

1 **Title Page**

2 **Cost-effectiveness of polygenic risk profiling for primary open-angle glaucoma in the**
3 **United Kingdom and Australia**

4 Qinqin Liu,^{1,2*} John Davis,^{1,2} Xikun Han,³ David A Mackey,^{1,4} Stuart MacGregor,³ Jamie E
5 Craig,⁵ Lei Si,^{6,7*} Alex W Hewitt.^{1,2*}

6
7 **Affiliations:**

- 8 1. Menzies Institute for Medical Research, School of Medicine, University of Tasmania,
9 Australia.
- 10 2. Centre for Eye Research Australia, University of Melbourne, Australia.
- 11 3. QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane, Australia.
- 12 4. Centre for Ophthalmology and Visual Science, Lions Eye Institute, University of
13 Western Australia, Australia.
- 14 5. Department of Ophthalmology, Flinders University, Flinders Medical Centre, Australia.
- 15 6. The George Institute for Global Health, UNSW Sydney, Kensington, Australia
- 16 7. School of Health Policy & Management, Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing 211166,
17 China

18
19 ***Correspondence to:**

20 Dr Qinqin Liu

21 Address: The Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, 32 Gisborne St, East Melbourne VIC 3002

22 Email:qinqinliu@outlook.com

23 T: +61 3 9929 8666

24

25 **Copyright:** the Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does
26 grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees)
27 on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be
28 published in BMJ editions and any other BMJ PGL products and sublicences such use and exploit
29 all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

30 **ABSTRACT**

31 **Objective**

32 Primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) is the most common subtype of glaucoma worldwide.
33 Early diagnosis and intervention is proven to slow disease progression and reduce disease
34 burden. Currently, population-based screening for POAG is not generally recommended due to
35 cost. In this study, we evaluate the cost-effectiveness of polygenic risk profiling as a screening
36 tool for POAG.

37 **Methods and Analysis**

38 We used a Markov cohort model to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of implementing polygenic
39 risk profiling as a new POAG-screening approach in the UK and Australia. Six health states were
40 included in this model: death, early, mild, moderate, severe, and healthy individuals. The
41 evaluation was conducted from the healthcare payer's perspective. We used the best available
42 published data to calculate prevalence, transition probabilities, utility and other parameters for
43 each health state and age group. The study followed the CHEERS checklist. Our main outcome
44 measure was the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) and secondary outcomes were years
45 of blindness avoided per person and a 'Blindness ICER'. We did one-way and two-way
46 deterministic and probabilistic sensitivity analyses to reflect the uncertainty around predicting
47 ICERs.

48 **Results**

49 Our proposed genetic screening programme for POAG in Australia is predicted to result in ICER
50 of AU\$34,252 (95% CI AU\$21,324-95,497) and would avoid 1 year of blindness at ICER of
51 AU\$13,359 (95% CI: AU\$8,143-37,448). In the UK, this screening is predicted to result in ICER
52 of £24,783 (13,373-66,960) and would avoid 1 year of blindness at ICER of £10,095 (95%CI:
53 £5,513-27,656). Findings were robust in all sensitivity analyses. Using the willingness to pay
54 thresholds of \$54,808 and £30,000, the proposed screening model is 79.2% likely to be cost-
55 effective in Australia and is 60.2% likely to be cost-effective in the UK, respectively.

56 **Conclusions**

57 We describe and model the cost-efficacy of incorporating a polygenic risk score for POAG
58 screening in Australia and the UK. Although the level of willingness to pay for Australian
59 Government is uncertain, and the ICER range for the UK is broad, we showed a clear target
60 strategy for early detection and prevention of advanced POAG in these developed countries.

61 **INTRODUCTION**

62 Primary open-angle glaucoma (POAG) is the leading cause of irreversible blindness globally,¹⁻³
63 and its prevalence is estimated to range between 2-3% worldwide.^{1,4,5} With an aging population,
64 the projected number of people with POAG globally is anticipated to increase to approximately
65 112 million by 2040.⁵

66
67 POAG has a major disease and economic burden on both individuals and society. Vision loss
68 from POAG is associated with higher risk of falls, depression and unemployment.⁶ Direct
69 healthcare cost estimates for glaucoma were £135 million⁷ across the United Kingdom (UK) in
70 2002, and AU\$144.2 million⁸ in Australia during 2004. It is also well established that the
71 financial burden of glaucoma increases as disease severity increases.⁹ Currently, it is estimated
72 that approximately 50% of glaucoma cases in the developed world are undiagnosed.^{4,10,11}
73 Therefore, early detection of undiagnosed POAG and prevention of progression would be
74 beneficial.

75
76 POAG is an ideal disease for screening and risk profiling given it is insidious, leads to significant
77 morbidity if left untreated, and effective treatment is available to slow the rate of progression
78 once diagnosed.¹² Economic evaluation of any screening programme is essential for government
79 and decision makers due to limited resources. Prior work has shown that the costs associated
80 with POAG are lower when the disease is in earlier stage^{13,14} and, given that advanced POAG at
81 presentation is a major risk factor for legal blindness,¹⁵ there are clear advantages to screening
82 for POAG. However, previous economic modeling has shown that population-based clinical
83 screening programmes are not currently cost-effective in most high-income countries such as the
84 UK and the US due to high implementation costs and the disproportionate disease burden in the
85 older population.¹⁶ One potential solution to this predicament is to identify people at high risk for
86 POAG and then undertake targeted clinical screening and monitoring in this high risk
87 subgroup.¹⁶

88
89 Given that POAG is one of the most heritable human diseases,¹⁷ genetic profiling presents as a
90 unique means to risk stratify and prioritise clinical screening of individuals. People with a family
91 history of POAG have significantly increased odds (between five to 10 times) for developing

92 POAG. Recently, polygenic risk scores (PRS), which combine the weighted risk across a few
93 thousand single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), has been shown to be a useful tool for
94 estimating an individual's genetic predisposition to complex diseases such as POAG.¹⁸ This
95 novel PRS was found to substantially outperform any previous POAG prediction tools based on
96 common genetic variation, whilst also outperforming genetic prediction tools for any other
97 common disease.¹⁹ Comparing the highest and lowest deciles for the PRS, a 15-fold increased
98 risk for developing advanced disease, as well as an earlier disease onset by up to a decade was
99 identified.¹⁸ Using the PRS in combination with age, sex and family history to predict POAG
100 diagnosis dramatically outperformed these parameters without the PRS.¹⁸ As such, PRS profiling
101 could have great health and economic impact on POAG prevention, early detection and
102 intervention for high-income countries.

103

104 In this study we sought to determine the cost-effectiveness of implementing a population-wide
105 genetic screening program using a PRS as an adjunct to prioritise individuals for clinical
106 monitoring for POAG. We modeled such a genetic-risk screening programme for the general
107 population aged between 40 to 80 years in the UK and Australia. We believe that this study will
108 provide valuable information for those governments and policy makers such as the Medical
109 Services Advisory Committee in Australia and National Health Service in the UK.

110

111 **METHODS**

112 **Study Design**

113 We developed a Markov cohort model to evaluate cost-effectiveness for POAG screening in
114 Australia and the UK from the healthcare payor's perspective. Based on the mid 2019
115 population reports by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), Australia's national statistical
116 agency,²⁰ and statistics from the Office for National Statistics (ONS), the UK's largest
117 independent producer of official statistics,²¹ we used 11,782,538 Australian and 33,618,730 UK
118 residents aged 40 and above as our study dataset. Individuals with an existing diagnosis of
119 POAG were removed from the sample, based on estimated prevalence and diagnosis rates in the
120 published literature.^{4,22}

121

122 The proposed design for the screening program is to screen the age groups of interest using a
123 genetic test to obtain the PRS, followed by comprehensive optometrist review every 2 years for
124 those who are identified at high risk via the genetic test. If POAG is diagnosed in an individual,
125 then they enter the established treatment care pathway. The model was built to allow flexibility
126 in determining the population of interest and the PRS threshold for defining individuals at ‘high
127 risk’ and thereby warranting targeted clinical screening.

128

129 **Model overview**

130 TreeAge Pro Healthcare²³ was used to construct the Markov models (Figure. 1), monitor the
131 transition between discrete health states, and represent the cost-effectiveness of the PRS in our
132 population cohorts. Two identical models were built, one for the UK and the other for Australia,
133 utilising different inputs for the key parameters. There were six health states in our model,
134 including healthy individuals, death and four health states associated with POAG stages: early,
135 mild, moderate, and severe. Our definition for the POAG severity classifications was adapted
136 from a prior report⁶ where: 1) “Early” was definite or probable POAG with no visual
137 impairment but changes to optic nerve and/ or retina; 2) “Mild” was definite POAG with mild
138 visual impairment; 3) “Moderate” was definite POAG with moderate visual impairment; 4)
139 “Severe” was characterised by a visual acuity of 6/60 or worse due to POAG.

140

141 Our model further divided individuals into age groups (40-49; 50-59; 60-69; 70-79; and 80 and
142 above) as well as into their PRS risk decile. For the base case model, the age groups of 50-59;
143 60-69 and 70-79 were selected for screening with genetic testing and the top two PRS deciles
144 were also selected for further investigation. A lifetime simulation time horizon was used,
145 whereby individuals could begin the model as either healthy or as undiagnosed POAG at an
146 early, mild, or moderate disease stage based on the prevalence for each disease stage in the
147 Australian and UK population. The methods are stated in the next section. The assumption was
148 made that patients with severe disease would have been diagnosed. Any stage can progress to the
149 next disease stage or to death, but disease stages cannot be skipped nor can a patient remit to an
150 earlier disease stage. The rate of progression to the next disease stage was modified by the
151 individual’s underlying genetic profile (as per their PRS risk decile) and their age and was
152 decreased by treatment.

153

154 **Modeling POAG prevalence**

155 After excluding the population with existing diagnosis of POAG, we estimated the prevalence of
156 early, mild, moderate and severe POAG in the screening population within the age groups of 40-
157 49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, 80 and above. The following formula was used to calculate the baseline
158 prevalence across a country, age, and disease state level:

159

$$160 \quad \textit{estimated prevalence} = \frac{\textit{POAG prevalence} \times (1 - \textit{Proportion diagnosed})}{1 - (\textit{POAG prevalence} \times \textit{proportion diagnosed})}$$

161

162 There have been several studies on the prevalence of POAG in Australia and the UK^{4,24,22}. After
163 reviewing the available data, the study by Keel *et al.* in 2018⁴, a multi-stage random-cluster
164 sampling with more than 5,000 participants chosen by door-to-door recruitment, was chosen to
165 provide the inputs, based on its methodology, sample size, and recency for Australian data. Keel
166 *et al.* also reviewed whether patients had an existing diagnosis, allowing estimation of diagnosis
167 rates by disease stage. A conservative assumption was made that “probable” POAG in the study
168 by Keel *et al.* aligned with early disease and that “definite POAG” aligned with mild moderate
169 and severe disease. As it is likely that mild POAG was categorised as ‘probable’ in the study by
170 Keel *et al.*, for a reasonable proportion of cases, our study underestimates the cost-effectiveness
171 of our interventions.

172

173 For the estimation of UK POAG prevalence and diagnosis probability, a meta-analysis by
174 Rudnicka *et al.*²⁵ from 2006 was utilised to provide the required inputs and adjusted based on the
175 proportion of individuals by race in the most recent data from the UK’s ONS (not shown). On
176 review of the literature, data on disease state as a proportion of POAG diagnosis by age were not
177 available for the UK. Given the cultural, racial, and healthcare system similarities, Australian
178 values were utilised as the base case and then tested in sensitivity testing to understand the
179 ranges for which the results were consistent. Our values for the prevalence of POAG by disease
180 stage by age, in the population without existing POAG diagnosis, are provided in Table 1.

181

182 **Transition probabilities**

183 All transitions between health states take place in an annual cycle. A thorough search was
184 undertaken on Pubmed and Google scholar to identify transition probabilities by disease stage by
185 age for POAG in Australia and the UK, using the following combined terms: “glaucoma” AND
186 “progression” OR “transition” AND “Australia” OR “United Kingdom”. However, only very
187 limited data were available, and no primary source data were identified at the age/disease stage
188 granularity required for this model. A 50-year annual progression model was created in
189 Microsoft Excel to model population prevalence of ‘early’ and ‘mild and above’ POAG by age
190 group, for a cohort of 40-year-old individuals. Excel’s solver function was used to solve for
191 transition probabilities that met the observed population prevalence (discussed above in
192 ‘Modelling POAG prevalence’), with the constraint that the transition probabilities for each age
193 group must be above zero and higher than the younger age group. Two potential sources were
194 identified as sources for the progression rates from mild to moderate and moderate to severe. The
195 first of these was in the CERA Tunnel Vision study.⁶ The second was “The clinical effectiveness
196 and cost-effectiveness of screening for open angle glaucoma: a systematic review and economic
197 evaluation” by Burr *et al.*,¹⁶ which utilised visual field mean defect deterioration (MD) and
198 extrapolated it out to more severe disease stages. For this study we utilised the results from the
199 Tunnel Vision study, as it is based on population prevalence, and then investigated these
200 transition probabilities in sensitivity analysis to test model robustness. Transition probabilities
201 are presented in Table 1.

202

203 **Utility Values - QALYs and years of blindness**

204 Quality-adjusted-life-years (QALYs) were estimated for population groups from utility data
205 using the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & \textit{Individual's QALYs} \\ & = \sum_{t=0}^{80} \textit{Country and Age specific utility} \\ & \quad \times \textit{Disease stage utility multiplier} \end{aligned}$$

206 Glaucoma utility multipliers by disease stage were taken from the study by Burr *et al.*²⁶ for mild
207 and moderate POAG and from Brown *et al.*²⁷ for severe POAG. No disease and early disease
208 were assumed to have a utility multiplier of 1, and death had a utility value of 0. These disease-
209 based disease multipliers were then applied to utility-by-age data for the countries of interest.^{28,29}

210

211 The model also evaluated years of blindness, with the disease stage of severe POAG contributing
212 1 year of blindness per year and all other disease states contributing no years of blindness.

213

214 **Screening risk stratification**

215 The recent study by Craig and colleagues¹⁸ gave the odds ratio (OR) for developing POAG by
216 PRS decile. We adjusted the ORs to be centred around 1 at the population mean risk (Table 2).
217 Then, as the population prevalence for POAG is less than 10%, the rare disease assumption was
218 used to estimate the relative risk (RR) as being the same as the OR. This relative risk was then
219 applied to disease prevalence states at the beginning of the model and to each transition
220 probability to POAG disease states.

221

222 **Cost**

223 Three distinct cost categories were identified for this model: 1) the cost of the genetic screening
224 test and follow-up monitoring cost for high-risk individuals; 2) the cost of POAG treatment; 3)
225 POAG associated health-economic costs. The details of all cost categories are in Appendix Table
226 1.

227

228 In the base case, screening was assumed at AU\$350 and £175 based on the published price of a
229 breast cancer-focused gene panel test in Australia³⁰ and the UK,³¹ respectively. The monitoring
230 cost, for those identified as high risk based on their risk decile, was the cost of a follow-up
231 review every 2 years by an optometrist while the individual remained in the ‘no disease’ stage.³²
232 All other costs are the cost of POAG treatment by disease stage.

233

234 POAG treatment cost for the Australian population was derived from total Australian Glaucoma
235 spending. Glaucoma spending in Australia in 2015, across all categories of spend, was given as
236 \$237,208,702 by Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW).³³ This was then divided by
237 the estimated number of treated patients based on 2015 ABS age-population data multiplied by
238 the disease prevalence and diagnosis rates published in Keel *et al.*,⁴ to give an estimated
239 \$1,867.88 per person-year. Finally, this was adjusted for Australian Health Price Index (HPI) by
240 taking the HPI Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) between 2014 and 2018 and applying it

241 for 4 years to get a value of \$2,012.80.³⁴ For the UK, the results of work by Rahman *et al.*³⁵ were
242 utilised and adjusted for UK Consumer Price Inflation (CPI) Index 06: Health³⁶ between 2013
243 and 2020. These values were then adjusted by disease stage based on the ratio of expenditure by
244 disease stage compared to average cost in the study by Varma *et al.*³⁷

245
246 Three major domains were included as POAG-associated health-economic costs based on
247 previous research³⁸: aged care facility admissions, falls, and depression. Costs of these events
248 were taken from government data^{33,39} and other publications⁴⁰ and then applied to the groups
249 based on their age,^{39,41} and glaucoma relative risk.³⁸

250
251 **Other parameters**

252 Diagnosis rates: For the non-screening control model, and for individuals in the screening model
253 who were not in the age groups or risk deciles identified for screening and follow-up, we
254 assumed that the diagnosis rates were the same as those used for prevalence estimation. Patients
255 in the screening model, who were also in the age groups and risk deciles identified for screening
256 and follow-up, had a diagnosis rate of 100%.

257
258 Treatment impact: Patients who were diagnosed had a reduced risk of progression between
259 disease states (excluding mortality) and incurred full treatment costs. This value was based on
260 Garway Heath *et al.*, which demonstrated a Hazard Ratio of 0.44 for patients with glaucoma
261 receiving treatment.⁴²

262
263 Mortality rates: mortality rates were taken by age from the Australian ABS data⁴³ and the UK
264 OHS data⁴⁴ and multiplied by relative risk by POAG severity.⁶

265
266 Willingness to pay (WTP): WTP for Australia was set at \$54,808 based on a parliamentary
267 review into incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) approved by PBAC for Oncology
268 medication, as no equivalent review was found for ophthalmological treatment or screening
269 programs⁴⁵. In the UK, the WTP threshold is between £20,000 to £30,000, which has been
270 publicly identified by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)⁴⁶ and a value
271 of £30,000 was utilised for this model.

272

273 Discounting: A global discount rate of 5% p.a. was used for all utility and cost variables in
274 Australia and 3.5% for all utility and cost variables in the UK.

275

276 Age: All age-dependent variables were based on individuals' current age in each cycle, not on
277 age at model initiation.

278

279 **Outcome**

280 The main outcome was the ICER, defined as incremental cost in the intervention group, divided
281 by incremental QALYs. A positive ICER shows the additional cost per year of QALY gained by
282 the genetic screening program group; a negative ICER demonstrates either a decrease in QALYs
283 or a cost saving (but was not observed in our modelling). A secondary outcome of years of
284 blindness avoided per person, and a 'Blindness ICER', defined as incremental cost divided by
285 years of blindness avoided, was also calculated.

286

287 **Sensitivity analysis**

288 One-way and two-way deterministic, and probabilistic sensitivity analyses were performed to
289 reflect the uncertainty around predicting ICERs. Variables that had confidence intervals available
290 and were constant between age groups utilised their 95% confidence intervals as their
291 probabilistic parameters. Variables that had confidence intervals available, but are conditional on
292 an individual's age, used the confidence intervals for the 50-year-old age group, and then
293 multiplied that by the base case ratios between age groups. For cost variables, the study used a
294 range from half to double their values, with the exception of the ongoing monitoring costs for
295 individuals identified as high risk in Australia, which were capped at \$150 (representing biannual
296 ophthalmologist review). Transition probabilities that were calculated by the authors or taken
297 from published data without confidence intervals were tested in one-way and two-way sensitivity
298 analyses over arbitrarily large ranges to identify points at which the intervention was no longer
299 cost-effective.

300

301 Progression rates from no POAG to early POAG, and from early to mild POAG, utilised beta
302 distributions. The relative risk of POAG based on treatment utilised a lognormal distribution. All

303 costs were modelled on a triangular distribution. ICER uncertainty was evaluated by
304 recalculating the ICER over 10,000 iterations for each country, and the 95% CIs for ICERs were
305 based on the 2.5%-97.5% percentile range of results from the second order Monte Carlo analysis.

306

307 **RESULTS**

308 The cost-effectiveness analysis for genetic screening was demonstrated in *TreeAge* as the ICER
309 (Australian dollars and British pounds) and incremental effectiveness (QALYs) (Table 3). The
310 results showed that the genetic screening yielded 1 QALY at a cost of AU\$34,252 (95% CI
311 AU\$21,324-95,497) and £24,783 (13,373-66,960) per person in our base case in Australia and
312 the UK, respectively .

313

314 Using the WTP thresholds of \$54,808 and £30,000, the proposed screening model is 79.2%
315 likely to be cost-effective in Australia and 60.2% likely to be cost-effective in the UK
316 respectively (Fig. 2). The Monte Carlo probabilistic sensitivity analysis showed the screening
317 programme in Australia is likely to be cost-effective in 50%, 80% and 95% of the simulated
318 cases when the WTP threshold is AU\$40,608, AU\$55,467, and AU\$80,170, respectively (Fig.
319 2a). In the UK model, the screening programme is cost-effective in 50%, 80% and 95% of
320 simulations when the WTP threshold is £27,189, £38,461 and £56,661, respectively (Fig. 2b).

321

322 In addition, our cost-effectiveness analysis showed that the genetic screening for POAG
323 decreased years of blindness at a reasonable cost. In Table 2, such screening in Australia would
324 avoid 1 year of blindness at ICER of AU\$13,359 (95% CI: AU\$8,143-37,448), which is one-
325 sixth of the country's gross domestic product (GDP) per-capita; similarly, it would avoid 1 year
326 of blindness at ICER of £10,095 (95%CI: £5,513-27,656) which is approximately one-third of
327 the UK GDP per capita.

328

329 *Sensitivity analysis results*

330 Sensitivity analyses were performed to determine whether the results of the Markov model
331 would change by varying different model parameters. Running the model over 30 years returned
332 an ICER of 34,852 compared to 34,252 for our base model and remained cost-effective
333 (Appendix Table 3). This is as expected, as after 30 years the annual discounting drastically

334 reduces the incremental impact. Furthermore, many age groups have had significant mortality,
335 removing them from the Markov model after 30 years. Similar results were obtained when
336 comparing 30- and 80-year time frames for the UK (not shown).

337
338 The tornado diagram displays the parameters with the largest influence on cost-effectiveness
339 (Figure. 3). The top three variables in both countries are the annual screening costs for
340 individuals with high PRS who have not yet developed POAG, the cost of the PRS screening
341 test, and the probability of developing early POAG from no disease.

342
343 For variables with higher degrees of uncertainty surrounding the data in the literature, we
344 completed sensitivity analyses over arbitrarily large ranges to identify areas where the
345 programme would no longer be cost-effective. With regards to costs, there is a clear pattern
346 between the genetic test and the annual monitoring. In both countries, the cut-off for either cost
347 in terms of generating an ICER below the WTP threshold is co-dependent (Figure. 4a and 4d). It
348 is obvious that the lower both costs are, the more likely the PRS will be cost-effective. We
349 showed that the ICER is below WTP when the incidence of early and transition probability of
350 early to mild are above 0.002 and 0.015 in Australia, and that a similar pattern in the UK model
351 when the incidence of early are above 0.002 and transition probability are above 0.005 (Figure.
352 4b and 4e). In contrast, our study demonstrated a different pattern between the countries when
353 there is large variation in the transition probabilities of mild to moderate and moderate to severe
354 (Figure. 4c and 4f). In both countries, cost-effectiveness is always below WTP if the transition
355 probabilities of mild to moderate and moderate to severe are both above 0.05; however, in the
356 UK there is an additional constraint where if the transition probabilities are both above 0.6, the
357 screening is no longer cost-effective. Of interest, the region of non-cost effectiveness in the ‘top-
358 right’ of the UK sensitivity analysis for mild to moderate and moderate to severe is cost-effective
359 if the WTP threshold is set arbitrarily higher at £50,000 (not shown).

360
361 **DISCUSSION**
362 The World Health Organization (WHO) has established criteria for conditions amenable to
363 screening based on benefit, risk and cost.¹² According to these criteria, POAG is an ideal target
364 for screening given it is insidious; leads to significant morbidity if left untreated; and effective

365 treatment, by lowering intraocular pressure (IOP) to slow or halt progression, is available.⁴⁷ In
366 2007, Burr and colleagues published a comprehensive report on cost-effectiveness of screening
367 for POAG in the UK and they concluded that the population-based screening programme for
368 POAG is not cost-effective using strategies such as glaucoma-trained optometrists or dedicated
369 techniques like IOP measurement and visual field test.¹⁶ To date, no high-income countries have
370 adopted a population-based screening programme for the early detection of the POAG. Although
371 the literature over the last decade has been inconsistent regarding the cost-effectiveness of
372 glaucoma screening in developed countries, the evidence indicates two critical factors influence
373 the cost-effectiveness of a POAG screening programme: 1) screening cost and 2) identification
374 of the high-risk subpopulation.

375
376 Our study demonstrated that using the PRS as a POAG screening tool is likely cost-effective for
377 the current Australian population age above 50 and is potentially cost-effective in the UK.
378 Although in the UK model the cost-effectiveness of the genetic testing is cost-effectiveness at
379 WTP or below in 50% of simulations, our ICERs are less than previous UK-based glaucoma
380 screening models.⁴⁸ There are two possible reasons the PRS screening program is more cost-
381 effective when compared to previously proposed screening programmes. Firstly, instead of
382 repeating the screening tests every 3 or 5 years, the single largest cost in our proposed program is
383 a one-off test for each participant and possibly to assess genetic risk for many other
384 diseases.^{49,50,51} Secondly, the PRS would determine a high-risk subpopulation who require
385 regular follow-up, thereby reducing the population who require ongoing repeat screening costs.
386 This would logically reduce the screening cost when compared with repeated IOP measurements,
387 visual field tests and clinical examinations by trained personnel every few years. As a result, our
388 proposed programme would fit the recommendation of targeting high-risk populations at a
389 frequent interval for the POAG screening.

390
391 There is growing evidence the PRS could be incrementally valuable to traditional risk factors and
392 implemented clinically to improve current clinical risk prediction models in many common
393 diseases. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) allowed marketing of the first direct-to-
394 consumer tests that provide genetic risk information for certain conditions such as Parkinson's
395 and Alzheimer's disease in 2017.⁵² Furthermore, research on PRS among the common diseases

396 has expanded exponentially in recent years. Craig and colleagues,¹⁸ reported substantial evidence
397 of PRS as a remarkable predictor for the risk of POAG progression to advanced POAG, and
398 demonstrates one potential clinical use of PRS – as an adjunct for disease screening. Taking
399 these together, we believe that POAG is a good candidate disease for the first government
400 program utilising PRS screening.

401
402 In most high-income countries, optometrists are well-trained to detect POAG. Most previous
403 proposed screening strategies included optometrists conducting the majority of screening tasks.
404 Glaucoma Australia recommended that all Australians 50 years or older visit an optometrist
405 every 2 years for a comprehensive eye exam.⁵³ We believe if PRS is implemented for POAG
406 screening, a targeted subpopulation with high risk of developing POAG could safely undergo the
407 same clinical screening. In addition, the subpopulation of individuals with low risk could reduce
408 or delay their monitoring, reducing the total cost of monitoring POAG.

409
410 Despite the uncertainty regarding some of the input variables, our sensitivity analysis
411 demonstrated that our results are robust for Australia, with a higher degree of variability in the
412 UK. As this is a new proposed screening methodology, there are no data on the costs for PRS
413 testing for POAG or the annual monitoring cost for healthy but high-risk individuals that this
414 model would identify. Furthermore, the transition probabilities between health states are also not
415 available at an Age by Disease stage level of granularity. The cost of monitoring healthy high-
416 risk individuals has the most impact on our ICER. We believe that the cost would not exceed the
417 standard comprehensive eye exam by trained optometrists in Australia, e.g. less than AU\$100
418 per person per event.⁵⁴ Similarly for the UK, we believe that costs would not exceed £52 every 2
419 years.³² In addition, our sensitivity analysis also showed our ICER was below WTP threshold
420 even if transition probabilities between health states are significantly lower than the evidence
421 suggests. For instance, the PRS programme would be cost-effective even if only 10% of
422 individuals with mild POAG progress to moderate (Fig. 4) per year. According to published
423 reports, the transition probability between mild and moderate POAG is 20% to 85% per year^{6,16}
424 and moderate to severe is 10% to 30% per year.^{6,16} However we acknowledge that our results, in
425 particular for the UK, have a wide range. This could be minimised by the collection of more
426 granular disease severity by age data from the populations of interest.


427

428 One of the limitations for this study is the difficulty in determining the true WTP threshold in
429 Australia. In contrast to the UK, which has a published and defined WTP for NHS programs,
430 there is a much wider range of WTP for policy-makers in Australia. For example, according to
431 one recent report published by the Parliament of Australia, the Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory
432 Committee's acceptable ICER is in the range of \$45 000-\$75 000 for cancer drugs.⁴⁵ Given the
433 PRS would be a novel programme for the Australian and the UK Government, the WTP
434 threshold may not be comparable with other drug therapies and interventions. Although our
435 study showed the PRS test would have an ICER of AU\$34,252 and £24,783 for each country,
436 this would be the first genetic testing program to be considered as a massive public health
437 prevention programme. The uncertainty of an appropriate ICER for utilising a PRS to reduce
438 vision loss remains in the political domain.

439

440 In conclusion, our study was first to report a potential cost-effective POAG screening test using
441 PRS in Australia and the UK. Although the level of WTP for Australian Government is
442 uncertain, and the ICER range for the UK is broad, we showed a clear target strategy for early
443 detection and prevention of advanced POAG in a developed nation.

444



445
446

447 **Figure 1: A schematic of Markov Model structure used for the genetic screening of**
448 **primary open-angle glaucoma ‘pathway’**

449 *i) No POAG: healthy individual; ii) Early: Abnormalities of the optic nerve without any visual field abnormalities;
450 iii) Mild: Damage to the optic nerve and some peripheral vision loss; iv) Moderate: Severe optic nerve damage and
451 advanced peripheral vision loss; v) Severe: Visual acuity of 6/60 or worse or VF constricted to 10°

452

453

454 **Table 1. Summary of the prevalence and transition probabilities for all stages of POAG**
 455 **based on age in Australia and the UK.**

456

Prevalence at model beginning	Country	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Source
No disease	Australia	99.94%	98.99%	98.84%	97.97%	97.54%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
Early	Australia	0.06%	0.95%	0.94%	1.70%	1.25%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
Mild	Australia	0.00%	0.06%	0.03%	0.04%	0.15%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
Moderate	Australia	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	0.29%	1.05%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
Severe	Australia	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
No disease	UK	99.71%	99.46%	98.99%	98.04%	96.24%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Early	UK	0.29%	0.48%	0.46%	0.81%	1.15%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Mild	UK	0.00%	0.07%	0.07%	0.14%	0.33%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Moderate	UK	0.00%	0.00%	0.49%	1.01%	2.28%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Severe	UK	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Annual transition probability	Country	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80+	Source
No disease to Early	Australia	0.02%	0.28%	0.28%	0.29%	0.29%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
Early to Mild	Australia	0.00%	3.80%	9.80%	10.00%	17.00%	Calculated from Keel et al. ⁴
Mild to Moderate	Australia	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	Data from reference ⁶
Moderate to Severe	Australia	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	Data from reference ⁶
No disease to Early	UK	0.03%	0.14%	0.14%	0.22%	0.90%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Early to Mild	UK	0.00%	3.50%	11.40%	11.40%	36.50%	Calculated from Rudnicka et al. ²⁵
Mild to Moderate	UK	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	Data from reference ⁶
Moderate to Severe	UK	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	Data from reference ⁶

457

458

459

460 **Table 2. Odds Ratio for each PRS decile in the POAG**

461

Decile	Original OR*	Population average-adjusted OR
0-10%	1	0.20
10-20%	2.33	0.46
20-30%	1.97	0.39
30-40%	2.76	0.55
40-50%	4.04	0.80
50-60%	3.98	0.79
60-70%	5.93	1.17
70-80%	4.87	0.96
80-90%	8.73	1.73
90%-100%	14.91	2.95

462

463 * Original OR: Odds ratio referenced from the study by *Craig et al.*¹⁸

464


465
466
467
468

Table 3. Base case cost-effectiveness results from genetic screening for POAG compared to current practice


	Lifetime costs per person, Local currency	QALYs per person	Incremental costs per person, Local currency (95% CI)	Incremental QALYs per person (95% CI)	QALY ICERs, Local currency (95% CI)	Years of blindness per person	Years of blindness avoided per person	Blindness ICERs, Local currency (95% CI)
Australia								
Current POAG practice	53943	12.794				0.392		
Genetic screening	54424	12.808	574 (402-741)	0.014 (0.006-0.024)	34252 (21324-95497)	0.356	0.036 (0.015-0.063)	13359 (8143-37448)
United Kingdom								
Current POAG practice	36489	13.156				0.272		
Genetic screening	37127	13.167	278 (221-389)	0.0112 (0.005-0.020)	24783 (13373-66960)	0.244	0.028 (0.011-0.049)	10095 (5513-27656)
<p><i>Local currency is Australian dollars for Australia and Great British Pounds for the United Kingdom. Costs, QALYs, and Years of Blindness are discounted lifetime totals per person. ICERs are calculated by comparing the Genetic Screening to the Current POAG practice. QALY=quality adjusted life year, ICER = incremental cost effectiveness ratio, POAG = primary open angle glaucoma. Given values are based on the expected values for the variables, whilst the 95% confidence intervals are derived from the Monte Carlo analysis.</i></p>								

469

470



471




472


473

474 **Figure 2: Cost-effectiveness acceptability curve for the genetic screening programme. The**
475 **probability that the screening programme is cost-effective at different willingness to pay**
476 **(WTP) thresholds for Australia (a) and the UK (b) models.**

477



478




479

480



481 **Figure 3 Tornado diagram demonstrating deterministic one-way sensitivity analysis. Costs**
 482 **are given in Australian dollars in Fig 3a and British pounds in Fig 3b. The programme was**
 483 **defined as cost-effective if ICER is less than the WTP threshold, which was set at**
 484 **AU\$54,808 in Australia and £30,000 in the UK.**

485



486

487 (a)





488 (b)

489

490 (c)

(d)

491



492

493

494 (e)

(f)

495

496 **Figure 4. Two-way sensitivity analysis of the cost-effectiveness simultaneously varying key**
 497 **parameters over large ranges. These analyses included cost of screening and cost of genetic**
 498 **test and ongoing review (a, b), probability of developing Early and Mild POAG (c, d), and**
 499 **probability of developing Moderate and Severe POAG (e, f) in Australian and the UK**
 500 **models, respectively.**

502 REFERENCES

- 503 1 Klein BE, Klein R, Sponsel WE, *et al.* Prevalence of glaucoma. The Beaver Dam Eye
504 Study. *Ophthalmology* 1992; **99**: 1499–504.
- 505 2 Taylor HR, Vu HTV, McCarty CA, Keeffe JE. The need for routine eye examinations.
506 *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2004; **45**: 2539–42.
- 507 3 Quartilho A, Simkiss P, Zekite A, Xing W, Wormald R, Bunce C. Leading causes of
508 certifiable visual loss in England and Wales during the year ending 31 March 2013. *Eye*
509 2016; **30**: 602–7.
- 510 4 Keel S, Xie J, Foreman J, *et al.* Prevalence of glaucoma in the Australian National Eye
511 Health Survey. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2019; **103**: 191–5.
- 512 5 Tham Y-C, Li X, Wong TY, Quigley HA, Aung T, Cheng C-Y. Global prevalence of
513 glaucoma and projections of glaucoma burden through 2040: a systematic review and meta-
514 analysis. *Ophthalmology* 2014; **121**: 2081–90.
- 515 6 Centre for Eye Research Australia and Access Economics Pty Limited. Tunnel Vision-The
516 Economic Impact Of Primary Open Angle Glaucoma. Centre for Eye Research Australia,
517 University of Melbourne, Australia, February 2008.
518 http://www.icoph.org/dynamic/attachments/resources/cera_tunnelvision.pdf (accessed Oct
519 27, 2020).
- 520 7 Rouland J-F, Berdeaux G, Lafuma A. The economic burden of glaucoma and ocular
521 hypertension: implications for patient management: a review. *Drugs Aging* 2005; **22**: 315–
522 21.
- 523 8 Taylor HR, Pezzullo ML, Keeffe JE. The economic impact and cost of visual impairment in
524 Australia. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2006; **90**: 272.
- 525 9 Real JP, Lafuente MC, Palma SD, Tártara LI. Direct costs of glaucoma: Relationship
526 between cost and severity of the disease. *Chronic Illn* 2020; **16**: 266–74.
- 527 10 Wong EYH, Keeffe JE, Rait JL, *et al.* Detection of undiagnosed glaucoma by eye health
528 professionals. *Ophthalmology*. 2004; **111**: 1508–14.
- 529 11 Gupta P, Zhao D, Guallar E, Ko F, Boland MV, Friedman DS. Prevalence of Glaucoma in
530 the United States: The 2005-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey.
531 *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* 2016; **57**: 2905–13.
- 532 12 Wilson JMG, Jungner G. Principles and Practice of Screening for Disease. 1968.
- 533 13 Traverso CE, Walt JG, Kelly SP, *et al.* Direct costs of glaucoma and severity of the disease:
534 a multinational long term study of resource utilisation in Europe. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2005; **89**:
535 1245–9.

- 536 14 Lee PP, Walt JG, Doyle JJ, *et al.* A multicenter, retrospective pilot study of resource use
537 and costs associated with severity of disease in glaucoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2006; **124**: 12–
538 9.
- 539 15 Gessesse GW, Damji KF. Advanced glaucoma: management pearls. *Middle East Afr J*
540 *Ophthalmol* 2013; **20**: 131–41.
- 541 16 Burr JM, Mowatt G, Hernández R, *et al.* The clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of
542 screening for open angle glaucoma: a systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health*
543 *Technol Assess* 2007; **11**: iii – iv, ix – x, 1–190.
- 544 17 Fingert JH. Primary open-angle glaucoma genes. *Eye*. 2011; **25**: 587–95.
- 545 18 Craig JE, Han X, Qassim A, *et al.* Multitrait analysis of glaucoma identifies new risk loci
546 and enables polygenic prediction of disease susceptibility and progression. *Nat Genet* 2020;
547 **52**: 160–6.
- 548 19 Khera AV, Chaffin M, Aragam KG, *et al.* Genome-wide polygenic scores for common
549 diseases identify individuals with risk equivalent to monogenic mutations. *Nat Genet* 2018;
550 **50**: 1219–24.
- 551 20 Australian Bureau of Statistics. *Australian Demographic Statistics / Estimated resident*
552 *population / Details* 2019. ABS, Commonwealth of Australia; published online 19 Dec
553 2019.
554 [https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/3101.0Jun%202019?OpenDocu](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/3101.0Jun%202019?OpenDocument)
555 [ment](https://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/3101.0Jun%202019?OpenDocument) (accessed Oct 16, 2020).
- 556 21 Office for National Statistics. Research report on population estimates by characteristics.
557 Office for National Statistics website; last revised 25 Aug 2017
558 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populatio](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/methodologies/researchreportonpopulationestimatesbycharacteristics#findings)
559 [nestimates/methodologies/researchreportonpopulationestimatesbycharacteristics#findings](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/methodologies/researchreportonpopulationestimatesbycharacteristics#findings)
560 (accessed Oct 8, 2020).
- 561 22 Royal College of Ophthalmologists. The Way Forward: Glaucoma - options to help meet
562 demand for the current and future care of patients with eye disease. National Institute for
563 Health and Care Excellence; published online 27 Jan 2017.
564 [https://www.evidence.nhs.uk/document?id=1618377&returnUrl=Search%3Fps%3D40%26](https://www.evidence.nhs.uk/document?id=1618377&returnUrl=Search%3Fps%3D40%26q%3Deye%2Bcare&q=eye+care)
565 [q%3Deye%2Bcare&q=eye+care](https://www.evidence.nhs.uk/document?id=1618377&returnUrl=Search%3Fps%3D40%26q%3Deye%2Bcare&q=eye+care) (accessed Oct 8, 2020).
- 566 23 TreeAge Software, LLC. [TreeAge Pro Healthcare](#). [TreeAge 2020](#)
567 <https://www.treeage.com/product/treeage-pro-healthcare/> (accessed Oct 1, 2020).
- 568 24 Mitchell P, Smith W, Attebo K, Healey PR. Prevalence of Open-angle Glaucoma in
569 Australia. *Ophthalmology*. 1996; **103**: 1661–9.
- 570 25 Rudnicka AR, Mt-Isa S, Owen CG, Cook DG, Ashby D. Variations in Primary Open-Angle
571 Glaucoma Prevalence by Age, Gender, and Race: A Bayesian Meta-Analysis. *Investigative*
572 *Ophthalmology & Visual Science*. 2006; **47**: 4254.

- 573 26 Burr JM, Kilonzo M, Vale L, Ryan M. Developing a preference-based Glaucoma Utility
574 Index using a discrete choice experiment. *Optom Vis Sci* 2007; **84**.
575 DOI:10.1097/OPX.0b013e3181339f30.
- 576 27 Brown MM, Brown GC, Sharma S, Kistler J, Brown H. Utility values associated with
577 blindness in an adult population. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2001; **85**: 327–31.
- 578 28 McCaffrey N, Kaambwa B, Currow DC, Ratcliffe J. Health-related quality of life measured
579 using the EQ-5D–5L: South Australian population norms. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2016;
580 **14**: 1–12.
- 581 29 Kind P, Hardman G, Macran S. UK Population Norms for EQ-5D. 1999.
- 582 30 Sonic Genetics. Breast cancer focused gene panel. Sonic Genetics website, 2020
583 <https://www.sonicgenetics.com.au/our-tests/all-tests/breast-cancer-focused-gene-panel>
584 (accessed Sept 29, 2020).
- 585 31 NHS. Screening for breast cancer genes ‘is cost-effective’. NHS website
586 <https://www.nhs.uk/news/cancer/screening-breast-cancer-genes-cost-effective/> (accessed
587 Oct 9, 2020).
- 588 32 Violato M, Dakin H, Chakravarthy U, *et al.* Cost-effectiveness of community versus
589 hospital eye service follow-up for patients with quiescent treated age-related macular
590 degeneration alongside the ECHOES randomised trial. *BMJ Open* 2016; **6**: e011121.
- 591 33 Australian Institute of Health and welfare. Disease expenditure in Australia. Australian
592 Government; last updated: 13 Jun 2019. [https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/health-welfare-
593 expenditure/disease-expenditure-australia/contents/summary](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/health-welfare-expenditure/disease-expenditure-australia/contents/summary) (accessed Sept 29, 2020).
- 594 34 Australian Institute of Health and welfare. Health expenditure Australia 2017–18.
595 Australian Government; release date: 25 Sep 2019. [https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/health-
596 welfare-expenditure/health-expenditure-australia-2017-18/data](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/health-welfare-expenditure/health-expenditure-australia-2017-18/data) (accessed Sept 29, 2020).
- 597 35 Rahman MQ, Beard SM, Discombe R, Sharma R, Montgomery DM. Direct healthcare costs
598 of glaucoma treatment. *Br J Ophthalmol* 2013; **97**. DOI:10.1136/bjophthalmol-2012-
599 302525.
- 600 36 King A. CPI INDEX 06 : HEALTH 2015=100. Office for National Statistics; published
601 online Oct 2020.
602 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflationandpriceindices/timeseries/d7bz/mm23> (accessed
603 Oct 29, 2020).
- 604 37 Varma R, Lee PP, Goldberg I, Kotak S. An Assessment of the Health and Economic
605 Burdens of Glaucoma. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2011; **152**: 515.
- 606 38 Dirani M, Crowston JG, Taylor PS, *et al.* Economic impact of primary open-angle
607 glaucoma in Australia. *Clin Experiment Ophthalmol* 2011; **39**. DOI:10.1111/j.1442-
608 9071.2011.02530.x.

- 609 39 Department of Health, Australian Institute of Health and welfare. Aged care service list: 30
610 June 2019. Australian Government; released online Sep 2019 <https://www.gen->
611 [agedcaredata.gov.au/Resources/Access-data/2019/September/Aged-care-service-list-30-](https://www.gen-agedcaredata.gov.au/Resources/Access-data/2019/September/Aged-care-service-list-30-)
612 [June-2019](https://www.gen-agedcaredata.gov.au/Resources/Access-data/2019/September/Aged-care-service-list-30-) (accessed Oct 2, 2020).
- 613 40 McCrone P, Dhanasiri S, Patel A, Knapp M, Lawton-Smith S. Paying the Price: the cost of
614 mental health care in England to 2026. King's Fund, London, 2008.
615 [https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Paying-the-Price-the-cost-of-mental-health-](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Paying-the-Price-the-cost-of-mental-health-care-England-2026-McCrone-Dhanasiri-Patel-Knapp-Lawton-Smith-Kings-Fund-May-2008_0.pdf)
616 [care-England-2026-McCrone-Dhanasiri-Patel-Knapp-Lawton-Smith-Kings-Fund-May-](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Paying-the-Price-the-cost-of-mental-health-care-England-2026-McCrone-Dhanasiri-Patel-Knapp-Lawton-Smith-Kings-Fund-May-2008_0.pdf)
617 [2008_0.pdf](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Paying-the-Price-the-cost-of-mental-health-care-England-2026-McCrone-Dhanasiri-Patel-Knapp-Lawton-Smith-Kings-Fund-May-2008_0.pdf) (accessed Oct 15, 2020).
- 618 41 Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Trends in hospitalised injury due to falls in older
619 people 2007–08 to 2016–17. Australian Government; release date: 19 Sep 2019
620 [https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/injury/trends-in-hospitalised-injury-due-to-](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/injury/trends-in-hospitalised-injury-due-to-falls/contents/table-of-contents)
621 [falls/contents/table-of-contents](https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/injury/trends-in-hospitalised-injury-due-to-falls/contents/table-of-contents) (accessed Oct 2, 2020).
- 622 42 Garway-Heath DF, Crabb DP, Bunce C, *et al.* Latanoprost for open-angle glaucoma
623 (UKGTS): a randomised, multicentre, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015; **385**: 1295–
624 304.
- 625 43 Australian Bureau of Statistics. Deaths, Year of occurrence, Age at death, Age-specific
626 death rates, Sex, States, Territories and Australia. ABS, Commonwealth of Australia, 2020.
627 [http://stat.data.abs.gov.au/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DEATHS_AGESPECIFIC_OCCURE](http://stat.data.abs.gov.au/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DEATHS_AGESPECIFIC_OCCURENCEYEAR)
628 [NCEYEAR](http://stat.data.abs.gov.au/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=DEATHS_AGESPECIFIC_OCCURENCEYEAR) (accessed Oct 15, 2020).
- 629 44 Morgan E. Mortality rates (qx), principal projection, England and Wales. 2019. Office for
630 National Statistics; published online 2 Dec 2019.
631 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpe](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/datasets/mortalityratesqxprincipalprojectionenglandandwales)
632 [ctancies/datasets/mortalityratesqxprincipalprojectionenglandandwales](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/datasets/mortalityratesqxprincipalprojectionenglandandwales) (accessed Oct 16,
633 2020).
- 634 45 Parliament of Australia. Report: Availability of new, innovative and specialist cancer drugs
635 in Australia. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra 2015.
636 [https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/C](https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Cancer_Drugs/Report)
637 [ancer_Drugs/Report](https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Cancer_Drugs/Report) (accessed Sept 30, 2020).
- 638 46 McCabe C, Claxton K, Culyer AJ. The NICE Cost-Effectiveness Threshold.
639 *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2008; **26**: 733–44.
- 640 47 Heijl A, Leske MC, Bengtsson B, *et al.* Reduction of intraocular pressure and glaucoma
641 progression: results from the Early Manifest Glaucoma Trial. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2002; **120**:
642 1268–79.
- 643 48 Burr J, Hernández R, Ramsay C, *et al.* Is it worthwhile to conduct a randomized controlled
644 trial of glaucoma screening in the United Kingdom? *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2014; **19**: 42–
645 51.
- 646 49 Callender T, Emberton M, Morris S, *et al.* Polygenic risk-tailored screening for prostate

- 647 cancer: A benefit–harm and cost-effectiveness modelling study. *PLOS Medicine*. 2019; **16**:
648 e1002998.
- 649 50 Naber SK, Kundu S, Kuntz KM, *et al*. Cost-Effectiveness of Risk-Stratified Colorectal
650 Cancer Screening Based on Polygenic Risk: Current Status and Future Potential. *JNCI*
651 *Cancer Spectr* 2020; **4**: kz086.
- 652 51 Kuchenbaecker KB, McGuffog L, Barrowdale D, *et al*. Evaluation of Polygenic Risk Scores
653 for Breast and Ovarian Cancer Risk Prediction in BRCA1 and BRCA2 Mutation Carriers. *J*
654 *Natl Cancer Inst* 2017; **109**. DOI:10.1093/jnci/djw302.
- 655 52 Office of the Commissioner. FDA allows marketing of first direct-to-consumer tests that
656 provide genetic risk information for certain conditions. 2017; published online June 4.
657 [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-allows-marketing-first-direct-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-allows-marketing-first-direct-consumer-tests-provide-genetic-risk-information-certain-conditions)
658 [consumer-tests-provide-genetic-risk-information-certain-conditions](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-allows-marketing-first-direct-consumer-tests-provide-genetic-risk-information-certain-conditions) (accessed Sept 28,
659 2020).
- 660 53 Glaucoma Australia. Testing For Glaucoma. Glaucoma Australia Saving Sight 2020.
661 [https://glaucoma.org.au/what-is-glaucoma/testing-for-](https://glaucoma.org.au/what-is-glaucoma/testing-for-glaucoma?gclid=CjwKCAjwiaX8BRBZEiwAQQxGx3N8v0Ro1_ai_9e1zcv_vjtVcBHz41d)
662 [glaucoma?gclid=CjwKCAjwiaX8BRBZEiwAQQxGx3N8v0Ro1_ai_9e1zcv_vjtVcBHz41d](https://glaucoma.org.au/what-is-glaucoma/testing-for-glaucoma?gclid=CjwKCAjwiaX8BRBZEiwAQQxGx3N8v0Ro1_ai_9e1zcv_vjtVcBHz41d)
663 [uiHOiO_bbQdeO_3i2IozN8RoCZfgQAvD_BwE](https://glaucoma.org.au/what-is-glaucoma/testing-for-glaucoma?gclid=CjwKCAjwiaX8BRBZEiwAQQxGx3N8v0Ro1_ai_9e1zcv_vjtVcBHz41d) (accessed Oct 16, 2020).
- 664 54 Department of Health, Australian Government. Medicare Benefits Schedule -Item 10910.
665 Commonwealth of Australia MBS online.
666 <http://www9.health.gov.au/mbs/fullDisplay.cfm?type=item&qt=ItemID&q=10910>
667 (accessed Sept 29, 2020).
- 668

669 **Competing interest statement**

670 All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form (available on request from the
671 corresponding author) and declare as following:

672 **Acknowledgements**

673 D.A.M., S.M., J.E.C., L.S. and A.W.H. are supported by the Australian National Health and
674 Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Fellowships. X.H. is supported by the University of
675 Queensland Research Training Scholarship and QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute
676 PhD Top Up Scholarship. We are grateful for funding from a NHMRC Program grant
677 (1150144), Partnership grant (1132454) and a Centre for Research Excellence grant (1116360).

678

679 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures**

680 S.M., J.E.C., and A.W.H. are listed as co-inventors on a patent application (WO2019241844A1)
681 for the use of genetic risk scores to determine risk and guide treatment for glaucoma.

682

683 Except above, the remaining authors declare: no support from any other organisations for the
684 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in
685 the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could
686 appear to have influenced the submitted work.