

1 Genetic newborn screening stakeholder perspectives.

2 Didu Kariyawasam ^{1,2*}, Joanne Scarfe (joint first authors) ³, Christian Meagher ², Michelle A.

3 Farrar ^{1,2}, Kaustav Bhattacharya ^{2,4,5}, Stacy M. Carter⁶, Ainsley J. Newson⁷, Margaret

4 Otlowski⁸, Jo Watson⁹, Nicole Millis¹⁰, Sarah Norris³

5 ¹Department of Neurology, Sydney Children's Hospital Network, Sydney, NSW, Australia

6 ²Discipline of Paediatrics and Child Health, School of Clinical Medicine, UNSW Medicine
7 and Health, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

8 ³The University of Sydney, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney School of Public Health,
9 Menzies Centre for Health Policy & Economics, NSW, Australia

10 ⁴Genetic Metabolic Disorders Service. Sydney Children's Hospital Network, Randwick and
11 Westmead, NSW, Australia

12 ⁵Faculty of Medicine and Health, Discipline of Genomics, Sydney University, Westmead,
13 NSW, Australia

14 ⁶Australian Centre for Health Engagement, Evidence and Values, School of Health and
15 Society, The University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, Australia

16 ⁷Sydney Health Ethics, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The
17 University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

18 ⁸Centre for Law and Genetics, Faculty of Law, College of Arts, Law and Education,
19 University of Tasmania, Tasmania, Australia

20 ⁹HTA Consumer Consultative Committee, Department of Health & Aged Care, Canberra,
21 ACT, Australia

22 ¹⁰Rare Voices Australia, Mentone, VIC, Australia

23 ***NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

Didu Kariyawasam

24 Email: didu.kariyawasam@health.nsw.gov.au

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 **ABSTRACT**

46 **Background**

47 Newborn bloodspot screening is a well-established population health initiative that detects
48 serious, childhood-onset, treatable conditions to improve health outcomes. With genomic
49 technologies advancing rapidly, many countries are actively discussing the introduction of
50 genomic assays into newborn screening programs. While adding genomic testing to
51 Australia’s newborn screening program could improve outcomes for infants and families, it
52 must be considered against potential harms, ethical, legal, equity and social implications, and
53 economic and health system impacts. We must ask not only ‘*can*’ we use genomics to screen
54 newborns?’ but ‘*should we*?’ and ‘*how much should health systems invest in genomic*
55 *newborn screening*?’.

56 **Methods**

57 This study will use qualitative methods to explore understanding, priorities, concerns and
58 expectations of genomic newborn screening among parents/carers, health
59 professionals/scientists, and health policy makers across Australia. In-depth, semi-structured
60 interviews will be held with 30-40 parents/carers recruited via hospital and community
61 settings, 15-20 health professionals/scientists, and 10-15 health policy makers. Data will be
62 analysed using inductive content analysis. The Sydney Children’s Hospital Network Human
63 Research Ethics Committee approved this study protocol [2023/ETH02371]. The Standards
64 for Reporting Qualitative Research will guide study planning, conduct and reporting.

65

66

67

68 **Discussion**

69 Few studies have engaged a diverse range of stakeholders to explore the implications of
70 genomics in newborn screening in a culturally and genetically diverse population, nor in a
71 health system underpinned by universal health care. As the first study within a multi-part
72 research program, findings will be used to generate new knowledge on the risks and benefits
73 and importance of ethical, legal, social and equity implications of genomic newborn
74 screening from the perspective of key stakeholders. As such it will be the foundation on
75 which child and family centered criteria can be developed to inform health technology
76 assessments and drive efficient and effective policy decision-making on the implementation
77 of genomics in newborn screening.

78 **Keywords:** Genomics, newborn bloodspot screening, benefits and harms, parents, policy,
79 health professionals, interview, health technology assessment, ethics, legal issues, qualitative
80 research.

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90 INTRODUCTION

91 Newborn bloodspot screening (NBS) is at an inflexion point in its evolution. A population
92 health initiative, it has a historical mandate to identify newborns at risk of serious, childhood
93 onset and usually treatable conditions, traditionally through analysis of biochemical
94 indicators (1). The rapid advancement of genomic capabilities with the advent of next
95 generation DNA sequencing methods has led to substantial interest amongst stakeholders to
96 leverage these technologies within NBS ('genomic NBS'). While the precise ways in which
97 genomic NBS could be deployed are yet to be determined, a key artefact of any move to the
98 use of genomics in NBS, is the potential to screen for many more genetic conditions than
99 presently (2), with the goal of shortening an often arduous and complex diagnostic journey
100 for affected individuals and their families (3). Avoiding a diagnostic odyssey is especially
101 relevant for the diagnostically challenging 7000 or so rare non-communicable, genetic
102 conditions (4), which collectively affect 8% of the Australian population, equivalent to 2
103 million individuals (5). For those affected with these conditions, there is typically a high
104 level of symptom complexity conferring a significant health and psycho-social challenge, in
105 part secondary to the accumulation of comorbidities associated with often delayed diagnosis.
106 Identifying an increased risk of a genetic conditions through genomic NBS may lead to a
107 timely diagnosis. A timely diagnosis, in turn, could enable expedient access to medical
108 interventions and participation in research, facilitate early engagement with support, care and
109 disability services and allow for financial and reproductive planning for affected families (6).
110 Cumulatively, the effects of receiving an early diagnosis are manifold but essentially seek to
111 improve health and psychosocial outcomes for the screened newborn (primary benefits) and
112 as a downstream consequence, the wider family (secondary benefits) (1, 6).

113 These potential opportunities and benefits need to be balanced against possible harms to
114 screened newborns and their families, as well as considered against the challenges that will

115 arise from implementation at scale within complex health systems. If risks and barriers to
116 successful use of genomic NBS are not identified and proactively addressed, the
117 incorporation of genomics may lead to the erosion of an established and highly successful
118 screening program (7). Moreover, it may risk existing high public trust in, and uptake of,
119 NBS (8).

120 Proposed and implemented strategies for genomic NBS include identifying variations in
121 single genes within first tier analysis (as deployed for NBS in spinal muscular atrophy) (9),
122 using genomics as second tier screening for children with biochemical signatures of disease
123 to reduce false positive rates (as proposed for NBS in Duchenne muscular dystrophy) (10),
124 the use of targeted gene panels of varying sizes (11), or even whole exome or genome
125 sequencing techniques for use as a health resource throughout one's life (2, 12). For exome or
126 genome sequencing techniques in particular, gaps in knowledge remain regarding their
127 utility, cost effectiveness and feasibility for use at a population level.

128 Since 2022, the Medical Services Advisory Committee (MSAC), an Australian body that
129 considers the addition of new conditions onto routine national NBS panels has evaluated and
130 endorsed the use of first tier genetic technologies X-linked adrenoleukodystrophy, and
131 continues to assess genomic NBS for a growing number of conditions ranging from
132 hemoglobinopathies to lysosomal disorders (13). In line with the prevailing policy and
133 international practice, MSAC continues to take what may be termed as a '*condition led*'
134 approach, as opposed to a '*technology led*' approach to facilitate health technology
135 assessments within newborn screening (14, 15). As such, conditions are individually
136 evaluated for NBS endorsement through processes such as health technology assessments
137 (HTAs). These processes focus on clinical and cost-effectiveness aspects of population
138 screening, underpinned by evidence of test performance (rates of true/false positives and

139 true/false negatives), acceptability of treatments for those identified as at risk through NBS,
140 and an agreed policy on who, how and when to treat, often generated through pilot (NBS)
141 programs that run over the course of many years (16). The creation of a robust evidence-base
142 to inform these outcomes is time consuming, requires significant clinical research
143 infrastructure and is especially challenging for rare diseases. Here, the development and
144 application of HTA criteria is adversely impacted by small patient numbers within each
145 condition, the lack of a coordinated strategy for data collection and synthesis, and less clinical
146 evidence being available due to the challenges of conducting large scale clinical trials (17,
147 18). Furthermore, whilst HTAs recognise ethical, legal and equity aspects of genomics
148 (including some early consideration of its role in population screening) these factors are
149 currently only minimally integrated into the assessment processes (19). This is in contrast to
150 growing support for incorporating such components early into health policy decision-making
151 processes by stakeholders (20), reflecting an emerging paradigm of genomic NBS as a health
152 intervention that is part of a ‘sociotechnical network’ of people *and* technologies, not separate
153 from but requiring integration with clinical evidence of utility and incremental benefit from
154 existing models of diagnosis and clinical care (21).

155 For future NBS programs to be flexible to accommodate the appropriate introduction of new
156 health technologies such as genomics, decision-making must be efficient, robust and
157 informed by all available evidence whilst also being contextualised for the specific challenges
158 shared by many rare diseases (22), facilitated by the integration of real-world evidence,
159 combined with expert input, clinical merit and public consultation (23). In tandem and in line
160 with national policy, evaluating stakeholder perspectives of risk-benefit can help us
161 understand the power and pitfalls of genomic capabilities in NBS, and inform a patient-driven
162 and personalized model of care (24), (15). Synthesising stakeholder perspectives offers
163 significant knowledge benefits including identification of conceivable benefits, risks, barriers

164 and enablers of implementation. This evidence generation can help to streamline support and
165 access to care by enabling co-design of an effective and holistic model of screening,
166 diagnostic and clinical management. Concomitantly, this foundation may help to inform NBS
167 policy and practice that is equitable, ethically appropriate and adapted to meet the needs of
168 newborns and their families(15).

169 Whilst some of these issues have been explored in health systems with large private health
170 insurance funding models, namely in North America (25-27), there is paucity of research on
171 stakeholder perspectives of genomic NBS within health domains that are predominantly
172 publicly funded, cover wide geographical expanses characteristic of the Australasian region,
173 and encompass socio-demographically heterogenous (including Indigenous) populations. In
174 Australia, while there has been a degree of systematic synthesis of information on genomic
175 NBS from the perspective of the lay public (26, 28), and from rare disease medical experts
176 (29, 30), the attitudes of parents of children with heterogenous genetic conditions (diagnosed
177 with and without NBS) have not been analysed, nor have the unique challenges faced by
178 policy makers when considering whether and how to incorporate genomics into NBS (31).

179 This study forms the first part of gEnomics4newborns research project: Integrating Ethics and
180 Equity with Economics and Effectiveness for genomics in newborn screening (MRF2015965)
181 (Figure 1). Accordingly, it will create knowledge on the perceived risks and benefits, barriers
182 and facilitators of implementation of genomic NBS within an Australian context. This study
183 will underpin the creation of a policy resource that will define key criteria for the assessment
184 of new conditions onto routine NBS panels (screened through genetic technologies).
185 Uniquely, this study will begin to inform policy decision makers on the priorities and relative
186 importance of equity, ethical, legal, and social factors from a stakeholder perspective and

187 how these can be incorporated into HTAs to maximise benefit, whilst mitigating harms of
188 genomic technologies on a population level.

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205 **Figure 1. Placing the current study as the foundation of a research program to integrate**
206 **ethical, legal, social and equity factors into health technology decision-making for**
207 **genomic newborn screening.**

208

209 *Stakeholders include: Parents/carers, health care professionals/scientists, health policy makers.

210 **Includes: Best-worst case scaling, Citizen’s Jury and Yarning Circle.

211 Evidence generated through engagement with stakeholders will provide essential knowledge for a
212 multimodal approach to generating recommendations. This will involve: 1. Best-worst case scaling, a
213 process through which choice data from individuals is collated to understand choice processes using a
214 top to bottom ranking method, 2. Citizen’s Jury, a deliberative inclusive approach to engaging with
215 the community on complex issues. This process supports a group of randomly selected
216 demographically diverse ‘jurors’ to hear and examine information given by expert witnesses on the
217 complexities of genomics in NBS, and then to make recommendations about how policy makers
218 should approach genomic NBS health technology assessment, 3. Yarning Circles, an established
219 process of dialogue used within Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture to assimilate and weigh
220 information. This multimodal approach will lead to development of Assessment Criteria that can be
221 used by future policy makers to establish methods of assessing new conditions in a faster, less
222 resource-intensive manner and incorporating ethical, legal, social and equity aspects of genomic NBS.

223

224

225

226

227

228

229 **AIM**

230 This study aims to explore stakeholders' understanding, attitudes, concerns, and priorities
231 related to genomic NBS in Australia. These stakeholders include parents and carers who have
232 participated in NBS who have had one or more children diagnosed with genetic conditions,
233 and those who have received false positive, false negative and uncertain newborn screen
234 results; health care professionals and scientists; and health policy makers. This study will
235 investigate a diverse range of perspectives on current and future impacts of the use of
236 genomics in NBS, including the ethical, legal, social and equity implications, and explore
237 how these views merge or diverge.

238 **METHODS**

239 **Ethics approval**

240 Ethics approval for the study is provided by the Sydney Children's Hospital Network Human
241 Research Ethics Committee [2023/ETH02371].

242 **Study design**

243 This is a co-designed multi-cohort qualitative study using semi-structured interviews to
244 explore understanding, experiences, and expectations of the potential use of genomics in NBS
245 among parents/carers, health professionals and scientists, and health policy makers across
246 Australia. Interview guides were developed following a scoping literature review of genomics
247 in NBS, as well as input from the broader gEnomics4newborns stakeholders who have
248 expertise in health and policy, clinical practice, consumer advisory and rare diseases
249 advocacy groups. The full interview guides are included as Supplementary Material (S1
250 Appendix). In-depth, semi-structured individual and dyadic interviews will be held with
251 parents and carers (n=30-40 participants), and individual interviews will be conducted with
252 health professionals and scientists (n=15-20) and health policy makers (n=10-15). A thematic

253 summary of the interview guides follows (Table 1). The Standards for Reporting Qualitative
254 Research (SRQR) are being employed from study planning to conduct and reporting. (32).

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278 **Table 1. Thematic summary of interview guides**

Domain	Discussion topics
<i>Parents / Carers – Cohort 1a (i) and 1b</i>	
Experience of child’s condition	Condition type and characteristics
Achieving a diagnosis	Experience of achieving a diagnosis through NBS
	Experience of achieving a diagnosis outside of NBS
Care and management	Care and management of condition
	Impact of condition on child and family
<i>Parents/Carers – Cohort 1a (ii)</i>	
Experience of NBS	Experiences of participating in NBS
	Experience of receiving a false positive or false negative NBS result
	Perspectives on NBS following false positive or false negative result
<i>All parent/carer cohorts</i>	
Genomic NBS	Understanding and interpretation of genomic NBS
	Perceived risks of genomic NBS
	Minimising harm to families through genomic NBS
	Inclusion of conditions in genomic NBS
Model of care for genomic NBS	Consent to participate in genomic NBS
	Delivery of results
	Receiving uncertain results
	Supporting families through achieving a screening result and diagnosis
	Influence of genomics on acceptability of NBS as a public health program
<i>Health professionals / Scientists</i>	
Professional experience	General
	NBS and genetic diseases
	Genomic sequencing
Genomic NBS	Perspectives on incorporating genomics into NBS
	Included conditions
	Perspectives on potential benefits and harms

	Ethical, legal and equity considerations
	Policy and implementation
<i>Policy makers</i>	
Professional experience	Professional field
Genomic NBS	Views on the use of genomics in population screening and in NBS specifically
	Perceived impact of genomics on current Australian NBS programs
	Perceived benefits and challenges of genomic NBS
Genomic NBS policy	Impact on National Policy Framework
	Views on current processes and required information when assessing genomic NBS
	Ethical, legal, social and equity considerations
Genomic NBS implementation	Implementation challenges and perceived solutions
	Impact of genomic NBS on parents/carers and families

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289 *Sample and recruitment*

290 Purposive sampling will be used to select participants and capture diversity in participant
291 characteristics, including a range of (positive and negative) experiences across NBS and
292 diagnosis. The number of participants will be determined through an iterative process of data
293 collection, analysis and reflection, with data collected until theoretical saturation is reached
294 and a range of perspectives are captured across participant types (33). Parents and carers of
295 children diagnosed with a genetic condition, and parents and carers of children who received
296 a false positive NBS result will be invited to participate in either individual or joint
297 interviews with the other parent/carer of the child (defined as participant dyads). They will be
298 recruited from hospital and community settings. All participants within this study are adults
299 >18 years of age.

300 The study will recruit participants across a range of genders, sociodemographics and timing
301 of screening and/or diagnosis. Non-English speakers will be supported by language
302 interpreter services. Participants who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander will
303 be included in the study as they appear incidentally in the sample. These participants will be
304 supported by the Aboriginal Hospital Liaison Officer and Aboriginal and Torres Strait
305 Islander support services. Four cohorts will be recruited into the study:

306

307 **Cohort 1a** Parents or carers who have participated in NBS in Australia and have: (i) children
308 diagnosed within NBS programs with genetic conditions included in the current NBS Policy
309 Framework (parents/carers of true screen positive individuals i.e. NBS screen positive and
310 children go on to be diagnostically confirmed to have the condition) (17); or (ii) experienced
311 false or uncertain results: a false positive result (NBS screen is positive but the child is NOT
312 confirmed to have a genetic condition), a false negative result (NBS screen is negative for the
313 named condition but the child develops symptoms of a condition and is later confirmed to

314 have a genetic diagnosis) or a screen result with uncertain significance (i.e. those where there
315 are variants of unknown clinical significance in disease causing genes).

316 *Exclusion criteria*

317 Parents/carers of children receiving a true screen negative result (parents/carers of individuals
318 who are screened negative for conditions on the newborn screening panel and do not go on to
319 be diagnosed with the condition at the time of the study) are excluded from the cohort, as the
320 views of these individuals have been explored in previous research (34), and will also be
321 captured in the other studies within the research program.

322

323 **Cohort 1b.** Parents or carers of children diagnosed with a genetic condition that would be
324 unlikely to be (or has not been) approved under the current Australian NBS Policy
325 Framework and associated decision-making pathways. Parents and carers who have been
326 determined by their clinician to be at high risk of significant psychological distress by
327 participating in the study will be excluded.

328 For these cohorts, clinicians from Sydney Children's Hospital Network (SCHN) will pre-
329 screen, select, contact, and obtain consent to be contacted by researchers from eligible
330 participants from their clinical patient databases for parents/carers in Cohorts 1a and 1b. The
331 managing clinician will be invited to put forward the name and contact details of participants
332 who consent to be contacted to the study team. Potential participants will also be invited to
333 enrol by study investigators when they are attending SCHN for routine clinical appointments
334 as part of clinical care, where the managing clinician will obtain consent from prospective
335 participants for the study team to contact them. To ensure diversity of opinions from across
336 the community, patient advocacy and support organisations will also be approached to
337 distribute advertisements for participation in the study via email and social media.

338 Recruitment will be facilitated by partner consumer advocacy organisations in the rare

339 disease community, the study's Consumer Advisory Group, and project investigators.

340 Parents/carers of children who received a false positive or false negative NBS result will be
341 recruited via SCHN clinical databases. To avoid conflicts of interest, study investigators
342 outside of the managing clinical team will recruit individuals into the study.

343 To ensure a diversity of opinions across the parent/carer cohorts, a recruitment screener will
344 be used following the consent process to ensure that a diversity of participants and range of
345 experiences are captured (S2 Appendix). A Decision Regret Scale will be administered
346 during the screening process to capture the extent to which participants do or do not regret
347 participating in newborn screening and, where relevant, consenting to their child/ren
348 undergoing genetic testing (35).

349 **Cohort 2.** Health professionals (including midwives, genetic counsellors, and those
350 experienced in NBS) and scientists involved in research and clinical care of children with
351 genetic conditions and/or expertise in NBS and/or genomic medicine. Health professionals
352 and scientists will be identified by purposive sampling relating to area of practice or
353 expertise, experience, gender, age and ethnicity, with sampling aiming to represent
354 stakeholders across Australia with at least one health professional/scientist from each state.
355 Health professionals/scientists will be identified through investigator networks, contacted via
356 email, and followed up with an additional email reminder or phone call two weeks later.

357 **Cohort 3.** Policy makers across Federal and State governments involved in NBS, genomics,
358 and/or HTA. Policy maker recruitment will be facilitated by project investigators and
359 researchers through existing networks.

360 For cohorts 2 and 3, passive snowball sampling may be used where interviewees will provide
361 names of potentially suitable colleagues and information already in the public domain will be
362 used to approach these individuals.

363 *Data collection*

364 Participants will take part in a single interview conducted by one researcher either face to
365 face at a private location within hospital sites (such as an office or family room), or by
366 videoconferencing as preferred by the participant. Parent/carer dyads will be interviewed
367 together where possible. The managing clinician will not interview parents/carers of patients
368 they are currently treating. Interviews will be audio-recorded with participants' consent and
369 will be 45-60 minutes in duration. If a participant experiences distress during or after an
370 interview, a Psychological Distress Protocol will be implemented.

371

372 *Data analysis*

373 All recorded interviews will be transcribed verbatim and checked by the interviewer for
374 errors. Transcripts will be managed using qualitative data analysis software NVivo V 14 and
375 analysed using inductive content analysis (ICA). ICA is a method of analysing data where
376 'content categories' are generated from the data (36). ICA is appropriate for use where
377 existing research is nascent, where an outcome of the research is to describe and understand
378 the area being investigated, and where the research has direct importance for policy and
379 practice (36). A proportion of early transcripts will be coded by two researchers
380 independently. Preliminary coding will be compared on an agreed inductive coding frame
381 that captures the breadth of views and experiences in the data. This coding frame will be
382 applied to further transcripts independently by two researchers and revised iteratively as
383 needed. Data from consumers, health professionals, scientists, and policy makers will be
384 analysed separately, however where similar themes arise across the participant types this will
385 be reported. Parent/carer dyads will be analysed as one unit (37). Reflexivity will be
386 maintained by the research team through analysis and writing by recording, discussing, and

387 challenging assumptions derived from their cultural, personal, and professional backgrounds
388 (32).

389 **DISCUSSION**

390 This will be a first-in kind study in Australia which focuses on the perspectives of genomic
391 NBS from parents/carers whose children have been diagnosed with a genetic condition (both
392 with and without NBS). Whilst previous studies have evaluated the perspectives of the public
393 and professional stakeholders on genomic NBS in Australia (34, 38), the current study seeks
394 to advance knowledge by assessing the perceived opportunities and challenges of using
395 genomics in NBS amongst families with lived experiences of receiving a genetic diagnosis
396 and evaluating how concordant or divergent their views are with other stakeholders including
397 health care professionals, scientists and policy makers. This cumulative knowledge will be
398 used to develop an integrated foundation on the key factors requiring consideration when
399 making decisions on the clinical utility, validity and (unintended) ramifications of selecting
400 conditions for genomic NBS.

401 As such, the study aligns with several pillars of the National Strategic Action Plan for Rare
402 Diseases, which sets the impetus for collaborative research to facilitate effective clinical
403 translation of health services (22). This study also reflects key national priorities that call for
404 engagement of affected individuals and their families to help harness the current and future
405 potential of genomics, facilitating processes for early diagnosis and ensuring that
406 implementation of novel (genomic) technologies is equitable and fit for the needs of
407 consumers (22).

408 Implementing genetic methodologies in newborn screening models undoubtedly provides a
409 platform for the early identification of medically actionable conditions, with the prospect of
410 changing disease trajectories and improving survival, function and quality of life for affected

411 newborns (39, 40). As such, the drive to introduce novel genomic NBS programs is becoming
412 increasingly apparent, with governmental initiatives, commercial and advocacy pressures all
413 creating a wide and mounting array of conditions that are technically capable of being
414 identified through population genetic screening in the newborn period (41).

415 However, underpinning these calls to action is a dearth of robust and high rigour evidence on
416 the impact and potential risks and opportunities that such genomic NBS programs will create,
417 particularly as genetic testing in and of itself has far reaching and long-term implications on
418 not only affected individuals but also their families and the health system at large (42). Whilst
419 many genomic tests are valued for the diagnosis and monitoring of conditions, their use on a
420 population level (to screen for disease) has not always conferred a benefit on health
421 outcomes, quality of life or survival (42). The limitations of a technology centric approach to
422 NBS include ascertaining the predictiveness of genomic tests to account for the certainty and
423 timing of disease onset for some conditions, (the latter leaving a population that requires
424 proactive surveillance over the course of a lifetime, with the associated potential for
425 psychosocial implications of ‘waiting for disease onset’) (43-45), the dangers of including *en*
426 *masse* conditions in which there is no benefit from screening (46), the lack of reference
427 genetic data for variants in ethnically diverse populations and the use of genetic screening for
428 conditions where superior screening methods exist (42). These factors require careful
429 evaluation, so that a barometer for the harms of screening can be in place when making
430 health technology assessments, so as not to overstate the intended benefits.

431 Moreover, the processes that underpin genomics in NBS require specific consideration as
432 issues of public health ethics. These include, but are not limited to, considering how a
433 screening offer can be autonomously weighed by parents given the context of a likely
434 publicly funded universal test offer, the influence of solidarity i.e. the concept of standing for,
435 with and as newborns when thinking about the implications of this technology, , rather than

436 just being led by the existence of new (genomic) technology, and the collective values of
437 reciprocity and trust to overcome inequities in access to novel technologies across the
438 population (47). The potential for stigma and discrimination and legal imperatives to counter
439 these effects are also important aspects to define and redress (48-50).

440 Through the evaluation and synthesis of stakeholder perspectives on the risks, benefits,
441 attitudes and expectations from genomic NBS, the findings from this study will generate new
442 knowledge to inform a model of genomic NBS that is adaptable to changing health
443 technologies, effective and of high quality, incorporates processes to mitigate and address
444 perceived harms and is placed within an ethically, legally and socially robust framework.
445 Furthermore, this study will be used to develop the rationale and key criterion for
446 implementing genomic NBS for conditions that differ in prevalence, disease characteristics
447 and genotype across the heterogenous Australian population, to help overcome barriers to
448 equity of access to novel (genetic) technologies and clinical care, as mandated by recent
449 governmental initiatives and health policy directives (51). By using the perspectives of
450 various key stakeholder communities to identify, consider and prioritise key utility, equity,
451 ethical and social issues, the study findings will feed directly into methodological
452 development in understanding the role of ethical, legal and social implications in HTA,
453 improving transparency and fairness in health assessments (19, 52), whilst also placing
454 stakeholder perspectives within the decision-making process, as a means to address perceived
455 ethical and social complexities.

456

457

458

459

460 **FUNDING**

461 This study is part of the ‘gEnomics4newborns: Integrating Ethics and Equity with
462 Effectiveness and Economics for genomic newborn screening’ project funded by the
463 Commonwealth of Australia Medical Research Future Fund, grant MRF2015965.

464 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

465 AJN is a member of the New South Wales Ministry of Health Newborn Screening Expert
466 Advisory Group. All other authors declare no competing interests.

467 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

468 This paper is submitted on behalf of the gEnomics4newborns Project Team including all
469 chief investigators, associate investigators, co-researchers, and partners.

470 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

471 The study was conceived and designed by SN, SK, JS, AJN, SC, MF and MO. SK, JS and
472 CM wrote the first draft of the manuscript before receiving input from SN, AJN, SC, MO,
473 MF, KB, JW, and NM. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481 REFERENCES

- 482 1. Grosse SD, Boyle CA, Kenneson A, Khoury MJ, Wilfond BS. From public health emergency to
483 public health service: the implications of evolving criteria for newborn screening panels. *Pediatrics*.
484 2006;117(3):923-9.
- 485 2. Kingsmore SF, Smith LD, Kunard CM, Bainbridge M, Batalov S, Benson W, et al. A genome
486 sequencing system for universal newborn screening, diagnosis, and precision medicine for severe
487 genetic diseases. *American journal of human genetics*. 2022;109(9):1605-19.
- 488 3. Powell CM. What Genomic Sequencing Can Offer Universal Newborn Screening Programs.
489 The Hastings Center report. 2018;48 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S18-s9.
- 490 4. Haendel M, Vasilevsky N, Unni D, Bologa C, Harris N, Rehm H, et al. How many rare diseases
491 are there? *Nature reviews Drug discovery*. 2020;19(2):77-8.
- 492 5. Australian Bureau of Statistics Australian Demographic Statistics Dec 2018, cat. no. 3101.0.
493 <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/3101.0>.
- 494 6. Ji C, Farrar MA, Norris S, Bhattacharya K, Bennetts B, Newson AJ, et al. The Australian
495 landscape of newborn screening in the genomics era. 2023.
- 496 7. Hayerem RZ, Miller FA, Barg CJ, Bombard Y, Cressman C, Painter-Main M, et al. Using
497 Newborn Screening Bloodspots for Research: Public Preferences for Policy Options. *Pediatrics*.
498 2016;137(6).
- 499 8. Johnston J, Lantos JD, Goldenberg A, Chen F, Parens E, Koenig BA. Sequencing Newborns: A
500 Call for Nuanced Use of Genomic Technologies. The Hastings Center report. 2018;48 Suppl 2(Suppl
501 2):S2-s6.
- 502 9. Kariyawasam DST, Russell JS, Wiley V, Alexander IE, Farrar MA. The implementation of
503 newborn screening for spinal muscular atrophy: the Australian experience. *Genetics in medicine* :
504 official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics. 2020;22(3):557-65.
- 505 10. Farrar MA, Kariyawasam D, Grattan S, Bayley K, Davis M, Holland S, et al. Newborn Screening
506 for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. *Journal of neuromuscular*
507 *diseases*. 2023;10(1):15-28.
- 508 11. Maron JL, Kingsmore S, Gelb BD, Vockley J, Wigby K, Bragg J, et al. Rapid Whole-Genomic
509 Sequencing and a Targeted Neonatal Gene Panel in Infants With a Suspected Genetic Disorder. *Jama*.
510 2023;330(2):161-9.
- 511 12. Pichini A, Ahmed A, Patch C, Bick D, Leblond M, Kasperaviciute D, et al. Developing a
512 National Newborn Genomes Program: An Approach Driven by Ethics, Engagement and Co-design.
513 *Front Genet*. 2022;13:866168.
- 514 13. Australian Government: Department of Health And Aged Care What is screened in the
515 program: Conditions screened in Australia's NBS programs 4 Dec 2023.
516 <https://www.health.gov.au/our-work/newborn-bloodspot-screening/what-is-screened>.
- 517 14. Metternick-Jones SC, Lister KJ, Dawkins HJ, White CA, Weeramanthri TS. Review of current
518 international decision-making processes for newborn screening: lessons for Australia. *J Frontiers in*
519 *Public Health*. 2015;3:214.
- 520 15. Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care. Newborn Bloodspot Screening
521 - National Policy Framework 21 May 2018.
522 [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/newborn-bloodspot-screening-national-policy-](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/newborn-bloodspot-screening-national-policy-framework?language=en)
523 [framework?language=en](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/newborn-bloodspot-screening-national-policy-framework?language=en).
- 524 16. Fischer KE, Grosse SD, Rogowski WH. The role of health technology assessment in coverage
525 decisions on newborn screening. *International journal of technology assessment in health care*.
526 2011;27(4):313-21.
- 527 17. Bailey DB, Jr. The Krabbe Conundrum-How Are Benefits and Harms Weighed to Determine
528 the Net Benefit of Screening? *JAMA pediatrics*. 2023;177(10):995-6.
- 529 18. Stark Z, Scott RH. Genomic newborn screening for rare diseases. *J Nature Reviews Genetics*

- 530 2023;24(11):755-66.
- 531 19. Potter BK, Avard D, Entwistle V, Kennedy C, Chakraborty P, McGuire M, et al. Ethical, legal,
532 and social issues in health technology assessment for prenatal/preconceptional and newborn
533 screening: a workshop report. *Public health genomics*. 2009;12(1):4-10.
- 534 20. Downie L, Halliday J, Lewis S, Amor D. Principles of genomic newborn screening programs: a
535 systematic review. *JAMA Network Open*. 2021;4(7):e2114336-e.
- 536 21. Berg JS, Agrawal PB, Bailey DB, Jr., Beggs AH, Brenner SE, Brower AM, et al. Newborn
537 Sequencing in Genomic Medicine and Public Health. *Pediatrics*. 2017;139(2).
- 538 22. Australian Government Department of Health National Strategic Action Plan for Rare
539 Diseases 26 February 2020 [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/national-strategic-](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/national-strategic-action-plan-for-rare-diseases)
540 [action-plan-for-rare-diseases](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/national-strategic-action-plan-for-rare-diseases).
- 541 23. Downie L, Halliday J, Lewis S, Amor DJ. Principles of Genomic Newborn Screening Programs:
542 A Systematic Review. *JAMA network open*. 2021;4(7):e2114336.
- 543 24. Chan K, Hu Z, Bush LW, Cope H, Holm IA, Kingsmore SF, et al. NBSTRN Tools to Advance
544 Newborn Screening Research and Support Newborn Screening Stakeholders. *International journal of*
545 *neonatal screening*. 2023;9(4).
- 546 25. Armstrong B, Christensen KD, Genetti CA, Parad RB, Robinson JO, Blout Zawatsky CL, et al.
547 Parental Attitudes Toward Standard Newborn Screening and Newborn Genomic Sequencing:
548 Findings From the BabySeq Study. *Front Genet*. 2022;13:867371.
- 549 26. Lemke AA, Harris-Wai JN. Stakeholder engagement in policy development: challenges and
550 opportunities for human genomics. *Genetics in medicine : official journal of the American College of*
551 *Medical Genetics*. 2015;17(12):949-57.
- 552 27. Milko LV, Rini C, Lewis MA, Butterfield RM, Lin FC, Paquin RS, et al. Evaluating parents'
553 decisions about next-generation sequencing for their child in the NC NEXUS (North Carolina
554 Newborn Exome Sequencing for Universal Screening) study: a randomized controlled trial protocol.
555 *Trials*. 2018;19(1):344.
- 556 28. Timmins GT, Wynn J, Saami AM, Espinal A, Chung WK. Diverse Parental Perspectives of the
557 Social and Educational Needs for Expanding Newborn Screening through Genomic Sequencing.
558 *Public health genomics*. 2022:1-8.
- 559 29. White S, Mossfield T, Fleming J, Barlow-Stewart K, Ghedia S, Dickson R, et al. Expanding the
560 Australian Newborn Blood Spot Screening Program using genomic sequencing: do we want it and are
561 we ready? *European journal of human genetics : EJHG*. 2023;31(6):703-11.
- 562 30. Gold NB, Adelson SM, Shah N, Williams S, Bick SL, Zoltick ES, et al. Perspectives of Rare
563 Disease Experts on Newborn Genome Sequencing. *JAMA network open*. 2023;6(5):e2312231.
- 564 31. Stojanovic J, Wübbeler M, Geis S, Reviriego E, Gutiérrez-Ibarluzea I, Lenoir-Wijnkoop I.
565 Evaluating Public Health Interventions: A Neglected Area in Health Technology Assessment. *Frontiers*
566 *in public health*. 2020;8:106.
- 567 32. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative
568 research: a synthesis of recommendations. *J Academic Medicine*. 2014;89(9):1245-51.
- 569 33. Dworkin SL. Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Arch Sex*
570 *Behav*. 2012;41(6):1319-20.
- 571 34. Lynch F, Best S, Gaff C, Downie L, Archibald AD, Gyngell C, et al. Australian Public
572 Perspectives on Genomic Newborn Screening: Risks, Benefits, and Preferences for Implementation.
573 *International journal of neonatal screening*. 2024;10(1).
- 574 35. Brehaut JC, O'Connor AM, Wood TJ, Hack TF, Siminoff L, Gordon E, et al. Validation of a
575 decision regret scale. *Medical decision making : an international journal of the Society for Medical*
576 *Decision Making*. 2003;23(4):281-92.
- 577 36. Vears DF, Gillam L. Inductive content analysis: A guide for beginning qualitative researchers.
578 *J Focus on Health Professional Education: A Multi-disciplinary Journal*. 2022;23(1):111-27.
- 579 37. Eisikovits Z, Koren C. Approaches to and outcomes of dyadic interview analysis. *Qualitative*
580 *health research*. 2010;20(12):1642-55.

- 581 38. Cao M, Notini L, Ayres S, Vears DF. Australian healthcare professionals' perspectives on the
582 ethical and practical issues associated with genomic newborn screening. *Journal of genetic*
583 *counseling*. 2023;32(2):376-86.
- 584 39. Kariyawasam DS, D'Silva AM, Sampaio H, Briggs N, Herbert K, Wiley V, et al. Newborn
585 screening for spinal muscular atrophy in Australia: a non-randomised cohort study. *The Lancet Child*
586 *& adolescent health*. 2023;7(3):159-70.
- 587 40. Yang L, Chen J, Shen B. Newborn Screening in the Era of Precision Medicine. *Advances in*
588 *experimental medicine and biology*. 2017;1005:47-61.
- 589 41. Ersig AL, Jaja C, Tluczek A. Call to Action for Advancing Equitable Genomic Newborn
590 Screening. *J Public Health Genomics*. 2023;26(1):188-93.
- 591 42. Turnbull C, Firth HV, Wilkie AO, Newman W, Raymond FL, Tomlinson I, et al. Population
592 screening requires robust evidence—genomics is no exception. *J The Lancet*. 2023.
- 593 43. Raj A, Rifkin SA, Andersen E, van Oudenaarden A. Variability in gene expression underlies
594 incomplete penetrance. *Nature*. 2010;463(7283):913-8.
- 595 44. Mirshahi UL, Colclough K, Wright CF, Wood AR, Beaumont RN, Tyrrell J, et al. Reduced
596 penetrance of MODY-associated HNF1A/HNF4A variants but not GCK variants in clinically unselected
597 cohorts. *American journal of human genetics*. 2022;109(11):2018-28.
- 598 45. Horton R, Lucassen A. Ethical issues raised by new genomic technologies: the case study of
599 newborn genome screening. *J Cambridge Prisms: Precision Medicine*. 2023;1:e2.
- 600 46. Wilson JMG, Jungner G, Organization WH. Principles and practice of screening for disease.
601 1968.
- 602 47. Newson AJ. The promise of public health ethics for precision medicine: The case of newborn
603 preventive genomic sequencing. *J Human Genetics*. 2022;141(5):1035-43.
- 604 48. Vears DF, Savulescu J, Christodoulou J, Wall M, Newson AJ. Are We Ready for Whole
605 Population Genomic Sequencing of Asymptomatic Newborns? *Pharmacogenomics and personalized*
606 *medicine*. 2023;16:681-91.
- 607 49. King JR, Grill K, Hammarström L. Genomic-Based Newborn Screening for Inborn Errors of
608 Immunity: Practical and Ethical Considerations. *International journal of neonatal screening*.
609 2023;9(2).
- 610 50. Newson AJ, Ayres S, Boyle J, Gabbett MT, Nisselle A. Human genetics Society of Australasia
611 Position Statement: genetic testing and personal insurance products in Australia. *Twin Research and*
612 *Human Genetics*. 2018;21(6):533-7.
- 613 51. Stark Z, Boughtwood T, Haas M, Braithwaite J, Gaff CL, Goranitis I, et al. Australian
614 Genomics: Outcomes of a 5-year national program to accelerate the integration of genomics in
615 healthcare. *American journal of human genetics*. 2023;110(3):419-26.
- 616 52. Jansen ME, Lister KJ, van Kranen HJ, Cornel MC. Policy Making in Newborn Screening Needs
617 a Structured and Transparent Approach. *Frontiers in public health*. 2017;5:53.

618

Knowledge inquiry & synthesis



Consultation with stakeholders* to assess their **priorities, attitudes and concerns** regarding genomic NBS including the relative importance, facilitators and barriers of **legal, social, ethical, and equity** considerations




Explore and test how ethics and equity factors can be incorporated in HTA for genomic NBS, using a multimodal approach**

Co-developing tools for an Australian context



Develop key assessment criteria to inform accelerated and patient/family centred decision making for conditions that have the potential to be part of genomic NBS



Build and test an economic model for genomic NBS, explicitly incorporating aspects of equity

Evaluation and implementation



Development of policy-relevant tools to support streamlined, less resource-intensive health technology assessments of new conditions for genomic NBS, that explicitly take account of the ethical, legal, sociocultural and equity aspects of genomics