

CADTH RAPID RESPONSE REPORT: SUMMARY OF ABSTRACTS

# Rapid Genome-wide Testing: Clinical Utility and Cost- Effectiveness

Service Line: Rapid Response Service  
Version: 1.0  
Publication Date: August 21, 2019  
Report Length: 6 Pages

**Authors:** Diksha Kumar, Charlene Argáez

**Cite As:** *Rapid genome-wide testing: clinical utility and cost-effectiveness*. Ottawa: CADTH; 2019 Aug. (CADTH rapid response report: summary of abstracts).

**Disclaimer:** The information in this document is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. While patients and others may access this document, the document is made available for informational purposes only and no representations or warranties are made with respect to its fitness for any particular purpose. The information in this document should not be used as a substitute for professional medical advice or as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) does not endorse any information, drugs, therapies, treatments, products, processes, or services.

While care has been taken to ensure that the information prepared by CADTH in this document is accurate, complete, and up-to-date as at the applicable date the material was first published by CADTH, CADTH does not make any guarantees to that effect. CADTH does not guarantee and is not responsible for the quality, currency, propriety, accuracy, or reasonableness of any statements, information, or conclusions contained in any third-party materials used in preparing this document. The views and opinions of third parties published in this document do not necessarily state or reflect those of CADTH.

CADTH is not responsible for any errors, omissions, injury, loss, or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the contents of this document or any of the source materials.

This document may contain links to third-party websites. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third-party sites is governed by the third-party website owners' own terms and conditions set out for such sites. CADTH does not make any guarantee with respect to any information contained on such third-party sites and CADTH is not responsible for any injury, loss, or damage suffered as a result of using such third-party sites. CADTH has no responsibility for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information by third-party sites.

Subject to the aforementioned limitations, the views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Health Canada, Canada's provincial or territorial governments, other CADTH funders, or any third-party supplier of information.

This document is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. The use of this document outside of Canada is done so at the user's own risk.

This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this document will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The copyright and other intellectual property rights in this document are owned by CADTH and its licensors. These rights are protected by the Canadian *Copyright Act* and other national and international laws and agreements. Users are permitted to make copies of this document for non-commercial purposes only, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH and its licensors.

**About CADTH:** CADTH is an independent, not-for-profit organization responsible for providing Canada's health care decision-makers with objective evidence to help make informed decisions about the optimal use of drugs, medical devices, diagnostics, and procedures in our health care system.

**Funding:** CADTH receives funding from Canada's federal, provincial, and territorial governments, with the exception of Quebec.

Questions or requests for information about this report can be directed to [requests@cadth.ca](mailto:requests@cadth.ca)

## Research Questions

1. What is the clinical utility of providing rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care?
2. What is the cost-effectiveness of providing rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care?
3. What are the evidence-based guidelines of providing rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care?

## Key Findings

One randomized controlled trial and three non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical utility of providing rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care. No relevant economic evaluations or evidence-based guidelines were identified.

## Methods

A limited literature search was conducted by an information specialist on key resources including PubMed, the Cochrane Library, the University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, the websites of Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. The search strategy was comprised of both controlled vocabulary, such as the National Library of Medicine's MeSH (Medical Subject Headings), and keywords. The main search concepts were rapid genome testing and intensive care units. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2014 and August 13, 2019. Internet links were provided, where available.

## Selection Criteria

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Selection Criteria**

<b>Population</b>	Patients of all ages in an intensive care setting (i.e., neonatal, pediatric, or adults) Exclusion: pre-natal patients (i.e., in utero)
<b>Intervention</b>	Rapid genome-wide testing [e.g., rapid/expedited/express whole exome sequencing, broad panel of multiple genes (e.g., neonatal crisis panel)] Rapid or expedited turnaround time = 1 to 4 weeks
<b>Comparator</b>	No testing; Genome-wide testing with routine turnaround time (i.e., 6 to 12 weeks)

<b>Outcomes</b>	Q1: Clinical utility, clinical outcome (e.g., mortality, change in active patient management) Q2: Cost-effectiveness Q3: Evidence-based guidelines
<b>Study Designs</b>	Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations, evidence-based guidelines

## Results

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations, and evidence-based guidelines.

One randomized controlled trial<sup>1</sup> and three non-randomized studies<sup>2-4</sup> were identified regarding the clinical utility of providing rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care. No health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, economic evaluations, or evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

## Overall Summary of Findings

One randomized controlled trial<sup>1</sup> and three non-randomized studies<sup>2-4</sup> were identified regarding the clinical utility of providing rapid turnaround for genome-wide testing for patients in intensive care.

The authors of one randomized controlled trial<sup>1</sup> concluded that infants in neonatal and pediatric intensive care units who were tested using trio rapid whole-genome sequencing received more timely diagnoses compared to the control group. Similarly, the authors of one non-randomized study<sup>2</sup> reported decreased time to diagnosis, among other conclusions, when comparing RapSeq (a targeted gene panel) to a historical control. The authors of the second non-randomized study<sup>3</sup> found that the clinical utility of rapid-whole genome sequencing in acutely ill infants is significantly greater than for standard genetic tests. They also noted a reduction in likelihood of mortality.<sup>3</sup> The authors of the third non-randomized<sup>4</sup> study found significantly different diagnostic yields and effect on medical management when comparing infants who were tested with rapid versus non-rapid exome sequencing.

## References Summarized

### Health Technology Assessments

No literature identified.

### Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

No literature identified.

## Randomized Controlled Trials

1. Petrikin JE, Cakici JA, Clark MM, et al. The NSIGHT1-randomized controlled trial: rapid whole-genome sequencing for accelerated etiologic diagnosis in critically ill infants. *NPJ Genom Med.* 2018 Feb;3:6.  
[PubMed: PM29449963](#)

## Non-Randomized Studies

2. Brunelli L, Jenkins SM, Gudgeon JM, et al. Targeted gene panel sequencing for the rapid diagnosis of acutely ill infants. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.* 2019 Jul;7(7):e00796.  
[PubMed: PM31192527](#)
3. Farnaes L, Hildreth A, Sweeney NM, et al. Rapid whole-genome sequencing decreases infant morbidity and cost of hospitalization. *NPJ Genom Med.* 2018 Apr;3:10.  
[PubMed: PM29644095](#)
4. Meng L, Pammi M, Saronwala A, et al. Use of exome sequencing for infants in intensive care units: ascertainment of severe single-gene disorders and effect on medical management. *JAMA Pediatr.* 2017 Dec 4;171(12):e173438.  
[PubMed: PM28973083](#)

## Economic Evaluations

No literature identified.

## Guidelines and Recommendations

No literature identified.

## Appendix — Further Information

### Previous CADTH Reports

5. Next generation DNA sequencing: a review of the cost effectiveness and guidelines. (*Rapid Response Report: Summary with Critical Appraisal*). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2014 Feb: <https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/htis/apr-2014/RC0519%20-%20Next%20Generation%20Sequencing%20Final.pdf>  
Accessed 2019 Aug 19.

### Non-Randomized Studies

#### *Alternative Intervention – Not Specific to Rapid Tests*

6. van der Sluijs PJ, Aten E, Barge-Schaapveld D, et al. Putting genome-wide sequencing in neonates into perspective. *Genet Med*. 2019 May;21(5):1074-1082.  
[PubMed: PM30287924](#)

#### *No Comparator*

7. Mestek-Boukhibar L, Clement E, Jones WD, et al. Rapid Paediatric Sequencing (RaPS): comprehensive real-life workflow for rapid diagnosis of critically ill children. *J Med Genet*. 2018 Nov;55(11):721-728.  
[PubMed: PM30049826](#)
8. Stark Z, Lunke S, Brett GR, et al. Meeting the challenges of implementing rapid genomic testing in acute pediatric care. *Genet Med*. 2018 Dec;20(12):1554-1563.  
[PubMed:PM29543227](#)

### Guidelines and Recommendations – Methodology Not Specified

9. Cancer Research UK. Policy statement: patient access to molecular diagnostics and targeted medicines in England. London (UK): Cancer Research UK; 2018 Sep: [https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/access\\_to\\_molecular\\_diagnostic\\_tests\\_and\\_targeted\\_medicines\\_in\\_england\\_0.pdf](https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/sites/default/files/access_to_molecular_diagnostic_tests_and_targeted_medicines_in_england_0.pdf)  
Accessed 2019 Aug 19.  
See: Single Tests, Panel Tests or Whole Genome Sequencing?
10. Borghesi A, Mencarelli MA, Memo L, et al. Intersociety policy statement on the use of whole-exome sequencing in the critically ill newborn infant. *Ital J Pediatr*. 2017 Nov 3;43(1):100.  
[PubMed: PM29100554](#)