



February 2024

A Landscape Assessment of Newborn Screening (NBS) in Europe

Executive summary

Newborn screening (NBS) has become an integral part of many public health programmes.¹ NBS programmes have minimised patient suffering which results from extended diagnostic pathways, as well as the irreversible damage to health due to late diagnosis. Furthermore, they have played a role in diminishing the longer-term disease burden on healthcare systems. Through a simple non-invasive test, NBS offers the prospect of diagnosis and treatment of serious conditions at an early stage, often prior to the onset of symptoms. Patients stand to gain the greatest benefit from treatment where it can be initiated in time to halt any irreversible disease progression and subsequent damage. Whilst the benefits of NBS are well established, there are important disparities across Europe in the number of diseases included in the panel of tests conducted on newborns – ranging from over 30 diseases in some countries, to as few as two in others. In recent years, we have seen encouraging increases in the number of rare diseases for which effective treatments are available.² If this trend continues, it promises substantial positive impact for both patients and healthcare systems, when combined with early diagnosis and the timely initiation of treatment. Many NBS programmes across Europe have recognized the need to utilise advances in clinical science and consequently have expanded the number of diseases that they screen for. As the treatment landscape for rare diseases and gene therapies evolves, the role of NBS as a critical driver of value and efficiency for European healthcare systems increases. The cost-effectiveness of NBS has been demonstrated across many diseases. NBS also encompasses equity and human rights dimensions. It helps address unmet medical needs and reduce population health inequities, which arise from unequal access to high quality diagnostic and treatment services.

This paper provides insights from a policy landscape assessment conducted between October 2020 to October 2021, outlining the differences in the composition and functioning of NBS programmes across 32 European countries. Additional research was conducted in January 2024 to capture recent changes in NBS panels. In addition, the paper looks to explain the observed differences through comparative analysis of specific policies governing periodic updates to NBS panels and explores the interplay of stakeholders involved in this process. Finally, this paper articulates the implications for policy change needed to make NBS programmes more patient-focused and better fit for purpose, as well as the role that decision-making stakeholders should play in driving the change towards optimising the positive impact of NBS programmes on patients and healthcare systems in the future.

Background

Screening is the process of identifying members of a population who may have, or may be at risk of developing, a specific disease or condition. This generally involves the use of tests across a population in order to identify individuals who have certain risk factors (e.g., genetic) or are in the early stages of disease but are asymptomatic. An underlying concept of screening is that early detection benefits a patient's clinical outcomes and the healthcare system's public health outcomes.³ A powerful example of this is newborn screening, which forms an integral part of public health programmes and has demonstrated a positive impact on patients and healthcare systems alike.⁴

Newborn screening (NBS) using a dried blood spot is currently undertaken in all European countries. It is a simple, non-invasive test which involves the extraction of a few drops of blood from a baby's heel and is used to detect a variety of disorders which may hinder the baby's development significantly impacting their future health and, in some cases, causing a premature death. Ideally, screening occurs within the first few days of a newborn's life. Detection, diagnosis and intervention resulting from NBS can support the mitigation of severe health problems at the earliest opportunity. Importantly, this not only provides physicians with a broader set of treatment and care options but also maximizes the clinical benefit of treatment and disease management for patients.⁵ For healthcare systems, a well-developed NBS programme can reduce waste by maximizing direct clinical outcomes.⁶ The cost-effectiveness of NBS for several diseases, including spinal muscular atrophy, has been demonstrated across multiple studies.^{7,8}

In recent years, many NBS programmes across Europe have experienced expansion, increasing the total number of diseases that are screened for.⁹ This has partially been driven by increasing uptake of the technological capabilities that enable NBS, a key example being the application of tandem mass spectrometry.¹⁰ Tests using tandem mass spectrometry for NBS are relatively inexpensive and can quickly process large numbers of samples.¹¹ Such technological developments have made a significant impact on both the number and types of diseases that can be screened.

An additional key factor driving the expansion of NBS programmes is the notable increase in the number of treatments, including gene therapies, that are now available to treat previously intractable rare diseases with few if any adequate treatment options. For some diseases, there is a markedly greater benefit to be derived from early and pre-symptomatic diagnosis and prompt treatment. Thus, there is an increased importance of NBS as a healthcare system value-maximising public policy tool in Europe. At the national level, NBS has become a regular feature of rare disease plans, with numerous countries developing policies to improve their NBS programmes.¹² At the European level, there are several EU initiatives, such as Screen4Care, which aim to support Member States in improving their NBS offering.¹³ EU Health Commissioner Stella Kyriakides recently highlighted that while NBS can play a potentially life-saving role in achieving earlier diagnosis and initiation of treatment, there are still significant NBS access disparities across the EU, causing unmet medical needs.¹⁴ Notably unmet medical need has been prioritised as a key area of action in the upcoming Belgian Presidency.¹⁵ The national and EU-level efforts to address this unmet need by developing and expanding NBS programmes across Europe have been further championed by key stakeholders such as EURORDIS, ISNS and IPOPI who have worked individually and collaboratively to highlight this public health priority.^{16,17}

Given the growing importance of NBS, this paper will: (a) provide insights on the differences in the current composition and functioning of NBS programmes across European countries; (b)

explain the observed differences through comparative analysis of specific policies governing the periodic updates to NBS panels; and (c) explore the interplay of stakeholders involved in this process. Finally, this paper will articulate the implications for policy change needed to make NBS programmes more patient-focused and suited for purpose, as well as the role that various stakeholders should play in driving the change towards optimising the positive impact of NBS programmes on patients and healthcare systems in the future.

Methodology

To determine the current landscape for NBS programmes across Europe, we first conducted high-level research into national or regional/provincial NBS programmes across 32 countries and developed a comparative mapping, capturing the differences in NBS programmes across European countries.¹⁸ Collation of information regarding the current number and type of diseases included in each country's NBS programme was used to develop a comparative "NBS matrix". This matrix was summarised in an infographic highlighting the differences in the diseases included in NBS programmes across Europe (see Figure 1 below). Further analysis involved a review of the current NBS literature using a predetermined information framework, drawing on academic papers, government reports and other grey literature. Following validation of this with in-country experts, we identified the fundamental aspects of each country's NBS programme and compared their similarities and differences across areas such as funding, management and the implementation time of recently approved panel expansions.

The second phase of our research involved an analytical deep-dive into NBS programmes that were deemed collectively representative of pan-European diversity. This analysis focused on the key national policies and regulations that govern NBS, as well as the stakeholders and institutions involved in the decision-making process. We investigated three key components of these national NBS programmes: the process of panel expansion, the role of national and cross-country policies, and the involvement of key (non-)decision-making stakeholders.

To obtain a representative understanding of the broader NBS landscape across Europe, we selected 12 countries which are listed below in Table 1. The selection aimed to represent different geographical regions of Europe, as well as variation in levels of GDP/capita and types of healthcare systems. Following selection, each country was analysed to identify strengths and weaknesses in their NBS programmes. These findings were used to inform the identification of common themes across countries and the subsequent development of recommendations around the future evolution of NBS programmes across Europe.

Table 1: Country selection for the "deep-dive" analysis

Country	GDP/capita (US\$) ¹⁹	Healthcare system classification	Region
Sweden	50,339	National Health Services	Northern
Norway	67,989	National Health Services	Northern
United Kingdom	39,229	National Health Services	Western
France	39,257	Social Health Insurance	Western
Germany	45,466	Social Health Insurance	Western
Switzerland	81,867	Social Health Insurance	Western
Spain	26,832	National Health Services	Southern

Italy	30,657	National Health Insurance	Southern
Portugal	21,608	National Health Services	Southern
Poland	15,304	Social Health Insurance	Central and Eastern
Russia	9,972	Social based mixed system	Central and Eastern
Hungary	15,373	Social Health Insurance	Central and Eastern

Key findings

Current European NBS landscape

As illustrated in the “NBS matrix” (Figure 1), we found that there are large disparities between countries in the number and types of diseases that are included in national NBS programmes. For example, some countries such as Italy, Portugal and Austria, screen for over 30 diseases as part of their national panel²⁰, with Italy leading the way in Europe by screening for more than 45 diseases. By contrast, many countries were found to screen for significantly fewer diseases, including the UK which tests for less than 10 diseases in its national panel, whilst Cyprus is only testing for two.

Figure 1 also highlighted trends in the frequency that each disease is included across NBS programmes, with phenylketonuria (PKU) and congenital hypothyroidism (CHT) being universally screened for across all 32 countries in-scope. It is noted that they have a relatively high incidence compared to other screened diseases (both have incidences of greater than 1 in 10,000, whilst other diseases included in programmes can have incidence rates as low as 1 in 250,000).²¹ However, there are other diseases which have similarly high incidence rates, such as sickle cell disease, that is nationally screened for in less than 30% of countries.

Comparisons of the key characteristics of NBS programmes across countries also provide some insights to explain differences in access to NBS. This includes elements such as:

- **Programme governance** – NBS programmes are run by governing bodies, which tend to operate at the national level, but can also be found regionally. In some cases, such as Spain, there are regional differences in NBS disease coverage, with some autonomous regions such as Catalonia testing for over 30 different diseases, whilst the national programme tests for less than 10.
- **Review process** – There are notable differences in the process by which countries update their NBS programmes. Some, such as the UK, do this on a recurring basis (e.g. annually), whilst others, such as Germany, do this on an ad-hoc basis.
- **Time to implementation** – There are challenges related to NBS programme expansion following approval of inclusion of new diseases, resulting in large variations in the implementation time across countries. Where some countries have taken less than 1 year to implement the most recent approval into their NBS programme (Denmark, Belgium, UK), implementation of decisions in other countries took three or more years (Greece and Romania).

As of March 2021
Changes by January 2024

Between March 2021 and January 2024, 90% of countries have updated their NBS panels. On average, countries have added/or planned to add 4 diseases

Part of national program
Recommended for inclusion
Part of regional program
Not program to be started
Ongoing/completed

Incidence higher than 1 in 10,000
(www.eurosurveillance.org)

January 2024

January 2021

Italy 60 48
Russia 36 36
Austria 31 31
Portugal 31 30
Poland 33 29
Hungary 28 27
Sweden 27 27
Netherlands 31 27
Norway 26 26
Slovakia 26 26
Denmark 25 25
Finland 24 23
Estonia 23 22
Germany 21 21
Ukraine 21 21
Czech Republic 21 20
Slovenia 21 19
France 15 13
Belgium 23 12
Lithuania 12 12
Switzerland 11 10
Croatia 10 10
UK † 11 9
Spain 41 8
Ireland ^ 10 8
Latvia 8 8
Luxembourg 6 6
Malta 5 5
Greece 30 4
Bulgaria 4 4
Romania 4 3
Cyprus 2 2

SMA
GBA
GLD
NBS
ALD
POMPE
FABRY
BIOP1 (S)
BIOP1 (REG)
2MRC
MAL
TYR II
GM1T
SAH
3MCCA
2M3HA
SCAD
BIG
EXP
GPD
ORN
A-T
B-T
GALK
MUT
Chi A/B
CT I B
M/ SCHAD
MTHFR
H-PHE
Chi C/D
MAT
SCD
TYR
BKT
TTP
3MCC
SQD
HMG
MCD
AFG
CTT
ASA
RMAA
CACT
MADO/GA2
HCU
CUD
GAL
PA
BTD
TYR I
CPT I
CAH
CPT I
CF
VLCAO
FA
LCHAD
MSUD
GA1
MCAD
CHT
PKU

† The SMA pilot program in the UK is local, with only a small number of babies being screened for SMA each year

Deep dive assessment: key barriers to panel expansion and implementation

As such, while government mandates to improve NBS programmes are important, there are other key factors which drive NBS panel expansion. We have grouped these factors based on when they arise in the process:

The first core process entails ensuring that proposals for disease inclusion in the NBS panel are on the agenda for the relevant decision-making bodies (e.g. HTA bodies or screening committees). Factors which impact this include: the involvement of non-decision-making stakeholders (e.g. patient advocacy groups) in increasing awareness and knowledge of the disease; the transparency, regularity and ease of the proposal submission process; and relevant resources and funding to support consideration of screening for an additional disease.

The review and approval of additions (and withdrawal) of diseases from the screening panel centres around the evaluation of proposals for disease inclusion (and exclusion). This entails ensuring that the evaluation criteria for inclusion are appropriate, clear and transparent (e.g. use of the Wilson and Junger criteria¹⁸), that timelines for review are carried out in a timely

manner, and that external stakeholders are involved in the evaluation process, so that they can provide specialist expertise and/or patient perspectives.

3. Factors affecting implementation

The implementation process and the adherence to any timelines will be driven by key factors including having the necessary infrastructure and clinical expertise needed to carry out testing, as well as being able to allocate the level of funding that is needed to support the expansion of the NBS panel. Importantly, political willingness to support implementation timelines is also critical, as highlighted by policy in the UK which mandates implementation in England and Wales within twelve months of approval. In addition, where countries have a centralised national laboratory, other factors, such as government procurement policies, can also slow implementation times. This is seen in the Netherlands, where there is a lengthy tender process.

Upon developing the core processes, further analysis of the key factors that drive or inhibit NBS panel expansion led to the identification of ‘key barriers’, which could limit access to newborn screening. In addition to this, ‘best practices’ which contribute to addressing some of the identified challenges were also mapped across countries. See Table 2 below.

Table 2: A table outlining the barriers and best practices to improving NBS

Barriers	Best practices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complicated or undefined process for proposing panel expansion • Infrastructure requirements (e.g. laboratory or staff) limit the rate of implementation of NBS expansions • Lack of obligation to act on comments from non-decision-making stakeholders • Variation in enforcement of implementation post-approval • Lack of funding to support screening expansions • Inconsistencies in evaluation processes among countries • Criteria to demonstrate the value of screening 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear government mandates to improve NBS programmes • Presence of a governance system to oversee NBS programme coverage • Open and transparent application process for proposing programme amendments • Horizon scanning and outward-looking policy evaluations • Receptivity to non-decision-making stakeholder involvement in shaping the NBS agenda and evaluation process • Adoption of clear criteria (e.g. Wilson and Jungner) to substantiate diseases inclusion • Appropriate follow-up and referral pathways • Political willingness to facilitate timely implementation (e.g. within 12 months)

Policy recommendations

Based on the identification of barriers and best practices, we have developed a set of policy recommendations for policymakers and other key stakeholders (including PAGs and KOLs) with influence on the NBS policy environment, to address these challenges and support future evidence-based expansion. These have been categorised in line with our three identified core processes:

1. Factors affecting proposals for disease inclusion

- NBS decision-making bodies should ensure regular consideration of proposed additional tests, as is done by countries such as UK and Norway.
- A periodic review process should be implemented for diseases already included in NBS programmes, to mitigate against declines in their risk-benefit profile and highlight if a disease should no longer be included in a country's NBS panel
- Engagement of patient professional representatives (e.g. patient advocacy groups and clinical experts) can drive political support for the establishment of national screening committees and enabling NBS expansion
- Payers should ensure sufficient funding is in place for programme expansion, within scope
- International collaboration between health decision-makers is needed to support wider considerations of evidence-based expansion proposals by aligning on consistent criteria for including new diseases into NBS programmes

2. Factors affecting review and approval

- Decision-making bodies should be transparent in stating their processes, evaluation criteria and evidence requirements to facilitate the submission of panel expansion proposals
- NBS decision-making bodies across (and within) countries should ensure their criteria are aligned to promote efficient evaluation processes, e.g. align on any criteria used to extend requirements from those of Wilson and Jungner
- Authorities should consult patient and physician representatives at each stage of the expansion process to evaluate the inclusion of an additional diseases in the screening panel
- To increase the transparency of decision-making on the inclusion of a new test there should be a commitment to providing an explanation of how stakeholder input was evaluated and considered in the decision-making process
- Assessments should consider the availability and clinical benefit of relevant treatments when assessing the potential value of a screening test for a specific disease

3. Factors affecting implementation

- Countries should conduct mapping exercises of current laboratory locations and capabilities, to ensure that future updates to NBS programmes are implemented in a timely manner. Current barriers include the introduction of the test to the laboratories, as well as the design and introduction of the activities required following a positive test (e.g. diagnostic reconfirmation and patient and parental follow-up).
- Timely implementation of NBS needs to be incentivised through policy directives e.g. by the setting of targets around implementation timelines

Conclusion

While there have been developments in NBS programmes across Europe in recent years, the increased stakeholder recognition of NBS benefits, availability of genetic testing and advanced screening techniques, coupled with new highly effective treatments should prompt countries to progress their NBS programmes further. More efficient and accelerated processes for NBS panel expansion will align the advancement of these programmes with the speed of medical innovation, maximising the benefit delivered to patients and healthcare systems. To do so, national and regional authorities should look to ensure that:

1. The expansion process is transparent and well equipped to facilitate efficient and timely evaluation of NBS expansion proposals.
2. The evaluation process for disease inclusion is transparent and includes input from external stakeholders such as clinical experts and patient advocacy groups.
3. Appropriate funding and resources are dedicated to both testing infrastructure and clinical expertise to ensure efficient implementation of additional NBS tests after approval.

Authors and transparency notice

Tim Wilsdon is a vice president, and **Milan Ferguson** is a consulting associate in the Life Sciences Practice at Charles River Associates (CRA).

The research used to develop this publication was supported by Novartis. However, the conclusions, interpretations and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors alone.

CRA is a leading global consulting firm that offers strategy, financial, and economic consulting services to industry, government and financial clients. Maximizing product value and corporate performance, CRA consultants combine knowledge and experience with state-of-the-art analytical tools and methodologies tailored to client-specific needs. Founded in 1965, CRA has offices throughout the world.

The Life Sciences Practice works with leading biotech, medical device, and pharmaceutical companies; law firms; regulatory agencies; and national and international industry associations. We provide the analytical expertise and industry experience needed to address the industry's toughest issues. We have a reputation for rigorous and innovative analysis, careful attention to detail, and the ability to work effectively as part of a wider team of advisers. To learn more, visit crai.com/lifesciences.

Contacts

Tim Wilsdon

Vice President

+44-20-7664-3707

twilsdon@crai.com

Milan Ferguson

Consulting Associate

+44-207-664-3606

mferguson@crai.com



The conclusions set forth herein are based on independent research and publicly available material. The views expressed herein are the views and opinions of the authors and do not reflect or represent the views of Charles River Associates or any of the organizations with which the authors are affiliated. Any opinion expressed herein shall not amount to any form of guarantee that the authors or Charles River Associates has determined or predicted future events or circumstances and no such reliance may be inferred or implied. The authors and Charles River Associates accept no duty of care or liability of any kind whatsoever to any party, and no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any party as a result of decisions made, or not made, or actions taken, or not taken, based on this paper. If you have questions or require further information regarding this issue of *CRA Insights: Life Sciences*, please contact the contributor or editor at Charles River Associates. Detailed information about Charles River Associates, a trademark of CRA International, Inc., is available at www.crai.com.

Copyright 2024 Charles River Associates

Abbreviations

- 2M3HBA = 2-Methyl-3-hydroxy butyric aciduria
- 2MBG = 2-Methylbutyryl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- 3MCC = Deficit of 3-methylcrotonyl-CoA carboxylase deficiency
- 3MGCA = 3-methylglutaconic aciduria
- ARG = Arginase deficiency
- ASA = Argininosuccinic aciduria
- A-T = Alpha thalassemia
- BIOPT (BS) = Biopterin cofactor biosynthesis deficiency
- BIOPT (REG) = Biopterin cofactor regeneration deficiency
- BKT = Deficit of Beta-ketothiolase
- B-T = Beta thalassemia
- BTD = Defect of biotinidase
- CACT = Carnitine/acyl-carnitine translocase deficiency
- CAH = Congenital adrenal hyperplasia
- Cbl A = Methylmalonic acidemia
- Cbl B = Methylmalonic acidemia
- Cbl C = Methylmalonic Acidemia with Homocystinuria
- Cbl D = Methylmalonic acidemia with homocystinuria
- CF = Cystic fibrosis
- CHT = Congenital hypothyroidism
- CIT = Citrullinemia type I
- CIT II = Citrullinemia type II (Citrine deficiency)
- CPT I = Carnitine palmitoyl-transferase (L) deficiency
- CPT II = Carnitine palmitoyl-transferase II deficiency
- CUD = Lack of carnitine transport
- EURORDIS = European Rare Diseases Organisation
- EXP = Short-chain acyl CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- FABRY = Fabry disease
- G6PD = Glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase
- GA I = Glutaric acidemia type I
- GA2 = Glutaric acidemia type II
- GAL = Galactosemia
- GALK = Galactokinase deficiency
- GBA = Gaucher disease
- GNMT = Glycine N-methyltransferase deficiency
- HCU = Homocystinuria (CBS deficiency)
- HMG = 3-Hydroxy-3-methyl glutaric aciduria
- H-PHE = Benign hyperphenylalaninemia
- IBG = Isobutyryl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- IPOPI = International Patient Organisation for Primary Immunodeficiencies
- ISNS = International Society for Neonatal Screening
- KOL = Key opinion leader
- IVA = Isovaleric acidemia
- LCHAD = Long-chain hydroxyacyl CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- M / SCHAD = Short / medium chain 3-OH acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- MADD = Multiplex acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- MAL = Malonic aciduria
- MAT = Methionine adenosyltransferase deficiency
- MCAD = Medium-chain acyl CoA dehydrogenase deficiency
- MCD = Multiple carboxylase deficiency
- MMA = Vitamin B12 deficiency
- MPS I = Type I mucopolysaccharidosis
- MSUD = Maple syrup urine disease
- MTHFR = Homocystinuria due to MTHFR deficiency
- MUT = Methylmalonic acidemia
- OTC = Ornithine transcarbamylase deficiency
- PA = Propionic acidemia
- PAG = Patient advocacy group
- PKU = Phenylketonuria
- POMPE = Pompe disease
- SAHH = Deficit of S-adenosylhomocysteine hydrolase
- SCD = Sickle cell disease
- SCID = Severe combined immunodeficiency
- SMA = Spinal muscular atrophy
- TFP = Deficit of the trifunctional protein
- TYR I = Type I tyrosinemia
- TYR II = Tyrosinemia type II
- TYR III = Tyrosinemia type III
- VLCAD = Very long chain acyl CoA dehydrogenase deficiency

References

- ¹ Kelly, N., Makarem, D. C., & Wasserstein, M. P. (2016). Screening of newborns for disorders with high benefit-risk ratios should be mandatory. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 44(2), 231-240.
- ² Kaufmann, P., Pariser, A. R., & Austin, C. (2018). From scientific discovery to treatments for rare diseases—the view from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences—Office of Rare Diseases Research. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases*, 13(1), 1-8.
- ³ World Health Organization. (2020). Screening programmes: a short guide. Increase effectiveness, maximize benefits and minimize harm.
- ⁴ Kemper, A. R., Boyle, C. A., Aceves, J., Dougherty, D., Figge, J., Fisch, J. L., ... & Howell, R. R. (2008). Long-term follow-up after diagnosis resulting from newborn screening: statement of the US Secretary of Health and Human Services' Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders and Genetic Diseases in Newborns and Children. *Genetics in Medicine*, 10(4), 259-261.
- ⁵ Baker, M., Griggs, R., Byrne, B., Connolly, A. M., Finkel, R., Grajkowska, L., & Howell, R. R. (2019). Maximizing the benefit of life-saving treatments for Pompe disease, spinal muscular atrophy, and Duchenne muscular dystrophy through newborn screening: essential steps. *JAMA neurology*, 76(8), 978-983.
- ⁶ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2012). CDC grand rounds: newborn screening and improved outcomes. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report*, 61(21), 390-393.
- ⁷ Weidlich D, Servais L, Kausar I, Howells R, Bischof M. (2023). Cost-Effectiveness of Newborn Screening for Spinal Muscular Atrophy in England. *Neurology and Therapy*
- ⁸ Velikanova R, van der Schans S, Bischof M, van Olden RW, Postma M, Boersma C. Cost-Effectiveness of Newborn Screening for Spinal Muscular Atrophy in The Netherlands. (2022). *Value Health*.
- ⁹ Cornel, M., Rigter, T., Weinreich, S., Burgard, P., Hoffmann, G. F., Lindner, M., ... & Vitzthum, L. (2014). Newborn screening in Europe; expert opinion document. *Eur J Hum Genet*, 22, 12-7.
- ¹⁰ Tandem mass spectrometry is an analytical technique which can be used to detect the presence or absence of specific metabolites in blood samples, indicating that the newborn may have a disorder
- ¹¹ Pourfarzam, M., & Zadhoush, F. (2013). Newborn screening for inherited metabolic disorders; news and views. *Journal of research in medical sciences: the official journal of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences*, 18(9), 801.
- ¹² Dharssi, S., Wong-Rieger, D., Harold, M. and Terry, S., (2017). Review of 11 national policies for rare diseases in the context of key patient needs. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases*, 12(1), pp.1-13.
- ¹³ Screen4Care Project (2024). <https://screen4care.eu/>
- ¹⁴ European Commission (2023). https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/SPEECH_23_5845
- ¹⁵ Belgian Presidency (2024). <https://belgian-presidency.consilium.europa.eu/en/programme/priorities/>
- ¹⁶ EURORDIS (2021). Key Principles for Newborn Screening, https://download2.eurordis.org/documents/pdf/eurordis_nbs_position_paper.pdf [Accessed 22/02/2021]
- ¹⁷ ISNS. (2021). *Supporting the Development of Newborn Screening in Europe - ISNS*. [online] Available at: <https://www.isns-neoscreening.org/supporting-the-development-of-newborn-screening-in-europe/> [Accessed 12 March 2021].
- ¹⁸ The list of the 32 countries in scope is provide within the NBS infographic (Figure 1)
- ¹⁹ “World Economic Outlook Database, October 2020”. World Economic Outlook. International Monetary Fund. October 2020. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2020/October> [accessed 11/03/2021]
- ²⁰ Within the context of NBS, “panel” is a term used to describe the selection of diseases/disorders that are currently tested for as part of a NBS programme
- ²¹ Prevalence and incidence of rare diseases: Bibliographic data (2021). *Orphanet Report Series*. https://www.orpha.net/orphacom/cahiers/docs/GB/Prevalence_of_rare_diseases_by_alphabetical_list.pdf [accessed 11/03/2021]

References

- ²² Dharssi, S., Wong-Rieger, D., Harold, M. and Terry, S., (2017). Review of 11 national policies for rare diseases in the context of key patient needs. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases*, 12(1), pp.1-13.
- ¹⁸ Wilson, J. M. G., Jungner, G., & World Health Organization. (1968). Principles and practice of screening for disease.