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**Introduction/Objective:** Due to the introduction and widespread of next generation sequencing technologies in recent years, genomic medicine became clinically available surpassing the research context, which was previously restricted. Nonetheless, the clinical use of genomic tests also involves a number of challenges, such as how to deal with incidental findings disclosed by the new genomic tests. Incidental or secondary findings are defined as results which are unrelated to the disorder for which testing was obtained (Townsend et al, 2012). Although there are consensus statements already published (Green et al, 2013) on this matter, different cultures, have distinct opinions. In addition, with regard to genomic databases of public nature, there is a global call for researchers and professionals working with this type of data to share them in public databases, in order to accelerate genetics discoveries and help interpretation of variants of unknown significance. Despite this worldwide appeal and given the lack of regulatory context on genomic testing in Brazil, little is known about the views of health professionals and researchers on these matters. In this context, we propose this study which aims to know about the opinion of health professionals and scientists on reporting incidental findings both in the research context and in the clinical setting.

**Methods/Results**: During the 3rd BRAINN Congress, a structured questionnaire will be applied to health professionals, researchers and students interested in participating in the survey. To assist participants answers, along with the questionnaire it will be available an informative flyer on genomic medicine, its diagnostic applicability and basic concepts of incidental findings in genomic context and public databases. Participation can be anonymous and the survey results will be timely published.

**Conclusions:** Our results could provide input for discussions on incorporation and regulation of genomics tests in healthcare systems, involving health professionals, scientists, managers, support patients associations and other stakeholders.
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