Report – Cost and Clinical Utility of WES and WGS in pediatric patients with suspected genetic disease

May 12, 2022

By: Michael P. Douglas, University of California San Francisco (UCSF) Center for Translational and Policy Research on Precision Medicine (TRANSPERS); Patricia A. Deverka, UCSF TRANSPERS (formerly)

Additional contributors: Bruce Gelb, Icahn School of Medicine; Bart Ferket, Icahn School of Medicine; Kristen Hassmiller Lich, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill; Hadley Stevens Smith, Baylor College of Medicine; Mary Norton, UCSF; Jonathan Berg, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill; Anne Slavotinek, UCSF; Lucia Hindorff, National Human Genome Research Institute; Kathryn Phillips, UCSF.

Abstract

Payer coverage for Exome Sequencing (ES) is becoming commonplace (albeit in some cases with prior authorization restrictions), coverage for Genome Sequencing (GS) is rare, with most payers considering it as investigational and not medically necessary. Previous studies had identified several concerns and challenges from the payer perspective. **The objective of this study is to conduct a targeted literature review of the evidence describing the cost and clinical utility of GS and ES compared to standard of care (SoC) testing in children ≤18 years with suspected genetic disease.**

We conducted a systematic literature review to identify evidence for cost, diagnostic utility and clinical utility between SoC, ES, and GS in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic diseases. We also identified list prices for individual tests from Concert Genetics. Descriptive analyses were conducted for cost and comparative effectiveness data.

We identified five studies on costs of ES and GS, as well as data from concert genetics, and 62 studies of comparative effectiveness of GS or ES in pediatric patients <18 yrs. with suspected genetic disease. We identified 2 reviews/systematic literature review, one cost savings, one micro-costing, and one cost-effectiveness analysis, in addition to the list prices from Concert Genetics which support the range of costs in the articles. List prices ranged from an average of $2264 (small panel) to $7245 for a rapid ES trio. Nearly half the studies (28/63; 44%) only reported diagnostic yield, and 18 studies with NICU/PICU patients and 18 studies of outpatients that reported a change in management. The change in management was very heterogeneous ranging from 24% to 83% depending on the patients' suspected disorder and test type (e.g., rapid GS, rapid ES, GS). We were unable to determine if any of the GS test types (ultra-rapid GS or rapid GS or GS, range 24% - 83%) provided a greater change in clinical management rate than the ES test types (rapid ES or ES, range 35% - 83%).

There is limited evidence of GS over ES in the ability to effect change in management. Available evidence suggests that rapid over standard GS or ES is of greater benefit in the NICU/PICU setting vs. outpatient setting. Future clinical studies must include both diagnostic yield and clinical management outcomes in order to provide stakeholders with the necessary evidence to support decision-making on implementation and coverage.

Introduction

While payer coverage for Exome Sequencing (ES) is becoming commonplace (albeit in some cases with prior authorization restrictions), coverage for Genome Sequencing (GS) is rare, with most payers considering it as investigational and not medically necessary. We identified the main concerns and challenges to coverage of GS vs. ES from the payer perspective in two previous studies. [Trosman 2019, Phillips 2020] These studies identified 5 concerns and challenges: 1. lab quality concerns, 2. more variants of unknown significances (VUS) with GS than ES, 3. need for provider education to avoid misuse of ES and GS, 4. costs of GS are higher than ES and both tests cost more than multi-gene panels, and 5. lack of clinical utility data to justify use of GS vs. ES. This report will focus on costs and evidence of clinical utility as these are both necessary for evaluation of test value.

Our report excludes three of the concerns or challenges. First, the concern for lab quality which is primarily addressed in evidence of analytic validity. This concern, while relevant for GS and ES, is also relevant for all Next Generation Sequencing (NGS)-based testing. This concern is directly addressed via the FDA approval process of sequencing machines (e.g., Illumina has approval for their MiSeqDx Sequencer) [Collins, 2013] or through the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) which regulates all laboratory testing performed on humans. [CMS CLIA website - https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Legislation/CLIA] Furthermore, any Next Generation Sequencing (NGS)-identified variant of concern should undergo verification using Sanger Sequencing prior to use in clinical decision making. Second, the concern of more VUS with GS than ES is a false assumption in clinical sequencing. While GS generates more sequence data than ES, the VUS outside of the exome have impact in the protein synthesis. VUS are more likely to be identified in non-European Caucasian populations such as African or Asian due to limited or lack of data. Third, the concern for the need of provider education to avoid misuse of GS vs. ES, while valid, also applies to all types of NGS-based testing and laboratory testing. This concern can be addressed by training physicians, the use of prior authorization, and/or the requirement for tests to be ordered by a genetic specialist(s) within the payers' medical policy.

The objective of this study is to conduct a targeted literature review of the evidence describing the cost and clinical utility of GS and ES compared to standard of care testing in children ≤18 years with suspected genetic disease. The concern payers have for the cost of GS vs. ES or other tests (e.g., NGS panels, chromosomal micro-array [CMA]) is valid with GS costing approximately 2x the cost of ES. The main concern with the economic value of GS vs. ES is how this is perceived. Grosse (GIM 2021) describes the varying ways of interpreting cost vs. price and how they differ. Furthermore, they describe how these impact cost-effectiveness analyses, which are also dependent on the clinical context and payer setting. The main concern is evidence of clinical utility of GS and ES. Previous studies, a systematic literature review by Stevens Smith et al (2019), and a meta-analysis by Clark (2018) describe the clinical utility of GS and ES, with both concluding there is limited/no evidence that GS is superior at diagnosis or effecting a change in management or improved clinical outcomes in patients with suspected genetic disorders. In many cases, the definition of clinical utility is different by stakeholder. For example, a patient (or parents of a patient) may find value in the diagnosis of condition even if there is not the ability to change the clinical management or outcome (e.g., morbidity or mortality). A physician may find similar value as they no longer have to attempt to provide a diagnosis to the parents (e.g., ending the diagnostic odyssey), while a payer may not consider this an appropriate endpoint to warrant paying for GS above ES, NGS panels, or CMA. The definition most payers use for clinical utility is the change clinical management that results in a change in health outcome (e.g., decreased morbidity or mortality). In this report, we focus on the comparative effectiveness of clinical utility for diagnostic yield, change in clinical management and change in health outcomes with the use of GS and ES to diagnose children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease in both the inpatient (NICU/PICU) and outpatient settings.

Methods

Our objective was to identify evidence to answer the following research questions:

- What are the costs of ES compared to SoC testing (CMA, panels) in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease?

- What are the costs of GS compared to SoC testing (ES + CMA) in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease?
- What is the diagnostic utility of ES compared to SoC testing (CMA, panels) in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease?
- What is the clinical utility of GS compared to SoC testing (CMA, panels) in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease?
- What is the diagnostic utility of ES compared to GS in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease?
- What is the clinical utility of ES compared to GS in children (0-18 years) with suspected genetic disease?

We conducted a literature review to identify original research articles pertaining to the costs of GS and ES, and comparative effectiveness of the diagnostic yield and clinical utility of GS and ES. We also searched the Concert Genetics website for list prices of ES and GS in the US. We formulated search strategies (MD/PD) and reviewed these with an experienced methodologist (Jennifer Malinowski, ACMG) (Supplemental Table 1: Search Strategies of Cost Studies and Supplemental Table 2: Search Strategies of Comparative Effectiveness Studies).

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

- Cost Studies: ES or GS in pediatric setting with results reported in USD.
- Comparative Effectiveness Studies: ES or GS (alone or as a comparison to each other, NGS panel, or SOC) in pediatric setting.
- Limits: Humans, English

Article Selection

Articles were selected for inclusion in the following manner: One author (MD) screened the titles/abstracts followed by a team of authors that reviewed the full text of the articles (Cost articles – MD/PD; Comparative Effectiveness articles – MN/MD). Additional articles were included using snowball method of reviewing references of included articles.

Data Abstraction

Teams of authors (MD, PD, MN) abstracted the key variables from included articles. One author (MD) conducted searches and compiled cost data from the Concert Genetics website (www.concertgenetics.com) for GS, ES, NGS Panels, and CMA list prices.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analyses were conducted for cost and comparative effectiveness data.

Results

We identified five studies on costs of ES and GS, as well as data from concert genetics, and 62 studies of comparative effectiveness of GS or ES in pediatric patients ≤18 yrs. with suspected genetic disease.

Cost

We identified 2 reviews/systematic literature review, one cost savings, one micro-costing, and one cost-effectiveness analysis, in addition to the list prices from Concert Genetics which support the range of costs in the articles identified (Table 1). The articles reported costs in a variety of manners:

- list price from one lab (UT Austin) (Chrystoja, 2014)
- prices from three labs (not defined) (Sabatini, 2018)
- price from one lab (Iowa Institute of Human Genetics) (Joshi, 2016)
- costs reported in literature (not defined) (Schwarze, 2018)
- CMS reimbursement rates (Lavelle, 2022)

- List prices from Concert Genetics (this study)

TABLE 1: Cost, and List Price of Rapid & Standard GS and ES (singleton and trio), CMA, and panels

Reference (article type)	Rapid GS		Rapid ES		GS		ES		CMA	Panels
	Single	Trio	Single	Trio	Single	Trio	Single	Trio		
Chrystoja 2014 (Review article)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$6500 (UT Austin list price)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Joshi 2016 (Cost Savings)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$6100	$1110	Epilepsy Panel $1500 - $6000 (proband only)
Sabatini 2016 (Micro-costing)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$2428 to $3388	N/A	N/A	X-linked Panel $914; Hearing Loss Panel $1048 – 1949); Clinical Exome Panel (~500 genes) $1499
Schwarze 2018 (SLR)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$1,906 to $24,810	N/A	$555 to $5,169	$3,825 to $9,304	N/A	N/A
Lavelle 2022 (CEA)	N/A	$12,000 ($9,000-$15,000)	N/A	$10,320 ($6,720-$13,920)	N/A	$10,450 ($7,008-$14,304)	N/A	$8,112 ($6,720-$10,560)	$2154 [2]	N/A
List Price[1]	N/A	N/A	$3926.67 ($1490 - $8000, SD $3550.22)	$7245 ($2890 - $11600, SD $6158.90)	$4381 ($2490 - $7395, SD $2022.21)	$6145 ($4990 - $7300, SD $1633.42)	$3113.50 ($1095 - $5600, SD $1595.90)	$4230 ($1500 – $8000, SD $2350.35)	$1565 ($350 - $2184, SD $485)	$2264 ($1595 - $3000, SD $529)

[1] List Prices found on Concert Genetics website were averaged for each type of test. The minimum and maximum are in parentheses with standard deviation.
[2] Genetic testing performed on patients with suspected genetic conditions prior to diagnosis
Abbreviations: N/A = not available

The cost of sequencing is as expected with GS being more expensive than ES which is more expensive than CMA which is similar in price to NGS panels. The cost of GS and ES trios (singleton and 2 parents) is approximately 1.5 times the cost of their respective singleton (proband). The range of prices for a particular test (e.g., GS) varies widely, most likely due to how costs were measured in specific institutions.

Comparative Effectiveness

We included 63 studies on the comparative effectiveness of GS or ES in pediatric patients with suspected genetic disorders (see Supplemental Figure 1: PRISMA Diagram of Comparative Effectiveness Studies). Some studies included testing conducted in both inpatient and outpatient settings, so the total number of tests studied = 65 (see Table 1). ES in

the outpatient setting was the most frequently studied test (41/65), with GS only evaluated as an outpatient test in 6/65. Rapid GS and ES are primarily evaluated in the inpatient (NICU/PICU) setting.

Table 2 – Total Studies by Setting (N = 63 studies, 65 test types)

	Ultra-rapid GS	Rapid GS	Rapid ES	GS	ES
Inpatient	1	10	5	1	1
Outpatient				6	41

NOTES:
*Soden is reported twice – once as rapid GS in NICU and once as ES in outpatient
**Meng is reported twice – once as rapid ES in NICU/PICU and once as ES in outpatient

Diagnostic Yield

Nearly half the studies (28/63; 44%) only reported diagnostic yield and did not address the outcome of the test(s) ability to effect change in management or clinical benefits/harms (See Table 3). All of these studies evaluated outpatient testing and vast majority (24/28) evaluated only ES. There was broad geographic representation in these studies with 43% coming from the US, and others from Canada, The Netherlands, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Spain, China, Japan, and Taiwan. The sample size varied between studies with the majority of studies less than 1000 patients with heterogenous comparators (previous genetic and non-genetic testing, CMA, panel) and heterogenous methods for identifying study population. There was a consistent finding that ES proband had higher diagnostic yields than standard of care testing, but depends on the pre-test likelihood of genetic disease, with ES trios having a similar range of diagnostic yields as ES of proband. There were too few studies to conclude if GS has higher diagnostic yield than ES + CMA or other previous genetic and non-genetic testing.

TABLE 3. Studies that only reported Diagnostic Yield (n=28). Shading represents grouping by sequencing test type.

Lastname, year	Site	Setting	Population	Sequencing Test	Comparator	Diagnostic Yield	Change in Clinical Management
Lionel et al, 2017	Canada	Outpatient	Pediatric patients with phenotype suggestive of genetic disorder	GS (PROBAND, TRIO)	standard genetic testing	41% (42/103), 24% (25/103) standard	not reported
Liu et al, 2019	China	Outpatient	Patients with 16 distinct rare diseases	GS (PROBAND)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	79 individuals from 16 independent families were performed for whole-genome sequencing (WGS) in an effort to identify the causative mutations for 16 distinct rare diseases. disease-causing variants were identified in 10 of the 16 investigated diseases, yielding a diagnostic rate of 62.5%.	not reported
Alfares et al, 2018	Saudi Arabia	Outpatient	Patients with negative array comparative genomic hybridization and negative or inconclusive WES results before WGS was performed	GS (PROBAND)	CMA, ES	9% (10/108), decreased after reanalysis to 7% (7/108)	not reported
Bowling et al, 2017	United States	Outpatient	Children with developmental delay or intellectual disability	ES, GS (TRIOS, DUO, PROBAND)	not reported	Total: 27% (100/371) (27); Trio: 29% (90/309), Duo: 19% (8/42), Proband: 15% (3/20)	not reported
Farwell et al, 2015	United States	Outpatient	Patients suspected genetic diseases	ES (PROBAND, TRIO)	single and trio	21% (14/68, singleton), 37% (82/220, trio)	not reported
Lee et al, 2014	United States	Outpatient	Patients with suspected genetic conditions	ES (PROBAND, TRIO)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	TOTAL 26%(213/814); Trio: 31% (127/410), Singleton 22% (74/338)	not reported
Charng et al, 2016	SA	Outpatient	Patients from families with brain malformation and/or developmental delay/intellectual disability.	ES (PROBAND, TRIOS)	not reported	55% (17/31)	not reported
Monies et al, 2017	SA	Outpatient	Patients with suspected Mendelian phenotypes	ES (PROBAND, TRIO)	panels	TOTAL 43% (149/347)	not reported
Retterer et al, 2016	United States	Outpatient	Patients with many different clinical indications suspected genetic disorders	ES (PROBAND, TRIO)	not reported	21% (69/332, singleton), 31% (521/1686, trio)	not reported

Helbig et al, 2016	United States	Outpatient	Patients with Epilepsy	ES (TRIOS, PROBAND)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	TOTAL: 28% (322/1131); Epilepsy: 33% (105/314); non-epilepsy: 26% (212/817);	not reported
Jianling et al, 2019	United States	Outpatient	patients with suspected genetic disorders	ES (TRIOS)	ES (single, duo, quad)	28% (OF 40, singleton), 41% (of 66, duo, trio, quad)	not reported in total
DDD, 2015	United Kingdom	Outpatient	Children undiagnosed developmental disorders	ES (TRIOS)	CMA	28% (317/1133)	not reported
Wright, 2015	United Kingdom	Outpatient	Children undiagnosed developmental disorders	ES (TRIOS)	CMA	27% (306/1133)	not reported
Eldomery et al, 2017	United States	Outpatient	Children who received clinical WES and for whom a molecular diagnosis was not achieved at the time of initial reporting	ES (TRIOS)	not reported	48% (30/63)	not reported
Trujillano et al, 2017	Mixed	Outpatient	Patients with suspected Mendelian disorder	ES (TRIOS)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	31% (307/1000)	not reported
Vissers et al, 2017	Netherlands	Outpatient	Patients with neurological symptoms with suspected genetic etiology	ES (TRIOS)	standard genetic testing	29% (44/150); standard 7% (11/150)	not reported
Zhu et al, 2015	United States	Outpatient	Patients with suspected genetic disorders	ES (TRIOS)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	24% (29/119)	not reported
Yang et al, 2013	United States	Outpatient	Pediatric Patients with suspected genetic disorders	ES (PROBAND)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	25% (62/250)	not reported
Yang et al, 2014	United States	Outpatient	Pediatric Patients with suspected genetic disorders	ES (PROBAND)	not reported	25% (504/2000)	not reported
Need et al, 2012	United States	Outpatient	Patients with unexplained and suspected genetic conditions	ES (PROBAND)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	50% (6/12)	not reported
Rump et al, 2016	Netherlands	Outpatient	Patients with intellectual disability and microcephaly	ES (PROBAND)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	29% (11/38)	not reported

Wortman et al, 2015	Netherlands	Outpatient	Patients with suspected mitochondrial disease	ES (PROBAND)	panel	TOTAL 39% (42/109); 50% (21/42) virtual panel; ES 67% (28/42)	not reported
Yavarna et al, 2015	Qatar	Outpatient	Patients with suspected Mendelian Disease, Neurocognitive	ES (PROBAND)	previous genetic and non-genetic testing	60% (89/149)	not reported
Prasad et al, 2018	United States	Outpatient	Patients where homozygosity was detected by CMA with neurodevelopmental conditions	ES (PROBAND)	CMA	11.3% (6/53)	not reported in total
Arteche-Lopez et al, 2021	Spain	Outpatient	Patients with clinical suspicion of autism spectrum disorder	ES (PROBAND)	targeted genetic test, CMA	TOTAL 13%(44/343); 15% (33/225) ES	not reported
Jiao et al, 2019	China	Outpatient	pediatric patients with neurodevelopmental disorders	ES (PROBAND)	ES and CNVseq	36.6% (63/172)	not reported in total
Yokoi et al, 2020	Japan	Outpatient	Pediatric patients with multiple congenital anomalies and/or intellectual disability	ES (PROBAND)	CMA	No obvious difference in the diagnostic rate between the two methods; however, clinical exome sequencing was superior in terms of cost and time.	not reported
hen et al, 2021 C	Taiwan	Outpatient	Children with intellectual disability	ES (PROBAND)	CMA	In 61 children, we identified 13 copy number variants in 12 probands and 24 variants in 25 probands, and the total diagnostic rate was 60.7%.	not reported

Clinical Utility

From our search we identified 18 studies with NICU/PICU patients and 18 studies of outpatients that reported a change in management. In an effort to not duplicate the previous work of others (Stevens Smith, Clark), we report only the results from studies that are newer than these articles or that were not included in these articles. These include 13 studies in the NICU/PICU and five in the outpatient settings. The full set of all articles identified are in SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 3 - ALL NICU-PICU Change in Management Studies (N=18), and SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 4 - ALL Outpatient Change in Management Studies (N = 18).

NICU/PICU setting

The majority (11/13) of studies reported the diagnostic yield and change in clinical management utilizing rapid GS or rapid ES, and one study each for GS and ES (See Table 4). One study reported on ultrarapid GS. All but four studies had less than 100 patients in total. The change in management was very heterogeneous ranging from 24% to 83% depending on the patients' suspected disorder and test type (e.g., rapid GS, rapid ES, GS). We were unable to determine if any of the GS test types (ultra rapid GS or rapid GS or GS, range 24% - 83%) provided a greater change in clinical management rate than the ES test types (rapid ES or ES, range 35% - 83%).

Table 4: New studies of NICU/PICU (inpatient) setting reporting diagnostic yield and change in management (n = 13). Shading represents grouping by sequencing test type.

Lastname, Year	Site	Population	Sequencing Test	Comparator or pre-post testing	Diagnostic Yield	Change in Clinical Management	How Change in Clinical Management was defined and documented***
Kingsmore et al 2019	United States	Acutely Ill infants with suspected genetic disorders	Rapid ES (TRIOS) Rapid GS (TRIOS) Ultra Rapid GS (trios)	Not reported	20% (19/95) rapid ES 19% (18/94) rapid GS 46% (11/24) ultra Rapid GS	Reported in Dimmock et al., 2020	Reported in Dimmock et al., 2020
Dimmock et al, 2020	United States	Infants in NICU/PICU with diseases of unknown etiology	rapidGS (TRIOS)	rapidES	21% (20/95) rapid ES 21% (20/94) rapid GS 46% (11/24) ultra Rapid GS	TOTAL: 28% (57/207); 63% (15/24) urWGS	Change in surgeries 24 Change in medication 23 Dietary changes 9 Other changes 14 B: Reported by physician
Dimmock et al, 2021	United States	Acutely ill Medi-Cal beneficiaries without a clear non-genetic etiology	rGS	undiagnosed (does not describe any previous tests)	40% (74/184)	32% (58/184)	Changes in surgeries (24), changes in medication (23), dietary changes (9), other care (14), transplantation (0) B. Reported by physician
Wu et al, 2021	China	Critically ill Infants with CNS anomaly, complex congenital heart disease, evidence of metabolic disease, recurrent severe infection, suspected immune deficiency, or multiple malformations	rapidGS (TRIOS)	WES single	36.6% (WGS TRIO); 20.3% (WES SINGLE)	70% (52/74)	16 (21.6%) change in management (detailed in supplemental table); 24 infants (32.4%) were referred to a new subspecialist; 12 (17%) mortality B: Reported by physician
Mestek-Boukhibar et al, 2018	United Kingdom	Critically ill children in PICU	rGS (TRIOS)	Previous genetic and non-genetic tests**	42% (10/24)	30% (3/10)	Not reported D: Undefined/not specified
Sanford et al, 2019	United States	Children in PICU that did not have an etiologic diagnosis	rGS (TRIOS, DUOS, SINGLETON)	Previous genetic and non-genetic tests**	45% (17/38 rGS)	24% (4/17 ICU changes) 65% (11/17 non-ICU changes)	ICU changes only (1), ICU and non-ICU changes (3), non-ICU changes (9), family intervention only (2) B: Reported by physician
Van Dieman et al, 2017	Netherlands	Crittically ill Children in NICU or PICU with	rGS (TRIOS)	Previous genetic and	30% (7/23 rGS)	71% (5/7)	Withdraw of care (5), Family planning - future children (2),

		suspected genetic disorders		non-genetic tests			presymptomatic testing (1), preimplantation testing (1), preconception planning (1) D: Undefined/not specified
French et al, 2019	United Kingdom	NICU/PICU patients with possible single gene disorder	GS (TRIOS)	undiagnosed (does not describe any previous tests)	21% (40/195; GS trios); 13% (14/106) NICU; 25% (15/61) PICU	65% PICU 83% NICU	Informed existing specialist care (35%, 14), Initiated new specialist care (48%, 19), Modification of treatment (13%, 5), Significant recurrence risk (35%, 14), Diagnosis explained death (13%, 5), Supportive/Palliative care (18%, 7) D: Undefined/not specified
Gubbels et al, 2020	United States	ICU babies with hypotonia, seizures, metabolic, or multiple congenital anomalies	rES (TRIOS)	Previous genetic and non-genetic tests**	58% (29/50: rES)	83% (24/29)	Referral to specialist (20), new therapeutic options (4), palliative care (9), earlier transition to supportive care (3), identification of at-risk family members (8), reproductive implications (17) A: EHR review and B: Reported by physician
Wang et al, 2020	China	NICU & PICU patients with complicated clinical features	rES (TRIOS)		48% (62/130 rES trios)	48.4% (30/62)	Dietary or medicinal treatment (17), transplantation (13), Symptomatic treatment and rehabilitation (20), give up medical support (8), palliative care (4) D: Undefined/not specified
Carey et al, 2020	United States	PICU pediatric patients with new-onset metabolic/neurologic disease	rES (TRIOS)	undiagnosed (does not describe any previous tests)	50% (5/10 rES)	60% (3/5)	Clinically actionable (3) D: Undefined/not specified
Stark et al, 2018	Australia	acutely ill pediatric patients with suspected monogenic diseases	rES (Proband)	Previous genetic and non-genetic tests**	53% (21/40; rES)	35% (14/40)	Medication started/adjusted (4), Medication stopped (1), Surveillance initiated (7), Surveillance stopied (0), Avoidance of tissue biopsy (3), redirection to palliative care (2) B: Reported by physician

Elliot et al, 2019	Canada	NICU neonates with suspected genetic disorders	ES (TRIOS)	panels, CMA	60% (15/25; ES trios); 72% (18/25; ES, panel or CMA)	83% (15/18)	Comfort care, additional testing, consultations, therapy changes A: EHR review and B: Reported by physician

NOTES:

Study Types: Randomized Control Trials (Dimmock et al 2020, Kingsmore et al 2019, and Petrikin et al, 2018); all others are case series

*Previous genetic tests - studies reported various genetic tests (e.g., single gene tests, small panels, CMA)

**Previous genetic and non-genetic tests – studies reported various genetic tests (e.g., single gene tests, small panels, CMA) and non-genetic tests (e.g., metabolic, biologic tests)

***How change in management was determined: A. Actual Change – documented by electronic health record or similar, B. Actual Change – self reported by physician, C. Proposed – proposed or expected changes, or D. Undefined/not specified

Outpatient setting

All of the studies (N=3) reported the diagnostic yield and change in clinical management singleton ES (see table 5). The studies had less than 200 patients in total, with two of the studies with 100 or less patients. The change in management was very heterogeneous ranging from 6% to 61% depending on the patients' suspected disorder.

Table 5: New studies of outpatient setting reporting diagnostic yield and/or change in management (n = 3). Shading represents grouping by sequencing test type.

Lastname, Year	Site	Population	Sequencing Test	Comparator or pre-post testing	Diagnostic Yield	Change in Clinical Management	How Change in Clinical Management was defined and documented
Reuter et al, 2019	United States	Patients with unknown suspected genetic disorders accepted to Undiagnosed Disease Network	ES (Proband)	Previous genetic and non-genetic testing**	35% (23/66)	61% (14/23)	diagnosis confirmed current treatment or medical surveillance (3/23), initiated a clinically indicated evaluation or medical surveillance (11/23), including referrals to specialist providers for ongoing surveillance of disease-related manifestations (i.e., tumor surveillance), or initiated a specific medical therapy (2/23). B: Reported by physician
Costain et al, 2019	Canada	Children with undiagnosed epilepsy	ES (Proband)	Targeted NGS Panel	37% (71/197)	6% direct; 30% possible	Not defined. C. Proposed changes in management
Snoeijen-Schouwenaars et al, 2019	Netherlands	Patients with both unexplained epilepsy and borderline Intellectual disability	ES (Proband)	Previous genetic tests*	25% (25/100)	40% (10/25) possible change in treatment	Not defined. C. Proposed changes in management

NOTES:

Study Types: All are case series

*Previous genetic tests - studies reported various genetic tests (e.g., single gene tests, small panels, CMA)

**Previous genetic and non-genetic tests – studies reported various genetic tests (e.g., single gene tests, small panels, CMA) and non-genetic tests (e.g., metabolic, biologic tests)

***How change in management was determined: A. Actual Change – documented by electronic health record or similar, B. Actual Change – self reported by physician, C. Proposed – proposed or expected changes, or D. Undefined/not specified

Reporting of Change in Management

For both NICU/PICU and outpatient settings, the change in management was documented in the studies was heterogenous. How the actual change in management was described was extremely heterogenous with most studies using different descriptions for the types of change in management (see SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 5: Detailed Methods and Type of Change in Management of Reporting (NICU/PICU and Outpatient) Genome and Exome Sequencing).

Most studies method of documenting the change in management using physician reporting (e.g., survey or interview) or electronic health records (See table 6). Few studies reported "proposed" or "intended" changes in management and many did not document how they determined the change in management.

TABLE 6: Total Change in Management Reporting by NICU/PICU and Outpatient Settings for Genome and Exome Sequencing

	Electronic Health Record Review		Physician Reporting (survey or interview)		Proposed/Intended Changes		Not Defined/Specified	
	NICU/PICU	Outpatient	NICU/PICU	Outpatient	NICU/PICU	Outpatient	NICU/PICU	Outpatient
Rapid GS (n = 10, NICU/PICU; n = 0 studies outpatient)	18	0	25	0	0	0	6	0
GS (n = 1 study NICU/PICU; n = 2 studies outpatient)	0	0	0	2	0	0	6	2
Rapid ES (n = 5 studies NICU/PICU; n = 0 studies outpatient)	6	0	10	0	0	0	10	0
ES (n = 1 study NICU/PICU; n = 16 studies outpatient)	4	12	4	22	0	5	0	26
TOTAL	28	12	39	24	0	5	22	28

Discussion

Costs

We found limited data on the actual cost vs. price vs. list price for ES and GS. The cost or price varies based on the source. However, prices of tests alone underestimate the total cost of ES and GS but allow cross-study comparisons. The more rational measurement of comparison is done via cost-effectiveness review articles.

How costs are determined can make a difference in how health economic questions might be addressed. The use of a standard "cost" and cost-effectiveness analysis is a better way to consider whether it's worth paying the higher price/cost of GS vs ES. The Lavelle article is the most current and comprehensive for our target population – pediatric patients suspected of genetic disorders.

Another consideration is reimbursement for GS or ES. Reimbursement for outpatient testing is typically billed to insurance as an individual item, whereas in the NICU/PICU setting all laboratory tests being lumped in with costs of a hospitalization. In the later, the hospital may end up being the responsible party for the majority of the cost of GS or ES.

Comparative Effectiveness

We found limited evidence of a benefit of GS over ES, although there is a benefit over CMA and NGS Panels. The primary benefit appears not in the rate of change in management but in the timeliness of testing with rapid GS needed in the NICU/PICU vs. standard traditional GS or ES in the outpatient setting. Rapid GS or ES has a quick turn around of less than 14 days which is critical in the treatment of critically ill NICU/PICU patients. There is an expectation about the potential ability to take action on a given result (alteration of care in an acute setting versus longer term outpatient management of the diagnosed condition) to affect clinical outcomes.

Previous studies identified the ability of GS and ES to effect a change in management with varying results. The addition of the 13 NICU/PICU and 3 outpatient studies to the summary of evidence previously provided by Clark and Stevens Smith do not change the conclusions. There is no/limited evidence that GS is better than ES at identifying the ability to change clinical management.

Furthermore, there is a confounding factor of the ability of treating teams to perform adequate pre-test counseling and post-test results disclosure in a given inpatient/outpatient setting (taking into account that family members may or may not be available in each setting, and that inpatients can sometimes be discharged before test results come back raising questions about follow-up). Also, there is a difference in personal utility of genetic information for family members in acute versus chronic setting.

Conclusion

There is limited evidence of GS over ES in the ability to effect change in management. Available evidence suggests that rapid over standard GS or ES is of greater benefit in the NICU/PICU setting vs. outpatient setting.

References [other than included studies, see supplemental materials]

Phillips KA, Trosman JR, Douglas MP, Gelb BD, Ferket BS, Hindorff LA, Slavotinek AM, Berg JS, Russell HV, Devine B, Greve V, Smith HS. US private payers' perspectives on insurance coverage for genome sequencing versus exome sequencing: A study by the Clinical Sequencing Evidence-Generating Research Consortium (CSER). Genet Med. 2022 Jan;24(1):238-244. doi: 10.1016/j.gim.2021.08.009. Epub 2021 Nov 30. PMID: 34906461; PMCID: PMC8962136.

Trosman JR, Weldon CB, Slavotinek A, Norton ME, Douglas MP, Phillips KA. Perspectives of US private payers on insurance coverage for pediatric and prenatal exome sequencing: Results of a study from the Program in Prenatal and Pediatric Genomic Sequencing (P3EGS). Genet Med. 2020 Feb;22(2):283-291. doi: 10.1038/s41436-019-0650-7. Epub 2019 Sep 10. PMID: 31501586; PMCID: PMC7004856.

Collins FS, Hamburg MA. First FDA authorization for next-generation sequencer. N Engl J Med. 2013 Dec 19;369(25):2369-71. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1314561. Epub 2013 Nov 19. PMID: 24251383; PMCID: PMC5101955.

Grosse SD, Gudgeon JM. Cost or price of sequencing? Implications for economic evaluations in genomic medicine. Genet Med. 2021 Oct;23(10):1833-1835. doi: 10.1038/s41436-021-01223-9. Epub 2021 Jun 10. PMID: 34113006; PMCID: PMC8487947.

Smith HS, Swint JM, Lalani SR, Yamal JM, de Oliveira Otto MC, Castellanos S, Taylor A, Lee BH, Russell HV. Clinical Application of Genome and Exome Sequencing as a Diagnostic Tool for Pediatric Patients: a Scoping Review of the Literature. Genet Med. 2019 Jan;21(1):3-16. doi: 10.1038/s41436-018-0024-6. Epub 2018 May 14. PMID: 29760485.

Clark MM, Stark Z, Farnaes L, Tan TY, White SM, Dimmock D, Kingsmore SF. Meta-analysis of the diagnostic and clinical utility of genome and exome sequencing and chromosomal microarray in children with suspected genetic diseases. NPJ Genom Med. 2018 Jul 9;3:16. doi: 10.1038/s41525-018-0053-8. PMID: 30002876; PMCID: PMC6037748.