

1 **Reflex single-gene non-invasive prenatal testing significantly increases the**
2 **cost-effectiveness of carrier screening**

3 Shan Riku,^a Herman Hedriana,^b Jacqueline A. Carozza^a, and Jennifer Hoskovec^{a*}

4 ^a*BillionToOne, Inc., Menlo Park, CA, USA*; ^b*University of California Davis Health, Sacramento,*
5 *CA, USA*

6 *To whom correspondence may be addressed: Jennifer Hoskovec, BillionToOne., Inc., 1035
7 O'Brien Drive, Menlo Park, CA, 94025; phone: (650) 460-2551; email:
8 jhoskovec@billiontoone.com

9

10 **Reflex single-gene non-invasive prenatal testing significantly increases the**
11 **cost-effectiveness of carrier screening**

12 **Abstract**

13 **Objective:** To evaluate the clinical and cost savings benefits of adoption of a carrier screen with
14 reflex single-gene non-invasive prenatal test (sgNIPT) in prenatal care.

15 **Method:** A decision-analytic model was developed to compare carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT
16 (maternal carrier status and fetal risk reported together) as first-line carrier screening to the
17 traditional carrier screening workflow (positive maternal carrier screen followed by paternal
18 screening to evaluate fetal risk). The model compared the clinical outcomes and cost
19 effectiveness between the two screening methods. These results were used to simulate
20 appropriate pricing for reflex sgNIPT.

21 **Results:** Reflex sgNIPT carrier screening detected 108 of 110 affected pregnancies per 100,000
22 births (98.5% sensitivity), whereas traditional carrier screening detected 46 of 110 affected
23 pregnancies (41.5% sensitivity). The cost to identify one affected pregnancy was reduced by 62%
24 in the reflex sgNIPT scenario compared to the traditional scenario. Adding together the testing
25 cost savings and the savings from earlier clinical intervention made possible by reflex sgNIPT,
26 the total cost savings was \$37.6 million per 100,000 pregnancies. Based on these cost savings,
27 we simulated appropriate reflex sgNIPT pricing range: if the cost to identify one affected
28 pregnancy is the unit cost, carrier screening with reflex sgNIPT can be priced up to \$1,859 per
29 test (or \$7,233 if sgNIPT is billed separately); if the cost per 100,000 pregnancies is the unit cost,
30 carrier screening with sgNIPT can be priced up to \$1,070 per test (or \$2,336 if sgNIPT is billed
31 separately).

32 **Conclusion:** Using the carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT as first-line screening improves the
33 detection of affected fetuses by 2.4-fold and can save costs for the healthcare system. A real-life
34 experience will be needed to assess the clinical utility and exact cost savings of carrier screen
35 with reflex sgNIPT.

36

37 **Keywords:** carrier screening; genetic disorders; pregnancy healthcare costs; decision-analytical
38 model; cystic fibrosis; spinal muscular atrophy; thalassemia; sickle cell disease; genetic
39 counseling; cell-free DNA

40

41 **Introduction**

42 Autosomal recessive disorders represent a large disease burden worldwide.¹ Manifestation of
43 autosomal recessive disorders in the first 25 years of life is estimated to be 1.7 in 1,000², and can
44 be considerably higher in certain populations.³ Carrier screening is a genetic testing methodology
45 that aims to identify individuals or couples who carry one variant allele within a gene and are at
46 risk of having offspring with the associated genetic disorder.⁴ The American College of
47 Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommends all patients who are considering
48 pregnancy or currently pregnant be carrier screened for cystic fibrosis (CF), spinal muscular
49 atrophy (SMA) and hemoglobinopathies.⁴ Most patients are screening after they become
50 pregnant, with one 2019 study reporting that 436 out of 462 patients (94.4%) undergoing carrier
51 screening were screened prenatally.⁵

52 The primary goal of carrier screening is to identify high-risk fetuses so that patients and
53 providers can make informed decisions about undergoing diagnostic testing and considering
54 prenatal and neonatal interventions. In the traditional carrier screen, pregnant patients are first
55 carrier screened. While one in six pregnant patients is a carrier, only one in 900 newborns is
56 affected with CF, SMA, or hemoglobinopathies, indicating that >99% of carrier pregnant
57 patients carry unaffected fetuses. If the maternal carrier screen is positive, the next step is
58 paternal carrier screening. If both parents are carriers, the fetus has a 1 in 4 risk of being affected
59 and diagnostic testing is needed to determine disease status. However, the paternal carrier screen
60 follow-up rate is low due to financial, societal, and logistical barriers.^{6,7} As a result of low
61 paternal participation, traditional carrier screening fails to identify nearly 60% of affected
62 pregnancies in the U.S.^{5,7}, and it incurs costs associated with paternal screening and choice of
63 prenatal and newborn interventions.

64 Single-gene non-invasive prenatal testing (sgNIPT) has the potential to overcome the
65 challenges with traditional carrier screening workflow. A commercially available carrier screen
66 with reflex sgNIPT was introduced into clinical use in 2019 in the U.S.⁸. This screen provides
67 both maternal carrier status and fetal risk assessment from one maternal blood sample without
68 the need for partner testing. Upon receipt of the maternal blood sample, carrier screening is
69 performed for cystic fibrosis, spinal muscular atrophy, and alpha and beta hemoglobinopathies as
70 recommended by ACOG⁴. Maternal carrier screening is performed via next generation
71 sequencing on genomic DNA extracted from the maternal blood sample. If the pregnant patient
72 is a carrier of any condition on the carrier screening panel, sgNIPT is then performed on the cell-
73 free DNA extracted from the original sample as a reflex (see **Method S1**). Fetal risk assessment
74 is provided as a personalized numerical risk and summarized as low risk (fetal risk $<1/500$), high
75 risk (fetal risk $>1/4$), increased risk or decreased risk (fetal risk between $1/500-1/4$) or no result.
76 Within two weeks, the ordering health care provider receives both the maternal carrier result and
77 the fetal risk which can be used to counsel the patient about options for diagnostic testing,
78 particularly in the case of high-risk results (**Figure 1**). Reflex sgNIPT has an analytical
79 sensitivity of $>98\%$ and specificity of $>99.9\%$ ⁸.

80 Here, we use a decision-analytical model to evaluate the clinical and cost saving impacts
81 of adopting the carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT as a first-line screening test compared to the
82 traditional carrier screen. We find that carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT detects more affected
83 fetuses and saves \$37.6 million per 100,000 pregnancies in cost to the healthcare system.
84 Because the sgNIPT portion of the screen is not currently billed to payors or patients due to its
85 recent commercial introduction, we use these cost savings results to explore appropriate pricing
86 for the screen.

87

88 **Methods**

89 *Decision-analytic model*

90 A decision tree was developed to simulate the experience of pregnant patients who are unaware
91 of their carrier status going through a traditional carrier screening process versus a reflex sgNIPT
92 screening process (**Figure 1**). The model included patients with singleton pregnancies who
93 elected maternal carrier screening. Patients undergoing preconception carrier screening and
94 patients with multiple pregnancy were excluded. Since a small fraction of patients undergo
95 maternal carrier screening prior to conception (e.g., 5.6% in a 2019 study⁵) and twin pregnancy
96 rate is only 3.3% in the US⁶, this model includes ~94% of patients undergoing maternal carrier
97 screening. The traditional carrier screen base scenario was developed from the standard
98 workflow typically carried out in obstetric clinics in the US. We did not account for the
99 concurrent screening model where the mother and father of the pregnancy are tested
100 simultaneously, as this model is not commonly used in obstetric clinics⁹⁻¹². The carrier screen
101 with reflex sgNIPT workflow (reflex sgNIPT scenario) was developed from the standard carrier
102 screening workflow in obstetric clinics.

103

104 *Model inputs*

105 Detailed assumptions and model inputs are provided in Supplementary Materials (**Method S2**
106 and **Tables S1 and S2**). To simplify the model, several key assumptions were made as described
107 below (basic workflow and test performance inputs are summarized in **Table 1**).

108 First, we only included the ACOG-recommended carrier screening workflow for cystic
109 fibrosis (CFTR), spinal muscular atrophy (SMN1), sickle cell disease / beta hemoglobinopathies
110 (HBB), and alpha thalassemia (HBA1/HBA2) in the analyses.

111 Second, the model assumed 100% carrier screening detection rates for both the base and
112 reflex sgNIPT scenarios. Most laboratories in the U.S., including the carrier screen with reflex
113 sgNIPT, offer NGS-based carrier screening which has 95-99+% detection rates for most genes.¹³

114 Third, the model focused on the comparison of workflows from the start of the carrier
115 screening to the identification of high-risk fetuses, with both mother and father being identified
116 as carriers in the base scenario and receiving a high-risk sgNIPT result in the reflex sgNIPT
117 scenario. Due to the difference in how the tests are offered, uptake of the traditional carrier
118 screening panels and the carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT panel among patients may vary.
119 Further, due to the difference in reported fetal risk (25% fetal risk based on autosomal recessive
120 inheritance with the traditional screening method, and 25-90% fetal risk based on internal criteria
121 for carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT), uptake of diagnostic testing such as amniocentesis after
122 the high-risk screening result may differ. However, given the insufficient data to fully simulate
123 these differences, the uptake of diagnostic testing was excluded from the comparison model.

124 Fourth, because sgNIPT is not currently billed to payors or patients, we did not include
125 the price of sgNIPT itself in the model. We assumed the same procedure cost inputs (\$694 based
126 on Fee schedules set by Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services; **Table S3**) for traditional
127 carrier screen and the carrier screen portion of the carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT. We then
128 explore appropriate pricing for carrier screen with sgNIPT using the results of the model.

129

130 *Sensitivity analysis*

131 For sensitivity analysis, we used the total cost savings per 100,000 pregnancies as the model
132 output. We then ran the model with the different values for each input individually (not
133 considering interactions between the inputs for simplicity) to obtain the outputs and visualized
134 the results with a tornado plot, arranged in order of largest impact on the model output. The
135 estimates for low and high values are as follows: Paternal Follow-Up Rate: 20% and 80%; MFM
136 Referral Rate: 10% and 70% (base scenario) or 40% and 100% (sgNIPT scenario) – the range is
137 higher for sgNIPT since it provides a personalized fetal risk of up to 90% for high-risk cases;
138 Diagnostic Testing Rate: 20% and 80% (both scenarios); Paternal Testing Cost: \$694 (if there
139 are no administrative costs) and \$1,204 (if there are double administrative costs follow-up costs);
140 MFM Cost: \$818 and \$1,618 (~30% decrease and increase from original input); Diagnostic
141 Testing Cost: \$530 and \$930 (~30% decrease and increase from original input); % SMA
142 Diagnosed Before Age 2 (Base): 40% and 80%; and % Eligible SMA Patients Choose
143 Zolgensma: 50% and 100%.

144

145 **Results**

146 *Clinical outcomes of base and reflex sgNIPT scenarios*

147 The clinical outcome, detection of fetuses at high risk for common recessive disorders
148 recommended by ACOG for prenatal screening (cystic fibrosis, spinal muscular atrophy, and
149 hemoglobinopathies), was assessed for the base scenario (traditional workflow) and reflex
150 sgNIPT scenario for 100,000 pregnancies (**Table 2**). Based on carrier rates in the U.S., 16,067
151 pregnant patients were screened to be positive carriers for one of the disorders for both scenarios
152 (**Table S1**). The true number of affected fetuses is 110 out of 100,000 (0.11%), calculated from
153 the incidence rates of each disorder.

154 Overall, reflex sgNIPT scenario detected far more affected fetuses than the base scenario.
155 In the base scenario, 6,667 (41.5%) of the 16,067 positive carriers followed up with paternal
156 testing based on previously published data.⁵ Therefore, 46 (41.5%) of 110 affected fetuses were
157 detected through this scenario, and 64 affected fetuses ($110 - 46 = 64$; 58.5%) were missed due to
158 the lack of paternal follow-up. In the reflex sgNIPT scenario, the maternal carrier status and fetal
159 risk analysis are delivered to the patient together. Based on the 98.5% test sensitivity⁸, 108 out of
160 110 affected fetuses ($110 * 98.5\% = 108$) were identified. Two out of 110 (1.5%) affected
161 fetuses were missed through this workflow. Overall, there was a 2.4-fold increase in the
162 detection rate of high-risk fetuses by carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT (108/110 identified)
163 compared to the traditional workflow base scenario (46/110).

164

165 *Clinical utility and cost effectiveness of base and reflex sgNIPT scenarios*

166 We then compared the clinical follow-up costs, including paternal testing and diagnostic
167 testing, between base and reflex sgNIPT scenarios (**Method S3**). When the fetus was identified
168 as high-risk in the base scenario (fetal risk is 25% if both the maternal and paternal carrier
169 screens are positive) or reflex sgNIPT scenario (fetal risk ranges from 25% to 90%), we
170 considered the affected pregnancy detected regardless of the diagnostic testing uptake.

171 The reflex sgNIPT scenario reduced the need for paternal screening, thus significantly
172 lowering follow-up costs per 100,000 pregnancies. Follow-up testing in the base scenario costs
173 \$9.3M per 100,000 pregnancies, the sum of follow-up counseling and paternal screening (\$9.2M)
174 and diagnostic testing cost for high-risk fetuses (\$0.1M) (**Table 3**). In contrast, follow-up testing
175 in the reflex sgNIPT scenario costs \$1.0M per 100,000 pregnancies, the sum of follow-up
176 counseling (\$0.7M) and diagnostic testing (\$0.3M) (**Table 3**). Therefore, reflex sgNIPT saved

177 \$8.3M in follow-up costs per 100,000 pregnancies by reducing need for paternal screening.
178 Internal quality assurance data supports that patients who receive low-risk sgNIPT results do not
179 typically seek paternal screening.

180 We also calculated that the cost to identify one affected fetus is several times lower in the
181 reflex sgNIPT scenario compared to the base scenario. To calculate the cost to identify one
182 affected fetus, we first summed the total cost per 100,00 pregnancies (including the maternal
183 screening cost of \$694 per pregnancy) for each scenario and then divided by the number of
184 fetuses detected. The base scenario identified 46 out of 110 affected fetuses (**Table 2**) at a cost of
185 \$78.7M, resulting in a cost of \$1.73M per affected fetus (**Figure 2**). The reflex sgNIPT scenario
186 identified 108 out of 110 affected pregnancies (**Table 2**) at a cost of \$70.4M, resulting in a cost
187 of \$0.65M per affected fetus (**Figure 2**). Not including the cost of performing sgNIPT itself
188 since it is not yet billed, the reflex sgNIPT scenario reduces the cost to identify one affected
189 pregnancy by 62% (2.6-fold) from the base scenario (**Figure 2**) by identifying more affected
190 fetuses and lowering the paternal screening cost. Of note, in either scenario the cost to screen one
191 affected fetus is lower than the lifetime treatment cost (the weighted average lifetime treatment
192 cost for the disorders screened is estimated to be \$2.6M per patient; details provided in **Method**
193 **S4** and **Table S6**).

194

195 *Clinical impact and healthcare cost saving from SMA treatment selection*

196 Early identification of high-risk fetuses allows timely prenatal and neonatal interventions for
197 clinicians and patients (**Table 4**), which in turn can lead to more effective management and
198 potential cost savings. In particular, SMA has several treatment options, including Zolgensma
199 and Spinraza. These therapies are most effective when delivered neonatally prior to onset of

200 symptoms. Moreover, the single-dose gene therapy Zolgensma (\$2.1M per dose) is more cost-
201 effective than the lifetime medication Spinraza (\$0.75M for initial dose and \$0.46M per year
202 afterward) (**Table S4, Table S5**). However, Zolgensma must be administered to neonates before
203 two years of age. Since SMA is not included in newborn screening panels in all U.S. states
204 (twelve states do not test for SMA as of June 2021), prenatal SMA diagnosis is essential for
205 affected families to have access to early, clinically effective, and cost effective treatment
206 options.¹⁴ The reflex sgNIPT scenario identifies more SMA-affected fetuses than the base
207 scenario, resulting in more newborns eligible for Zolgensma. We estimated the total cost savings
208 from more access to Zolgensma in the reflex sgNIPT scenario to be \$29.3M per 100,000
209 pregnancies (**Table 5, Method S4**).

210

211 *Overall cost savings from adoption of carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT*

212 Together, we estimate that the cost savings in the reflex sgNIPT scenario (not including the cost
213 of sgNIPT itself) is \$37.6M per 100,000 pregnancies, which is the sum of follow-up cost savings
214 (\$8.2M) (**Table 2**) and more cost-efficient clinical intervention for fetuses affected with SMA
215 (\$29.3M) (**Table 5**).

216 We analyzed the sensitivity of the model output, the cost savings per 100,000
217 pregnancies, towards model inputs and found that sgNIPT saves costs compared to the base
218 scenario over a wide range of input values (**Figure 3**). The inputs can be grouped into two
219 categories: those that affect follow-up costs, and those that affect SMA treatment costs. The cost
220 savings per 100,000 births is most sensitive to inputs that affect SMA treatment costs, including
221 the base scenario SMA diagnosis rate before age two and the number of eligible SMA patients
222 who chose Zolgensma. For example, a low base diagnosis rate (40%) results in relatively higher

223 cost savings (up to \$68.1M) and a high base diagnosis rate (80%) results in relatively lower cost
224 savings (\$27.4M). Additionally, the model is also sensitive to the percent of eligible SMA
225 patients who choose Zolgensma over Spinraza. These two inputs are difficult to know with
226 confidence because several U.S. states do not offer SMA newborn screening or are in the process
227 of implementing it,¹⁴ and data on long-term efficacy and patient choices is not yet available¹⁵.
228 Therefore, the exact cost savings for the sgNIPT scenario will vary within the U.S. depending on
229 local SMA diagnosis rate before age two and availability of treatments.

230 Out of the inputs that impact follow-up costs, the model is most sensitive to the base
231 scenario paternal testing follow-up rate and relatively insensitive to other follow-up testing costs
232 and referral rates. If paternal follow-up is low (20%), the cost savings for sgNIPT decrease to
233 \$32.8M per 100,000 pregnancies because fewer follow-up tests are needed (**Figure 3**). If
234 paternal follow-up is high (80%), cost savings for sgNIPT increase to \$46.2M per 100,000
235 pregnancies (**Figure 3**). Note that the effect is reversed for the cost to detected one affected fetus.
236 If paternal follow-up is low (20%), fewer affected fetuses are identified which increases the cost
237 to detected one affected fetus from \$1.73M to \$3.36M (**Table S7**). If paternal follow-up is high
238 (80%), more affected fetuses are identified which decreases the cost to detected one affected
239 fetus from \$1.73M to \$0.99M (**Table S7**). In both cases, sgNIPT cost to identify one affected
240 fetus (\$0.65M) remains the lowest.

241

242 *Additional considerations for non-U.S. healthcare systems*

243 While the termination of pregnancy (TOP) is another available intervention available after early
244 identification of affected fetuses, we did not include it as part of our U.S.-focused cost savings
245 calculation. However, TOP is commonly considered outside the U.S. in nationwide

246 implementations of prenatal screening programs. The disorders in our panel significantly impact
247 quality of life and shorten lifespan even with current availability of treatments (**Table 4**). On
248 average, lifetime treatment cost is \$2.62M per patient (**Table S6**). We estimate that
249 implementation of reflex sgNIPT could reduce lifetime treatment costs by \$145.4M per 100,000
250 pregnancies due to potential TOP (**Table S8, Method S5**). The lifetime treatment cost inputs in
251 the this model are derived from U.S. healthcare costs, and may need to be adjusted for other
252 countries.

253

254 *Pricing simulations for carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT*

255 The cost savings analysis above does not include the price of reflex sgNIPT since it is not
256 yet billed to payers or patients. Therefore, the price of the reflex sgNIPT itself will decrease total
257 cost savings. We used the results from our cost savings analysis to perform two simulations of
258 appropriate pricing for carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT based on the value provided and
259 identify price ranges that will save costs for the healthcare system overall (**Method S6**).

260 In the first simulation, we take the unit cost to be the cost to identify one affected fetus.
261 The cost savings value is \$1.08M per affected fetus (\$1.73M in the base scenario - \$0.65M in the
262 reflex sgNIPT scenario). If we pass 100% of the cost savings value to the price of carrier screen
263 with reflex sgNIPT, then the parity price is \$1,859 (**Figure 4A, Method S6**). If reflex sgNIPT
264 portion was priced separately from the carrier screen portion the parity price is \$7,233, several-
265 fold higher than the combined carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT price since the cost is divided
266 only among carriers reflexed to sgNIPT instead of among all pregnancies carrier screened.

267 In the second simulation, we take the unit cost to be the cost of carrier screening and
268 downstream treatment per 100,000 pregnancies. As previously calculated, the cost savings value

269 is \$37.6M per 100,000 pregnancies. If we pass 100% of the cost savings value to the price of
270 carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT, then the parity price is \$1,070 (**Figure 4B, Method S6**). If
271 reflex sgNIPT portion was priced separately from the carrier screen portion, the parity price is
272 \$2,336.

273

274 **Discussion**

275 Results from our decision-analytic model analyses show that compared to the traditional
276 sequential carrier screen workflow, the carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT workflow improves
277 clinical outcome (detection of affected fetuses) and saves costs by eliminating paternal carrier
278 screening and enabling more cost-effective SMA treatment interventions. Furthermore, we
279 identified carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT pricing that would preserve cost savings for the
280 healthcare system.

281 Carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT detects more affected pregnancies with less burden on
282 the healthcare system. Although the traditional workflow is effective for detecting carriers of
283 autosomal recessive conditions, the detection rate of high-risk fetuses is limited to 41.5%, as the
284 lack of paternal follow-up testing is significant and leaves >58% of carrier pregnant patients
285 without a fully informative risk assessment for their pregnancy.^{5,7} In contrast, the reflex sgNIPT
286 carrier screen provides patients and physicians with a personalized risk for the fetus, allowing for
287 more informed counseling, decision-making, and patient autonomy regarding follow-up testing
288 and interventions. Additionally, the reduced need for paternal follow-up testing may
289 significantly lower the burden on the physician, clinical staff, and patient, given the logistics
290 involved in counseling about and arranging paternal testing.

291 Second, the reflex sgNIPT workflow reduces the time from blood draw to identification
292 of high-risk fetuses by up to eight weeks compared to the traditional workflow. Early
293 identification of high-risk fetuses will improve pregnancy and delivery management, patient
294 counseling and education, and access to early intervention, therapeutics, research studies, and
295 clinical trials. With pregnancies affected with alpha thalassemia, for example, only patients at 18
296 to 26 weeks gestational age are eligible for the in-utero hematopoietic stem cell transplantation
297 clinical study.¹⁶ Faster turnaround time with reflex sgNIPT increases the likelihood of meeting
298 the eligibility criteria and receiving treatment. Several treatment options, for example gene
299 therapies for SMA, are most effective when implemented prior to the onset of symptoms. Uptake
300 of genetic counseling and patient education after a positive newborn screen is low for some
301 conditions.¹⁴ Early prenatal identification of high-risk fetuses makes it possible to connect the
302 affected families with medical professionals who can educate and support them regarding
303 options for diagnosis, treatment, and interventions.

304 The findings reported herein should be viewed considering several limitations. First, we
305 recognize that paternal follow-up rates may vary between populations, within the U.S. or among
306 different countries. The model can be refined if additional data on paternal follow-up rates are
307 available. Second, clinical performance metrics in this report could change when data from a
308 larger clinical study on the carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT become available. Third, since
309 paternal carrier screening likely remains useful for future pregnancies of identified carriers or
310 may be required by some laboratories as a control during diagnostic testing, the reflex sgNIPT
311 workflow may not completely eliminate the cost of paternal testing, although it likely would
312 reduce the urgency and frequency of the test. Fourth, cost savings from prenatal and neonatal
313 interventions were calculated based on limited available literature, as many of these interventions

314 are recent and rapidly evolving. While some of the data used in the models is dated, we chose the
315 available data that was most applicable to the carrier screen clinical scenario. In particular, long-
316 term data about extended life expectancy and outcomes for SMA patients treated with Spinraza
317 or Zolgensma are still lacking, and the phenotypic severity is difficult to predict¹⁵. In addition,
318 SMA newborn screening is rapidly changing and varies widely between countries, which would
319 impact the cost savings amount.¹⁴ Furthermore, we expect that treatments will improve rapidly in
320 clinical and cost effectiveness (e.g., stem cell transplantation for hemoglobinopathies¹⁶⁻¹⁸).
321 Despite the above limitations, the current study provides a comprehensive assessment, using
322 available data, on the clinical outcomes and cost effectiveness when using carrier screen with
323 reflex sgNIPT as a first-line screening method versus the traditional sequential screening
324 workflow. Furthermore, the model inputs and calculations can be updated (**Supplementary File**
325 **1**) to accommodate new or situation-specific data.

326

327 **Conclusion**

328 Carrier screening with reflex sgNIPT improves clinical outcome by detecting fetuses at high risk
329 for autosomal recessive disorders with higher sensitivity, giving patients and providers access to
330 additional prenatal and neonatal intervention options. Furthermore, carrier screening with reflex
331 sgNIPT can lead to significant cost savings to the healthcare system. While cost savings depends
332 on the carrier screen with sgNIPT pricing (the current commercial test does not bill it), we used
333 our model to explore pricing that saves costs for the system. If we define the unit cost as the cost
334 to identify one affected fetus, a price less than \$1,859 per carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT (or
335 \$7,233 if sgNIPT is billed separately) will save cost for the system. If we define the unit cost as
336 the cost to screen 100,000 births, a price less than \$1,070 per carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT

337 (or \$2,336 if sgNIPT is billed separately) will save cost for the system. Follow-up clinical studies
338 are needed to assess the real-life clinical utility and cost savings of carrier screen with reflex
339 sgNIPT.

340 **Transparency**

341 *Declaration of Funding*

342 BillionToOne, Inc. provided financial support for the conduct of the research and preparation of
343 the article.

344

345 *Declaration of Financial/Other Interests*

346 SR and JH are employees of BillionToOne (or a subsidiary) and hold stock or options to hold
347 stock in the company. JAC is compensated by BillionToOne. HH serves on the Advisory Board
348 for BillionToOne and does not hold stock or option to hold stocks.

349

350 *Author Contributions*

351 S.R. built the decision-analytical model. S.R. and J.A.C analyzed data. All authors wrote and
352 edited the manuscript.

353

354 **Acknowledgements**

355 We thank Dr. Oguzhan Atay, Dr. John ten Bosch, and Carrie McGehee for providing valuable
356 inputs to the decision-analytic model, and Dr. Rong Mao for providing editorial support for this
357 manuscript.

358

359 **TABLES**

360 **TABLE 1.** A summary of clinical decision probabilities and test performance as part of the key
361 assumptions for the decision-analytic model used in our analyses.

Variables	Input Value
<i>Clinical decision probabilities (base scenario)</i>	
MFM referral rate upon positive maternal carrier result	36%*
Follow-up paternal carrier screening uptake	41.5% ⁵
<i>Clinical decision probabilities (UNITY scenario)</i>	
MFM referral rate upon positive maternal carrier result	80%**
<i>sgNIPT test performance</i>	
Sensitivity	98.5% ⁸
Specificity	99.9% ⁸
sgNIPT no-call rate	0.5%***

362
363 * Based on internal OBGYN market research results. Four out of 11 OBGYNs (36%)
364 interviewed refer patients to MFM clinic upon positive maternal carrier screen results.

365 ** Uptake for invasive diagnostic testing upon high-risk trisomy NIPT results are 73% for
366 Trisomy 21, and 90% for Trisomy 18 and Trisomy 13.¹⁹ Assuming a similar MFM referral rate
367 for high-risk sgNIPT results to those for trisomy NIPT, we estimated the referral rate to be 80%.

368 *** Based on internal data

369
370 MFM, maternal-fetal medicine. sgNIPT, single-gene non-invasive prenatal testing; OBGYN,
371 obstetrics and gynecology.

372 **TABLE 2.** Clinical outcomes per 100,000 individuals screened in the base and reflex sgNIPT
373 scenarios of our decision-analytical model and the differences between these two scenarios.

Clinical outcomes	Base scenario	Reflex sgNIPT scenario	Difference
Number of positive maternal carriers	16,067*	16,067*	-
Number of paternal tests performed	6,668	-	(6,668)
Number of affected fetuses detected	46	108	62
Number of affected fetuses missed	64	2	(62)
Affected fetus detection rate (sensitivity)	41.5% ⁵	98.5% ⁸	57.0%

374

375 * This number is based on the carrier frequency computed in **Table S1** per 100,000 individuals
376 ($100,000 \times 16.1\%$).

377 sgNIPT, single-gene non-invasive prenatal testing.

378

379 **TABLE 3.** Total cost savings from reflex sgNIPT follow-up testing costs per 100,000
 380 pregnancies.

Item	Base	Reflex	Follow-up
	Scenario	sgNIPT Scenario	Cost Savings
Follow-up cost with positive results (\$MM)	\$9.2	\$0.7	\$8.5
<i>% carrier results that need follow-up (%) - ACOG panel</i>	16.1%	-	
<i>% follow-up needed for UNITY panel</i>	-	1%	
<i>% patients completing paternal testing</i>	42%	-	
<i>Paternal Test follow-up cost per case (Test & Admin)</i>	\$944	-	
<i>% patients referred to MFM</i>	36%	80%	
<i>Additional MFM follow-up cost per case</i>	\$1,236	\$1,236	
Follow-up diagnostic testing cost (\$MM)	\$0.1	\$0.3	-\$0.2
<i>% of positive paternal result</i>	2.7%	-	
<i>% diagnostic testing uptake</i>	50%	50%	
<i>Cost of diagnostic testing</i>	\$730	\$730	
Total follow-up cost (\$MM)	\$9.3	\$1.0	\$8.3

381

382 MFM, maternal-fetal medicine; SMA, spinal muscular atrophy.

383

384 **TABLE 4.** Available prenatal and neonatal interventions for conditions screened by the reflex
 385 sgNIPT workflow.

Condition	Disease description	Prenatal and neonatal interventions
Spinal Muscular Atrophy (SMA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • severe muscle weakness and wasting • loss of motor skills • breathing problems • life expectancy for Type 1 (most severe) if untreated = 2 years • most common genetic cause of infant death 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spinraza, Zolgensma, and Evrysdi (genetic treatments administered after birth) increase survival and improve symptoms • early treatment before onset of symptoms is crucial for effectiveness
Cystic Fibrosis (CF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • breathing problems, • severe lung damage • serious digestive problems • symptoms worsen over time • average life expectancy = mid-thirties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • medication and therapies improve symptoms and quality of life • early diagnosis and careful lifelong management may increase life expectancy
Sickle Cell Disease / Beta Hemoglobinopathies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fewer healthy red blood cells • fatigue and pain • complications such as poor growth, infection, heart problems, and stroke • shortened life expectancy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • medications, regular blood transfusions, and bone marrow/stem cell transplants manage disease • gene therapy may be available for some patients • prenatal screening helps identify pregnancies at risk that may benefit from cord blood banking at birth
Alpha Thalassemia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fewer healthy red blood cells • alpha thalassemia major (most severe) results in death before birth or shortly after in untreated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prenatal care essential to reduce risk of maternal complications for pregnancies with alpha thalassemia major • prenatal treatment may increase survival likelihood

386

387 sgNIPT, single-gene non-invasive prenatal testing; SMA, spinal muscular atrophy; CF, cystic

388 fibrosis.

389 **TABLE 5.** Total cost savings from SMA treatment selection per 100,000 pregnancies.

Item	Base Scenario	Reflex sgNIPT Scenario	Cost Savings
Number of SMA fetuses per 100,000 births (prevalence)	9	9	-
% SMA patients diagnosed before age 2 (prenatally or postnatally)	70%	99%	-
% eligible patients (= diagnosed under age 2) choosing Zolgensma as treatment	90%	90%	-
Per SMA patient lifetime treatment cost (\$MM)	\$6.8	\$3.5	-
Total SMA treatment cost for 100,000 births (\$MM)	\$60.3	\$31.1	\$29.3


390

391 SMA, spinal muscular atrophy.


392

393 **FIGURES**

A. Traditional carrier screening workflow



B. Carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT workflow



394

395 **FIGURE 1.** Schematic diagram of the decision tree model used for traditional carrier screen

396 workflow (A) and reflex sgNIPT carrier screen workflow (B).

Cost per affected pregnancy detected (\$MM)




397

398

399 **FIGURE 2.** Comparison of cost effectiveness between base and reflex sgNIPT scenarios of
400 detecting one affected pregnancy. Cost was calculated by dividing the total screening cost by the
401 number of affected pregnancies detected.

402



403

404 **FIGURE 3.** Sensitivity to inputs of reflex sgNIPT scenario cost savings per 100,000 pregnancies.

405 The cost savings were calculated using a high and low value for each indicated input. The input

406 value range is annotated next to each bar. The input values used in the model to yield \$37.6M in

407 cost savings are as follows: % SMA Diagnosed Before Age 2 (Base) = 70%; % Eligible SMA


408 Patients Choose Zolgensma = 70%; Paternal Follow-Up Rate = 41.5%; MFM Referral Rate

409 (Base) = 36%; Paternal Testing Cost = \$944; MFM Cost = \$1,236; MFM Referral Rate (sgNIPT)

410 = 80%; Diagnostic Testing Rate (sgNIPT) = 50%; Diagnostic Testing Cost = \$730; Diagnostic

411 Testing Rate (Base) = 50%.

412



413

414 **FIGURE 4.** Pricing simulation for carrier screen with reflex sgNIPT using two different unit

415 costs to determine the price-parity point with base scenario costs: (A) the cost to identify one

416 affected fetus and (B) the cost per 100,000 pregnancies. Percentages refer to the percent of value

417 (determined by the base costs) passed to the reflex sgNIPT costs.

418

419 **References**

- 420 1. Antonarakis, S. Carrier screening for recessive disorders. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **20**, 549–561
421 (2019).
- 422 2. Baird, P. A., Anderson, T. W., Newcombe, H. B. & Lowry, R. B. Genetic disorders in
423 children and young adults: a population study. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **42**, 677 (1988).
- 424 3. IC, V. & RD, P. Global burden of genetic disease and the role of genetic screening. *Semin.*
425 *Fetal Neonatal Med.* **20**, 354–363 (2015).
- 426 4. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Committee Opinion No. 691:
427 Carrier Screening for Genetic Conditions. *Obstet. Gynecol.* **129**, e41–e55 (2017).
- 428 5. Giles Choates, M. *et al.* It takes two: uptake of carrier screening among male reproductive
429 partners. *Prenat. Diagn.* **40**, 311–316 (2020).
- 430 6. Martin, J. A., Hamilton, B. E., Osterman, M. J. K. & Driscoll, A. K. Births: final data
431 for 2018. **68**, (2019).
- 432 7. Carlotti, K., Hines, K., Weida, J., Lah, M. & Schwantes-An, T. Perceived barriers to
433 paternal expanded carrier screening following a positive maternal result: To screen or not
434 to screen. *J. Genet. Couns.* **30**, 470–477 (2021).
- 435 8. Tsao, D. S. *et al.* A novel high-throughput molecular counting method with single base-
436 pair resolution enables accurate single-gene NIPT. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 1–14 (2019).
- 437 9. Simone, L. *et al.* Reproductive male partner testing when the female is identified to be a
438 genetic disease carrier. *Prenat. Diagn.* **41**, 21–27 (2021).
- 439 10. Shapiro, A. J., Kroener, L. & Quinn, M. M. Expanded carrier screening for recessively
440 inherited disorders: economic burden and factors in decision-making when one individual
441 in a couple is identified as a carrier. *J. Assist. Reprod. Genet.* **38**, 957–963 (2021).

- 442 11. Jurgensmeyer, S. *et al.* Female and male perspectives on male partner roles in expanded
443 carrier screening. *J. Assist. Reprod. Genet.* **38**, 375–385 (2021).
- 444 12. Arjunan, A. *et al.* Evaluating the efficacy of three carrier screening workflows designed to
445 identify at-risk carrier couples. *Prenat. Diagn.* **41**, 896 (2021).
- 446 13. LabCorp. Cystic Fibrosis DNA Analysis; Sample Report 480533. 4 (2016). Available at:
447 https://files.labcorp.com/testmenu-d8/sample_reports/480533.pdf.
- 448 14. Kay, D. *et al.* Implementation of population-based newborn screening reveals low
449 incidence of spinal muscular atrophy. *Genet. Med.* **22**, 1296–1302 (2020).
- 450 15. Darrow, J. J., Sharma, M., Shroff, M. & Wagner, A. K. Efficacy and costs of spinal
451 muscular atrophy drugs. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **12**, 9648 (2020).
- 452 16. Mackenzie, T. In Utero Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation for Alpha-thalassemia
453 Major (ATM). *ClinicalTrials.gov* (2017). Available at:
454 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02986698>.
- 455 17. Dever, D. P. & Porteus, M. H. The changing landscape of gene editing in hematopoietic
456 stem cells: a step towards Cas9 clinical translation. *Curr. Opin. Hematol.* **24**, 481–488
457 (2017).
- 458 18. Markt, S. *et al.* Intrabone hematopoietic stem cell gene therapy for adult and pediatric
459 patients affected by transfusion-dependent β -thalassemia. *Nat. Med.* **25**, 234–241 (2019).
- 460 19. Benn, P. *et al.* An Economic Analysis of Cell-Free DNA Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing in
461 the US General Pregnancy Population. *PLoS One* **10**, (2015).

462