medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evaluating the cost-effectiveness of polygenic risk score-stratified screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm

M. Kelemen[1,2], T. Roychowdhury[3], J. Danesh[1,2], E. Di Angelantonio[1,2], M. Inouye[1,2,4], J. O'Sullivan[6], L. Pennells[1,2], M.J. Sweeting[6], A.M. Wood[1,2], S. Harrison[7], L.G. Kim[1,2]

[1]British Heart Foundation Cardiovascular Epidemiology Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

[2]Victor Phillip Dahdaleh Heart and Lung Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

[3]Department of Genetics, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA.

[4]Baker Heart & Diabetes Institute, Melbourne, Australia.

[5]Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Stanford University, California, USA.

[6]Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Leicester, UK.

[7]Genomics PLC, Oxford, UK.

Abstract

As the heritability of abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) is high and AAA partially shares genetic architecture with other cardiovascular diseases, there is interest in whether genetic information could inform AAA screening strategies. Exploiting pleiotropy and meta-analysing summary data from large AAA studies, we constructed a polygenic risk score (PRS) for AAA. Compared with the low PRS tertile, the intermediate and high PRS tertiles had hazard ratios for AAA of 2.13 (95%CI 1.61, 2.82) and 3.70 (95%CI 2.86, 4.80) respectively, after adjusting for known clinical risk factors. Using simulation modelling, we compared PRS- and smoking-stratified screening with inviting men at age

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

65 and not inviting women (current UK strategy). In a futuristic scenario where genomic information is available on the population, our modelling suggests inviting male current smokers with high PRS earlier than 65 and targeting screening in female smokers with high/intermediate PRS at 65 and 70 respectively, may improve cost-effectiveness.

Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) is an enlargement of the abdominal aorta to greater than 3 cm diameter. To promote early detection and management of AAA (which reduces the likelihood of fatal aortic ruptures), authorities in the UK, Sweden, and Oslo, Norway, offer screening to all men aged 65[1]. By contrast, the US Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends a one-off screening with ultrasound scan (USS) in men aged 65-75 who have ever smoked and recommends selective screening based on clinical judgement in men who have never smoked[2]. However, despite the introduction of such screening programmes, ruptured AAA continues to be a significant source of morbidity and mortality, exemplified by AAA's contribution to around 0.8% of deaths in men aged 65 and older and 0.4% in women aged 65 and older in England and Wales[3].

Rupture of AAAs occurs primarily in people not captured by current screening programmes. They include, for example women, men under 65, men invited to screening at 65 but who did not attend, and men with a normal aortic ultrasound scan at age 65 but who develop an AAA later in life. A small number of ruptures also occur in screen-detected AAAs[4] either prior to reaching the threshold for elective intervention, whilst waiting for this intervention, or after being declared unfit for intervention. However, the prevalence of AAA is falling over time. For example, less than 1% of men screened as part of the UK National Health Service (NHS) abdominal aortic aneurysm screening programme (NAAASP) in 2021 were observed to have an AAA[3]. By contrast, the prevalence of AAA was 4.9% in the UK Multicentre Aneurysm Screening Study (MASS)[5], carried out in 1997-9. This temporal decline in the population burden of AAA suggests that the cost-effectiveness of AAA screening may also be changing, encouraging consideration and evaluation of more targeted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

screening approaches[6]. The USPSTF has, for example, highlighted that research is needed to define the benefits of screening in particular subgroups, suggesting that a stratified approach may have net benefit over current strategies[2]. One potential subgroup is current cigarette smokers, for whom a strong association with AAA[7] has been reported (7-fold increase in risk in men, and 15-fold in women).

As the heritability of abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) is high (perhaps as high as 70%[8]) and genome wide association studies (GWAS) have identified numerous variants associated with AAA susceptibility[9–11], there is interest in whether use of genetic information could supplement and/or support population screening strategies for AAA. Polygenic risk scores (PRS), which aggregate the effects of genetic variants across the genome, can help stratify populations to help identify individuals with higher risk of disease[12,13]. As AAA often co-occurs with other forms of cardiovascular diseases[14] and as the condition partially shares genetic architecture with other cardiovascular diseases[15], we hypothesise that methods[16–18] leveraging shared genetic effects across multiple correlated clinical traits should optimise the performance of an AAA PRS.

In this study, we developed a state-of-the-art PRS for AAA. We then adapted a discrete event simulation model previously developed to evaluate the potential cost-effectiveness of screening females for AAA[19] to explore the potential clinical impact and cost-effectiveness of a stratified screening programme informed by our PRS.

Results

Overview of our study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Our analysis plan comprised three stages relating to (i) development of a novel PRS for AAA, (ii) evaluation of the association of this PRS with AAA, and (iii) use of a discrete event simulation model to assess the potential for using this PRS and smoking status to inform screening for AAA.

To develop our PRS, we assembled the largest to-date training dataset for AAA by combining information from multiple large biobanks (Methods). To further improve performance, based on clinical experience of known co-morbidities of AAA we incorporated information from other cardiovascular diseases into our PRS, utilising a recently developed method that leverages shared genetic effects[16]. Our final PRS was built by LDpred2[20] and evaluated on a non-overlapping subset of participants in the UK Biobank study. We then tested our PRS's association with incident AAA using Cox regression models on the age time-scale. Finally, to explore how a PRS-informed age at invitation strategy may influence long-term clinical and cost outcomes, we deployed a previously validated discrete event simulation (DES) model for AAA screening, with PRS tertile-specific AAA prevalences estimated from a Fine and Gray regression model treating non-AAA mortality as a competing risk. Incremental net benefit estimates from the DES were then used to propose and evaluate policy recommendations. Full details of our methods can be found in the Online methods section. See Supplementary Figure 1 for a summary of the study design.

AAA polygenic risk score development

We benchmarked a number of different PRS and selected the best-performing model, which integrated information from all available AAA studies and also from GWAS summary data from two traits that shared genetic aetiology with AAA: coronary artery disease (CAD) and *AAA-related* (a composite phenotype of conditions related to AAA) (full list of conditions provided in Table S2). Our best-performing PRS was selected using area under the receiver-operator curve (AUC) in our test-set for prevalent/incident AAA risk combined (prevalent cases can be included here as only considering PRS in the model, thus eliminating the possibility of reverse causality). The full details of all PRS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

models, their development and performance summaries can be found in the Methods section and Table S3. The performance of the best PRS, evaluated using the incident time-to-AAA outcome in our test-set, is shown in Fig 1.

Association of PRS with AAA

Amongst the 91,731 individuals in the UK Biobank test set, 634 (1.7%) men and 106 (0.2%) women had an AAA event (i.e. events captured by the definition and data in UK Biobank, hereafter referred to as AAA; see Methods) during the follow-up period. 72,928 (79.5%) had complete data on all risk factors; of these, 464 men (1.5%) and 81 women (0.2%) had an AAA. Median follow-up was 12.0 (IQR 11.2 to 12.7) years. Only 222 (0.2%) individuals were censored. A summary of risk factors and missing data is provided in Table S5; events and frequencies by sub-group are given in Table S6.

Hazard ratios from multivariable Cox regression modelling are provided in Table 1, based on the complete case analysis. The results demonstrated a higher rate of AAA across the PRS risk groups - defined as tertiles of the PRS distribution - even after adjustment for the other risk factors. Compared to the low PRS risk group, the intermediate PRS risk group had a 2-fold higher hazard of AAA (HR 2.13, 95% CI 1.61 to 2.82), and the high PRS risk group a nearly 4-fold increase (HR 3.70, 95% CI 2.86 to 4.80). Alternatively, if PRS was modelled as a continuous predictor, the adjusted HR per 1 standard deviation increase was 1.77 (95% CI 1.63 to 1.93). As expected, the hazard of AAA was also higher in ex and current smokers compared to never smokers (HRs: 2.36, 95% CI 1.82, 3.05; and 7.74, 95% CI 5.83, 10.29 respectively). There was no evidence of an interaction between sex and PRS (either as categorical, p=0.4, or continuous, p=0.8) or deviation from the proportional hazards assumption (p>0.05 for all covariables in models with categorical and continuous PRS, using Schoenfeld residuals).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Sensitivity analysis addressing missingness

Results of a sensitivity analysis based on multiply imputed data are shown in Supplementary Table S7. The results were similar to the primary analysis, though the adjusted hazard ratio for the high risk PRS group was higher (4.46, 95% CI 3.52, 5.66).

Estimation of AAA prevalence

In a Fine and Gray competing risks model including only sex, the modelled estimated prevalence of AAA in men at age 65 was 0.41%. This finding suggests our data identified just under half of the AAAs observed in NAAASP at this age, where the observed prevalence was around 0.91%[21]. The lower yield of AAA cases in UK Biobank was likely due to a combination of the "healthy cohort" effect and the outcome definition which only captured AAAs identified at a hospital visit. We derived a scaling factor (F) to estimate population PRS-specific AAA prevalences for the DES from the UK Biobank AAA prevalence modelled here as the ratio of the NAAASP and UK Biobank prevalences in men (0.91/0.41 = 2.2). No equivalent data were available for UK women due to the lack of a systematic screening programme, so in our modelling we assumed F to be the same for both men and women.

Discrete event simulation modelling

Incremental net benefit by PRS and smoking status

Figures 2 and 3 show the impact on incremental net monetary benefit (INB) for a range of different ages at invitation in men (followed up from age 60) and women (followed up from age 65) respectively, based on a willingness-to-pay of £30,000 per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY). The results depend on AAA prevalence at the starting age, so the INB is presented for a range of prevalences (modelled as known input parameters) corresponding to different sub-groups based on PRS risk and smoking status, i.e. these are sub-group INB estimates. Vertical lines indicated on

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figures 2 and 3 represent point estimates of smoking/PRS sub-group prevalences, though these are estimated with uncertainty. Results based on PRS risk or smoking status alone, and based on a willingness-to-pay of £20,000 per QALY, are given in Supplementary Figures 2-5.

For men, when AAA prevalence was below 0.2% at age 60, the INB was negative at all invitation ages - indicating no benefit in offering screening (Figure 2). Ever smokers with low/intermediate PRS and ex-smokers with low PRS had AAA prevalences estimated in this range. For current smokers in the highest PRS risk group (prevalence around 1.5% at age 60), there was a positive INB at all ages at invitation for this subgroup of the population, and an increase in INB for invitation earlier than age 65; the INB was maximised by inviting this group at age 60. For all the remaining smoking/PRS subgroups (i.e. never smokers with high PRS, ex-smokers with intermediate/high PRS and current smokers with low/intermediate PRS; prevalences range from 0.2 - 0.7% at age 60), there was evidence that invitation to screening confers a positive net benefit, particularly at earlier invitation ages. The results showed the highest INB in these subgroups occurred following invitation between ages 60 and 62. There was little difference in terms of INB between inviting at age 60 or 62 because of the trade-off between missing late-developing AAAs and the relatively small numbers who may benefit from early intervention when the prevalence at age 60 is below 1%.

In women, when AAA prevalence was below 0.25% at age 65, the sub-group INB was negative at all invitation ages (Figure 3). When considering subgroups of the population in isolation, only current smokers with intermediate PRS (prevalence 0.35% at age 65) and current smokers with high PRS (prevalence 0.8% at age 65) showed a small positive benefit. For the former this occurred at invitation age 70, and for the latter at invitation ages 65 and 70.

Incremental net benefit by population strategy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evaluation of the impact of strategies stratified by PRS and/or smoking scaled to the whole population are given in Table 2, i.e. these are population-level INB estimates.

In men, for a healthcare provider willing to pay £30,000 per QALY gained, offering universal screening at age 62 improved the incremental net benefit compared to the current strategy of universal screening at age 65 (mean population INB £41 v £11, Table 2a). When extrapolated to the population of 348,000 60-year-old men in England[22], this equated to an overall net gain of around £10.4m at a willingness-to-pay of £30,000 per QALY. Using PRS-specific or smoking-specific age at invitation improved this further (both mean population INB £42; net gain £10.9m over the whole population). The largest gains in men arose from a policy stratifying on a combination of both PRS and smoking, with an estimated net gain of £12.6m over the whole population. Specifically, this policy invites men who are current smokers with high PRS risk at age 60, no invitation for never-smokers with low/intermediate PRS or ex-smokers with low PRS, and invites the remainder of the male population at age 62. In addition, this policy demonstrated the largest reduction in number of scans, with a 41% reduction compared to current policy (Table 2a). In comparison, a policy of inviting all at age 62 marginally increased scans compared to current policy.

In women, adopting a policy of inviting current smokers with high and intermediate PRS at ages 65 and 70 respectively conferred a modest improvement over the current approach of no screening (population INB around £3, Table 2b). This equates to around £0.9m over the population of 298,000 65-year-old women in England[22]. This is marginally higher than the overall gain over the population of £0.6m estimated for a policy of inviting all current female smokers at age 65. Inviting all women with high PRS at age 70 conferred a negative population INB.

Discussion

Our results may have several implications. First, it highlights that leveraging shared genetic aetiology by combining information from multiple traits can substantially improve PRS performance.. This is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

particularly relevant for lower prevalence diseases such as AAA, where there are fewer GWAS studies with a lower number of cases (compared to coronary artery disease, for example). Second, current screening may not be optimal in terms of cost-effectiveness and does not capture AAAs in some individuals before rupture occurs. PRS could be used to identify individuals in the population who are currently not eligible for AAA screening, but are at high risk (such as females who are smokers or with high PRS, or men aged less than 65 who are smokers or with high PRS), and to optimise timing of invitation. We provide evidence from a previously-validated simulation model that PRS-stratified AAA screening has the potential to improve cost-effectiveness over current strategies.

Results from the simulation model suggested that adopting a stratified approach to screening invitation age in men, and applying targeted screening in women, could be cost-effective for a healthcare provider willing to pay £30,000 per QALY when compared to current strategy. In men, whilst PRS-based stratification conferred some increase in incremental net benefit, improvement arising from smoking-based stratification was almost identical. However, the largest gains were estimated to arise from using PRS and smoking in combination. Our modelling suggests that inviting male current smokers with high PRS at age 60 alongside no invitation for those with very low risk (never/ex-smokers with low PRS and never smokers with intermediate PRS) and invitation at age 62 for the remaining men, may improve cost-effectiveness. In women, combining smoking and PRS information enabled identification of a subgroup (current smokers with high and intermediate PRS, invited at age 65 and 70 respectively) in whom screening was cost-effective.

Our proposed smoking and PRS-risk-based AAA screening invitation strategy incorporates earlier invitations than currently offered for those in the highest PRS-risk groups where AAA may develop earlier. Conversely, those without a high PRS are offered a later (or no) invitation. This does not necessarily imply an increase in missed AAAs for these individuals, since there is a trade-off in optimising identification of AAAs (i.e. early enough to maximise capture before rupture, late enough

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to minimise missing AAAs that develop post-screening) with maximising life-years gained by intervening at younger ages. In addition, the continued exclusion of very low risk groups from screening (women who are never/ex-smokers and those with low PRS) limits the potential for harms associated with overdiagnosis in those who would likely not go on to experience AAA intervention or rupture[19].

We report a strong association between our AAA PRS and reported AAA outcome alongside an apparently more modest improvement for a PRS-stratified screening approach in terms of mean INB. This is in part because benefits are only accrued in those with an AAA, but are averaged over the whole screened population when calculating cost-effectiveness measures. Additionally, the possibility for a PRS that is strongly associated with the outcome to translate into a modest impact on a screening programme has been previously documented[23]. For a given PRS cut-off, even though the proportion of cases to non-cases may be considerably lower amongst those with low PRS (reflecting a large hazard or odds ratio when assessing association), the majority of cases may still occur in this group when a relatively small proportion of the population has a high PRS. If translated into a screening programme based on a PRS cut-off, this would result in missing many cases. We address this here by taking a lifetime perspective and by considering variations to the timing of screening invitation in addition to comparisons to no screening. The use of the DES to evaluate the outcomes associated with each policy ensures that increases in AAA prevalence and AAA ruptures during the unscreened period for those with low/intermediate PRS are accounted for in the results.

Limitations

Our work makes the assumption that generating a PRS profile might, in the future, not carry an additional cost, given expectations that PRS might one day be offered at the population-level and utilised across a range of diseases, implying a negligible per-trait cost. We acknowledge this is a major assumption. However, this scenario - i.e. one in which genomic information will become part

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of routine healthcare and available for screening purposes[24–28] - has been advocated by some leading authorities[29]. Such a programme of systematic collection of genomics data - with reasonable level of uptake in the population - would, of course, need to be in place to facilitate implementation of a PRS-stratified screening strategy as described here.

We modelled AAA incidence data in UK Biobank, which is not directly linked to the AAA national screening programme in the UK. UK Biobank also has a "healthy volunteer bias" that could impact the performance of our PRS – however, we anticipate that the cost-effectiveness of PRS-stratified AAA screening would be more favourable, given the expected higher and earlier disease prevalence in a cohort without healthy volunteer bias. Relatedly, we do not present a risk prediction model or provide optimism-corrected model evaluations. Our test set, while it did not overlap with our training set, was from the same population (UK Biobank). Before wider deployment, our models may need to be evaluated in an external validation set. The PRS contains only common genetic variants (MAF > 0.01) and there may be rare and low-frequency variants that impact risk of AAA. We assume that the outcomes of AAA repair, growth rates/rupture risk of AAA, and non-AAA mortality rates are consistent across all strata of smoking and PRS for AAA susceptibility, and by age, which may not be the case. We have modelled upon an assumption that there is one single screening point, but alternative approaches with repeat screening of high-risk individuals may further improve clinical and cost-effectiveness outcomes. Finally, due to the limited data availability, our study participants were restricted to individuals of European ancestry. The portability of PRS across populations has been shown to be reduced due to differences in patterns of linkage disequilibrium, allele frequencies and effect sizes[30], thus we expect that our model to be mainly relevant to European ancestry populations. Due to the low prevalence of AAA, large population studies across multiple ancestries will be required, such as those provided by the *Our Future Health*[31] and *All of Us*[32] projects, to increase the representation of more diverse populations in future AAA studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In summary, we have developed a novel PRS for AAA that demonstrates independent association with incident AAA above clinical risk factors. We found that PRS-informed screening could identify subpopulations who are currently excluded from screening policy (such as intermediate and high PRS female smokers), in whom screening may be cost-effective. We also report that screening in men could be optimised by varying the age at invitation according to polygenic risk and smoking status.

Online methods

Development of a polygenic risk score

The polygenic risk score presented here relies on two AAA data sources as follows: (i) GWAS performed in the UK BioBank (UKB)[33] (1,068 cases and 127,011 controls, selected in a way to exclude all individuals who are part of the AAAGen study), and (ii) summary level data from the AAAgen cohort[8] without the UKB (effective sample size of ~104,179; see details in Supplement S1). The full study details can be found in Table S1. We also considered summary association data from other phenotypes which we believed may share genetic aetiology with AAA: (i) coronary heart disease (CHD)[8] , (ii) stroke[34], and (iii) conditions related to AAA in the UKB (Table S2). We adopt the assumption of the GWAS from which our PRS was sourced from, i.e. that the risk liability can be estimated from the combined set of prevalent and incident cases. Detailed data processing, quality control steps applied to each dataset and the full list of ICD10 codes for the "AAA-related" phenotype can be found in the Supplementary Information.

To maximise performance, we performed a fixed-effect meta-analysis on all AAA studies. We then evaluated two PRS pre-processing methods that exploit genetic overlaps between the aetiologies of different traits, shaPRS[16] and MTAG[35], to additionally integrate information from CAD, stroke and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

AAA-related traits. To generate the final PRS from the subset of the 831,447 SNPs that met our quality control criteria in the HapMap3 panel, we also evaluated two methods, PRS-CS and LDpred2. The best individual PRS was chosen by comparing the AUC (from a univariable logistic regression model assuming a linear relationship with continuous PRS) and the squared Pearson correlation coefficient (r^2) between predicted and observed phenotypes evaluating the performance of all PRS models in a non-overlapping, randomly selected test set of 91,731 European ancestry individuals in UKB, which included 921 (prevalent and incident combined) AAA cases.

Our final PRS model is deposited in the PGS Catalog[36] (PGS003429) and is also available to download from the Supplementary Data. The combined raw SNP summary association statistics, together with the estimated coefficients of the conventional risk factors are also available in the Supplementary data.

Modelling the independent association of PRS with AAA

The non-overlapping subset of 91,731 individuals in UK Biobank also served as the test set for our risk prediction model, using 740 incident time-to-AAA as the outcome of interest to allow for appropriate adjustment of other potentially time-varying risk factors. Date and cause of death together with date of loss-to-follow-up were collected. The outcome was defined as first hospital inpatient admission with AAA code (either AAA-related surgical procedure or AAA code recorded at admission for other cause) or AAA death. This includes ICD-10 codes I71.3 and I71.4 together with surgical procedure codes (see Table S4 for full list); as such this definition does not relate to specific diagnostic criteria such as aneurysm size. This outcome may strictly be defined as "recorded AAA" to reflect the fact that it captures only a proportion of existing AAAs in the population (since those with an unidentified unruptured AAA and those with an unruptured AAA who do not attend hospital in the follow-up period will not be included here), though for simplicity will be hereafter referred to as AAA. Under this definition, the AAA may be known either because of rupture, surgical intervention

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

or detection either via NAAASP or opportunistically. Individuals with a prevalent AAA event at entry into UKB were excluded from this analysis.

Cox regression models on the age time-scale were used to explore the independent association between PRS and time to AAA with and without adjustment for known risk factors. Individuals were censored on the date of loss-to-follow-up, end-of-follow-up on 31st March 2021, age 80, or date of non-AAA mortality, whichever was sooner. Models were fitted using data for men and women combined, with adjustment for sex and testing for sex x PRS interaction, due to the low number of AAA cases in women. We selected conventional risk factors based on their likely availability at the clinic: date of birth, BMI, self-reported smoking status (never, ex, current), self-reported alcohol consumption (non-drinker, drinker), diabetes, anti-hypertensive drug use, lipid-lowering drug use, systolic blood pressure (SBP), high-density lipoprotein (HDL), total cholesterol, Townsend deprivation index, and family history of CVD, as recorded at entry into UKB. Linearity was assumed for continuous variables in the Cox modelling. In contrast to the PRS development stage where exploration of the associations between genetic factors and blood pressure implicates the use of underlying blood pressure and cholesterol (i.e. adjusted for medication to estimate the pre-medication values), this stage of modelling uses baseline SBP and cholesterol measurements as the relevant predictors of future AAA risk.

Tertiles of PRS were used to allow continuity with the simulation modelling component of this work, which requires grouping of PRS for evaluation of stratified screening. Tertiles were selected to minimise impact on precision of estimates - particularly important in the analysis of this relatively rare condition - and for ease of interpretation. Key results are also presented per standard deviation increase in PRS. In a sensitivity analysis, we additionally explore the impact of using multiple imputation to account for missing values of risk factors. Full details of methods are given in the Supplementary Material.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discrete event simulation modelling

We further use the UK Biobank data to explore the potential impact of setting PRS-sex-specific ages for screening invitation, and determine the costs and benefits of this AAA screening programme. Fine and Grey regression modelling is employed to calculate cumulative incidence functions (CIFs) for time to AAA whilst accounting for competing risks due to non-AAA mortality. This model is used to estimate the prevalence of AAA in men at age 65 in UKB, which is benchmarked against the observed prevalence of AAA at this age in the National Health Service Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Screening Programme (NAAASP). This measure gives an indication of the proportion of AAAs that are captured by the definition of recorded AAA used in UKB and is used as a scaling factor (F) for sub-group baseline prevalences estimated from the Fine and Gray model at age 60 in men and age 65 in women that are then taken forward to make group-specific inferences on results from the DES. Since women are not screened in the UK, it is not possible to estimate a separate scaling factor for women, so we assume that the ratio of recorded:underlying AAAs (and thus, F) is the same in women as in men.

To explore how a PRS-sex-specific age at invitation strategy may influence long-term outcomes, we adapted a previously developed discrete event simulation (DES) model for AAA screening. The SWAN model has been described and validated previously, with full details of model structure and input parameters provided elsewhere[13]. In brief, the DES combines growth and rupture rate models reflecting the natural history of AAA with information from screening programmes on uptake, detection (including that taking place outside of systematic screening), distribution of AAA diameters, and both elective and emergency surgical intervention. The model input parameters are informed by systematic review and meta-analysis where possible, with non-AAA mortality informed using national summary statistics.

We use the model to track clinical events and costs from age 60 to 95 (men) or age 65 to 95 (women) in 1m hypothetical individuals, separately for men and women. Younger ages are not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

considered here since model input parameters (e.g. attendance at screening, rates of dropout, incidental detection and re-intervention) are largely derived from populations aged 65+. Models are run for a range of prevalences at the starting age (60 in men; 65 in women) and for different invitation ages between 60 and 67 in men and between 65 and 75 in women, treating the prevalences as known input parameters and plotting final results over the full range of values.

Results are summarised in terms of mean quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) and mean costs, for each baseline prevalence and invitation age. The incremental net benefit (INB) is also calculated to provide an estimate of the mean net monetary gain for invitation at a particular age compared to a no-invite strategy (for a given baseline prevalence) by assigning a willingness-to-pay (WTP) per QALY gained, set here at £30,000 per QALY. Population strategy is optimised by identifying the age at invitation corresponding to the highest INB within each sub-group. Results corresponding to each sub-group are then combined to provide an overall population cost-effectiveness by scaling according to the observed proportion in the UKB test set.

Data and code availability

Code to perform all PRS development analyses reported in this manuscript is available at github.com/mkelcb/aaa-paper. The final AAA PRS file is available from the Supplementary data and from the PGS Catalog with score ID PGS003429. The full DES model is available at https://github.com/mikesweeting/AAA_DES_model.

Declaration of interests

SH and JOS are employees in Genomics PLC. J.D. serves on scientific advisory boards for AstraZeneca, Novartis, and UK Biobank, and has received multiple grants from academic, charitable and industry

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

sources outside of the submitted work. MJS reports full-time employment with AstraZeneca and AstraZeneca stock ownership. The other authors declare no competing financial interests.

Funding information

M.K. is funded by the BHF Cambridge CRE (RE/18/1/34212). L.G.K. was supported by the NIHR BTRU in Donor Health and Genomics (NIHR BTRU-2014-10024) and is supported by the NIHR BTRU in Donor Health and Behaviour (NIHR203337). M.I. was supported by the Munz Chair of Cardiovascular Prediction and Prevention and the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (BRC-1215-20014; NIHR203312)*. M.I. was also supported by the UK Economic and Social Research 878 Council (ES/T013192/1). L.P. is supported by a BHF Programme Grant (RG/18/13/33946). J.D. holds a British Heart Foundation Professorship and a NIHR Senior Investigator Award [*]. This work was supported by core funding from the British Heart Foundation (RG/13/13/30194; RG/18/13/33946), BHF Cambridge CRE (RE/18/1/34212) and the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (BRC-1215-20014; NIHR203312). *The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR, NHSBT or the Department of Health and Social Care. This work was also supported by Health Data Research UK, which is funded by the UK Medical Research Council, Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, Economic and Social Research Council, Department of Health and Social Care (England), Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Government Health and Social Care Directorates, Health and Social Care Research and Development Division (Welsh Government), Public Health Agency (Northern Ireland), and British Heart Foundation and Wellcome.

Acknowledgments

This research has been conducted using the UK Biobank Resource under Application Number 7439.

Copyright © 2023, NHS England. Re-used with the permission of the NHS England [and/or UK

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Biobank]. All rights reserved. This research used data assets made available by National Safe Haven as part of the Data and Connectivity National Core Study, led by Health Data Research UK in partnership with the Office for National Statistics and funded by UK Research and Innovation (research which commenced between 1st October 2020 – 31st March 2021 grant ref MC_PC_20029; 1st April 2021 -30th September 2022 grant ref MC_PC_20058).

For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

References

1. Abdominal aortic aneurysm screening. *nhs.uk* https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/abdominal-aortic-aneurysm-screening/.
2. US Preventive Services Task Force *et al.* Screening for Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. *JAMA* **322**, 2211–2218 (2019).
3. Barton, F. & Ward, S. Deaths registered in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsregistrationsummarytables/2021refreshedpopulations (2023).
4. Thompson, S. G. *et al.* Systematic review and meta-analysis of the growth and rupture rates of small abdominal aortic aneurysms: implications for surveillance intervals and their cost-effectiveness. *Health Technol. Assess.* **17**, 1–118 (2013).
5. Scott, R. A. P. The Multicentre Aneurysm Screening Study (MASS) into the effect of abdominal aortic aneurysm screening on mortality in men: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* **360**, 1531–1539 (2002).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6. Ropers, F. G. *et al.* Health screening needs independent regular re-evaluation. *BMJ* **374**, (2021).

7. Carter, J. L. *et al.* Sex-Specific Associations of Vascular Risk Factors With Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm: Findings From 1.5 Million Women and 0.8 Million Men in the United States and United Kingdom. *J. Am. Heart Assoc.* (2020) doi:10.1161/JAHA.119.014748.

8. Wahlgren, C. M., Larsson, E., Magnusson, P. K. E., Hultgren, R. & Swedenborg, J. Genetic and environmental contributions to abdominal aortic aneurysm development in a twin population. *J. Vasc. Surg.* **51**, 3–7; discussion 7 (2010).

9. Bown, M. J. *et al.* Abdominal aortic aneurysm is associated with a variant in low-density lipoprotein receptor-related protein 1. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **89**, 619–627 (2011).

10. Jones, G. T. *et al.* Meta-Analysis of Genome-Wide Association Studies for Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Identifies Four New Disease-Specific Risk Loci. *Circ. Res.* **120**, 341–353 (2017).

11. Roychowdhury, T. *et al.* Multi-ancestry GWAS deciphers genetic architecture of abdominal aortic aneurysm and highlights PCSK9 as a therapeutic target. *bioRxiv* (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.05.27.22275607.

12. O'Sullivan, J. W. *et al.* Polygenic Risk Scores for Cardiovascular Disease: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* **146**, e93–e118 (2022).

13. Responsible use of polygenic risk scores in the clinic: potential benefits, risks and gaps. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 1876–1884 (2021).

14. Müller, V. *et al.* Comorbidities Associated with Large Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms. *Aorta (Stamford)* **7**, 108–114 (2019).

15. Klarin, D. *et al.* Genetic Architecture of Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm in the Million Veteran Program. *Circulation* **142**, 1633–1646 (2020).

16. Kelemen, M., Vigorito, E., Anderson, C. A. & Wallace, C. ShaPRS: Leveraging shared genetic effects across traits or ancestries improves accuracy of polygenic scores. *bioRxiv* (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.12.10.21267272.

17. Abraham, G. *et al.* Genomic risk score offers predictive performance comparable to clinical risk

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

factors for ischaemic stroke. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1–10 (2019).

18. Mishra, A. *et al.* Stroke genetics informs drug discovery and risk prediction across ancestries. *Nature* **611**, 115–123 (2022).
19. Sweeting, M. J. *et al.* Analysis of clinical benefit, harms, and cost-effectiveness of screening women for abdominal aortic aneurysm. *Lancet* **392**, 487–495 (2018).
20. Privé, F., Arbel, J. & Vilhjálmsson, B. J. LDpred2: better, faster, stronger. *Bioinformatics* **36**, 5424–5431 (2020).
21. Jacomelli, J. Latest annual NHS abdominal aortic aneurysm screening data report published. https://phescreening.blog.gov.uk/2021/03/03/latest-annual-nhs-aaa-screening-data-report/.
22. Park, N. Estimates of the population for the UK, England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. (2022).
23. The illusion of polygenic disease risk prediction. *Genet. Med.* **21**, 1705–1707 (2019).
24. Wong, J. Z. Y. *et al.* Cost effectiveness analysis of a polygenic risk tailored breast cancer screening programme in Singapore. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* **21**, 1–10 (2021).
25. Thomas, C. *et al.* The Costs and Benefits of Risk Stratification for Colorectal Cancer Screening Based On Phenotypic and Genetic Risk: A Health Economic Analysis. *Cancer Prev. Res.* **14**, 811 (2021).
26. Martikainen, J. *et al.* Economic evaluation of using polygenic risk score to guide risk screening and interventions for the prevention of type 2 diabetes in individuals with high overall baseline risk. *Front. Genet.* **13**, (2022).
27. Kiflen, M. *et al.* Cost-Effectiveness of Polygenic Risk Scores to Guide Statin Therapy for Cardiovascular Disease Prevention. *Circulation: Genomic and Precision Medicine* (2022) doi:10.1161/CIRCGEN.121.003423.
28. Mujwara, D. *et al.* Integrating a Polygenic Risk Score for Coronary Artery Disease as a Risk-Enhancing Factor in the Pooled Cohort Equation: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Study. *Journal of the American Heart Association: Cardiovascular and Cerebrovascular Disease* **11**,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(2022).

29. Genome UK: 2022 to 2025 implementation plan for England. *GOV.UK* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-2022-to-2025-implementation-plan-for-england/genome-uk-2022-to-2025-implementation-plan-for-england.
30. Cavazos, T. B. & Witte, J. S. Inclusion of variants discovered from diverse populations improves polygenic risk score transferability. *HGG Adv* **2**, (2021).
31. Our future health. *Our Future Health* https://ourfuturehealth.org.uk/.
32. All of Us Research Program Investigators *et al.* The 'All of Us' Research Program. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **381**, 668–676 (2019).
33. Sudlow, C. *et al.* UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med.* **12**, e1001779 (2015).
34. Malik, R. *et al.* Multiancestry genome-wide association study of 520,000 subjects identifies 32 loci associated with stroke and stroke subtypes. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 524–537 (2018).
35. Turley, P. *et al.* Multi-trait analysis of genome-wide association summary statistics using MTAG. *Nat. Genet.* **50**, 229–237 (2018).
36. Lambert, S. A. *et al.* The Polygenic Score Catalog as an open database for reproducibility and systematic evaluation. *Nat. Genet.* **53**, 420–425 (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Fig 1 Observed non-parametric cumulative incidence curves for recorded AAA in the UKB test set, in women (left) and men (right). PRS groups correspond to tertiles of PRS risk.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Fig 2 Incremental net benefit compared to no invitation, by age at invitation and baseline prevalence at age 60 in men. INB is evaluated at a willingness-to-pay of £30,000 per QALY. Points plotted are point estimates with 95% uncertainty interval derived from 100 bootstrap PSA samples. PRS/smoking sub-group prevalences estimated from UKB test set as CIF x inflation factor; indicated on the x-axis.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Fig 3 Incremental net benefit compared to no invitation, by age at invitation and baseline prevalence at age 65 in women. INB is evaluated at a willingness-to-pay of £30,000 per QALY. Points plotted are point estimates with 95% uncertainty interval derived from 100 bootstrap PSA samples. PRS/smoking sub-group prevalences estimated from UKB test set as CIF x inflation factor; indicated on the x-axis.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1 **Hazard ratios for recorded AAA from multivariable Cox regression**

Risk factor	HR (95% CI)	p-value
PRS group		
Low risk	1	<0.001
Intermediate risk	2.13 (1.61, 2.82)	
High risk	3.70 (2.86, 4.80)	
Sex		
Female	1	<0.001
Male	4.56 (3.54, 5.88)	
Townsend deprivation index (per 1 unit increase)	1.02 (0.99, 1.05)	0.1
Alcohol intake		
Non-drinker	1	0.001
Drinker	0.57 (0.42, 0.79)	
Family history of CVD		
No	1	0.6
Yes	1.05 (0.88, 1.25)	
Diabetic		
No	1	0.6
Yes	1.09 (0.78, 1.53)	
Smoking status		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Never smoker Ex-smoker Current smoker	1 2.36 (1.82, 3.05) 7.74 (5.83, 10.29)	<0.001
BMI (per kg/m^2 increase)	1.02 (0.99, 1.04)	0.2
Systolic blood pressure (per 10mm/Hg increase)	0.97 (0.93, 1.02)	0.3
Anti-hypertensive medication No Yes	 1 2.88 (2.36, 3.52)	<0.001
Total cholesterol (per mmol/L increase)	1.12 (1.01, 1.23)	0.02
HDL cholesterol (per mmol/L increase)	0.27 (0.20, 0.39)	<0.001
Lipid-lowering medication No Yes	 1 2.82 (2.27, 3.51)	<0.001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2 Population incremental net benefit estimates arising from different invitation age strategies in (a) men, and (b) women

(a)

	Strategy				
	Current: invite all age 65	**Invite all age 62**	**Invite age determined by PRS$^{\$}$**	**Invite age determined by smoking$^{\$\$}$**	**Invite age determined by PRS + smoking$^{\$\$\$}$**
Mean INB (95% UI)*	£11.03 (-£1.74, £37.12)	£40.89 (£25.75, £58.49)	£42.49 (£25.86, £54.63)	£42.31 (£36.78, £66.66)	£47.28 (£39.29, £70.87)
Mean QALYs	17.1603	17.1614	17.1611	17.1611	17.1612
Mean costs	£271.79	£275.63	£265.96	£265.91	£263.80
Net gain over population**	NA	£10.4m	£10.9m	£10.9m	£12.6m
Events per 10,000 invited					
Scans***	9229	9560	6250	6196	5474
Elective operations	108.3	111.2	110.9	110.8	111.0
Emergency operations	42.9	42.1	42.0	42.2	41.9
Ruptures	118.1	115.9	116.1	116.3	115.9
AAA-related deaths	97.3	96.0	96.2	96.3	96.2

Note: These results account for the differing proportions of the population within each sub-group, as observed in the test set.

$^{\$}$ Invite intermediate and high PRS only, at age 62 (maximises PRS-specific INBs)

$^{\$\$}$ Invite ex and current smokers only, at age 62 (maximises smoking-specific INBs)

$^{\$\$\$}$ Invite current smokers with high PRS at age 60; no invite for never smokers with low/intermediate PRS; no invite for ex-smokers with low PRS; invite remainder at age 62 (maximises PRS/smoking-subgroup-specific INBs)

* Mean incremental net benefit compared to no invite derived from point estimate; 95% uncertainty interval derived 5th/95th centiles of INB from 100 PSA bootstrap samples

** based on UK population estimates for 60-year-old men (N=348,000). Comparison to current strategy, based on willingness-to-pay of £30,000 per QALY

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

*** includes both initial screen and follow-up monitoring scans for those with detected AAA; input parameter for attendance set to 75% for men / 72% for women (as per original DES)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.02.23297906; this version posted December 7, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(b)

	Strategy			
	Current: no invite	**Invite high PRS only$**	**Invite current smokers only$$**	**Invite age determined by PRS + smoking$$$**
Mean INB (95% UI)*	N/A	-£3.74 (-£8.25, £6.24)	£2.09 (-£0.06, £14.01)	£2.95 (£0.47, £12.78)
Mean QALYs	15.2443	15.2445	15.2445	15.2445
Mean costs	£72.57	£81.63	£75.14	£74.51
Net gain over population**	NA	-£1.1m	£0.6m	£0.9m
Events per 10,000 invited				
Scans***	0	2629	569	395
Elective operations	17.5	18.1	17.9	17.8
Emergency operations	18.7	18.5	18.6	18.6
Ruptures	72.4	71.8	72.0	72.1
AAA-related deaths	65.5	65.2	65.3	65.3

$ Invite high PRS at age 70; otherwise no invite

$$ Invite current smokers at age 65; otherwise no invite

$$$ Invite current smokers with high PRS at age 65; invite current smokers with intermediate PRS at age 70; otherwise no invite (maximises PRS-smoking-subgroup-specific INBs)

* Mean incremental net benefit compared to no invite derived from point estimate; 95% uncertainty interval derived 5th/95th centiles of INB from 100 PSA bootstrap samples

** based on UK population estimates for 65-year-old women (N=298,000). Comparison to current strategy, based on willingness-to-pay of £30,000 per QALY

*** includes both initial screen and follow-up monitoring scans for those with detected AAA