Productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with Angelman syndrome

Authors: Sally Hartmanis[1*], Emma K Baker[2,3,4], David E Godler[2,3], Danny Liew[1]

Affiliations:

[1]School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia

[2]Diagnosis and Development, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Royal Children's Hospital, 50 Flemington Road, Parkville, Victoria 3052, Australia

[3]Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences, Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia

[4]School of Psychology and Public Health, La Trobe University, Plenty Road and Kingsbury Drive, Bundoora, Victoria 3086, Australia

[*]Corresponding author:

Sally Hartmanis

School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine

Monash University

553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne

Victoria 3004 Australia

+61 (0)419 382 972

sally.hartmanis@angelmansyndrome.org

Abstract

Purpose

Angelman syndrome (AS) is a severe neurodevelopmental condition associated with a significant socioeconomic burden. However, no studies have thus far quantified or monetised the parental productivity burden of AS. The present study sought to estimate this burden.

Methods

The parental productivity burden of AS in Australia was estimated using cost-of-illness modelling with simulated follow-up over a 10-year period using 2019 as the baseline year. This involved estimating the prevalence of persons with AS and their parents, the productivity adjusted life years (PALYs) lost by parents, and the corresponding cost to society.

Results

The productivity burden borne by the estimated 153 to 1,322 (lower to upper scenario) parents of the 199 to 1,714 persons with AS ranged from 229.6 to 1,980.2 PALYs (discounted). This corresponded to a societal cost (discounted) of AUD$21.0 to $181.2 million, and a loss of 38% of PALYs per-parent.

Conclusion

AS imposes a significant productivity burden on Australian parents of affected persons, with a large associated impact on the broader economy. These findings are important for informing government planning regarding the supports that should be provided to persons with AS and their families. They will also be important for informing the reimbursement strategy for AS therapies.

Introduction

Angelman syndrome (AS) is a rare genetic neurodevelopmental condition characterised by global developmental delay, including severe to profound intellectual disability, absent speech, motor function impairment, and significant behavioural challenges such as insomnia, hyperactivity, excessive smiling and laughing, obsession with water, and repetitive and aggressive behaviours.[1–3] Persons with AS also often experience multiple comorbidities, including epilepsy, cerebral palsy, scoliosis, and blindness and other visual impairments.[1,4] As such, persons with AS require lifelong care and support.[2]

At present, there is only limited peer-reviewed evidence regarding the population prevalence and incidence of AS, although 1 in 15,000 is a commonly-reported prevalence.[1] The paucity of data can be attributed to a number of factors, including the absence of a newborn screening program for AS, overlapping phenotypic characteristics with other syndromes, issues pertaining to the accuracy of diagnostic methods, the lack of genetic confirmation for approximately 10% of cases, the establishment of a global registry only in 2016, and historically low levels of awareness among clinicians.[1,5–7] The latter is driven by a number of factors, including that AS was only first described in 1965, the major genetic mechanism was not recognised until the 1980s, and consensus regarding the clinical diagnostic criteria was only achieved in 1995.[1,5,8] Many of these factors mean that children with AS, and their families, are often subject to a 'lengthy diagnostic odyssey' with most only receiving a diagnosis between the ages of one and five years.[1]

Furthermore, many of the studies claiming to report a population prevalence have determined the prevalence of AS within a small sample of persons with intellectual disability, followed by extrapolation to the total population.[1] As such, estimates of AS prevalence published to date vary greatly from 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 86,250,[4,9] while estimates of incidence

range from 1:22,305 to 1:40,000 per year.[5,10] The epidemiological characteristics of AS do not appear to differ by race.[10]

AS results in a significant socioeconomic burden, both on the healthcare system and affected families.[1] Persons with AS require a high-level of specialist medical care within both an outpatient and inpatient setting, with the most frequent causes of hospitalisation comprising care for oral-dental issues, seizures, orthopaedic problems, and acute respiratory disorders.[3,11] This is most pronounced among young children with AS, who tend to require a greater number of surgeries and hospitalisations, and who need to spend more time in hospital once admitted.[3] Furthermore, the care required by persons with AS when undergoing routine health-related procedures often involves a significantly greater use of resources due to the need for additional interventions.[5] These can include, for example, a general anaesthetic when visiting the dentist for a routine teeth cleaning service.[5] In addition, persons with AS often require many pharmaceuticals either for directly treating the symptoms of their condition or one of the recognised comorbidities of AS, with almost 80% of children aged six years requiring at least one medication (despite the fact that there is no specific therapeutic treatment for AS).[1–4] Furthermore, the parents of persons with AS are at significant risk of stress and other mental health problems. This risk is greater than that experienced by the parents of persons with autism, Cornelia de Lange syndrome and Cri du Chat syndrome.[12] This impact is particularly notable for mothers of children with AS.[12–14]

Despite the above considerations, there remains limited evidence regarding the productivity impact borne by the parents of persons with AS, with very little published data regarding the adverse effects on parents' employment and productivity.[1,3,15–17] This impact can be quantified using productivity adjusted life years (PALYs), which is a measure of the productivity burden imposed by a given condition.[18] PALYs are useful for estimating and communicating productivity impacts because they can be compared across conditions and

populations to inform policy and funding decisions.[18] PALYs are a function of the life years lived by a given population and their corresponding productivity index. The productivity index ranges from zero (completely unproductive) to one (completely productive) and is a measure of workforce participation, time off work (absenteeism), and reduced productive output while at work (presenteeism).[18,19] Each of these components are known to impact the parents of persons with AS.[1,3,15–17]

Characterising the parental productivity burden of AS is important for informing government decisions regarding the supports that should be provided to persons with AS and their families.[3] In future, it is hoped that these supports will include specific therapeutic treatments for AS, with trials underway at present investigating the efficacy and effectiveness of potentially curative gene therapies for AS.[20] Gene therapies developed and marketed for other conditions have been priced in the order of hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars per dose.[21] This means that evidence regarding the total socioeconomic burden, including the parental productivity burden, attributable to AS is needed to inform future health funding decisions. As such, the aim of the present study was to estimate the productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with AS over a 10-year period in Australia and the corresponding cost to society.

Materials and methods

The study was approved by the Royal Children's Hospital Human Research Ethics Committee (reference number 33066) and the Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (reference number 2021-25930-55113).

Model

The productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with AS in Australia was estimated using cost-of-illness modelling with simulated follow-up, facilitated by a Markov chain of

life tables, over a 10-year period with 2019 as the baseline year. This involved estimating the prevalence of persons with AS and their parents, the PALYs lost by parents, and the associated cost to society. The model structure is depicted in Figure 1.

Key data were obtained from a cohort of families of children with AS who participated in a natural history study of chromosome 15 imprinting disorders[22], peer-reviewed literature, and publicly-available data reported by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). The data analyses and supporting assumptions are discussed in the following sections, with further detail provided in Tables S1-4. Approaches were aligned to the applicable sections of the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement for health interventions.[23]

Data analysis

Prevalence of persons with AS

The prevalence of AS in Australia was estimated by determining the population prevalence of AS, the age and sex distribution of prevalent AS, and the average life expectancy of persons with AS. No studies reporting the population prevalence of AS in Australia were identified and variation across the reported estimates in other countries was significant (Supplementary Note, Supplementary Table S5). To account for the underlying uncertainty in the prevalence of AS within Australia, the lowest and highest reported population prevalence estimates of AS from the literature were used. As such, all results were estimated for a lower and upper prevalence scenario. The former was obtained from a retrospective registry review in Denmark,[4] which identified 80 patients with AS out of the 6.90 million patients in the Danish National Patient Registry (DNPR) from 1994 to 2015, corresponding to a prevalence of 1:86,250 (0.001%).[4] The upper prevalence estimate was obtained from an evaluation of patients referred to a university hospital in Denmark,[9] which

identified five patients with AS over five years, corresponding to a prevalence of 1:10,000 (0.01%).[9] Estimates of AS prevalence were applied to the total number of Australians in 2019 reported by the ABS to derive the total number of prevalent AS cases.[24]

The age and sex distribution of prevalent AS was assumed to follow the same distribution as that of prevalent disability in Australia in 2018 as reported by the ABS.[25] This approach assumed that the prevalence of AS within each age group was equally distributed within that age group. The average life expectancy of persons with AS was assumed to be 70 years.[26,27]

Prevalence of the parents of persons with AS

The prevalence of the parents of persons affected by AS was estimated by determining the average parental age during the year that each child with AS was born. This was estimated by deriving a weighted average of maternal and paternal age, respectively, for the required years using data reported by the ABS.[28] This approach assumed that the parents of persons with AS had the same average age as all Australians when their child was born. In addition, this approach assumed that each person with AS had one biological mother and one biological father who experienced productivity impacts attributable to AS.

PALYs lost

The PALYs lost by this prevalent group of parents were estimated by comparing the PALYs lived by this group with the PALYs lived by a simulated control group. This simulated control group allowed for the estimation of a counterfactual scenario in which the parents of persons with AS did not have a child with AS and, therefore did not experience any productivity impacts attributable to AS. It was assumed that the mortality rate of persons with AS had a negligible impact on the AS attributable productivity impacts experienced by

parents. PALYs accrued beyond the first year of the modelled simulation were discounted at 5.0% per annum.[29]

The number of life years lived by the parental and simulated control groups were estimated via the construction of a Markov chain of age and sex specific life tables to simulate the progress of the parental and control groups over a 10-year period, adjusted for background mortality.[30] Each group was followed until a maximum age of 70 years. Separate life tables were constructed for 20 age and sex sub-cohorts, with age stratified into 10 five-year age groups from 20-24 years to 65-69 years. The starting age in each sub-cohort was the mid-point of that age group. The 20-69 years age range was selected to reflect the ages during which people were commonly engaged in paid employment. It was assumed that there was no mortality attributable to being the parent of a person with AS, meaning life years lived in the parental and simulated control groups were the same. As such, the difference in the PALYs lived by each group was driven by their respective productivity indices (Supplementary Table S2-3).

The productivity index of the parental group was derived by estimating this group's average workforce participation, and the level of absenteeism and presenteeism attributable to having a child with AS (Supplementary Table S2). Uncertainty in these inputs was accounted for in sensitivity analyses in which the estimated parental average workforce participation, and attributable absenteeism and presenteeism were varied by +/-20%.

The average workforce participation of the parents of persons with AS was estimated using data collected from a cohort of families of children with AS who participated in a natural history study of chromosome 15 imprinting disorders.[22] A Client Service Receipt Inventory (CSRI) and Participant Developmental and Medical Anamnesis (PDMA) questionnaire was distributed to 28 parents of persons with AS. The parents responded to the

questionnaires on behalf of themselves and their spouse/partner. A sub-set of these data were used to derive the average workforce participation of 50 individual parents of persons with AS. As such, it was estimated that average workforce participation was 97.3% for fathers and 47.4% for mothers. This approach assumed that the workforce participation reported by this small sample size was reflective of the average workforce participation of the parents of persons with AS across all age groups included in the analysis.

No studies estimating absenteeism and presenteeism attributable to being the parent of a person with AS were identified. Therefore these inputs were estimated using the results from a study of the caregiver burden attributable to Dravet syndrome (DS).[31] The overlap in the AS and DS phenotypes has been described elsewhere.[32] Campbell et al (2018) measured caregiver productivity impairment using a subset of the Work Productivity and Activity Impairment (WPAI) questionnaire; a tool which has been validated for eliciting attributable caregiver productivity loss.[18,19,31] Of parents remaining in the workforce, their mean time missed from work each week ranged from 6.9 to 7.4 hours, while their productive output at work was impacted by 39.1 to 76.9%.[31] The mid-points of each of these ranges (7.2 hours and 58.0%, respectively) were used as inputs in the analysis. This approach assumed that the parental absenteeism and presenteeism attributable to DS was a reasonable approximation of the parental absenteeism and presenteeism attributable to AS.

The productivity index of the simulated control group was derived by estimating the average workforce participation of the general population (Supplementary Table S3). This was estimated using age and sex specific ABS employment data for 2019.[33] Absenteeism and presenteeism were not estimated for the general population because *relative* absenteeism and presenteeism measures attributable to AS were applied.

Cost to society

The cost to society resulting from this lost productive output was estimated by multiplying the number of PALYs lost within each age and sex sub-cohort included in the analysis by the average gross domestic product (GDP) per full-time equivalent (FTE) worker specific to that sub-cohort.[18,34] GDP per FTE is a function of GDP per hour worked per person adjusted for the proportion of FTEs within each age and sex sub-cohort.[33,34] The hourly contributions to GDP made by parents who worked were the same as the average for all working Australians.

Results

Prevalence of persons with AS and their parents

The prevalence of AS in Australia in 2019 was estimated to range between 199 and 1,714 persons (lower to upper prevalence scenario, Figure 2). The prevalence of the parents of persons affected by AS in Australia in 2019 between the ages of 20 and 69 years was estimated to range between 153 and 1,322 persons (Table 1).

PALYs lost

The productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with AS in Australia over a 10-year period was estimated to range from 85.1 to 733.6 PALYs (fathers), 144.5 to 1,246.6 PALYs (mothers), and 229.6 to 1,980.2 PALYs (total) (Table 1, Supplementary Table S6-8). This corresponded to a loss of 25% of PALYs (fathers), 53% of PALYs (mothers) and 38% of PALYs (total) per-parent (Table 1, Supplementary Table 6). These values were discounted. It was estimated that the productivity impacts borne by the mothers of persons with AS accounted for 63.0% of this burden. As expected, the proportion of PALYs lost was greatest between the ages of 30 and 54 years (Figure 3).[33,34]

Cost to society and sensitivity analyses

This productivity burden corresponded to a societal cost of $9.3 to $80.0 million (fathers), $11.7 to $101.3 million (mothers), and $21.0 to $181.2 million (total) (Table 1, Supplementary Table S6-8). This equated to a per-parent cost of $137,105.9 (Table 1). These values were discounted.

When comparing the results of the sensitivity analyses (Supplementary Table S9-10) with the base case (including both AS prevalence scenarios), it is clear that the paternal results are most sensitive to fluctuations in the key parental productivity index inputs. This is likely due to the extremely high average paternal workforce participation estimated. In addition, variations in the presenteeism inputs resulted in significant variation in the results.

Discussion

The present study highlights the significant burden that AS imposes on parents' productivity, and the broader economy. Mothers bear the bulk of this burden, while by contrast, fathers have higher workforce participation than the average population. The latter may be reflective of a productivity burden in reverse, in which fathers are forced or encouraged to remain in fulltime employment at greater levels than they otherwise would have. This is potentially associated with mental health and quality of life impacts not captured in the present study. As expected, the socioeconomic cost of this productivity burden was greatest during parents' prime working years.

The present study fills an important gap in the literature by quantifying and monetising the productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with AS. As far as the authors are aware, no studies estimating this burden have been published previously, although some studies have qualitatively explored this topic. These studies found that the challenging behaviours which characterise AS are associated with increased parental stress

which, in turn, is associated with poor parental health.[1,15–17,35] In particular, the sleep issues experienced by persons with AS, such as insomnia; wake time after sleep onset; fragmented sleep; and variability in total sleep time, are a major cause of parental stress and are also linked with higher rates of parental insomnia and daytime drowsiness.[1,15,36]

Beyond stress and fatigue, the parents of persons with AS also experience increased worry, depression, anxiety, fear, frustration, irritability, loss of control, social isolation and feelings of being unsupported.[1] This understandably impacts parents' relationships with their spouse/partner, other children, extended family and social network.[1,15] This may also be further exacerbated by the extent to which the lives of parents and the broader family unit revolve around the needs of the person with AS.[15] However, the parental impacts of caring for a person with AS are not limited to the psychosocial, and can also extend into the physical health domain, with many parents and caregivers having experienced back and other chronic pain from lifting and/or assisting their child, as well as other injuries resulting from aggressive behaviours such as hitting, scratching and biting.[1,15] Furthermore, the impacts of caring for a person with AS extend into parents' career choices, with reports of some parents having to change jobs, change careers, decrease their work hours or leave the workforce entirely.[1,15,17] In addition, those who remain in the workforce may experience greater time off work and reduced productivity while at work, as was estimated in this study.[15]

Studies estimating the productivity burden of intellectual disability in Australia provide useful context and points of comparison.[37,38] However, these studies each addressed slightly different research questions, and hence their results are not directly comparable to those described in the present study. Arora et al (2020) sought to quantify the costs associated with intellectual disability in childhood in Australia, including costs associated with healthcare, informal care and productivity losses.[37] In doing so, Arora et al (2020) estimated that the total cost of intellectual disability in Australia was AUD$72,027 per child and $12.5

billion per year, including $142.4 and $239.3 per month due to paid and unpaid absences from work, respectively.[37] Arora et al (2020) also found that only 47% of parents reported being employed, but this burden was not included in the productivity losses estimated.[37] Similarly, Doran et al (2012) estimated the cost of intellectual disability in Australia, arriving at a value of AUD$14.7 billion per year, with the opportunity cost of lost time accounting for 85% of this cost.[38] Doran et al (2012) also found that over 70% of parents sacrifice work opportunities to accommodate their caregiving responsibilities.[38] However, the productivity losses associated with these sacrifices were not estimated.[38] By contrast, Doble et al (2020) sought to estimate the impact of genomic testing on the total socioeconomic cost of monogenic disorders resulting in intellectual disability, including caregiver productivity costs. Doble et al (2020) found that the costs associated with intellectual disability average USD$172,000 per person per year. However, the productivity costs estimated were reported as a combined result for individuals with intellectual disability and their caregivers. As such, the caregiver productivity costs estimated by Doble et al (2020) were unable to be compared to those estimated in the present study.[39] These studies indicate that, in addition to parental productivity costs, intellectual disability results in many other costs to society, families and individuals. These include costs associated with healthcare, aids and modifications, community services, specialist education and day placement services, individual productivity losses (i.e., borne by the disabled person as distinct from those borne by their parents), residential and respite care, formal and informal care, and losses of wellbeing borne by the individual as well as their parents and siblings. As such, the parental productivity burden estimated in the present study is only a fraction of the total socioeconomic burden attributable to AS.

Cost-of-illness studies are used to estimate the socioeconomic burden of a disease or disability on a population.[29] These studies can be used to raise awareness of the condition,

drive investment in therapeutic research and development, and provide critical inputs to government regulatory and reimbursement decision making.[29] As such, the present targeted cost-of-illness study could be used to inform planning regarding the supports that should be provided to persons with AS and their families.[3] This is most relevant when considering the current therapeutic pipeline for AS which will likely require significant government funding to bring these therapies to market without bankrupting families in dire need of relief.[20]

Several limitations to the present study warrant mention. First, as discussed, there was significant uncertainty regarding AS population prevalence and the parental productivity index inputs. Accordingly, results have been presented in uncertainty ranges. Regardless, the conclusion is unchanged: that the parental burden of AS is large. Secondly, the analysis only considered the parental productivity burden of AS over a 10-year period. This short time horizon was adopted to moderate the impact of the uncertainty of key data inputs. Another limitation arose from the assumption that parents who worked remained in the same jobs, and that among those who worked, their hourly contributions to GDP were the same as the average for all working Australians. This approach also assumed that the impact of other mechanisms by which parents contributed to the economy, such as through greater purchasing of healthcare goods and services, were negligible. Previous studies have found that parents of AS children have had to change careers in order to accommodate their caregiving responsibilities, while others reported that their progression in their chosen career track was stunted.[31,37] Furthermore, limitations in the granularity of data available to support the estimation of the parental productivity index meant that the parental productivity impact associated with the 'lengthy diagnostic odyssey' commonly experienced by the families of persons with AS was not to be estimated.[1] However, it is anticipated that diagnostic approaches which support reducing the time to an AS diagnosis could have a flow-on benefit of reducing a component of the parental stress associated with having a child with AS.[39]

This is the first known study to estimate the productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with AS, as well as the first study known to estimate the PALYs lost by a parental or caregiver population. This parental productivity burden must be considered when determining the reimbursement strategy for AS therapeutics. Even a small reduction in the severity of the AS phenotype is likely to meaningfully improve parents' ability to participate in the workforce. This, in turn, will generate significant flow-on benefits to parents' mental health, financial status, and relationships with their spouse/partner; other children; extended family; and social network, as well as to the broader economy. Given the magnitude of the estimated burden and the potential for alleviation through curative gene therapies for AS, continued research on the comprehensive socioeconomic burden of AS is needed.

Data availability

The datasets used and/or analysed during this study are either available to the public from various government sources or are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. All datasets relied upon have been cited, where appropriate, in the manuscript and included in the reference list.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: S.H., Formal Analysis: S.H., Investigation: S.H., Methodology: S.H., Project Administration: S.H., Supervision: D.L., Writing – Original Draft: S.H., Writing – Review & Editing: D.L., D.E.G., E.K.B., S.H.

Ethics declaration

Ethics approval for this study was obtained from the Royal Children's Hospital Human Research Ethics Committee (reference number 33066) and the Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (reference number 2021-25930-55113). All parents/caregivers provided written informed consent and participants who were deemed cognitively able also provided written informed consent for the use of their aggregated data.

Competing interests

E.K.B. and D.E.G. have received funding from the Foundation for Angelman Syndrome Therapeutics (FAST). The authors report that they have no other conflicts or competing interests relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

Abbreviations

AS; Angelman syndrome

CHEERS; Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards

CSRI; Client Service Receipt Inventory

DS; Dravet syndrome

FTE, full-time equivalent

PALY; productivity adjusted life year

PBAC; Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee

PBS; Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme

PDMA; Participant Developmental and Medical Anamnesis

WPAI; Work Productivity and Activity Impairment

References

1. Wheeler AC, Sacco P, Cabo R. Unmet clinical needs and burden in Angelman syndrome: a review of the literature. *Orphanet J Rare Dis*. 2017;12(1):164. doi:10.1186/s13023-017-0716-z
2. Khan N, Cabo R, Tan W-H, Tayag R, Bird LM. An observational study of pediatric healthcare burden in Angelman syndrome: results from a real-world study. *Orphanet J Rare Dis*. 2019;14(1):239. doi:10.1186/s13023-019-1210-6
3. Khan N, Cabo R, Tan W, Tayag R, Bird LM. Healthcare burden among individuals with Angelman syndrome: Findings from the Angelman Syndrome Natural History Study. *Mol Genet Genomic Med*. 2019;7(7):1-8. doi:10.1002/mgg3.734
4. Jørgensen IF, Russo F, Jensen AB, et al. Comorbidity landscape of the Danish patient population affected by chromosome abnormalities. *Genet Med*. 2019;21(11):2485-

2495. doi:10.1038/s41436-019-0519-9

5. Thomson AK, Glasson EJ, Bittles AH. A long-term population-based clinical and morbidity profile of Angelman syndrome in Western Australia: 1953–2003. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2006;28(5):299-305. doi:10.1080/09638280500190631

6. Õiglane-Shlik E, Talvik T, Žordania R, et al. Prevalence of Angelman syndrome and Prader–Willi syndrome in Estonian children: Sister syndromes not equally represented. *Am J Med Genet Part A*. 2006;140A(18):1936-1943. doi:10.1002/ajmg.a.31423

7. Tones M, Cross M, Simons C, et al. Research protocol: The initiation, design and establishment of the Global Angelman Syndrome Registry. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2018;62(5):431-443. doi:10.1111/jir.12482

8. Buntinx IM, Hennekam RCM, Brouwer OF, et al. Clinical profile of Angelman syndrome at different ages. *Am J Med Genet*. 1995;56(2):176-183. doi:10.1002/ajmg.1320560213

9. Petersen MB, Brøndum-Nielsen K, Hansen LK, Wulff K. Clinical, cytogenetic, and molecular diagnosis of Angelman syndrome: Estimated prevalence rate in a Danish county. *Am J Med Genet*. 1995;60(3):261-262. doi:10.1002/ajmg.1320600317

10. Luk HM, Lo IFM. Angelman syndrome in Hong Kong Chinese: A 20 years' experience. *Eur J Med Genet*. 2016;59(6-7):315-319. doi:10.1016/j.ejmg.2016.05.003

11. Domínguez-Berjón MF, Zoni AC, Esteban-Vasallo MD, Sendra-Gutiérrez JM, Astray-Mochales J. Main causes of hospitalization in people with Angelman syndrome. *J Appl Res Intellect Disabil*. 2018;31(3):466-469. doi:10.1111/jar.12411

12. Griffith GM, Hastings RP, Oliver C, et al. Psychological well-being in parents of children with Angelman, Cornelia de Lange and Cri du Chat syndromes. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2011;55(4):397-410. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01386.x

13. Wulffaert J, Scholte EM, Van Berckelaer-Onnes IA. Maternal parenting stress in

families with a child with Angelman syndrome or Prader–Willi syndrome. *J Intellect Dev Disabil*. 2010;35(3):165-174. doi:10.3109/13668250.2010.499101

14. van den Borne HW, van Hooren RH, van Gestel M, Rienmeijer P, Fryns JP, Curfs LMG. Psychosocial problems, coping strategies, and the need for information of parents of children with Prader–Willi syndrome and Angelman syndrome. *Patient Educ Couns*. 1999;38(3):205-216. doi:10.1016/S0738-3991(99)00004-X

15. Grieco JC, Romero B, Flood E, Cabo R, Visootsak J. A Conceptual Model of Angelman Syndrome and Review of Relevant Clinical Outcomes Assessments (COAs). *Patient - Patient-Centered Outcomes Res*. 2019;12(1):97-112. doi:10.1007/s40271-018-0323-7

16. Thomson A, Glasson E, Roberts P, Bittles A. "Over time it just becomes easier…": parents of people with Angelman syndrome and Prader–Willi syndrome speak about their carer role. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2017;39(8):763-770. doi:10.3109/09638288.2016.1161838

17. Willgoss T, Cassater D, Connor S, et al. Measuring What Matters to Individuals with Angelman Syndrome and Their Families: Development of a Patient-Centered Disease Concept Model. *Child Psychiatry Hum Dev*. September 2020. doi:10.1007/s10578-020-01051-z

18. Ademi Z, Ackerman IN, Zomer E, Liew D. Productivity-Adjusted Life-Years: A New Metric for Quantifying Disease Burden. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2021;39(3):271-273. doi:10.1007/s40273-020-00999-z

19. Giovannetti ER, Wolff JL, Frick KD, Boult C. Construct Validity of the Work Productivity and Activity Impairment Questionnaire across Informal Caregivers of Chronically Ill Older Patients. *Value Heal*. 2009;12(6):1011-1017. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2009.00542.x

20. Research - FAST (Foundation For Angelman Syndrome Therapeutics). https://cureangelman.org/research. Accessed April 17, 2021.

21. Salzman R, Cook F, Hunt T, et al. Addressing the Value of Gene Therapy and Enhancing Patient Access to Transformative Treatments. *Mol Ther*. 2018;26(12):2717-2726. doi:10.1016/j.ymthe.2018.10.017

22. Baker EK, Godler DE, Bui M, et al. Exploring autism symptoms in an Australian cohort of patients with Prader-Willi and Angelman syndromes. *J Neurodev Disord*. 2018;10(1):24. doi:10.1186/s11689-018-9242-0

23. Husereau D, Drummond M, Petrou S, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement. *Eur J Heal Econ*. 2013;14(3):367-372. doi:10.1007/s10198-013-0471-6

24. National, state and territory population, June 2020 | Australian Bureau of Statistics. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/national-state-and-territory-population/jun-2020#data-download. Accessed March 13, 2021.

25. Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia: Summary of Findings, 2018 | Australian Bureau of Statistics. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/disability/disability-ageing-and-carers-australia-summary-findings/latest-release#data-download. Accessed March 13, 2021.

26. Coppus AMW. People with intellectual disability: What do we know about adulthood and life expectancy? *Dev Disabil Res Rev*. 2013;18(1):6-16. doi:10.1002/ddrr.1123

27. Dagli A, Buiting K, Williams CA. Molecular and Clinical Aspects of Angelman Syndrome. *Mol Syndromol*. 2011;2(3-5):100-112. doi:10.1159/000328837

28. Births, Australia, 2019 | Australian Bureau of Statistics. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/births-australia/latest-release#data-download. Accessed March 20, 2021.

29. Larg A, Moss JR. Cost-of-Illness Studies. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2011;29(8):653-671. doi:10.2165/11588380-000000000-00000

30. Deaths, Australia, 2019 | Australian Bureau of Statistics. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/deaths-australia/latest-release. Accessed March 27, 2021.

31. Campbell JD, Whittington MD, Kim CH, VanderVeen GR, Knupp KG, Gammaitoni A. Assessing the impact of caring for a child with Dravet syndrome: Results of a caregiver survey. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2018;80:152-156. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2018.01.003

32. Willemsen MH, Rensen JHM, van Schrojenstein-Lantman de Valk HMJ, Hamel BCJ, Kleefstra T. Adult Phenotypes in Angelman- and Rett-Like Syndromes. *Mol Syndromol*. 2012. doi:10.1159/000335661

33. Characteristics of Employment, Australia, August 2020 | Australian Bureau of Statistics. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/labour/earnings-and-work-hours/characteristics-employment-australia/latest-release. Accessed April 10, 2021.

34. Australian National Accounts: National Income, Expenditure and Product, December 2020 | Australian Bureau of Statistics. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/economy/national-accounts/australian-national-accounts-national-income-expenditure-and-product/latest-release#data-download. Accessed May 15, 2021.

35. Miodrag N, Peters S. Parent stress across molecular subtypes of children with Angelman syndrome. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2015;59(9):816-826. doi:10.1111/jir.12195

36. Goldman SE, Bichell TJ, Surdyka K, Malow BA. Sleep in children and adolescents with Angelman syndrome: association with parent sleep and stress. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2012;56(6):600-608. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01499.x

37. Arora S, Goodall S, Viney R, Einfeld S. Societal cost of childhood intellectual disability in Australia. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2020;64(7):524-537. doi:10.1111/jir.12732

38. Doran CM, Einfeld SL, Madden RH, et al. How much does intellectual disability really cost? First estimates for Australia. *J Intellect Dev Disabil*. 2012;37(1):42-49. doi:10.3109/13668250.2011.648609

39. Doble B, Schofield D, Evans C-A, et al. Impacts of genomics on the health and social costs of intellectual disability. *J Med Genet*. 2020;57(7):479-486. doi:10.1136/jmedgenet-2019-106445

Tables

Table 1. The prevalence and productivity burden borne by the parents of persons with AS in Australia over a 10-year period

Age group	Parental prevalence			PALYs lost			Cost to society		
	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Fathers	Mothers	Total
Upper prevalence scenario									
20–24	-	-	-	-	-	-	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
25–29	-	-	-	-	-	-	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
30–34	13.43	26.86	40.29	14.16	30.59	44.75	$1,843,244.83	$3,186,897.74	$5,030,142.57
35–39	54.90	93.61	148.51	66.06	120.16	186.21	$7,595,519.50	$10,281,641.45	$17,877,160.95
40–44	86.89	86.89	173.78	187.56	246.71	434.27	$22,923,739.88	$21,966,871.95	$44,890,611.83
45–49	102.77	84.39	187.16	168.49	240.73	409.22	$15,803,646.86	$19,418,930.35	$35,222,577.21
50–54	84.39	99.71	184.10	223.78	281.55	505.33	$22,473,126.28	$25,018,273.55	$47,491,399.83
55–59	95.02	91.90	186.92	126.87	217.75	344.62	$10,286,907.33	$15,670,147.61	$25,957,054.94
60–64	91.90	102.30	194.20	33.07	117.78	150.85	$2,004,133.62	$5,936,670.04	$7,940,803.66

Age group	Parental prevalence			PALYs lost			Cost to society		
	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Fathers	Mothers	Total
65–69	93.92	112.70	206.62	(86.38)	(8.65)	(95.03)	($3,000,476.28)	($212,300.17)	($3,212,776.45)
All ages	623.22	698.36	1,321.58	733.60	1,246.62	1,980.22	$79,929,842.02	$101,267,132.52	$181,196,974.54
Per parent	-	-	-	1.18	1.79	1.50	$128,252.16	$145,007.16	$137,105.94
Lower prevalence scenario									
20–24	-	-	-	-	-	-	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
25–29	-	-	-	-	-	-	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
30–34	1.56	3.11	4.67	1.64	3.55	5.19	$213,709.55	$369,495.39	$583,204.94
35–39	6.37	10.85	17.22	7.66	13.93	21.59	$880,639.94	$1,192,074.37	$2,072,714.31
40–44	10.07	10.07	20.15	21.75	28.60	50.35	$2,657,824.91	$2,546,883.70	$5,204,708.62
45–49	11.92	9.78	21.70	19.54	27.91	47.45	$1,832,306.88	$2,251,470.19	$4,083,777.07
50–54	9.78	11.56	21.35	25.95	32.64	58.59	$2,605,579.86	$2,900,669.40	$5,506,249.26
55–59	11.02	10.65	21.67	14.71	25.25	39.96	$1,192,684.91	$1,816,828.71	$3,009,513.62

Age group	Parental prevalence			PALYs lost			Cost to society		
	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Fathers	Mothers	Total
60–64	10.65	11.86	22.52	3.83	13.66	17.49	$232,363.32	$688,309.57	$920,672.89
65–69	10.89	13.07	23.96	(10.02)	(1.00)	(11.02)	($347,881.31)	($24,614.51)	($372,495.82)
All ages	72.26	80.97	153.23	85.06	144.54	229.59	$9,267,228.06	$11,741,116.81	$21,008,344.87
Per parent	-	-	-	1.18	1.79	1.50	$128,252.16	$145,007.16	$137,105.94

Note: A negative productivity loss was estimated for the 65-to-69-year age group due to the lack of age specific parental productivity indices, resulting in the parental population accruing greater PALYs in this age group than the control population.

Figures



Figure 1. Structure of the cost-of-illness model developed to estimate the productivity burden borne by the parents of persons over a 10-year period in Australia

*Productivity altered due to caring for persons with AS

#Productivity of the aged and sex matched, general Australian population



Figure 2. Distribution of the number of people with AS in Australia by age and sex (A) lower prevalence scenario (B) upper prevalence scenario



Figure 3. The proportion of PALYs lost by the parents of persons with AS in Australia over a 10-year period by age and sex

Note: A negative productivity loss was estimated for the 65-to-69-year age group due to the lack of age specific parental productivity indices, resulting in the parental population accruing greater PALYs in this age group than the control population.

Additional information

Supplementary information.