lower success rates in PGT-M procedures due to her ovarian reserve and oocyte quality compared to a 28-year-old woman. Liaison with IVF clinics should be provided in a timely manner. As reproductive options are regulated under strict national laws, guidance should be provided in accordance with country-specific legislations. Ethical board approval for PND or PGT may have to be obtained in advance for individuals with a CPS on an individual basis; for those cases, refusal and alternatives should be included. If applicable, information about the availability of public funding for PGT should be included.

In addition to these general considerations (Supplementary Table 3), this guideline provides recommendations in four broad and overlapping areas:

1. Reproductive decision making (Table 1) - content and framework of reproductive counselling
2. Timing of reproductive counselling provision (Table 2)
3. Presentation of reproductive options (Table 3)
4. Range of assisted reproductive technologies (Table 4).

Table 1. Reproductive decision making—content and framework of reproductive counselling.

Recommendations	Strength
Rec. 1 Reproductive counselling should be offered to all individuals with a CPS ^a . It is voluntary for the individual with a CPS to accept or decline counselling.	Strong
Rec. 2 All individuals with a CPS and relevant ^b family members of reproductive age should be offered information about their reproductive options.	Strong
Rec. 3 Reproductive counselling must provide individuals with a CPS and relevant ^b family members with comprehensive, balanced, and timely information.	Strong
Rec. 4 Reproductive counselling should be non-directive ensuring patients can freely decline specific or all reproductive options without fear of recrimination, feelings of guilt or social pressure.	Strong
Rec. 5 Couples, at risk for a child with a CPS, considering prenatal diagnosis ^c should be encouraged to reflect on their views regarding continuation or termination of pregnancy preconceptionally ^d .	Moderate
Rec. 6 Couples with a CPS considering pregnancy should have access to a multidisciplinary team of healthcare experts in an individualised way. This may include: A genetic counsellor or clinical geneticist to assess genetic risk, discuss the feasibility of both prenatal diagnosis (PND) ^c and IVF (in vitro fertilization) with preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) ^c . A clinician experienced in performing and interpreting prenatal diagnostic tests to explain the risks, benefits, and procedures of PND ^c options such as amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling, and NIPT, if PND ^c is considered. A fertility doctor to provide guidance on PGT ^c , including PGT-M, and other assisted reproductive techniques where relevant. A psychologist trained in reproductive and genetic counselling, given the emotional and psychological impact of these decisions, In difficult or unusual cases, advice should be sought from additional experts.	Strong

^aCounselling is especially relevant in the reproductive age but can be relevant in other age groups as well, such as adolescence and older individuals informing their relatives.

^bDefinition: relevant family members can include first-degree relatives, such as parents, children, or siblings but also second- and higher-degree relatives. It depends on the characteristics and the inheritance mode of the syndrome. The healthcare professional will determine who the relevant family members are.

^cDefinition: prenatal diagnosis refers to tests conducted to diagnose a foetus in utero, including amniocentesis, chorionic villus sampling, and NIPT (NIPT needs to be confirmed by an invasive test).

^dPreconceptionally is before pregnancy.

Table 2. Timing of reproductive counselling provision.

Recommendations	Strength
Rec. 7 Reproductive counselling should be offered longitudinally to individuals with a CPS (and relevant ^a family members) with multiple opportunities for discussion during reproductive age. At the time of diagnosis, individuals with a CPS should receive clear information about the availability of genetic and reproductive counselling services for future family planning.	Strong
Rec. 8 Genetic and reproductive counselling should be available for individuals with a CPS and for parents (at risk) of an affected child, ideally beginning before family planning and continuing as needed.	Strong
Rec. 9 Individuals with a CPS should be offered age- and context-appropriate genetic and reproductive counselling at the time of diagnosis.	Strong
Rec. 10 Children at risk for cancer susceptibility should be offered counselling ^b regarding predictive testing and family planning once they reach adulthood, or earlier if they express interest or the condition affects childhood.	Moderate
Rec. 11 Counselling regarding reproductive options is relevant for all individuals with a CPS, regardless of whether they already have children, are considering more children, or are not currently planning a pregnancy, since this may influence decisions regarding testing or informing their children/family members.	Moderate

^aDefinition: relevant family members can include first-degree relatives, such as parents, children, or siblings, but also second- and higher-degree relatives. It depends on the characteristics and the inheritance mode of the syndrome. The healthcare professional will determine who the relevant family members are.

^bCounselling in minors should be provided with parental consent and involve specialist with expertise in paediatric care. If initiated in childhood, follow-up should be continuous to adapt to the individual's evolving understanding and needs.

Reproductive decision making—content and framework of reproductive counselling. The first set of recommendations 1–6 (Table 1) is regarding reproductive decision making, and the framework of counselling. An affected individual and the relevant family members should be informed about available tests and possible options (rec. 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, 16). Information regarding the pathogenic variant (ACMG/AMP class 5) or likely pathogenic variant (ACMG/AMP class 4), disease spectra, variability of expression, penetrance, mortality, morbidity and available surveillance programs is also important for the decision making [7–9]. Mosaicism reduces the risk of inheriting the (likely) pathogenic genetic variant and may influence the severity of symptoms; in

this situation, the offspring of an asymptomatic mosaic carrier can inherit the condition and may be more severely affected [10–12].

Natural conception without genetic testing implies an acceptance of the risk of passing on the (likely) pathogenic genetic variant to offspring. In classical autosomal dominant inheritance, that risk is usually 50%. In an individual with mosaic CPS, that risk may be reduced. Choosing natural conception can also mean accepting uncertainty about the child's genetic status until adulthood, when the child can decide whether or not to undergo predictive testing for an adult-onset condition. Current practice is that predictive testing for adult-onset conditions is generally not offered in childhood, in order to respect the child's future

Table 3. Presentation of reproductive options.

Recommendations	Strength
Rec. 12 Reproductive counselling for individuals with a CPS should provide sufficient time, follow-up opportunities, and access to psychological support.	Moderate
Rec. 13 Reproductive counselling should take psychological factors into account and be provided by a multidisciplinary team. This team should include professionals with expertise in reproductive genetics, oncology (when relevant), and psychological support. Access to additional specialists should be tailored to individual patient needs.	Strong
Rec. 14 Reproductive counselling should be offered to both male and female individuals with a CPS independently and include their partners, if appropriate.	Strong

Table 4. Range of assisted reproductive technologies.

Recommendations	Strength
Rec. 15 Female fertility preservation options, such as oocyte cryopreservation, should be included in reproductive counselling for individuals with a CPS, when there is a high risk of infertility due to cancer treatment ^a .	Strong
Rec. 16 Male fertility preservation options, such as sperm cryopreservation, should be included in reproductive counselling for individuals with a CPS, when there is a high risk of infertility due to cancer treatment ^b .	Moderate

^aThis discussion should be tailored to the individual's age, ovarian reserve, and the feasibility of fertility preservation in their specific healthcare setting. Ideally, oncologists should address this topic early, before treatment begins.

^bThis discussion should ideally take place at the time of cancer diagnosis and be led by the oncology team before treatment begins. Counselling should be tailored to individual risk factors and the feasibility of fertility preservation within the specific healthcare setting.

autonomy. However, when a CPS is associated with childhood-onset disease or when surveillance or preventive measures are indicated during childhood, predictive testing of the child can be considered at the time point when screening or intervention is recommended (rec. 10).

PND (rec. 5) could imply a possibility to terminate a pregnancy if the foetus has a (likely) pathogenic variant that causes the development of a CPS. Not only the associated risk of miscarriage (estimated as below 0.5% [13]) has to be considered, but also other complications and mostly the severity of the associated CPS. PND is an invasive test and is not recommended if: (1) there is no intention to terminate the pregnancy when a (likely) pathogenic variant is found, (2) one is not able to bear the emotional burden associated with a pregnancy termination, and (3) the local legal regulation does not permit a pregnancy termination.

PGT offers the option to select an embryo which does not carry the familial (likely) pathogenic variant for implantation. PGT-M (for monogenic conditions) avoids the procedure-related risks associated with invasive PND and the psychological burden related to a possible pregnancy termination. However, procedures of in vitro fertilization and embryo transfer can be challenging and may also be a psychological and medical burden. Local legal regulation has to be followed. In some centres it is possible that in a case where all embryos are positive for the (likely) pathogenic variant, the involved individuals may decide to pursue implantation, while in other centres the affected embryos are automatically discarded. This is dependent on local ethical frameworks and legal standing.

Prenatal and preimplantation genetic testing reveal only the presence of a (likely) pathogenic variant and cannot predict individual clinical presentation or prognosis for the majority of CPS. Uncertainty in clinical outcomes is of particular concern for individuals making reproductive decisions in those CPSs with limited or only poorly established genotype-phenotype correlations [14].

Decisions such as testing for a CPS have consequences not only for the individuals but also for other family members and the potential future offspring [15]. Furthermore, it should be noted that gaining knowledge and insight may also cause an increase in psychological burden and challenges in decision making [16–19]. There is no single “right” answer, and all decisions are individual and context dependent. Individuals affected by CPS often state gaps in their knowledge and difficulties in understanding their

options, even after receiving reproductive counselling [2]. Therefore, the complexity of reproductive decisions should be acknowledged in counselling.

Timing of reproductive counselling provision. The second set of recommendations is 7–11 in Table 2. Reproductive counselling and aiding decision for individuals with a CPS is a dynamic and unpredictable process since patient's understanding, wishes, desires, and needs change throughout the course of their life [20] (rec. 7, 9, 11). A person's perception of risk and perspective may also change over time. This could be related to the development of manifestations of the CPS.

There are several key decision points when genetic reproductive counselling is essential (rec. 7) [19, 21–26]: [1] prior to diagnostic testing, [2] at diagnosis of the syndrome, [3] at reproductive age, [4] when actively considering pregnancy, [5] substantial change in clinical course and health condition; incorporating the current family status in the process of counselling is of importance as some options may not be available (rec. 7–11).

Consequently, the reproductive counselling is not a “one and done” intervention, but rather should be considered as a dynamic process at different times as circumstances (clinical and psychological) and options might change (rec. 7, 8).

The ability for an individual to understand potentially complex medical and technical information while also considering the significant challenge of decision making and impact of long-term psychological burden is unique and highly personal. Consideration should therefore be made to break reproductive counselling into multiple sessions over time, by leaving patients room to digest the information, manage their own emotions and to process their thoughts (rec. 7) [14]. Some patients may reject the offer of counselling at one point but change their mind later or vice versa [27] dependent on life circumstances and, especially in CPSs in association to the clinical context (rec.1). It should be made clear that the decision to pursue counselling can be changed at any time without any disadvantage regarding the option of counselling (rec. 4, 7).

Presentation of reproductive options. The third set of recommendations 12–14 is given in Table 3. The best practice for reproductive counselling is a multidisciplinary approach. The core

disciplines should include [1] clinical geneticist or genetic counsellor, [2] disease-expert who know the clinical spectrum and course of the specific CPS, [3] gynaecologist or/and reproductive specialist (e.g., in case of in vitro fertilization) and [4] psychologist (rec. 6, 12, 13). It is crucial that all available options are explained and offered to the individual with CPS, and, if relevant, to their partner (rec. 2, 3, 14). Centres specializing in certain reproductive options (e.g. in vitro fertilization) can provide specific counselling, but also need to explain other options or refer the patient first to other expert providers for comprehensive counselling. Centres specialized in certain CPSs can collaborate with specialists (geneticist, oncologist, gynaecologist, etc.) to provide a comprehensive counselling. As mentioned in the previous section, multiple sessions and take-away materials can be helpful.

Range of assisted reproductive technologies (Table 4). The fourth set of recommendations 15 and 16 are given in Table 4. Assisted reproductive technologies are a broad term encompassing medical technologies used to support conception and pregnancy, primarily used to address infertility. This subject involves procedures such as in vitro fertilization, intracytoplasmic sperm injection, cryopreservation of gametes and embryos, and the use of donor gametes or embryos. It can also be used outside of an infertility setting in case of preimplantation genetic testing. The need, approval and availabilities of genetic testing in different scenarios of insemination and PND may vary due to national legislation and should be part of the discussion with the patients. All these different options should also be explained to the patient in a counselling (rec. 15, 16).

Discussion and future direction

Up to now, only one specific guideline on the issue of reproductive counselling has been published: the 2023 British Society of Genomic Medicine guideline [28]. The broad recommendations of the UK and our European guidelines are in concordance. Each of them is adapted to its own local legal regulation and health care systems. While the UK guideline gives specific guidance, for example to the timing of prenatal diagnosis with referral to the UK Abortion act 1967, our guideline focuses more on general timing and strategies to access reproductive counselling, and less on the detailed suggestions on the different reproductive options. This is because our guideline aims to cover all European countries with varying health care systems and possibilities for reproductive interventions. Also, it is important to note that legal and ethical regulation across European countries are diverse, for example, regarding termination of pregnancy.

Some brief recommendations regarding reproductive options are included in several guidelines for specific CPS. For example, recommendation number 6 in the “ERN GENTURIS clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis, treatment, management and surveillance of people with schwannomatosis” [29], and recommendations 7 and 8 in the “ERN GENTURIS guideline on constitutional mismatch repair deficiency diagnosis, genetic counselling, surveillance, quality of life, and clinical management” [30]. However, such recommendations are more general and abstract, like “patients should be offered reproductive counselling”, which is meant more for general health care professionals and specialists such as oncologists. By contrast, our guideline is meant to assist those who provide the counselling, for example, geneticists and gynaecologists, and it is hoped that the guideline should also encourage patients to request for specific reproductive counselling. This guideline is also meant to initiate the discussion about counselling and diagnostic approaches in individuals with a CPS. As CPSs are mostly complex genetic disorders associated with several challenges, answers cannot be provided by a single diagnostic entity. Moreover, multidisciplinary

approaches should be formalised to provide up-to-date genetic counselling and respective diagnostic and therapeutic options.

Reproductive medicine techniques have experienced rapid development [31], and pre-conceptual counselling was rated as the most important pregnancy related issue in a recent survey among clinicians and patient representatives from 20 ERNs [6]. However, the awareness of the applicability of methods such as PGT for CPSs appears to be still limited, among both health professionals and patients [2], and the limited access to specialists in reproductive counselling is a challenge [6].

The formulation of these guidelines for counselling on reproductive options for individuals with a CPS inevitably highlighted areas in which further research is required in order to guide more definitive conclusions. Examples of topics for further research include:

- Centres providing assisted reproductive technology for CPSs should collaborate to pool, analyse and publish data regarding safety and success rates.
- The effectiveness of alternative patient education tools to replace or supplement individualised in-person reproductive counselling should be assessed prior to their introduction into clinical care.
- There would be value in the community around CPSs (both experts and affected individuals) working together to outline an ethical framework regarding the reproductive options and decision-making.
- Condition-specific evidence regarding the ideal form that reproductive counselling should take is lacking.
- The role of lay organizations in the development of clinical care guidelines.
- Development of multinational registers.

REFERENCES

1. Engels M, Urbanczyk K, Holzspies J, Rohl C, Geveerink N, Hoogerbrugge N. The European Reference Network on Genetic Tumour Risk Syndromes (ERN GENTURIS): benefits for patients, families, and health care providers. *Fam Cancer*. 2025;24:33.
2. Calosci D, Passaglia L, Gabbiato I, Cartisano F, Affuso R, Sorrentino U, et al. Public awareness and acceptability of pgt-m in cancer predisposition syndromes. *Genes*. 2023;14:2069.
3. WHO. WHO Classification of Tumours - Genetic Tumour Syndromes 2025. Available from: <https://whobluebooks.iarc.fr/structures/genetic-tumour-syndromes/>.
4. Saletta F, Dalla Pozza L, Byrne JA. Genetic causes of cancer predisposition in children and adolescents. *Transl Pediatr*. 2015;4:67–75.
5. Garutti M, Foffano L, Mazzeo R, Michelotti A, Da Ros L, Viel A, et al. Hereditary cancer syndromes: a comprehensive review with a visual tool. *Genes*. 2023;14.
6. Zucchi D, Marinello D, Tani C, Fulvio G, Aguilera S, Benachi A, et al. Pregnancy-related issues in rare and low-prevalence diseases: results of ERN transversal working group on pregnancy and family planning survey. *Orphanet J Rare Dis*. 2025;20:112.
7. Niermeijer MF, de Die-Smulders CE, Page-Christiaens GC, de Wert GM. Genetic cancer syndromes and reproductive choice: dialogue between parents and politicians on preimplantation genetic diagnosis. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk*. 2008;152:1503–6.
8. Friedman LC, Kramer RM. Reproductive issues for women with BRCA mutations. *J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr*. 2005;34:83–6.
9. Harris M, Winship I, Spriggs M. Controversies and ethical issues in cancer-genetics clinics. *Lancet Oncol*. 2005;6:301–10.
10. Hartung TI, Kluwe L, Farschtschi SC. Analysing tumours for genetic diagnosis in mosaic neurofibromatosis type 1. *J Med Genet*. 2025;62:405–8.
11. Happle R, Torrelo A. Superimposed mosaicism in tuberous sclerosis complex: a key to understanding all of the manifold manifestations?. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. 2020;34:2511–7.
12. Evans DG, Ramsden RT, Shenton A, Gokhale C, Bowers NL, Huson SM, et al. Mosaicism in neurofibromatosis type 2: an update of risk based on uni/bilaterality of vestibular schwannoma at presentation and sensitive mutation analysis including multiple ligation-dependent probe amplification. *J Med Genet*. 2007;44:424–8.

13. Salomon LJ, Sotiriadis A, Wulff CB, Odibo A, Akolekar R. Risk of miscarriage following amniocentesis or chorionic villus sampling: systematic review of literature and updated meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol.* 2019;54:442–51.
14. Ponder M, Murton F, Hollowell N, Statham H, Green J, Richards M. Genetic counseling, reproductive behavior and future reproductive intentions of people with neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1). *J Genet Couns.* 1998;7:331–44.
15. de Vries-Kragt K. The dilemmas of a carrier of BRCA1 gene mutations. *Patient Educ Couns.* 1998;35:75–80.
16. Wilson RD, De Bie I, Armour CM, Brown RN, Campagnolo C, Carroll JC, et al. Joint SOGC-CCMG opinion for reproductive genetic carrier screening: an update for all Canadian providers of maternity and reproductive healthcare in the era of direct-to-consumer testing. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can.* 2016;38:742–62.e3.
17. Zirkelbach E, Hashmi S, Ramdaney A, Dunnington L, Ashfaq M, Nugent EK, et al. Managing variant interpretation discrepancies in hereditary cancer: clinical practice, concerns, and desired resources. *J Genet Couns.* 2018;27:761–9.
18. Gould H, Hashmi SS, Wagner VF, Stoll K, Ostermaier K, Czerwinski J. Examining genetic counselors' implicit attitudes toward disability. *J Genet Couns.* 2019;28:1098–106.
19. Di Pietro ML, Giuli A, Spagnolo AG. Ethical implications of predictive DNA testing for hereditary breast cancer. *Ann Oncol.* 2004;15:165–170.
20. Tutty E, Forbes Shepherd R, Hoskins C, Purvis R, Shanahan M, Boussioutas A, et al. Becoming and being a parent with an inherited predisposition to diffuse gastric cancer: a qualitative study of young adults with a CDH1 pathogenic variant. *J Psychosoc Oncol.* 2023;41:286–302.
21. Petersen GM. Genetic testing and counseling in familial adenomatous polyposis. *Oncology.* 1996;10:89–94.
22. Reynolds PP, Benkendorf JL. Genes and generalists: why we need professionals with added competencies. *West J Med.* 1999;171:375–9.
23. Blandy C, Chabal F, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Julian-Reynier C. Testing participation in BRCA1/2-positive families: initiator role of index cases. *Genet Test.* 2003;7:225–33.
24. Grover S. The psychological dimension of informed consent: dissonance processes in genetic testing. *J Genet Couns.* 2003;12:389–403.
25. Terzi YK, Oguzkan-Balci S, Anlar B, Aysun S, Guran S, Ayter S. Reproductive decisions after prenatal diagnosis in neurofibromatosis type 1: importance of genetic counseling. *Genet Couns.* 2009;20:195–202.
26. Donnelly LS, Watson M, Moynihan C, Bancroft E, Evans DG, Eeles R, et al. Reproductive decision-making in young female carriers of a BRCA mutation. *Hum Reprod.* 2013;28:1006–12.
27. Morand M, Roth M, Peterson SK, Bednar EM, Ramdaney A, Livingston JA, et al. Factors impacting adolescent and young adult cancer patients' decision to pursue genetic counseling and testing. *Support Care Cancer.* 2022;30:5481–9.
28. British Society for Genetic Medicine. Prenatal diagnosis and pre-implantation genetic testing for germline cancer susceptibility gene variants. London: British Society for Genetic Medicine; 2023.
29. Evans DG, Mostaccioli S, Pang D, Fadzil OCM, Pittara M, Champollion N, et al. ERN GENTURIS clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis, treatment, management and surveillance of people with schwannomatosis. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2022;30:812–7.
30. Colas C, Guerrini-Rousseau L, Suerink M, Gallon R, Kratz CP, Ayuso E, et al. ERN GENTURIS guidelines on constitutional mismatch repair deficiency diagnosis, genetic counselling, surveillance, quality of life, and clinical management. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2024;32:1526–41.
31. Zakaria WNA, Yoon SY, Wijaya A, Ahmad AH, Zakaria R, Othman Z. Global trends and themes in genetic counseling research. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2023;31:1181–4.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Manon Engels for logistic support, coordination of the guideline committee meetings and facilitating the guideline development process as well as SQ:RT for the literature review. They also acknowledge their colleagues from the ERN GENTURIS for fruitful discussions and suggestions. A special thanks to all the (external) experts who participated in the modified Delphi survey (in alphabetical order): Amedeo Azizi¹, Manuela Bapista², Tanya M. Bisseling³, Ignacio Blanco⁴, Alejandra Cano⁵, Melchor Carbonell Socias⁵, Andrada Ciuca⁶, Lotte Berdiin Colmorn⁷, Samantha Doyle⁸, Francesca Filippi⁹, Lenka Foretova¹⁰, Sophie Frank¹¹, Jacek Gronwald¹², Hildegunn Høberg Vetti¹³, Marek Karwacki¹⁴, Antonis Kattamis¹⁵, Mateja Krajc¹⁶, Barbara Laga¹⁷, Marie Louise Landsvig⁷, Milan Macek¹⁸, Dolores Manau¹⁹, Angela Mastronuzzi²⁰, Lorena Moreno Calle¹⁹, Kai Muru²¹, Federica Natacci⁹, Valeria Nicotra⁹, Rosie O Shea^{22,23}, Minna Pöyhönen²⁴, Tiia Reimand²¹, Alessandra Renieri²⁵, Kerstin Rhiem²⁶, Maria Constanza Roa Bravo²⁷, Kleoniki Roka¹⁵, Andrea Ros⁴, Susanne Schüler-Toprak²⁸, Fabiana Sousa², Verena Steinke-Lange²⁹, Isobel Turbin³⁰, Alexander E. Volk³¹, Karin A.W. Wadt^{7,32}.¹ Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; ² ULS São João, Porto, Portugal; ³ Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen the Netherlands; ⁴ Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol, Barcelona, Spain; ⁵ Hospital Universitario Vall d'Hebron, Barcelona, Spain; ⁶ Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj,

Romania; ⁷ Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark; ⁸ The National Maternity Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; ⁹ Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Policlinico di Milano, Milan, Italy; ¹⁰ Masaryk Memorial Cancer Institute, Brno, Czech Republic; ¹¹ Institut Curie, Paris, France; ¹² Pomeranian Medical University - University Clinical Hospital no 1, Szczecin, Poland; ¹³ Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway; ¹⁴ Medical University of Warsaw University Clinical Center, Warsaw, Poland; ¹⁵ Agia Sophia Children's Hospital, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece; ¹⁶ Institute of Oncology Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia; ¹⁷ University Hospital Gasthuisberg, Leuven, Belgium; ¹⁸ Charles University and Motol University Hospital, Prague, Czechia; ¹⁹ Hospital CLINIC of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; ²⁰ IRCCS Bambino Gesù Children's Hospital, Rome, Italy; ²¹ Tartu University Hospital, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia; ²² Trinity College Dublin, St. James's Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; ²³ School of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, Australia; ²⁴ Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland; ²⁵ AOU Senese, Siena, Italy; ²⁶ Center for Familial Breast and Ovarian Cancer, Center for Integrated Oncology (CIO), University Hospital Cologne, Cologne, Germany; ²⁷ Institut für Klinische Genetik, Universitätsklinikum Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden, Germany; ²⁸ University Medical Center Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany; ²⁹ MGZ - Medical Genetics Center, Munich, Germany; ³⁰ Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK; ³¹ University Hospital Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany; ³² University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark. Said C. Farschtschi, Candy Kumps, Periklis Makrythanasis, Ariane Van Tongerloo, Ellen Denayer, Mariette van Kouwen, Estela Carrasco López, Anna Sophie Berghoff, Claudia Cesaretti, Eva Trevisson, Renata Filipa Reis Sequeira Rodrigues d' Oliveira, Francesca Fianchi, Diana Salinas-Chaparro, Ileen Slegers, Marianne Geilswijk, Manon Suerink, Irene Spinelli, Sandra Janssens and Laura Kirstine Sønderberg Roos are members of ERN GENTURIS. Tamara Hussong Milagre, Salvo Testa and Claas Röhl are European Patient Advocacy Group (ePAG) representatives of ERN GENTURIS. The authors also thank Lan Kluwe for drafting the manuscript.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The ERN GENTURIS counselling on reproductive options guideline group consisted of Anna Sophie Berghoff, Estela Carrasco López, Claudia Cesaretti, Ellen Denayer, Francesca Fianchi, Marianne Geilswijk, Mariette van Kouwen, Periklis Makrythanasis, Renata d' Oliveira, Claas Röhl, Diana Salinas-Chaparro, Ileen Slegers, Irene Spinelli, Manon Suerink, Salvo Testa, Ariane Van Tongerloo, Eva Trevisson including the Core Working Group consisting of Said C. Farschtschi, Sandra Janssens, Candy Kumps, Tamara Hussong Milagre, Sarah Pugh, Laura Kirstine Sønderberg Roos. The core working group drafted and agreed on the recommendations that were included in the Delphi survey. The ERN GENTURIS counselling on reproductive options guideline group, as well as 41 additional clinicians or patients with expertise in reproductive counselling (listed in "Acknowledgements") participated in the Delphi survey. The core working group drafted the guideline document and all listed authors commented on drafts and agreed with the final paper.

FUNDING

This guideline has been supported by the European Reference Network on Genetic Tumour Risk Syndromes (ERN GENTURIS). ERN GENTURIS is funded by the European Union. For more information about the ERNs and the EU health strategy, please visit <http://ec.europa.eu/health/ern>. Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

COMPETING INTERESTS

All members of the ERN GENTURIS counselling on reproductive options guideline group, including the core working group, have provided disclosure statements on all relationships that they have that might be perceived to be a potential source of a conflict of interest. Said C. Farschtschi reported receipt of honoraria or consultation fees from Alexion and AstraZeneca. Tamara Hussong Milagre reported receipt of grant/research supports from Gilead Science (EVITA Platform) and receipt of honoraria or consultation fees from Novartis (Advisory Board). Claas Röhl reported receipt of grants/research supports from Boehringer Ingelheim, Alexion, BMS, Novartis, Roche, Tecan and participation in a company sponsored speaker's bureau (Boehringer Ingelheim, Alexion). Anna Sophie Berghoff has research support from Daiichi Sankyo, Roche and honoraria for lectures, consultation or advisory board participation from Roche Bristol-Meyers Squibb, Merck, Daiichi Sankyo, AstraZeneca, CeCaVa, Seagen, Alexion, Servier, Pfizer, as well as travel support from Roche, Amgen and AbbVie. All participants of the ERN GENTURIS Counselling on reproductive options Delphi survey provided disclosure statements on all relationships that they have that might be perceived to be a potential source of competing interests. Rosie O Shea, Kerstin Rhiem, Sophie Frank, and Kleoniki Roka reported receipt of honoraria or consultation fees from AstraZeneca. Rosie O Shea reported participation in a company-sponsored speaker's bureau: AstraZeneca. Kerstin Rhiem received

grants/research support from German Cancer Society and received honoraria or consultation fees from Novartis, streamed up GmbH. Susanne Schüler-Toprak reported receipt of honoraria or consultation fees from Pfizer, Roche, GSK, and Celgene. Karin Wadt received honoraria or consultation fees from Seagen Denmark ApS. Sophie Frank reported travel support from Pharma, GSK, Lily, and Pfizer. Hildegunn Høberg Vetti reported receipt of honoraria or consultation fees from Pfizer AS, Novartis Norway AS, and Pierre Fabre Pharma Norden AB. Amedeo Azizi received grants/research supports from Alexion as well as honoraria or consultation fees from Alexion, Novartis, and Johnson & Johnson.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Supplementary information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-025-02007-4>.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Said C. Farschtschi.

Reprints and permission information is available at <http://www.nature.com/reprints>

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2026