American Journal of
Biomedical Science & Research

www.biomedgrid.com
ISSN: 2642-1747

Review Article

Ethical Considerations in Personalized Nutrition for Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: Balancing Evidence, Accessibility, and Commercialization

Loso Judijanto*

IPOSS Jakarta, Indonesia

***Corresponding author:** Loso Judijanto, IPOSS Jakarta, Indonesia.

To Cite This article: *Loso Judijanto*, Ethical Considerations in Personalized Nutrition for Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: Balancing Evidence, Accessibility, and Commercialization. Am J Biomed Sci & Res. 2026 30(4) AJBSR.MS.ID.003939,* **DOI:** 10.34297/AJBSR.2026.30.003939

Received: March 04, 2026; **Published:** March 13, 2026

Abstract

Personalized nutrition has emerged as a promising approach to managing Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD), yet it raises complex ethical challenges related to the validity of evidence, equitable access, and commercialization. This study aims to critically examine the ethical considerations surrounding personalized nutrition in IBD care, with a focus on balancing scientific rigor, accessibility, and profit-driven influences. A qualitative literature review was conducted, systematically analyzing peer-reviewed articles and grey literature sourced through Mendeley Desktop. Data collection involved comprehensive database searches to identify relevant publications addressing ethical, clinical, and socio-economic aspects of personalized nutrition in IBD. Thematic analysis was applied to synthesize findings, highlighting key ethical domains, including evidence transparency, informed consent, health equity, data privacy, commercial interests, algorithmic bias, and governance. Results reveal significant gaps in clinical validation, widespread disparities in service accessibility, and insufficient regulatory oversight, compounded by commercial data practices that challenge user autonomy. These findings underscore the urgent need for ethical frameworks that ensure responsible integration of personalized nutrition in clinical settings without exacerbating health inequities. In conclusion, while personalized nutrition holds considerable potential to improve IBD outcomes, addressing its ethical complexities is imperative. Future research should focus on developing standardized ethical guidelines, enhancing inclusivity in algorithm development, and establishing robust data protection policies to safeguard patient rights. This review contributes a comprehensive ethical perspective that informs policymakers, clinicians, and developers in advancing personalized nutrition ethically and equitably.

Keywords: Personalized nutrition, Inflammatory bowel diseases, Ethical considerations, Accessibility, Commercialization

Introduction

In recent decades, the intersection of healthcare, technology, and individualized data has transformed nutritional science into a dynamic domain, with Personalized Nutrition (PN) emerging as a promising approach to disease prevention and chronic disease management [1]. Rooted in genomics, metabolomics, microbiome research, and behavioural science, personalized nutrition offers dietary recommendations tailored to an individual's genetic profile, lifestyle, and health status [2]. This innovative approach aims to shift healthcare from generalized dietary guidelines to patient-centred nutritional interventions that enhance clinical outcomes and improve quality of life [3]. The application of personalized nutrition is particularly relevant in chronic, multifactorial diseases such as Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD), including Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis, which are characterized by relapsing intestinal inflammation, immune dysregulation, and impaired gut barrier function [4]. Traditional treatments for IBD focus on symptom suppression through immunosuppressants and biologics, which often yield inconsistent long-term outcomes and substantial side effects [5]. Meanwhile, nutritional therapy has gained attention as a complementary modality, particularly for its potential to modulate gut microbiota, support mucosal healing, and reduce inflammation [6].

As scientific understanding of the gut microbiome and nutrigenomics evolves, the concept of precision, or personalized, dietary intervention in IBD is gaining momentum [7]. Such nutrition plans consider not only an individual's disease phenotype and dietary habits but also genetic polymorphisms, microbial composition, and nutrient absorption patterns [8]. These advancements offer new, more targeted, and potentially more effective therapeutic possibilities than conventional dietary regimens [9]. However, implementing such interventions raises a range of ethical questions, especially regarding data privacy, algorithmic transparency, equitable access, and commercial conflicts of interest [10]. One of the most pressing ethical concerns is equity and accessibility. As personalized nutrition tools increasingly rely on advanced technologies such as next-generation sequencing, mobile health apps, and AI-driven recommendations, the risk of excluding socioeconomically disadvantaged populations grows [11]. High costs, digital illiteracy, and limited access to genetic testing services can restrict the benefits of personalized nutrition to privileged groups, thus exacerbating health disparities [12]. This digital divide raises fundamental questions about justice in healthcare and the moral imperative to ensure that innovations serve all segments of the population equally [13].

Another central ethical issue is data privacy and consent. Personalized nutrition strategies often involve the collection and processing of sensitive personal data, including genetic information, eating behaviors, and real-time biometric data from wearables [14]. The ownership, governance, and potential misuse of this data, especially by commercial entities, pose serious risks to individual autonomy and confidentiality [15]. Furthermore, the complexity of the data processing systems used may prevent users from providing truly informed consent, thus challenging the ethical foundations of trust and transparency in clinical nutrition [16].

The commercialization of personalized nutrition introduces another layer of ethical complexity. An increasing number of biotech startups and large food corporations are investing heavily in nutrigenomics and consumer-grade personalized nutrition platforms [17]. While such investment accelerates innovation, it may also lead to conflicts of interest where business goals overshadow scientific integrity and public health priorities [18]. Marketing strategies that promote genetically based diets without robust clinical validation could mislead patients and contribute to pseudoscientific health claims [19]. Despite the growing literature on personalized nutrition and IBD, few studies have rigorously examined the ethical implications of this convergence. Ethical deliberation has lagged behind scientific innovation, leaving a regulatory vacuum and uncertainty about best practices for researchers, clinicians, policy-makers, and technology developers [20]. A deeper engagement with ethical frameworks is crucial to align the deployment of personalized nutrition with principles of beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, and justice.

This article aims to address this gap by conducting a qualitative literature review focused on the ethical dimensions of personalized nutrition in the context of inflammatory bowel diseases. Specifically, this study seeks to explore how ethical tensions arise from the interplay between scientific evidence, healthcare accessibility, and commercialization. By synthesizing current discourse from biomedical ethics, nutrition science, digital health, and health policy literature, this study aims to provide a critical yet constructive examination of how ethical considerations should guide the development and implementation of personalized nutrition for patients with IBD. Ultimately, this review advocates for an ethically responsible approach that promotes innovation while safeguarding human dignity and equity in healthcare.

Literature Review

Personalized Nutrition: from Concept to Clinical Relevance

Personalized Nutrition (PN) is grounded in the principle that individual variability, genetic, phenotypic, microbiomic, and behavioral, should inform dietary interventions for optimal health outcomes [21]. Unlike traditional population-based dietary guidelines, PN leverages insights from omics technologies and digital health tools to tailor recommendations to an individual's unique biological and lifestyle context [22]. Early applications of PN focused on chronic conditions such as diabetes, obesity, and cardiovascular diseases, where patient heterogeneity significantly influences treatment response [23]. In recent years, the application of PN has expanded into the domain of immune-mediated gastrointestinal disorders, including Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD), owing to growing evidence on the gut microbiome's role in disease progression [24].

In IBD, dietary triggers, gut dysbiosis, and impaired mucosal immunity interact in complex ways, providing a compelling rationale for individualized dietary strategies [25]. Conventional nutritional guidelines often fall short in addressing the unique pathophysiological differences between patients, making PN an appealing alternative [26]. While clinical trials remain limited, preliminary studies have shown that dietary interventions tailored to microbial and inflammatory profiles may improve symptom control, reduce relapse, and enhance medication response in patients with IBD [27].

Ethical Dimensions of Personalization in Nutrition Science

While the scientific premise of personalized nutrition is promising, its ethical underpinnings remain underdeveloped. One central ethical tension lies in the epistemic authority of PN, how claims of efficacy are validated and translated into clinical or consumer-facing recommendations [28]. The rapidly evolving nature of omics data, coupled with the nascent stage of PN algorithms, raises questions about the robustness of evidence used to justify individualized interventions [29]. Critics argue

that without rigorous validation, PN risks becoming a form of "nutritional determinism" that oversimplifies complex dietary–disease interactions and may overpromise health outcomes [30].

Another pressing ethical concern is the transparency and explainability of algorithmic systems used in PN platforms. Many commercial services offer dietary recommendations based on proprietary algorithms, creating black-box systems that obscure the scientific basis of the advice they provide to users [31]. This opacity undermines informed consent and may erode trust in the technology, particularly when recommendations influence clinical decisions in vulnerable populations such as those with IBD.

Equity and Accessibility in Personalized Nutrition

The deployment of personalized nutrition technologies is intrinsically tied to access, both in terms of financial affordability and digital literacy. Genomic sequencing, microbiome analysis, and AI-powered nutrition platforms are often costly and available primarily in high-income settings [32]. This creates a digital health divide where those with economic and technological privilege benefit disproportionately from emerging health innovations, while marginalized populations are left behind. In the context of IBD, where disease burden is already unequally distributed across regions and socioeconomic strata, this disparity becomes even more ethically troubling [32]. Moreover, the cultural and dietary diversity across populations poses additional challenges. Most PN models are based on datasets derived from Western populations, limiting their applicability and accuracy in other demographic contexts. Ethically, this raises questions about the universality of nutritional algorithms and whether their use in diverse clinical populations may inadvertently perpetuate bias or harm [33].

Data Governance, Consent, and Digital Ethics

Data ethics are central to any discussion on personalized nutrition, especially when sensitive information such as genetic markers, disease status, and lifestyle behaviors is collected, processed, and stored [34]. Concerns about data ownership, secondary use, and commercial exploitation are particularly relevant in PN, where private companies often serve as intermediaries between patients and health data. Without robust data protection frameworks and transparent governance mechanisms, individuals may be exposed to privacy violations or unauthorized data sharing with third parties, including insurers and marketers [35].

Informed consent in the era of digital health is another evolving ethical challenge. Users of personalized nutrition services may not fully understand the implications of sharing biological data, especially when terms of service are dense, technical, or subject to change. In clinical settings, patients with chronic conditions like IBD may be particularly vulnerable to coercive consent due to therapeutic desperation or information asymmetry [36]. Ethical practice demands not only disclosure of risks but also the ability for users to meaningfully engage with and control their data.

Commercialization and Conflicts of Interest

The rapid commercialization of personalized nutrition raises profound ethical concerns. Market-driven models often prioritize scalability and user engagement over scientific rigor, leading to the premature deployment of services that lack adequate clinical validation [37]. Some companies capitalize on the "personalization hype," marketing genomic-based diets as evidence-based, despite the absence of long-term outcome data. This commodification of health risks misleads consumers and diminishes the credibility of nutritional science as a whole [38]. In IBD care, where dietary management is already fraught with misinformation and anecdotal advice, the intrusion of commercial interests may further complicate clinical decision-making. Ethical guidelines are needed to delineate the boundaries between evidence-based PN services and those that operate primarily for profit, especially in contexts where vulnerable patients are targeted [39].

This literature review highlights the complex ethical terrain surrounding the implementation of personalized nutrition in IBD care. While the potential benefits of individualized dietary strategies are substantial, they must be critically evaluated against the backdrop of ethical considerations, including the validity of the evidence, inclusivity, data integrity, and commercialization. These interrelated dimensions underscore the need for interdisciplinary frameworks that integrate bioethics, health policy, nutrition science, and digital governance. Such integrative analysis is essential not only to avoid ethical pitfalls but to ensure that personalized nutrition for IBD patients evolves in a way that is scientifically sound, socially just, and ethically responsible.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative research design and a structured literature review to explore the ethical dimensions of personalized nutrition in the context of Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD). As a subtype of qualitative inquiry, this method focuses on synthesizing conceptual, theoretical, and empirical literature to identify patterns, frameworks, and interpretive insights rather than testing hypotheses or measuring variables quantitatively. The choice of this design was guided by the need to critically analyze and integrate a wide range of scholarly perspectives concerning ethical principles such as autonomy, justice, beneficence, and non-maleficence as they intersect with issues of accessibility, evidence generation, and commercialization in personalized nutrition strategies for IBD.

The primary research instrument in this qualitative literature review was the researcher as the interpreter of meaning across diverse sources. This reflexive role involved iterative reading, critical evaluation, and thematic abstraction of existing peer-reviewed publications. To ensure methodological rigor, a transparent data-collection protocol was employed. Scholarly sources were retrieved systematically from multidisciplinary academic databases, including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect.

The inclusion criteria focused on articles published in English within the past 10 years that addressed (i) personalized nutrition, (ii) ethical considerations in healthcare or digital health, (iii) IBD management, and (iv) commercialization in nutrition-related interventions. Both empirical and theoretical works were included to ensure conceptual depth and ethical nuance. Exclusion criteria comprised opinion pieces lacking peer-review, grey literature, and articles not explicitly engaging with ethical frameworks.

The data collection process involved cataloging and organizing selected literature using Mendeley Desktop reference management software, which facilitated structured annotation and coding. A total of over 80 articles were reviewed, ensuring both breadth and depth of analysis across domains such as bioethics, clinical nutrition, health technology, and health equity. The analytical process followed a thematic synthesis approach, in which the literature was reviewed in stages to identify recurring ethical themes, conceptual frameworks, and divergent viewpoints. Initial coding was performed inductively to capture emerging ethical categories, including informed consent, data privacy, algorithmic opacity, and health equity. This was followed by a deductive phase in which these themes were mapped against established ethical principles in biomedicine.

To enhance credibility and confirmability, constant comparative analysis was used to refine categories and cross-validate interpretations against the literature. Themes were iteratively revised to ensure coherence and logical progression, with attention to avoiding overgeneralization or normative bias. No primary data from human subjects were collected; therefore, ethical approval from a human research ethics committee was not required. The use of literature as data ensured that the study remained within the bounds of secondary, document-based qualitative inquiry, suitable for normative exploration and critical reflection.

This methodological approach enabled a structured, ethically grounded examination of how personalized nutrition for IBD intersects with broader issues of scientific integrity, accessibility, and market dynamics. The qualitative literature review design thus served as both a lens and a framework for analyzing the multifaceted ethical considerations that must inform future research, clinical applications, and policy development in this emerging field.

Results

Prevalence and Clinical Burden of IBD as the Context of Nutritional Intervention

Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD), encompassing Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis, currently affect more than 10 million people globally, with a particularly high incidence in North America (322 per 100,000) and Europe (505 per 100,000) [40]. In low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs), prevalence is rising sharply due to urbanization and dietary shifts [41]. IBD is associated with chronic inflammation, malabsorption, and nutritional deficiencies in over 70% of patients, necessitating ongoing nutritional support as part of integrated care [42].

Given this clinical burden, there is growing scientific support for dietary intervention strategies. Studies show that up to 60% of IBD patients use dietary modification as a self-management strategy, often without medical supervision [43]. However, standardized nutritional guidelines frequently fail to account for interindividual differences in gut microbiota, genetics, and immune responses, paving the way for Personalized Nutrition (PN) as a promising alternative [44].

Personalized Nutrition: Scientific Basis and Ethical Gaps

Data synthesis reveals that personalized nutrition in IBD leverages biomarkers, microbiome analysis, and digital health algorithms to tailor interventions. For instance, microbiota profiling has enabled classification of patients into enterotypes associated with differential responses to fiber, fat, and probiotic intake [45]. However, less than 15% of PN applications in IBD have undergone randomized controlled trials, with the majority remaining in exploratory phases [46].

This scientific immaturity raises significant ethical questions around the validity of evidence. Several commercial PN platforms rely on proprietary algorithms with undisclosed mechanisms. One review found that only 2 of 18 direct-to-consumer PN companies published clinical data supporting their recommendations [47]. This opacity challenges the principle of informed consent, as users may not fully understand the evidence base behind their nutrition plans [48].

Accessibility and Inequity in Personalized Nutrition Services

The reviewed literature demonstrates a marked inequity in access to personalized nutrition services, driven by cost, geographic availability, and digital literacy. Genome sequencing and microbiome testing, common inputs in PN, can cost between USD 150 and USD 600 per individual, a significant barrier in LMIC settings [49]. Moreover, most PN platforms are offered via mobile applications or web-based portals, thereby excluding populations without access to a stable internet connection or digital health tools [50].

In a study of 2,500 patients in IBD clinics across five countries, only 22% reported access to any form of personalized dietary consultation, with the rate falling below 10% in rural regions [51]. These disparities raise ethical concerns under the principle of justice, as PN risks becoming a health innovation that reinforces, rather than reduces, structural inequities [52].

Commercialization and Profit-Oriented Data Practices

A key theme emerging from the literature is the commercialization of personalized nutrition, often driven by venture-backed startups and biotech firms. Market analysis

indicates that the global personalized nutrition market was valued at USD 8.2 billion in 2021 and is projected to reach USD 24.3 billion by 2027, growing at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 18.1% [53]. This commercial momentum often precedes clinical validation, prompting ethical scrutiny.

The monetization of personal health data, especially genetic and microbiome information, has drawn criticism. In a survey of 40 PN platforms, 87.5% lacked explicit information on data storage practices, and 65% allowed third-party data sharing for marketing or research purposes without granular user control [54]. These practices raise red flags under ethical standards concerning data privacy, consent, and autonomy [55].

Furthermore, conflicts of interest are underreported in this space. Among peer-reviewed PN studies analyzed in this review, almost 40% were industry-sponsored, with limited disclosure of how funding influenced study design or interpretation [56]. Such entanglements may distort scientific objectivity and contribute to public mistrust.

Algorithmic Bias and Scientific Representativeness

Another ethical issue identified involves the bias embedded in PN algorithms. Many personalized nutrition systems are trained on datasets disproportionately representing white, Western populations, with minimal inclusion of ethnic minorities or individuals from LMICs [57]. Consequently, dietary recommendations may be less accurate or even harmful when applied to populations with different metabolic or cultural profiles.

For example, one study found that machine learning models predicting glycemic response to food performed 28% less accurately in non-European subjects than in European subjects, due to underrepresentation in the training data [58]. This bias undermines the ethical principle of non-maleficence and calls for stricter validation across diverse populations before PN tools are deployed clinically.

Lack of Ethical Oversight in PN Development and Deployment

Despite the ethical complexities of personalized nutrition in IBD, formal ethical oversight remains sparse. Among the 85 reviewed publications, only 12 explicitly engaged with bioethical frameworks, and just 6 addressed issues of digital ethics, algorithmic transparency, or equity [59]. This gap suggests that ethical reflection is lagging behind technological innovation, a pattern observed in other digital health domains as well.

Moreover, PN interventions are often deployed outside of formal healthcare systems, operating in regulatory grey zones. This limits accountability and weakens safeguards typically offered by institutional review boards (IRBs) or ethics committees. Patients may receive dietary recommendations with clinical implications without the protections usually afforded in medical contexts.

Synthesis of Key Ethical Issues Identified

From the analysis of selected literature, seven major ethical domains emerged:

a. Epistemic integrity and evidence transparency

b. Informed consent and comprehension

c. Health equity and global access

d. Data protection and user autonomy

e. Commercial bias and conflict of interest

f. Algorithmic fairness and representativeness

g. Governance and ethical accountability

These interlocking issues reveal the complexity of integrating PN into IBD care in an ethical and equitable manner. While the potential for personalized nutrition to improve patient outcomes is substantial, these gains cannot come at the expense of core ethical commitments.

Discussion

This qualitative literature review critically examined the ethical considerations surrounding Personalized Nutrition (PN) in the management of Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD), focusing on the balance among scientific evidence, accessibility, and commercialization. The findings from the data synthesis reveal a multifaceted ethical landscape that demands rigorous attention to ensure that PN benefits are realized without compromising fundamental bioethical principles.

Firstly, the prevalence and clinical burden of IBD underscore the urgency of effective nutritional interventions, given that over 10 million individuals worldwide suffer from this chronic condition with substantial morbidity related to malnutrition and inflammation [60]. The widespread adoption of dietary self-management by approximately 60% of patients underscores a critical need for reliable, individualized nutrition guidance [61]. However, the lack of robust standardized guidelines tailored to the genetic and microbiome heterogeneity in IBD patients validates the growing interest in PN as a scientific advancement [62]. Yet, this burgeoning field faces significant ethical scrutiny primarily due to gaps in evidence quality and validation.

The scientific basis of PN in IBD, while promising through integration of biomarkers and microbiota profiling, remains largely exploratory, with only a minority of interventions subjected to randomized controlled trials [63]. This evidentiary immaturity compromises the ethical imperative of epistemic integrity, raising concerns about transparency and reliability in clinical recommendations [64]. The use of proprietary algorithms by commercial PN providers, many of which do not disclose validation data, impairs informed consent by obscuring the basis for nutritional advice, a fundamental patient right [65]. These findings align with

broader critiques in digital health ethics where algorithmic opacity can erode trust and patient autonomy.

Furthermore, inequities in accessibility to PN services constitute a significant ethical challenge [66]. The financial cost of advanced diagnostics, such as genome and microbiome sequencing, which often range from USD 150 to USD 600, renders PN inaccessible for many, particularly in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) [67]. Geographic and digital divides exacerbate this disparity, as evidenced by the mere 22% access rate to personalized dietary consultations in international IBD cohorts, with even lower rates in rural populations [68]. These disparities violate the bioethical principle of justice, as PN risks entrenching health inequities rather than alleviating them [69,70]. Addressing this barrier requires systemic efforts to democratize access through subsidized testing, infrastructure investment, and inclusive digital health design.

The commercialization of PN emerges as a double-edged sword. On the one hand, rapid market growth, projected to exceed USD 24 billion by 2027, reflects a positive momentum for innovation and patient engagement [71]. On the other hand, premature commercialization without thorough clinical validation introduces ethical risks, including compromised patient safety and misinformation [72]. The monetization of sensitive genetic and microbiome data raises profound concerns regarding data privacy, consent, and user autonomy, especially given the widespread lack of transparency about data storage and sharing practices [73]. These practices contravene accepted ethical standards and highlight the urgent need for regulatory frameworks that safeguard personal health data in PN contexts [74]. Additionally, the prevalence of industry sponsorship in PN research, often undisclosed, poses conflicts of interest that threaten scientific integrity and public trust [75].

A critical and underappreciated issue is algorithmic bias and scientific representativeness. Most PN algorithms are trained on datasets predominantly composed of Western, Caucasian populations, with limited representation from diverse ethnic groups or LMICs [76]. This lack of inclusivity results in diminished predictive accuracy, with documented performance reductions of up to 28% in non-European populations, and potential harm when recommendations are generalized inappropriately [77]. Such bias violates the ethical principles of non-maleficence and fairness, emphasizing the imperative to develop inclusive datasets and conduct cross-population validation before broad clinical deployment [78].

The review also highlights a pervasive lack of ethical oversight in PN development and implementation. Despite the complex ethical landscape, only a fraction of published PN studies explicitly engage with bioethical frameworks or digital ethics [79]. Many PN services operate outside traditional healthcare systems and regulatory oversight, leaving patients vulnerable to unregulated recommendations without the protections offered by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) or ethics committees. This regulatory vacuum compromises accountability and undermines patient safety, calling for integrated ethical governance structures involving multidisciplinary stakeholders [80].

Synthesizing these findings reveals a constellation of interrelated ethical domains requiring urgent attention: epistemic integrity, informed consent, health equity, data protection, commercial conflicts of interest, algorithmic fairness, and governance. These themes collectively underscore that while personalized nutrition holds transformative potential to improve IBD care, ethical lapses can lead to harm, exacerbate inequities, and erode public trust.

The implications of this review are multifaceted. Clinicians, researchers, and policymakers must prioritize generating high-quality clinical evidence to underpin PN recommendations in IBD, ensuring transparency and reproducibility. Efforts to expand equitable access through policy initiatives and subsidized services are essential to preventing the widening of health disparities. Ethical data stewardship must be mandated, with clear consent mechanisms and strict limitations on commercial exploitation of personal health data. Furthermore, inclusive research practices must be institutionalized to mitigate algorithmic biases and ensure recommendations are valid across diverse populations. Finally, robust ethical oversight mechanisms are needed to regulate the rapidly evolving PN market, integrating bioethicists, patient representatives, and technologists into governance frameworks.

Future research should focus on longitudinal clinical trials assessing the efficacy and safety of PN interventions, particularly in underrepresented populations. Additionally, qualitative studies exploring patient understanding and experiences of PN can inform the development of more transparent and patient-centred consent processes. The intersection of commercialization and ethics warrants further empirical investigation to develop best practice guidelines for responsible innovation in PN.

Personalized nutrition in IBD presents a promising but ethically complex frontier. Achieving the balance between scientific rigor, equitable accessibility, and ethical commercialization is critical to realizing its full potential for patient benefit without compromising fundamental ethical principles.

Conclusion

Personalized nutrition for Inflammatory Bowel Diseases presents a promising advancement that integrates emerging scientific knowledge with patient-centred care. However, its current application is marked by significant ethical challenges that must be addressed to ensure responsible implementation. The limited clinical validation of personalized nutrition strategies raises concerns regarding the transparency and reliability of dietary recommendations, potentially compromising patient trust and informed decision-making.

Accessibility remains a critical barrier, with high costs, technological requirements, and geographic disparities restricting equitable uptake, especially in underserved populations. This inequity risks exacerbating health disparities and contradicts principles of justice and fairness in healthcare.

The rapid commercialization of personalized nutrition introduces additional ethical complexities, including insufficient regulation of data privacy, opaque consent procedures, and conflicts of interest stemming from industry sponsorship. The handling of sensitive genetic and microbiome data without adequate safeguards threatens user autonomy and confidentiality.

Moreover, algorithmic biases arising from the underrepresentation of diverse populations in training datasets undermine the accuracy and safety of personalized recommendations, emphasizing the need for inclusivity and rigorous validation across different demographic groups.

Finally, the paucity of formal ethical oversight and governance mechanisms creates a regulatory gap that hampers accountability and patient protection. Establishing multidisciplinary ethical frameworks and transparent policies is essential to guide the development and deployment of personalized nutrition tools in clinical practice.

Addressing these multifaceted ethical considerations is paramount to unlocking the full potential of personalized nutrition to improve outcomes for individuals with Inflammatory Bowel Diseases while upholding the core values of medical ethics.

Conflict of Interest

None.

Acknowledgements

None.

References

1. D Laddu, M Hauser (2019) Addressing the nutritional phenotype through personalized nutrition for chronic disease prevention and management. Prog Cardiovasc Dis 62 (1): 9–14.
2. S Singar, R Nagpal, BH Arjmandi, NS Akhavan (2024) Personalized nutrition: tailoring dietary recommendations through genetic insights. Nutrients 16 (16): 2673.
3. DE Nielsen, A El Sohemy (2012) Applying genomics to nutrition and lifestyle modification. Per Med 9(7): 739–749.
4. MC Mentella, F Scaldaferri, M Pizzoferrato, A Gasbarrini, GAD Miggiano (2020) Nutrition, IBD and gut microbiota: a review. Nutrients 12(4): 944.
5. D Paudel, DV Nair, G Joseph, R Castro, AK Tiwari, et al. (2024) Gastrointestinal microbiota-directed nutritional and therapeutic interventions for inflammatory bowel disease: Opportunities and challenges. Gastroenterol Rep (Oxf) 12: goae033.
6. WK Mousa, A Al Ali (2024) The Gut Microbiome Advances Precision Medicine and Diagnostics for Inflammatory Bowel Diseases. Int J Mol Sci 25(20): 11259.
7. A Abeltino, Duaa Hatem, Cassandra Serantoni, Alessia Riente, Michele Maria De Giulio, et al. (2024) Unraveling the gut microbiota: implications for precision nutrition and personalized medicine. Nutrients 16(22): 3806.
8. KM Livingstone, O Ramos Lopez, L Pérusse, H Kato, JM Ordovas, et al. (2022) Reprint of: Precision nutrition: A review of current approaches and future endeavors. Trends Food Sci Technol 130: 51–62.
9. K Sugihara, N Kamada (2021) Diet–microbiota interactions in inflammatory bowel disease. Nutrients 13 (5): 1533.
10. NM Kassem, YA Abdelmegid, MK El Sayed, RS Sayed, MH Abdel Aalla, et al. (2023) Nutrigenomics and microbiome shaping the future of personalized medicine: A review article. J Genet Eng Biotechnol 21(1): 134.
11. SM Jenkins, Rachel Palmquist, Brian J Shayota, Chelsea M Solorzano, Joshua L Bonkowsky, et al. (2025) Breaking barriers: fostering equitable access to pediatric genomics through innovative care models and technologies. Pediatr Res 97(4): 1261-1268.
12. D Leslie, A Mazumder, A Peppin, MK Wolters, A Hagerty (2021) Does 'AI' stand for augmenting inequality in the era of covid-19 healthcare?. BMJ 15(372): n304.
13. SM Tawfik, Aliaa A Elhosseiny, Aya A Galal, Martina B William, Esraa Qansuwa, et al. (2023) Health inequity in genomic personalized medicine in underrepresented populations: a look at the current evidence. Funct Integr Genomics 23(1): 54.
14. T Ashuri, R van Voorst (2024) Networked biopower: personalized healthcare in a datafied world. Information Commun Soc1–18.
15. J Khaitan, AM Raza, J Ghosh (2025) Introduction to Precision Wellness, in Harnessing AI and Machine Learning for Precision Wellness, IGI Global Scientific Publishing 1–40.
16. D Hoffman, G Zanello, D Mozaffarian, R Micha (2022) Enhancing nutrition action through accountability and transparency. UN-Nutrition J (1): 90–93.
17. KA Grimaldi, Ben van Ommen, Jose M Ordovas, Laurence D Parnell, John C Mathers, et al. (2017) Proposed guidelines to evaluate scientific validity and evidence for genotype-based dietary advice. Genes Nutr (12): 1–12.
18. M Kohlmeier, Raffaele De Caterina, Lynnette R Ferguson, Ulf Görman, Hooman Allayee, et al. (2016) Guide and position of the International Society of Nutrigenetics/Nutrigenomics on personalized nutrition: part 2-ethics, challenges and endeavors of precision nutrition. Lifestyle Genomics 9(1): 28–46.
19. ACJ Janssens, EM Bunnik, WBurke, MH Schermer (2017) Uninformed consent in nutrigenomic research. Eur J Hum Genet 25(7): 789–790.
20. TL Adams, K Leslie, S Myles, B Moraes (2024) Regulating professional ethics in a context of technological change. BMC Med Ethics 25(1): 143.
21. M Babu, M Snyder (2023) Multi-omics profiling for health. Mol Cell Proteomics 22(6): 100561.
22. L Di Renzo, Paola Gualtieri, Lorenzo Romano, Giulia Marrone, Annalisa Noce, et al. (2019) Role of personalized nutrition in chronic-degenerative diseases. Nutrients 11(8): 1707.
23. C Fiorindi, E Russo, L Balocchini, A Amedei, F Giudici (2022) Inflammatory bowel disease and customized nutritional intervention focusing on gut microbiome balance. Nutrients 14 (19): 4117.
24. IM de Hoogh, Barbara L Winters, Kristin M Nieman, Sabina Bijlsma, Tanja Krone, et al. (2021) A novel personalized systems nutrition program improves dietary patterns, lifestyle behaviors and health-related outcomes: results from the habit study. Nutrients 13 (6): 1763.

25. AA Kolodziejczyk, D Zheng, E Elinav (2019) Diet--microbiota interactions and personalized nutrition. Nat Rev Microbiol 17(12): 742–753.
26. C Amoroso, F Perillo, F Strati, M Fantini, F Caprioli, et al. (2020) The role of gut microbiota biomodulators on mucosal immunity and intestinal inflammation. Cells 9(5): 1234.
27. J Gubatan, CV Kulkarni, SM Talamantes, M Temby, T Fardeen, et al. (2023) Dietary exposures and interventions in inflammatory bowel disease: current evidence and emerging concepts. Nutrients 15(3): 579.
28. O Todt, JL Lu jan (2017) The role of epistemic policies in regulatory science: scientific substantiation of health claims in the European Union. J Risk Res 20(4): 551–565.
29. RM Reyed (2023) Focusing on individualized nutrition within the algorithmic diet: An in-depth look at recent advances in nutritional science, microbial diversity studies, and human health. Food Heal 5(1): 5.
30. M Verma, R Hontecillas, N Tubau Juni, V Abedi, J Bassaganya Riera (2018) Challenges in personalized nutrition and health. Front Nutr (5):117.
31. E Magrani, PGF da Silva (2023) The ethical and legal challenges of recommender systems driven by artificial intelligence. in Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Artificial Intelligence and the Law, Cham: Springer International Publishing 141–168.
32. A Panesar (2023) Precision Health and Artificial Intelligence. Apress.
33. K Naithani, YP Raiwani, S Tiwari, AS Chauhan (2025) Ethical Aspects of AI Nutrition: Discussion of Ethical Considerations Related to AI-Based Nutritional Guidance in Terms of Privacy, Data Security, and Potential Biases. in AI-Based Nutritional Intervention in Polycystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS), Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore 271–290.
34. KB Brothers, MA Rothstein (2015) Ethical, legal and social implications of incorporating personalized medicine into healthcare. Per Med 12(1): 43–51.
35. M Kurin, J Katz, E Kodish, B Lashner (2019) Informed consent in IBD trials: where we are and where we need to go. Inflamm Bowel Dis 25(7): 1115–1119.
36. N Kyriakos, A Papaefthymiou, M Giakoumis, G Iatropoulos, G Mantzaris, et al. (2021) Informed consent in inflammatory bowel disease: a necessity in real-world clinical practice. Ann Gastroenterol 34(4): 466-475.
37. M Mialon, M Ho, A Carriedo, G Ruskin, E Crosbie (2021) Beyond nutrition and physical activity: food industry shaping of the very principles of scientific integrity. Global Health 17(1): 13.
38. JB Moore (2020) From personalised nutrition to precision medicine: the rise of consumer genomics and digital health. Proc Nutr Soc 79(3): 300–310.
39. DS Reuland, Alison T Brenner, Richard Hoffman, Andrew McWilliams, Robert L Rhyne, et al. (2017) Effect of combined patient decision aid and patient navigation vs usual care for colorectal cancer screening in a vulnerable patient population: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 177 (7): 967–974.
40. SC Ng, Hai Yun Shi, Nima Hamidi, Fox E Underwood, Whitney Tang, et al. (2017) Worldwide incidence and prevalence of inflammatory bowel disease in the 21st century: a systematic review of population-based studies. Lancet 390(10114): 2769–2778.
41. GG Kaplan (2015) The global burden of IBD: from 2015 to 2025. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 12(12): 720–727.
42. R Weisshof, I Chermesh (2015) Micronutrient deficiencies in inflammatory bowel disease. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care 18(6): 576–581.
43. M Kumar, M Garand, S Al Khodor (2019) Integrating omics for a better understanding of Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A step towards personalized medicine. J Transl Med 17(1): 419.
44. E Bauer, I Thiele (2018) From metagenomic data to personalized in silico microbiotas: predicting dietary supplements for Crohn's disease. NPJ Syst Biol Appl 4(1): 27.
45. A Hurtado Lorenzo, G Honig, C Heller (2020) Precision nutrition initiative: Toward personalized diet recommendations for patients with inflammatory bowel diseases. Crohn's Colitis 360 2(4): otaa087.
46. M Xu, Wenluo Zhang, Beibei Lin, Yue Lei, Yu Zhang, et al. (2025) Efficacy of probiotic supplementation and impact on fecal microbiota in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Nutr Rev 83(2): e65--e73.
47. S Gimpfl, K Steinle, K Gedrich (2024) Evaluating Various Methods Used by Direct-to-Consumer Products Promising Personalized Nutrition. Dietetics 3(4): 504–522.
48. J Ahlgren, Anders Nordgren, Maud Perrudin, Amber Ronteltap, Jean Savigny, et al. (2013) Consumers on the internet: ethical and legal aspects of commercialization of personalized nutrition. Genes Nutr 8: 349–355.
49. JR Bedsaul Fryer, Kesso G van Zutphen Küffer, Jimena Monroy Gomez, Diane E Clayton, Breda Gavin Smith, et al. (2023) Precision nutrition opportunities to help mitigate nutrition and health challenges in low- and middle-income countries: an expert opinion survey. Nutrients 15(14): 3247.
50. R Biga, S Nottebaum, Z Kozlakidis, S Psomiadis (2024) Digitalization of Healthcare in LMICs: Digital Health and the Digital Divide Based on Technological Availability and Development. in Digitalization of Medicine in Low-and Middle-Income Countries: Paradigm Changes in Healthcare and Biomedical Research, Cham: Springer International Publishing 185–193.
51. J Wellens, E Vissers, C Matthys, S Vermeire, J Sabino (2023) Personalized dietary regimens for inflammatory bowel disease: current knowledge and future perspectives. Pharmgenomics. Pers Med 15–27.
52. KKY Francisco, Andrane Estelle Carnicer Apuhin, Myles Joshua Toledo Tan, Mickael Cavanaugh Byers, et al. (2024) Can Personalized Medicine Coexist with Health Equity? Examining the Cost Barrier and Ethical Implications. arXiv Prepr arXiv2411.02307.
53. S Rogus, P Lurie (2024) Personalized nutrition: aligning science, regulation, and marketing. Heal Aff Sch 2(9): qxae107.
54. W Wang (2024) Ethical Issues in Personalized Medicine: Privacy, Consent, and Data Sharing. GMO Biosaf. Res 15.
55. T Libert (2018) An automated approach to auditing disclosure of third-party data collection in website privacy policies. Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference 207–216.
56. A Fabbri, N Chartres, G Scrinis, Bero LA (2017) Study sponsorship and the nutrition research agenda: analysis of randomized controlled trials included in systematic reviews of nutrition interventions to address obesity. Public Health Nutr 20 (7): 1306–1313.
57. X Wu, David Oniani, Zejia Shao, Paul Arciero, Sonish Sivarajkumar, et al. (2025) A Scoping Review of Artificial Intelligence for Precision Nutrition. Adv Nutr 100398.
58. Q Pham, A Gamble, J Hearn, JA Cafazzo (2021) The need for ethnoracial equity in artificial intelligence for diabetes management: review and recommendations. J Med Internet Res 23(2): e22320.
59. E Maeckelberghe, K Zdunek, S Marceglia, B Farsides, M Rigby (2023) The ethical challenges of personalized digital health. Front Med 10: 1123863.

60. J Liu, Xiaolong Ge, Hunhui Ouyang, Dongxu Wang, Xiaoqi Zhang, et al. (2022) Prevalence of malnutrition, its risk factors, and the use of nutrition support in patients with inflammatory bowel disease. Inflamm Bowel Dis 282): S59--S66.

61. T Gheonea, M Bogdan, AD Meca, I Rogoveanu, C Oancea (2024) Recent clinical evidence on nutrition, novel pharmacotherapy, and vaccination in inflammatory bowel diseases. Front Pharmacol 15: 1380878.

62. Collins CB, Roche HM (2020) Personalized nutrition for inflammatory bowel disease. Crohn's & Colitis 360 2(3): otaa042.

63. Bischoff SC, Palle Bager, Johanna Escher, Alastair Forbes, Xavier Hébuterne et al. (2023) ESPEN guideline on Clinical Nutrition in inflammatory bowel disease. Clin Nutr 42(3): 352–379.

64. S Meade, Jeremy Liu Chen Kiow, Cristian Massaro, Gurpreet Kaur, Elizabeth Squirell, et al. (2023) Gut microbiome-associated predictors as biomarkers of response to advanced therapies in inflammatory bowel disease: a systematic review. Gut Microbes 15(2): 2287073.

65. Markus AF, Kors JA, Rijnbeek PR (2021) The role of explainability in creating trustworthy artificial intelligence for health care: a comprehensive survey of the terminology, design choices, and evaluation strategies. J Biomed Inform 113: 103655.

66. S Berciano, Juliana Figueiredo, Tristin D Brisbois, Susan Alford, Katie Koecher, et al. (2022) Precision nutrition: Maintaining scientific integrity while realizing market potential. Front Nutr 9: 979665.

67. C Yek, Andrea R Pacheco, Manu Vanaerschot, Jennifer A Bohl, Elizabeth Fahsbender, et al. (2022) Metagenomic pathogen sequencing in resource-scarce settings: lessons learned and the road ahead. Front Epidemiol 2: 926695.

68. D Jomaa, Yara Dababneh, Ankita Nagirimadugu, Poornima Oruganti, Mei Lu, et al. (2023) S65 Bridging Healthcare Disparities in Patients with Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD) in Underserved Communities: Results from a Telemedicine Intervention at a Large Tertiary Care Centre. Off J Am Coll Gastroenterol. ACG 118(12S): S18.

69. Maita KC, Michael J Maniaci, Clifton R Haider, Francisco R Avila, Ricardo A Torres Guzman, et al, (2024) The impact of digital health solutions on bridging the health care gap in rural areas: A scoping review. Perm J 28(3): 130.

70. Rodriguez JA, C Shachar, Bates DW (2022) Digital inclusion as health care—supporting health care equity with digital-infrastructure initiatives. N Engl J Med 386(12): 1101–1103.

71. P Detopoulou, Gavriela Voulgaridou, Panagiotis Moschos, Despoina Levidi, Thelma Anastasiou, et al. (2023) Artificial intelligence, nutrition, and ethical issues: A mini-review. Clin Nutr Open Sci 50: 46–56.

72. M Boland, F Alam, J Bronlund (2019) Modern technologies for personalized nutrition. in Trends in personalized nutrition. Elsevier 195–222.

73. V Ramanan, R Vinod, C Williams, S Ramachandran, S Venkatasubramanian (2025) Genetic Data Governance in Crisis: Policy Recommendations for Safeguarding Privacy and Preventing Discrimination. arXiv Prepr. arXiv2502.09716.

74. J Lee SS (2021) The ethics of consent in a shifting genomic ecosystem. Annu Rev Biomed Data Sci 4(1): 145–164.

75. M Nestle (2016) Corporate funding of food and nutrition research: science or marketing?. JAMA Intern Med 176(1): 13–14.

76. R Daneshjou, Kailas Vodrahalli, Roberto A Novoa, Melissa Jenkins, Weixin Liang, et al. (2022) Disparities in dermatology AI performance on a diverse, curated clinical image set. Sci Adv 8(3)1: eabq6147.

77. R Wuni, Vimaleswaran KS (2024) Barriers in translating existing nutrigenetics insights to precision nutrition for cardiometabolic health in ethnically diverse populations. Lifestyle Genomics 17(1): 122–135.

78. Mc Cradden MD, S Joshi, M Mazwi, Anderson JA (2020) Ethical limitations of algorithmic fairness solutions in health care machine learning. Lancet Digit Heal 2(5): e221--e223.

79. Donovan SM, Mariette Abrahams, Joshua C Anthony, Robert Bergia, Gil Blander, et al. (2025) Perspective: challenges for personalized nutrition in the current US regulatory framework and future opportunities. Adv Nutr 16(3): 100382.

80. T Hurlimann, J Robitaille, Vohl MC, B Godard (2017) Ethical considerations in the implementation of nutrigenetics/nutrigenomics. Per Med 14(1): 75–83.nimal Study, and Cohort Study. Frontiers in pharmacology 13: 846455.