medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Synthesized Economic Evidence on the Cost-effectiveness of Screening Familial Hypercholesterolemia: A meta-analytic review and Aggregate Distributional Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Mengying Wang [1], Shan Jiang [2#], Jiao Lu [3], Kai Tan [1], Yuanyuan Gu [2], Shunping Li [4,5,6]

1. School of Management, Shanxi Medical University, Taiyuan, Shanxi, China
2. Macquarie University Centre for the Health Economy, Macquarie Business School and Australian Institute of Health Innovation, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia
3. School of Public Policy and Administration, Xi 'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China
4. Centre for Health Management and Policy Research, School of Public Health, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China
5. NHC Key Lab of Health Economics and Policy Research (Shandong University), Jinan, Shandong, China
6. Center for Health Preference Research, Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong, China

Contact to: Dr. Shan Jiang, mingshan1018@gmail.com

Conflict of interest: None.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Background

Familial hypercholesterolemia is a prevalent genetic disorder with global implications for severe cardiovascular diseases. As the scrutiny on evaluating its economic impact intensifies, an imperative arises for a worldwide synthesis of economic evidence related to familial hypercholesterolemia screening. This study aims to globally examine economic assessments of familial hypercholesterolemia, synthesize evidence, and present economic insights into the impact of familial hypercholesterolemia screening on population equity.

Methods

A comprehensive, systematic literature review was conducted to identify economic evaluations of familial hypercholesterolemia screening programs. The quality appraisal of literature was guided by the quality of health economic studies instrument and consolidated health economic evaluation reporting standards 2022. Meta-analysis techniques were applied to integrate findings from various studies, focusing on the total cost-effectiveness and total net health benefit associated with both cascade and universal screening programs for familial hypercholesterolemia. An aggregate distributional cost-effectiveness analysis was employed to determine the potential impact of screening programs on health equity across populations.

Results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The study results reveal significant differences in the economic evaluations of familial hypercholesterolemia across different countries, and we provide detailed descriptions of unique characteristics. The combined results of cost-effectiveness analyses indicate that 90% of screening for familial hypercholesterolemia is cost-effective. Meta-analysis synthesized the economic impacts of seven sets of cascade and universal screening across diverse health outcomes. Aggregate distributional cost-effectiveness analysis showed that the difference was positive across all six studies, indicating that familial hypercholesterolemia screening strategy has the potential to mitigate health inequalities.

Conclusion

This study provides a global perspective on familial hypercholesterolemia economic evaluation. Despite international variations, findings suggest that, in the majority of cases, familial hypercholesterolemia screening is cost-effective, improving health equity and overall population health. The study offers a positive outlook for future health decisions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Familial hypercholesterolemia (FH) is a grave autosomal dominant inherited condition marked by elevated plasma concentrations of low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol.[1] The pathogenesis of FH arises from mutations in the genes encoding for the low-density lipoprotein receptor (LDLR), apolipoprotein B (APOB), and proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 (PCSK9).[2] [3] These genetic anomalies disrupt cholesterol metabolism within patients, leading to significantly raised plasma LDL cholesterol concentrations.[4] As a consequence, individuals with FH are predisposed to accelerated atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) and coronary artery disease (CAD) development, which invariably augments their risk of premature mortality.[5]

Classifications of FH differentiate between homozygous familial hypercholesterolemia (HoFH) and heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia (HeFH).[6] Cumulatively, their global prevalence was historically estimated to be 1 in 500. However, more recent investigations suggest a prevalence nearing 1 in 200, equating to a total of 32 million FH patients or variant carriers worldwide.[7] Alarmingly, despite its status as a prevalent genetic disorder, the majority of FH cases remain undiagnosed;[8] in many countries, less than 1% of potential FH cases have been accurately identified.[9]

On an optimistic note, even though FH can have severe health implications, early detection coupled with prompt pharmacological interventions - such as with statins,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ezetimibe, PCSK9 inhibitors, and the newly introduced bempedoic acid - can substantially reduce the risk of myocardial infarction in FH patients by up to 76%.[10 11] Such interventions also thwart the precocious onset of atherosclerosis, thereby enabling these FH patients to lead lives with normal life expectancy.[12] Hence, screening for FH is pivotal for preventing CVD events, enhancing life expectancy, and improving the overall quality of life in affected individuals.[7]

Some national health authorities and professional medical organizations are placing increasing emphasis on FH screening, endorsing actions through the formulation of guidelines and expert consensuses. For instance, in 2008, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) unveiled a UK guideline dedicated to the identification and management of patients with FH.[13] Similarly, the European Atherosclerosis Society's FH Studies Collaboration has recently underlined the imperative nature of a global registry for FH, advocating for concerted global initiatives.[14] The Australasia Network Consensus Group, aiming to better guide clinicians in the management of FH, has also instituted novel directives.[15] Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales have pioneered national FH services.[16] While the importance of FH screening has garnered recognition among numerous professionals, there remains a significant gap concerning its economic implications. Notably, there is a dearth of comprehensive research assessing whether FH screening warrants inclusion in health insurance schemes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Health inequality, as a pivotal policy concern within the global healthcare system, compels us to delve into the distribution of health costs and outcomes among diverse populations while evaluating the overall health input benefits of healthcare measures.[17] [18] Despite persistent calls for health technology assessment (HTA) agencies to incorporate fairness evaluations into their decision-making processes,[19] there remains a lack of systematic research on the impact of FH screening on health equity. To address this knowledge gap, our study employs, for the first time, an aggregate Distributional Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (DCEA) methodology. This approach, introducing considerations of fairness atop traditional health economic evaluations, comprehensively explore the impact of FH screening strategies on health equity.[20]

Considering the knowledge gap, the overarching objective of this manuscript is to synthesize the economic evidence regarding (1) the cost-effectiveness of FH screening through meta-analytic review and (2) the impact on the equity across the population.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

METHODS

We employed a systematic review and data extraction approach to provide robust evidence for economic evaluation of FH screening strategies. Following this, a meticulous meta-analysis was undertaken to synthesize the gathered data. Subsequently, we applied an aggregate distributional cost-effectiveness analysis. This comprehensive analysis not only furnishes policymakers with detailed information but also quantitatively assesses the impact of health policies on health equity.

1.Systematic Review

Search strategy

In this study, we employed a rigorous literature search method to ensure the systematic retrieval and analysis of economic evaluation literature on FH screening. We used key terms and corresponding MeSH terms such as "familial hypercholesterolemia," "cost-effectiveness analysis," "disease screening," and "health economics" to search multiple important databases, including PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase. The search cutoff date was October 20, 2023, and we limited the publication year of the literature to 2000 and beyond.

To ensure the accuracy and consistency of the research, we established predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Our inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) study participants being patients with FH, (2) the study involving FH disease screening, (3) the study conducting an economic evaluation of the screening methods, and (4) language restriction to English. Exclusion criteria included: (1) studies involving

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

participants with multiple diseases simultaneously, (2) studies where the primary focus of the economic evaluation is not disease screening, (3) studies not reporting the process or results of economic evaluations, and (4) reviews, conference papers, disease guidelines, etc.

Data Extraction

Considering the diverse nature of the study literature, we utilized Excel tools for the meticulous extraction of data. The extracted information encompassed a wide array of variables, including background, perspective, currency unit, screening strategies, screening targets, treatment drugs, economic evaluation methods, cost-effectiveness analysis results, and intricate details regarding the decision models employed. The systematic extraction and integration of this comprehensive dataset were pivotal in furnishing comparable information, thereby augmenting the evidentiary foundation for our study (Table 1 and 2).

Quality Assessment

To ensure the inclusion of literature adhering to high-quality research methods and reporting standards, a comprehensive quality assessment of the selected studies was conducted. Two distinct tools were employed for this purpose: the Quality of Health Economic Studies (QHES) instrument and the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) 2022.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

QHES instrument Evaluation

The Quality of Health Economic Studies (QHES) scale, a well-established instrument consisting of 16 key criteria, served as the primary tool for assessing the methodological rigor and overall quality of the selected studies.[21] Each criterion was diligently evaluated, with scores ranging from 0 to 100, offering a comprehensive overview of the studies' methodological soundness. Subsequently, the total scores were categorized into levels indicative of study quality: high quality (75-100), moderate quality (50-74), low quality (25-49), and very low quality (0-24).[22] See Appendix 4 for details of the QHES score.

CHEERS 2022 Evaluation

CHEERS 2022 served as a quantitative scoring system for the systematic review, encompassing 28 scoring criteria across seven critical domains, including title, abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, and others.[23] Each criterion was assigned specific scoring rules: complete reporting earned 1 point, partial reporting earned 0.5 points, and non-reporting received 0 points. The maximum total score was 28 points, with detailed scoring specifics available in the Appendix 3.[24]

2. Meta-Analysis

Eligibility for meta-analysis

Following the systematic review, we conducted a meta-analysis to synthesize the economic evidence. Apparently, total articles were eligible for evidence synthesis since

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

they were dealing with heterogeneous contexts. We applied some eligibility criteria to select articles for evidence synthesis that generated sensible outcomes. First, the included studies were consistent in terms of the screening strategies, such as cascade or universal screening. Second, we ensured the outcomes of included studies were consistent, such as CE, Life Years Gained, or Quality-Adjusted Life Years. Finally, the included studies applied the same perspective, whether it be a healthcare system or a societal perspective.

Evidence synthesis

Cost

We extracted cost values from eligible studies for the meta-analysis. Due to the heterogeneity in the use of currencies and years across different articles, we converted all costs to 2023 US dollars for calculation to ensure consistency. For those without reported confidence intervals, we calculated the intervals using a range of ±50%. The types of costs are shown in Appendix 2.

Effectiveness

Meta-analysis of health outcomes resulting from FH screening involved categorization into four distinct classes: deaths averted, adverse events averted, Life Years Gained and Quality-Adjusted Life Years. Extracted by different result categories in Appendix5. Results lacking reported confidence intervals were handled conservatively, with a ±50% adjustment to address potential variability in the numerical values. Additionally,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Spencer et al. reported results for 20 and 35-year-old cohorts, combining averages of effectiveness for both age groups. [25]

Incremental benefit calculation

Integration of health outcomes and incremental costs was performed to determine the ICER. The total incremental costs and total effectiveness were computed, and the ICER was derived by dividing the synthesized cost by synthesized health outcomes (i.e., QALYs, LYGs). Confidence intervals for ICERs were obtained using the Delta method. The Delta method involves calculating the variance of the ratio. Utilizing this variance of the ratio, the standard error is computed, subsequently allowing the derivation of a 95% confidence interval for ICER values. This method ensures a robust statistical approach to ascertain the uncertainty surrounding the cost-effectiveness estimates (Table 3).

Total Net Health Benefit

To facilitate a comprehensive evaluation of different FH screening groups, we employed the Comparative efficiency research (COMER).[26] Initially, we utilized this method to calculate the Net Health Benefit included in the study. NHB is a comprehensive indicator in health economics evaluations that takes into account both costs and benefits. The positive or negative sign and magnitude of its results provide an intuitive reflection of the efficiency levels of health projects. Subsequently, by taking the reciprocal of the variance of each study's NHB and applying weighting, we

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

calculated the Total Net Health Benefit (TNHB) for different FH screening groups. The detailed calculation methodology for COMER can be found in the Appendix 6. Furthermore, to enhance the granularity of our analysis, we calculated the incremental costs and incremental effects of each group of weights according to the weight value (Table3).

3.Aggregate DCEA

In our study, we conducted an aggregate Distributional Cost-Effectiveness Analysis based on the original cost-effectiveness analysis results of FH screening. This was undertaken to comprehensively assess how the health impacts and costs post FH screening are distributed among population subgroups and to estimate the fairness impact of FH screening strategies. The aggregate DCEA analysis provides detailed information on the degree and direction of the fairness impact of FH screening, offering policymakers a robust reference. The following are the steps we took:

Health Distribution

In the absence of interventions, the baseline health level of the population was established. The baseline distribution of population health and the distribution of health opportunity costs were derived from the work of Love-Koh et al.[27 28] Their study delineated the distribution of quality-adjusted life expectancy (QALE) at birth and the corresponding distribution of medical opportunity costs. To measure socio-economic poverty, the study employed the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), categorizing the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

population into five groups, IMD1 to IMD5, where IMD1 represents the most impoverished areas, and IMD5 represents the most affluent areas.[19] The Baseline distribution of health for IMD1 and IMD5 was 63.21 and 75.00, respectively, while the health opportunity costs distribution was 26% and 14%, respectively (Appendix 7). Subsequently, we incorporate the Net Health Benefit resulting from FH screening into the baseline population health distribution, yielding the health distribution after FH screening.

Opportunity cost relevant Net Health Benefit

For each Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) group, Incremental NHB is calculated and these values are subsequently consolidated. The NHB is determined by subtracting opportunity costs from the overall health gains. The threshold for health opportunity costs is set at the upper limit of the willingness-to-pay threshold, specifically the maximum willingness-to-pay threshold utilized in the study.

The calculation formula is as follows: Aggregated incremental net health benefit per quintile:

$$\Delta NHB_j \quad = \Delta QALY \times n_j - \frac{N \times \Delta costs}{k} d_j \qquad (1)$$

where $\Delta NHBj$ represents the incremental net health benefit for the j^{th}group; $\Delta QALY$ denotes the incremental health gains from FH screening; nj is the number of individuals screened in the jth group, N is the total number of screenings, K is the threshold for health opportunity costs, dj is the opportunity cost ratio for the jth group, and $\Delta costs$ refer to the incremental costs of screening for individuals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Equally distributed equivalent health

Equally distributed equivalent health (EDEH) is the equitable weighted average of health distribution. By calculating the post-decision EDEH and subtracting it from the baseline EDEH, the incremental EDEH is obtained. We computed the EDEH using the Atkinson inequality index and the average health level in the distribution. The Atkinson index represents inequality in the distribution, and the Atkinson Inequality Aversion Parameter (IAP) estimated according to Robson was 10.95.[29] Using the formulas for Atkinson index of inequality and EDEH based on the Atkinson index, where N is scaled based on the number of screened patients:

$$A(\epsilon) = 1 - \left(\frac{1}{N}\sum\left(\frac{h_i}{h}\right)^{1-\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} \quad (2)$$

where $A(\varepsilon)$ is the Atkinson Inequality Index, where N represents the total number of screenings, hi is the health level of each group, h is the average health level of the population, and ε is a constant aversion to relative inequality levels.

$EDEH$ based on Atkinson index

$$EDEH = N\big(1 - A(\varepsilon)\big)h \quad (3)$$

where $EDEH$ refers to the average level of per capita health, $A(\varepsilon)$ is the Atkinson Index, h is the average health level of the population, and N is the total number of screenings.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

EDEH-NHB

We computed the incremental EDEH and incremental NHB to assess changes in health distribution. The impact on health equity is evaluated by calculating the difference between EDEH and NHB. A positive value indicates a reduction in health inequality, while a negative value indicates an increase in inequality.[19]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

RESULTS

1.Literature Search Results

Inclusion of Literature

Through systematic searches of databases such as PubMed (47 articles), Web of Science (109 articles), and Embase (33 articles), we identified a total of 189 articles. After importing these articles into EndNote 20, 38 duplicates were removed, and 98 articles were excluded based on exclusion criteria, resulting in the final inclusion of 18 articles. Subsequently, an additional article was included, bringing the total to 19 articles for the final analysis. Please refer to Figure 1 for a detailed flowchart of the literature selection process (Figure 1).

Quality Assessment outcomes

The average QHES evaluation score stands at 87, with a score range spanning from 80 to 93. This signifies that the entirety of the selected literature attains a high-quality standard, achieving a 100% level of excellence. Furthermore, aligning with the CHEERS 2022 assessment, these articles garnered scores within the range of 19 to 24.5, with an average score of 21 for the 19 articles, once again affirming the exceptional quality of the chosen literature (Table 1). Throughout the scrutiny of each economic evaluation study, the employed methods and models demonstrated clear and transparent characteristics. They were elucidated with detailed explanations of the selected model's temporal framework. Despite variances in FH screening strategies across diverse countries, all articles employed explicit language to articulate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

comparator strategies. Moreover, they provided explicit and comprehensive reports of measurement results, establishing a robust foundation for the comparability of research outcomes.

Characteristics of included studies

This study involves a comprehensive analysis of 19 articles, covering different geographical focuses, with 32% conducted in the United Kingdom,[30-35] and 63% are concentrated in Europe. Regarding the analytical perspective, 79% of the studies focused solely on healthcare, considering direct medical costs such as screening and treatment expenses,16% concurrently considered healthcare and societal perspectives.[36-38] A substantial 89% discounted costs and health outcomes. Among the discounted studies, 82% employed identical discount rates for costs and benefits, with cost discount rates ranging from 3% to 6% and benefit discount rates ranging from 1% to 5%.

In the literature, 32% employed cost-effectiveness analysis,[33 34 39-42] while 21% used cost-utility analysis with QALY as the health outcome.[31 32 35] The modeling approaches varied, encompassing Markov models, decision trees, life-table analysis, simulated family trees, and combinations thereof. Markov models were the most prevalent, constituting over half of the studies, often reporting health state numbers ranging from 3 to 14. Notably, a unique U.S. study incorporated simulated family trees as part of its modeling approach.[39] In Appendix 1 and Table 1, we have presented a detailed display of the review results.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Among the FH screening studies, 90% reported ICER values below their respective country's willingness-to-pay thresholds, indicating cost-effectiveness. However, two U.S. studies introduced divergent findings.[43] Specifically, genomic screening was deemed not cost-effective at the current U.S. willingness-to-pay threshold.[25]

To fortify the robustness of the models, 95% of the studies conducted sensitivity analyses. Among them, 53% utilized probabilistic sensitivity analysis, simulating cost-effectiveness probabilities and drawing cost-effectiveness acceptability curves (CEACs) based on thresholds. It is worth noting that, with variations in the willingness-to-pay thresholds, there are significant differences in the probability of cost-effectiveness for the screening. For instance, in the U.S. population-wide genomic screening, for individuals aged 20, the cost-effective probabilities of FH screening were 1%, 38%, and 81% at QALY thresholds of $50000, $100000, and $150000, respectively. For those aged 35, the corresponding probabilities were 0%, 14%, and 57%.[25] (Table 2)

FH screening strategies

Child Screening

The atherosclerosis process initiates in childhood, and child screening has demonstrated favorable cost-effectiveness in select countries such as the UK, Australia, Argentina, and the Netherlands. McKay et al. conducted universal screening of 1-2-year-old children in the UK, followed by reverse cascade testing. The findings indicated that this strategy was economically viable within the UK's willingness-to-pay

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

threshold.[32] In Argentina, a probabilistic model assessed the expected cost-effectiveness of universal FH screening for 6-year-old children, revealing it as a highly cost-effective health technology.[44] Similar studies were conducted in Australia and the Netherlands. Ademi et al[38 45] the economic aspects of cascade screening for 10-year-old children from the perspectives of the Australian public healthcare system and Dutch healthcare and society, respectively. Results consistently showed that cascade screening for 10-year-old children was cost-effective compared to standard care in both Australia and the Netherlands.

Several Age-Groups

Economic evaluations of FH screening for various age groups were conducted globally. In the United States, a study on comprehensive genomic FH screening found improved cost-effectiveness for screening younger patient cohorts compared to older ones.[25] An Australian study conducted a cost-effectiveness assessment of genomic screening for young individuals with FH. Subgroup analysis revealed that narrowing the screening age range from 18-40 years to 18-25 years resulted in an increased cost per Quality-Adjusted Life Year.[36] Another Australian study focusing on cost-effectiveness analysis of cascade screening for FH in children conducted subgroup analyses for different age groups. The results revealed that, compared to 18-year-olds, screening 10-year-old children for FH and initiating statin therapy immediately remained cost-saving.[45]

Cascade screening and optimization

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The cost-effectiveness of cascade screening has been substantiated in numerous countries, demonstrating commendable efficiency. Some nations have integrated cascade screening with different case identification methods to determine the most cost-effective screening strategy. These methods include searching electronic health records, utilizing various clinical assessment standards,[31] screening identified cases separately based on genetic testing and cholesterol testing,[35] combining genetic testing and cholesterol testing but distinguishing the order,[32] The results underscore that incorporating these diverse case identification methods surpasses the cost-effectiveness of standalone cascade testing.[31]

Strategies combination

Recognizing the complementarity of these strategies, some countries are exploring combinations for a more comprehensive FH screening approach. In Poland, researchers combined Universal Screening followed by Cascade Screening for different populations or Opportunistic Screening followed by Cascade Screening for clinically or genetically diagnosed high-risk populations. Results from the evaluation of seven strategies indicated that screening patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS) under 55/65 years of age using clinical criteria emerged as the most cost-effective strategy. From the perspective of public payers, the most acceptable solution for introducing FH screening might be a combination of multiple strategies.[46]

2.Meta-Analysis Results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The cost-effectiveness analysis of the literature revealed that 90% of FH screening studies were deemed cost-effective (Table 2).The meta-analysis excluded literature that did not provide specific cost or outcome values[33 39 44] and literature where strategies were not comparable.[31 32 35 42 43 46] The final synthesis of results included eight studies on cascade screening[30 34 37 38 40 41 45 47] and three studies on Universal Screening.[25 34 36] These studies considered outcome measures such as QALY, LYG, adverse events averted, and deaths averted, resulting in the eventual synthesis of seven distinct groups (Table 3).

Cost-Effectiveness of Cascade Screening

For studies using QALY as the outcome measure,[30 37 38 45 47] the synthesized results showed a sum Incremental Cost of $39711734, a total QALYs gain of 800, and a calculated ICER per QALY of $49630. For studies using LYG as the outcome measure,[38 40 41 45 47] the synthesized results showed a sum Incremental Cost of $135493, sum LYG per person of 30.44, and a calculated ICER per LYG of $4451.Studies using adverse events averted as the outcome measure indicated a sum Incremental Cost of $39595745, sum adverse events averted was 975.2, and the calculated ICER was $40603. For studies using deaths averted as the outcome measure,[30 34 37 45] the sum Incremental Cost was $141082678, sum deaths averted was 786.55, and the calculated ICER was $179369.

Cost-Effectiveness of Universal Screening

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Similarly, for studies using LYG and QALY as the outcome measures,[25 36] The synthesized results showed a Sum Incremental Cost of $1082381499, Sum LYG per person of 33549.5, and a calculated ICER per LYG of $32262. The Sum QALY per gain was 51877.5, and the calculated ICER per QALY was $20860. For studies using deaths averted as the outcome measure,[34 36] the synthesized results showed a Sum Incremental Cost of $1075045353, Sum deaths averted was 1290.7, and the calculated ICER was $832917.

TNHB

Analyzing the COMER results, we present the synthesized data for Net Health Benefit across seven FH screening groups with distinct characteristics. The TNHB for the four cascade screening groups consistently exhibited positive values, whereas for the three universal screening groups, TNHB consistently showed negative values. Specifically, for cascade screening, the TNHB for QALYs was $25614, for LYG was $21801, for adverse events averted was $601825 and for deaths averted was $182905. In contrast, for universal screening, the TNHB for QALYs was -$5563039, for LYG was -$10472757 and for deaths averted was -$12891385. The results are summarized in Table 3.

3.Aggregate DCEA

Average Baseline EDEH

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In this study, the mean Quality-Adjusted Life Years per individual stood at 69.72, corresponding to an Equivalent Disposable Income per Equivalent Adult (EDEH) of 68.32, given an Atkinson Individual Average Propensity (IAP) of 10.95.

DCEA Calculation

Given the heterogeneity in costs, health outcomes, and opportunity cost thresholds across the 19 articles, we opted to conduct aggregate Distributional Cost-Effectiveness Analysis calculations on articles reporting complete data, resulting in 6 final publications (Table 4).

In the UK's 2017 cascade screening, with an opportunity cost threshold of £30000/QALY, the incremental NHB for FH cascade screening compared to no screening was 2477 QALYs. The post-decision EDEH was 2802 QALYs, with a difference of 325 QALYs, indicating a reduction in inequality.[30]

In the UK's 2018 cascade screening, with an opportunity cost threshold of £30,000/QALY, the incremental NHB for cascade screening of FH patients compared to no screening was 19 QALYs. The post-decision EDEH was 156 QALYs, with a difference of 137 QALYs, indicating a reduction in inequality.[31]

In the UK's universal screening plus reverse cascade screening, with an opportunity cost threshold of £20000/QALY, the incremental NHB for cholesterol-based cascade screening of FH patients compared to no screening was 1456 QALYs. The post-decision EDEH was 2012 QALYs, with a difference of 556 QALYs, indicating a reduction in inequality.[32]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In Australia's cascade screening, with an opportunity cost threshold of AU$28000/QALY, the incremental NHB for FH cascade screening compared to no screening was 1111 QALYs. The post-decision EDEH was 1147 QALYs, with a difference of 36 QALYs, indicating a reduction in inequality.[45]

In the US's cascade screening, with an opportunity cost threshold of $150000/QALY, the incremental NHB for adding medication adherence to cholesterol screening of FH patients compared to cholesterol screening alone was 450 QALYs. The post-decision EDEH was 500 QALYs, with a difference of 50 QALYs, indicating a reduction in inequality.[43]

In the Netherlands' cascade screening, with an opportunity cost threshold of €20000/QALY, the incremental NHB for cascade screening of children with FH compared to no screening was 1362 QALYs. The post-decision EDEH was 1393 QALYs, with a difference of 31 QALYs, indicating a reduction in inequality.[38]

CEA and DCEA Integration

Through cost-effectiveness analysis, FH screening was found to be cost-effective in majority of cases, with numerous studies identifying the most cost-effective options. Building upon these CEA analyses, DCEA calculations were performed, examining the impact on the distribution of health after allocating resources to FH screening. Across the six analyzed publications, all EDEH-NHB values were positive, indicating that the FH screening strategy, as an intervention measure, is capable of reducing inequality,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

improvement in population health and health equity, and an increase in social welfare.

Please refer to Table 4 for detailed DCEA results.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

DISCUSSION

This study represents the first-ever global comprehensive economic evidence synthesis on FH screening, addressing a crucial void in the existing literature. The absence of systematic evaluations in numerous countries prompted our investigation, which conducted an exhaustive literature search and synthesized evidence, contributing nuanced economic evaluation outcomes and health impact analyses associated with FH screening. The amalgamation of international experiences and evaluation outcomes paints an optimistic picture, suggesting the economic feasibility of FH screening. This effort not only offers technical guidance for FH screening economic evaluations on a global scale but also establishes a robust foundation for future economic evaluations in this domain.

Upon closer scrutiny of the economic evaluations of FH screening, a significant heterogeneity emerges, necessitating a comprehensive consideration of multiple factors. Firstly, the analytical perspective stands out as a key consideration. Most studies predominantly adopted a payer perspective, neglecting the comprehensive account of productivity losses. Even more, we need to calculate the return on investment of FH screening from a broader perspective, as the Netherlands has done.[38] Secondly, the choice of models emerges as a critical consideration. While Markov models are widely applied, the utilization of composite models, combining decision tree models with other approaches, can more comprehensively address the actual complexities associated with FH screening. This enhancement in model

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

reliability ensures a more accurate representation of the economic implications. Thirdly, flexibility in selecting time models based on practical exploration is paramount. The majority of studies focus on a lifetime horizon, but considering different tracking periods, such as 10 years, 30 years, and 60 years, enhances the adaptability of models to varying research needs, thereby increasing their practicality.

The demonstrated cost-effectiveness of cascade screening in an increasing number of countries highlights its importance. However, the exploration of cascading through multiple generations remains an important avenue for investigation. A study in the United States, simulating approximately 6 million individuals using the Simulation of Family Tree, revealed that beyond first and second-degree relatives, cascade screening is not cost-effective.[39] While many countries have conducted cascade screening and demonstrated its economic benefits, only a study in the United Kingdom has applied reverse cascade screening, proving its economic effectiveness after universal screening for children. This underscores the importance of future discussions on the strategic integration of reverse cascade screening for FH in children.[32]

The crucial importance of determining the cost-effectiveness of health technology, particularly in the context of publicly funded healthcare insurance systems, cannot be overstated. In many countries, the cost-effectiveness of FH screening remains uncertain, emphasizing the need to establish this before considering large-scale implementation.[48] Our study's promising outlook, revealing that FH screening is cost-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

effective in 90% of cases, underscores its potential contribution to the overall efficiency of healthcare systems. Policymakers can leverage these findings to enhance the financial sustainability of healthcare systems, ultimately contributing to improved patient health.

Analyzing the impact of FH screening on population equity, we found that FH screening can simultaneously improve health equity and elevate health levels in various circumstances. In many countries, where health disparities persist, our results provide a positive perspective on the potential of FH screening, particularly for resource-limited and impoverished regions. The FH screening intervention is poised to bring about significant health outcomes in these countries, thereby contributing to the improvement of societal fairness and equality.

Turning our attention to treatment options for FH, a diverse array of options, particularly in reducing low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C) levels, is available. Statins, widely used in FH treatment, effectively reduce LDL-C levels by inhibiting cholesterol synthesis enzymes. However, for FH patients requiring high-dose statin treatment yet intolerant to its side effects, PCSK9 inhibitors may emerge as a crucial alternative.[49] Although PCSK9 inhibitors demonstrate remarkable effectiveness in lowering LDL-C levels, their cost-effectiveness in patients with heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia does not meet the generally accepted incremental cost-effectiveness threshold.[50] The potential cost-effectiveness of screening plus PCSK9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

treatment approaches remains unclear. It is imperative to consider them in the broader context of screening and treatment strategies in future economic evaluations.

Precision public health, aiming to provide the right intervention to the right population at the right time, is a continually evolving field. The cost-effectiveness of genetic testing and cholesterol testing in FH screening economic evaluations varies between countries, influencing economic outcomes.[48] In a study conducted in the UK, all DNA-based methods were shown to be cost-effective compared to cholesterol-only methods.[35] However, in some US-based studies, the cost-effectiveness of genetic testing is challenged by the high costs associated with it.[25 43] This underscores the necessity of careful consideration of the complexities and factors involved in precision interventions. When genetic testing costs are prohibitively high, plasma cholesterol level screening may be the more appropriate intervention. Additionally, lowering the cost of genomic testing or integrating FH screening into broader multiphasic screening programs may offer more efficient intervention strategies, promoting the implementation of precision public health strategies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

CONCLUSION

Our research offers valuable insights into the economic evaluation of screening strategies for FH, revealing substantial differences among various countries in the economic assessment process. Despite variations in the economic evaluation across different studies, the attainment of a 90% FH screening rate demonstrates cost-effectiveness. Importantly, the implementation of these screening strategies extends beyond mere cost-effectiveness. Our findings highlight that they not only enhance population health but also contribute to the reduction of inequality, promoting health equity. This dual impact presents a positive outlook for the economic evaluation of FH screening in many countries.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1 Jingxin S, Shitong C. Expanding the genetic spectrum for chinese familial hypercholesterolemia population with six genetic mutations identified using a next-generation sequencing-based laboratory-developed screening test. *Mol. Genet. Genom. Med.* 2022;10:e2070.

2 Mehta R, Zubiran R, Martagon AJ, *et al*. The panorama of familial hypercholesterolemia in latin america: a systematic review. *J. Lipid Res.* 2016;57:2115-29.

3 Du Z, Du Y, Li L, *et al*. Metabolomic approach to screening homozygotes in chinese patients with severe familial hypercholesterolemia. *J. Clin. Med.* 2023;12.

4 Santos RD. Screening and management of familial hypercholesterolemia. *Curr. Opin. Cardiol.* 2019;34:526-30.

5 Zubieliene K, Valteryte G, Jonaitiene N, *et al*. Familial hypercholesterolemia and its current diagnostics and treatment possibilities: a literature analysis. *Med. Lith.* 2022;58.

6 Wei N, Hu Y, Liu G, *et al*. A bibliometric analysis of familial hypercholesterolemia from 2011 to 2021. *Curr. Probl. Cardiol.* 2023;48:101151.

7 Wisloff T, Mundal LJ, Retterstol K, *et al*. Economic evaluation of lipid lowering with pcsk9 inhibitors in patients with familial hypercholesterolemia: methodological aspects. *Atherosclerosis* 2019;287:140-6.

8 Brett T, Qureshi N, Gidding S, *et al*. Screening for familial hypercholesterolaemia in primary care: time for general practice to play its part. *Atherosclerosis* 2018;277:399-406.

9 Li IW, Watts R, Brett T, *et al*. Cost impact of undertaking detection and management of familial hypercholesterolaemia in australian general practice. *Aust. J. Gen. Pract.* 2022;51:604-9.

10 Versmissen J, Oosterveer DM, Yazdanpanah M, *et al*. Efficacy of statins in familial hypercholesterolaemia: a long term cohort study. *BMJ-British Medical Journal* 2008;337:a2423.

11 Goldberg AC, Leiter LA, Stroes E, *et al*. Effect of bempedoic acid vs placebo added to maximally tolerated statins on low-density lipoprotein cholesterol in patients at high risk for cardiovascular disease: the clear wisdom randomized clinical trial. *JAMA-J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 2019;322:1780-8.

12 Martin AC, Bell DA, Brett T, *et al*. Beyond cascade screening: detection of familial hypercholesterolaemia at childhood immunization and other strategies. *Curr. Opin. Lipidology* 2017;28:321-7.

13 Humphries SE. Guidelines for the identification and management of patients with familial hypercholesterolaemia (fh): are we coming to a consensus? *Atheroscler. Suppl.* 2011;12:217-20.

14 Napier KR, Pang J, Lamont L, *et al*. A web-based registry for familial hypercholesterolaemia. *Heart Lung Circ.* 2017;26:635-9.

15 Watts GF, Sullivan DR, Hare DL, *et al*. Synopsis of an integrated guidance for enhancing the care of familial hypercholesterolaemia: an australian perspective. *Am J Prev Cardiol* 2021;6:100151.

16 Pears R, Griffin M, Watson M, *et al*. The reduced cost of providing a nationally recognised service for familial hypercholesterolaemia. *Open Heart* 2014;1:e000015.

17 Love-Koh J, Cookson R, Gutacker N, *et al*. Aggregate distributional cost-effectiveness analysis of health technologies. *Value Health* 2019;22:518-26.

18 Asaria M, Griffin S, Cookson R, *et al*. Distributional cost-effectiveness analysis of health care programmes--a methodological case study of the uk bowel cancer screening programme. *Health Econ.* 2015;24:742-54.

19 Meunier A, Longworth L, Gomes M, *et al*. Distributional cost-effectiveness analysis of treatments

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

for non-small cell lung cancer: an illustration of an aggregate analysis and its key drivers. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2023;41:1011-25.

20 Kowal S, Ng CD, Schuldt R, *et al*. The impact of funding inpatient treatments for covid-19 on health equity in the united states: a distributional cost-effectiveness analysis. *Value Health* 2023;26:216-25.

21 Chiou CF, Hay JW, Wallace JF, *et al*. Development and validation of a grading system for the quality of cost-effectiveness studies. *Med. Care* 2003;41:32-44.

22 Ofman JJ, Sullivan SD, Neumann PJ, *et al*. Examining the value and quality of health economic analyses: implications of utilizing the qhes. *J Manag Care Pharm* 2003;9:53-61.

23 Husereau D, Drummond M, Augustovski F, *et al*. Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting standards 2022 (cheers 2022) statement: updated reporting guidance for health economic evaluations. *Value Health* 2022;25:3-9.

24 Husereau D, Drummond M, Augustovski F, *et al*. Consolidated health economic evaluation reporting standards (cheers) 2022 explanation and elaboration: a report of the ispor cheers ii good practices task force. *Value Health* 2022;25:10-31.

25 Spencer SJ, Jones LK, Guzauskas GF, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of population-wide genomic screening for familial hypercholesterolemia in the united states. *J. Clin. Lipidol.* 2022;16:667-75.

26 Crespo C, Monleon A, Diaz W, *et al*. Comparative efficiency research (comer): meta-analysis of cost-effectiveness studies. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* 2014;14:139.

27 Love-Koh J, Asaria M, Cookson R, *et al*. The social distribution of health: estimating quality-adjusted life expectancy in england. *Value Health* 2015;18:655-62.

28 Love-Koh J, Cookson R, Claxton K, *et al*. Estimating social variation in the health effects of changes in health care expenditure. *Med. Decis. Mak.* 2020;40:170-82.

29 Robson M, Asaria M, Cookson R, *et al*. Eliciting the level of health inequality aversion in england. *Health Econ.* 2017;26:1328-34.

30 Kerr M, Pears R, Miedzybrodzka Z, *et al*. Cost effectiveness of cascade testing for familial hypercholesterolaemia, based on data from familial hypercholesterolaemia services in the uk. *Eur. Heart J.* 2017;38:1832-9.

31 Crosland P, Maconachie R, Buckner S, *et al*. Cost-utility analysis of searching electronic health records and cascade testing to identify and diagnose familial hypercholesterolaemia in england and wales. *Atherosclerosis* 2018;275:80-7.

32 Mckay AJ, Hogan H, Humphries SE, *et al*. Universal screening at age 1–2 years as an adjunct to cascade testing for familial hypercholesterolaemia in the uk: a cost-utility analysis. *Atherosclerosis* 2018;275:434-43.

33 Marks D, Wonderling D, Thorogood M, *et al*. Cost effectiveness analysis of different approaches of screening for familial hypercholesterolaemia. *BMJ-British Medical Journal* 2002;324:1303.

34 Marks D, Thorogood M, Neil HAW, *et al*. Comparing costs and benefits over a 10 year period of strategies for familial hypercholesterolaemia screening. *Journal of public health (Oxford, England)* 2003;25:47-52.

35 Nherera L, Marks D, Minhas R, *et al*. Probabilistic cost-effectiveness analysis of cascade screening for familial hypercholesterolaemia using alternative diagnostic and identification strategies. *Heart* 2011;97:1175-81.

36 Marquina C, Lacaze P, Tiller J, *et al*. Population genomic screening of young adults for familial hypercholesterolaemia: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Eur. Heart J.* 2022;43:3243-54.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.09.23299771; this version posted December 10, 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

37 Lazaro P, Perez DIL, Watts GF, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of a cascade screening program for the early detection of familial hypercholesterolemia. *J. Clin. Lipidol.* 2017;11:260-71.

38 Ademi Z, Norman R, Pang J, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness and return on investment of a nationwide case-finding program for familial hypercholesterolemia in children in the netherlands. *JAMA Pediatr.* 2023;177:625-32.

39 Jackson CL, Huschka T, Borah B, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of cascade genetic testing for familial hypercholesterolemia in the united states: a simulation analysis. *American Journal of Preventive Cardiology* 2021;8:100245.

40 Oliva J, Lopez-Bastida J, Moreno SG, *et al*. [Cost-effectiveness analysis of a genetic screening program in the close relatives of spanish patients with familial hypercholesterolemia]. *Rev Esp Cardiol* 2009;62:57-65.

41 Wonderling D, Umans-Eckenhausen MAW, Marks D, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the genetic screening program for familial hypercholesterolemia in the netherlands. *Seminars in vascular medicine* 2004;4:97.

42 Marang-Van DMP, Ten AA, Bonneux L, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of a family and dna based screening programme on familial hypercholesterolaemia in the netherlands. *Eur. Heart J.* 2002;23:1922-30.

43 Chen CX, Hay JW. Cost-effectiveness analysis of alternative screening and treatment strategies for heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia in the united states. *Int. J. Cardiol.* 2015;181:417-24.

44 Araujo MB, Zerbino MC. Cost-effectiveness of pediatric universal screening for familial hypercholesterolemia in argentina. *Value Health Reg. Iss.* 2023;33:33-41.

45 Ademi Z, Norman R, Pang J, *et al*. Health economic evaluation of screening and treating children with familial hypercholesterolemia early in life: many happy returns on investment? *Atherosclerosis* 2020;304:1-8.

46 Pelczarska A, Jakubczyk M, Jakubiak-Lasocka J, *et al*. The cost-effectiveness of screening strategies for familial hypercholesterolaemia in poland. *Atherosclerosis* 2018;270:132-8.

47 Ademi ZMMP, Watts GFDP, Pang JP, *et al*. Cascade screening based on genetic testing is cost-effective: evidence for the implementation of models of care for familial hypercholesterolemia. *J. Clin. Lipidol.* 2014;8:390-400.

48 Jiang S, Wang H, Gu Y. Genome sequencing for newborn screening-an effective approach for tackling rare diseases. *JAMA Netw. Open* 2023;6:e2331141.

49 Gandra SR, Villa G, Fonarow GC, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of ldl-c lowering with evolocumab in patients with high cardiovascular risk in the united states. *Clin. Cardiol.* 2016;39:313-20.

50 Kazi DS, Moran AE, Coxson PG, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of pcsk9 inhibitor therapy in patients with heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia or atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. *JAMA : the journal of the American Medical Association* 2016;316:743-53.

Table 1. Characteristics and literature quality evaluation of FH screening studies included in the article

Country Author, Year,	Strategy type	Strategy number	Screening population	Definition of FH	Treatment	Economic evaluation method	Model	Time horizon	Cost unit	Discount rate	Perspective	QHES score	CHEERS 2022
UK, Kerr[30], 2017	CS	2	FH patients and their relatives	Genetic testing	Statins, Ezetimibe	CEA CUA	Markov	Lifetime	2014-15 UK pounds	3.5%	UK NHS perspective	87	22.5
UK, Crosland[31], 2018	CS	9	Patients aged 40-70 years with FH and relatives	Genetic testing	Statins	CUA	Decision tree + Markov model	Lifetime	2015-16 UK pounds	3.5%	UK NHS perspective	91	22
UK, McKay[32], 2018	US+RCT	8	Children 1-2 years old	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CUA	Decision tree + Markov model	Lifetime	2017 UK pounds	3.5%	UK NHS perspective	86	21
UK, Marks[33], 2002	US; CS; OS;	5	General population; Counseling patients; Inpatients with premature MI; FH patients and their relatives; People aged 16-54;	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CEA	Decision tree + life-table analysis	Lifetime	pounds	costs: 6% benefits:1%	UK NHS perspective	82	20
UK, Marks[34], 2003	US; CS;	2	16-year-olds; Patients aged 16-54 years and their relatives	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CEA	Decision tree + life-table analysis	10 years	pounds	Not Reported	UK NHS perspective	80	19
UK, Nherera[35], 2011	CS	4	FH patients (50 years old) and relatives (30 years old)	LDL-C testing	Statins	CUA	Decision tree + Markov model	Lifetime	2010-11 UK pounds	3.5%	UK NHS perspective	89	22

Australia, Ademi[45], 2020	CS	2	Ten years olds suspected of having FH	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CEA CUA	Markov	Lifetime	2019 Australian dollars	5%	Australian healthcare system perspective	91	23.5
Australia, Ademi[47], 2014	CS	2	FH patients and their relatives	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CEA CUA	Decision tree + Markov	10 years	2013 Australian dollars	5%	Australian health care perspective	88	20.5
Australia, Marquina[36], 2022	US	2	Population 18-40 years in Australia	Genetic testing	Statins; Ezetimibe	CEA CUA	Decision tree + Markov	Lifetime	2020 Australian dollars	5%	Australian healthcare and societal perspective	93	24.5
U.S. Chen[43], 2015	CS	3	Caucasian male adults	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CUA	Decision tree + Markov	Lifetime	2013 US dollars	3%	U.S. societal perspective	88	21
U.S. Spencer[25], 2022	US	2	Population-wide (20 and 35 years old)	Genetic testing	Statins	CEA CUA	Decision tree + Markov	Lifetime	2021 US. dollars	3%	U.S. health care sector perspective	90	22.5
U.S. Jackson[39], 2021	CS	2	FH+ progenitor population, and the children of the progenitor population, and subsequent off-spring	Genetic testing	Statins, Ezetimibe, PCSK9	CEA	Simulated family trees;	30 years	2018 US dollars	3%	U.S. health care provider's perspective	81	21.5
Argentina, Araujo[44], 2023	US	2	Living in Argentina aged 6 years children	LDL-C testing	Statins	CEA CUA	Decision tree	60 years	US dollars	5%	Argentine public healthcare system perspective	84	21

Poland, Pelczarska[46], 2018	US+ CS; OS+ CS;	7	People who got their first job; 6 years old Children; 49/75 years of age after the first ACS/stroke;	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CEA CUA	Decision tree + Markov	Lifetime	zloty and euros	Costs: 5% benefits:3.5%	Poland public payer perspective	89	21
Spanish, Lázaro[37], 2017	CS	2	FH patients and their relatives	Genetic testing	Statins; Ezetimibe	CEA CUA	Decision tree	10 years	2016 euros	3%	Spanish health system and social perspective	88	21
Spanish, Oliva[40], 2009	CS	2	Under 60 years old FH and relatives	Genetic testing	Statins	CEA	Life-table analysis	Lifetime	2005 euros	3%	Spanish health system perspective	89	21.5
Netherlands, Wonderling[41], 2004	CS	2	FH patients and their relatives	Genetic testing	Statins	CEA	Life-table analysis	Lifetime	2001 US dollars	4%	Netherlands health care perspective	85	20
Netherlands, Marang-van[42], 2002	CS	10	FH patients over 16 years of age and their relatives	Genetic testing; LDL-C testing;	Statins	CEA	Life-table analysis	Lifetime	2002 euros	Without discounting	Netherlands health care perspective	82	20.5
Netherlands, Ademi[38], 2023	CS	2	10-year-olds FH	Genetic testing	Statins	CEA CUA	Markov	Lifetime	2020 euros	Costs: 4% benefits:1.5%	Netherlands health care and societal perspectives	89	21.5

Abbreviations: FH: Familial hypercholesterolemia; CS: Cascade screening; US: Universal screening; OS: Opportunistic screening; RCT: Reverse cascade testing; ACS: Acute coronary syndrome; MI: Myocardial infarction; CEA: Cost effectiveness analysis; CUA: Cost-utility analysis; LDL-C: Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol;

Table 2. Summary of economic results is included in the article

Author Year	Outcome Measure	Cost (2023 US dollar)	Health benefit	ICERs (2023 US dollar)	WTP(/QALY)	Cost effectiveness
Kerr[30], 2017	QALY CE	Net marginal cost per relative tested:4702;	QALY per tested relative gain:0.48; Adverse events:46 MIs,50 cases of angina,8 strokes and 16 deaths;	9818.19/QALY	£20000/QALY £30000/QALY	✓
Crosland[31], 2018	QALY	Total costs: (1)11444;(2)11521; (3)11595;(4)11588; (5)11792.87;(6)11756; (7)11866;(8)11822; (9)11536;	QALYs:(1)11.4079; (2)11.41755;(3)11.46357; (4)11.46325;(5)11.41999; (6)11.41991;(7)11.46601; (8)11.4657;(9)11.45383;	(2) vs (1)7980.7/QALY (3) vs (4)22502.73/QALY (4) vs (9)5478.78/QALY (9) vs (1)1996.88/QALY	£15000 - £30000/QALY	✓
McKay[32], 2018	QALY	Total costs (1)364767;(2)905645; (3)1033512;(4)1085284; (5)4432244;(6)4498466; (7)4557261;(8)4623484;	OALYs: (1)992.2;(2)1009.1; (3)1010.7;(4)1027.5; (5)1000.7;(6)1022.2; (7)1011.5;(8)1033;	(2) vs (1)31149.61/QALY (3) vs (1)35304.4/QALY (4) vs (1)20144.43/QALY (5) vs (1)458090.37/QALY (6) vs (1)135974.87/QALY (7) vs (1)212476.88/QALY (8) vs (1)103235.34/QALY (8) vs (4)644978.34/QALY	£20000/QALY £30000/QALY	✓
Marks[33], 2002	LYG	Cost per case detected (NA)	Gain in life years: 7 years in men and 9.1 years in women aged 16-24 years	Clinical / Genetic (1)29100.35/174347.48/LYG (2)25260.95/156365.52/LYG (3)20729.17/47140.38/LYG (4)6917.17/10975.45/LYG (5)6202.45/33149.7/LYG	NA	✓
Marks[34] 2003	CE	Total cost: (1)13500753; (2)101486932;	Averted deaths: (1)11.7deaths (male9.8, female1.9); (2)560 deaths (male377, female182)	(1)1153911.14/CE (2)181224.63/CE	NA	✓

Nherera[35], 2011	QALY	Total Cost (1)80842;(2)92344; (3)95521;(4)99382; Incremental cost: (2) vs (1)11499; (4) vs (2)7038;	QALYs:(1)10.89;(2)24.12; (3)24.28;(4)25.18; Incremental QALY: (2) vs (1)13.23; (4) vs (1)1.06;	(2) vs(1)868.71/QALY (4) vs (2)6648.61/QALY	£20000/QALY	✓
Ademi[45], 2020	LYG QALY CE	Total costs (1)10190756; (2)10674822; net reduction cost: -852	QALY gained per person:(1) vs (2):1.07 LYG per person (1) vs (2):0.97; Averted 24.2 acute non-fatal events;7.55 death;	ICER/QALY: Dominant ICER/LYG: Dominant	AUD$28000/ QALY	✓
Ademi[47], 2014	LYG QALY CE	Incremental cost:84620	LYG:(1)784.78;(2)759.83 incremental LYG:24.95; QALY:(1)781.13;(2)752.06; incremental QALY:29.07;	(1) vs (2): 3391.93/LYG;2910.99/QALY	AUD $6000/QALY	✓
Marquina[36], 2022	LYG QALY CE	Healthcare: Total costs:(1)2391377517; (2)1329832917; Incremental cost:1061544600; Societal: (1)4898272968 (2)6692327539 Incremental cost: -1794054570;	Total years of life lived:(1)577088;(2)543600; incremental LYGs:33488; Total QALYs:(1)503500; (2)451711; incremental QALY:51790; Prevented 3093 CHD event;	Healthcare perspective: (1) vs (2)31698.75/LYG; 20496.99/QALY; Societal perspective: ICER/LYG: Dominant ICER/QALY: Dominant	AUD$28000/ QALY and AUD$50000/ QALY	✓
Chen[43], 2015	QALY	Total costs:(1)12461;(2)19640; (3)18692; Incremental costs: (2) vs (1)7179;(3) vs (1)6230;	Total QALYs:(1)18.28; (2)18.77;(3)18.29; Incremental QALYs (2) vs (1)0.49;(3) vs (1)0.01;	(2) vs (1)14651.74/QALY (3) vs (1)623101.28/QALY (2) vs (3)1975.46/QALY	$150000/QALY	✗
Spencer[25], 2022	LYG QALY	20-year-olds: Total costs:(1) 2551478334;(2)2530641435; Incremental Cost:20836900; 35-year-olds: Total Costs:(1)3519352312;(2)	20-year-olds: Incremental QALY:111; Incremental Life Years:69; 35-year-olds: Incremental QALY:84;	(1) vs (2) 20 years old:188573.94/QALY 35 years old:243791.72/QALY	$50000, $100000 and $150000/QALY	✗

		3498515413; Incremental Cost: 20836899	Incremental Life Years:54;			
Jackson[39]. 2021	LYG	FH Genetic Test:276 per relative	1st degree relatives: age<40 average LYG: positive 2st degree relatives: age<15 average LYG: positive 3st degree relatives: Age=5 average LYG: positive	positive	$50000/QALY	✓
Araujo[44], 2023	LYG QALY	NA	LYG each:8.14	1762.29/LYG	NA	✓
Pelczarska[46], 2018	LYG QALY	Incremental costs: (1)2142134;(2)3393626; (3)4003593.8;(4)2305455; (5)1137453;(6)11197272; (7)9479095;	LYG (total) (1)1564;(2)1650;(3)1476; (4)915;(5)4121;(6)1049; (7)4727; QALY (total) (1)1450;(2)1528;(3)1371;(4)712;(5)3774;(6)817;(7)4329;	(1)1369.48/LYG;1477.19/QALY (2)2056.14/LYG;2221.55/QALY (3)2711.38/LYG;2920.39/QALY (4)2519.68/LYG;3236.48/QALY (5)276.33/LYG;301.34/QALY (6)10669.22/LYG;13704.37/QALY(7)2004.85/LYG;2189.49/QALY	130002PLN (29800EUR)/ QALY	✓
Lázaro[37], 2017	CE QALY	Health care perspective: Direct costs total:(1)104657843; (2)65065947 Incremental Cost:39591894; Societal perspective: Total costs:(1)147451737; (2)152374442; Incremental cost: -4922706;	Cardiac events (1)813;(2)1661; event avoided:847; Coronary deaths: (1)196;(2)400; event avoided:203; QALYs:(1)62175;(2)61408; Incremental QALYs:767;	Healthcare perspective: 46737/Cardiac event; 194621.77/Coronary deaths; 51649.33/QALY; Societal perspective: -5810.72/Cardiac event; -24198.85/Coronary deaths; -6421.28/QALY;	€30000/QALY	✓
Oliva[40], 2009	LYG	Cost:(1)17272;(2)8349; Incremental cost:8922;	Life Years:(1)56.7;(2)55.4; Incremental Life Years:1.34;	6649.76/LYG	€10000/QALY	✓

Wonderling [41], 2004	LYG	Total incremental cost per new untreated case diagnosed:11433;	LYG:0.90 (discounted);	13452.45/LYG	NA	✓
Marang-van[42], 2002	LYG	Current screening: (1)46300180;(2)31235074; (3)15836251;(4)28593017; (5)21490645;(6)9649819; Alternative screening (7)42846515;(8)21170891; (9)32588637;(10)14644281;	Current screening (LYG) (1)865; (2)610;(3)361; (4)519;(5)407;(6)204; Alternative screening (7)836;(8)507;(9)623;(10)337;	(1)53509.08/LYG;(2)51211.92/LYG;(3)43842.87/LYG;(4)55056.49/LYG;(5)52795.28/LYG;(6)47415.27/LYG;(7)51278.68/LYG;(8)41725.44/LYG;(9)52307.43/LYG;(10)43409.79/LYG	€18151/QALY	✓
Ademi[38], 2023	LYG QALY	Health care perspective Total health care costs per person: (1) 24664443;(2)8613984; Incremental:48203; Societal perspective Incremental: -193386;	LYG per person: (1)38.78;(2):36.5; Incremental Life Years:2.28; QALY per person: (1)34.02;(2)31.48; Incremental QALYs:2.53;	Healthcare perspective:12378.51/QALY; Societal perspective: Dominant ROI:11.24;	€20000/QALY	✓

Abbreviations: LYG: Life years gained; QALY: Quality-adjusted life years; CE: Events averted; ROI: Return on investment; WTP: Willingness to pay; ICERs: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios; ✓: Cost effectiveness; ×:Not cost effectiveness

Table 3. Synthesis of cost-effectiveness analysis results and COMER outcomes

Groups	Study	Incremental costs (2023 US dollar)	Incremental effects	Total ICER (2023 US dollar)	NHB (2023 US dollar)	NHB<0 (%)	Weight (%)
CS(QALY)	Kerr[30],2017	4702.79	0.48	49630(37223 to 62038)	19648	NHB>0	0.4734
	Ademi[45],2020	-852.31	1.07		23369	NHB>0	0.3346
	Ademi[47],2014	84620.28	29.07		57823	NHB>0	0.0547
	Lázaro[37],2017	39591894.47	767		547516	NHB>0	0.0006
	Ademi[38],2023	31369.18	2.53		36563	NHB>0	0.1367
		$\Sigma\omega * c$=34991	$\Sigma\omega * e$=2.99		TNHB=25614(19210 to 32017)	TNHB>0	Σw=1
CS(LYG)	Ademi[45],2020	-852.31	0.97	4451(3338 to 5564)	21264	NHB>0	0.225
	Ademi[47],2014	84620.28	24.95		37634	NHB>0	0.0718
	Oliva[40],2009	8922.69	1.34		17108	NHB>0	0.3477
	Wonderling[41],2004	11433.06	0.9		20539	NHB>0	0.2412
	Ademi[38],2023	31369.18	2.28		29851	NHB>0	0.1142
		$\Sigma\omega * c$=15331	$\Sigma\omega * e$=2.95		TNHB=21801(16351 to 27251)	TNHB>0	Σw=1
CS (adverse events averted)	Kerr[30],2017	4702.79	104	40603(30452 to 50753)	5271321	NHB>0	0.0092
	Ademi[45],2020	-852.31	24.2		510117	NHB>0	0.9795
	Lázaro[37],2017	39591894.47	847		4734156	NHB>0	0.0114
		$\Sigma\omega * c$=449450	$\Sigma\omega * e$=34.29		TNHB=601825(451368 to 752281)	TNHB>0	Σw=1
CS (deaths averted)	Kerr[30],2017	4702.79	16	179369(134526 to 224211)	806993	NHB>0	0.0377
	Marks[34],2003	101486932.5	560		-64766053	NHB<0	0.000005
	Ademi[45],2020	-852.31	7.55		159735	NHB>0	0.9633
	Lázaro[37],2017	39591894.47	203		-28968295	NHB<0	0.00003

		$\Sigma\omega * c$=1110	$\Sigma\omega * e$=7.88		TNHB=182905(137178 to 228631)	TNHB>0	Σw=1
US(QALY)	Marquina[36],2022	1061544599.77	51790	20860(15645 to 26075)	854219290	NHB>0	0.00004
	Spencer[25],2022	20836899.42	97.5		-5599989	NHB<0	0.99996
		$\Sigma\omega * c$=20881624	$\Sigma\omega * e$=99.72		TNHB=-5563039(-6953798 to -4172279)	TNHB<0	Σw=1
US (deaths averted)	Marks[34],2003	13500753.09	11.7	832917(624687 to 1041146)	-12733549	NHB<0	0.99998
	Marquina[36],2022	1061544599.77	1279		-1014233111	NHB<0	0.00002
		$\Sigma\omega * c$=13665924	$\Sigma\omega * e$=11.9		TNHB=-12891385(-16114231 to -9668539)	TNHB<0	Σw=1
US(LYG)	Marquina[36],2022	1061544599.77	33488	32262(24197 to 40328)	177210008	NHB>0	0.004
	Spencer[25],2022	20836899.42	61.5		-11225925	NHB<0	0.996
		$\Sigma\omega * c$ =24996554	$\Sigma\omega * e$ =195.1		TNHB=-10472757(-13090946 to -7854568)	TNHB<0	Σw=1

Abbreviations: CS: Cascade screening; US: Universal screening; ω: weigh; Σω*c: The weighted sum of costs; NHB: Net health benefit; TNHB: Total health benefit; LYG: Life years gained; QALY: Quality-adjusted life years; CE: Events averted;

Table 4. The impact of FH screening strategies on health equity

Author, Year	Δ cost	ΔQALY	WTP	ΔNHB	ΔEDEH	ΔEDEH -ΔNHB	Value
Kerr[30](2017)	2781	0.48	30000	2477	2802	325	positive
Crosland[31](2018)	45.772	0.00965	30000	19	156	137	positive
McKay[32](2018)	335088	16.9	20000	1456	2012	556	positive
Ademi[45](2020)	-1134	1.07	28000	1111	1147	36	positive
Chen[43](2015)	5989	0.49	150000	450	500	50	positive
Ademi[38](2023)	23365	2.53	20000	1362	1393	31	positive

Abbreviations: Δ cost: Incremental cost; ΔQALY: Incremental quality adjusted life years; WTP: Willingness to pay; ΔNHB: Incremental Net Health Benefit; ΔEDEH: Incremental equally distributed equivalent health;

Figure 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Flow Diagram Illustrating the Study Selection Process