

Genetic Testing for Cystic Fibrosis

National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement on Genetic Testing for Cystic Fibrosis

Objective: To provide health care providers, patients, and the general public with a responsible assessment of the optimal practices for genetic testing for cystic fibrosis (CF).

Participants: A nonfederal, nonadvocate, 14-member panel representing the fields of genetics, obstetrics, internal medicine, nursing, social work, epidemiology, pediatrics, psychiatry, genetic counseling, bioethics, health economics, health services research, law, and the public. In addition, 21 experts from these same fields presented data to the panel and a conference audience of 500.

Evidence: The literature was searched through MEDLINE, and an extensive bibliography of references was provided to the panel and the conference audience. Experts prepared abstracts with relevant citations from the literature. Scientific evidence was given precedence over clinical anecdotal experience.

Consensus Process: The panel, answering predefined questions, developed its conclusions based on the scientific evidence presented in open forum and the scientific literature. The panel composed a draft statement that was read in its entirety and circulated to the experts and the audience for comment. Thereafter, the panel resolved conflicting recommendations and released a revised statement at the end of the conference. The panel

finalized the revisions within a few weeks after the conference.

Conclusions: Genetic testing for CF should be offered to adults with a positive family history of CF, to partners of people with CF, to couples currently planning a pregnancy, and to couples seeking prenatal care. The panel does not recommend offering CF genetic testing to the general population or newborns. The panel advocates active research to develop improved treatments for people with CF and continued investigation into the understanding of the pathophysiology of the disease. Comprehensive educational programs targeted to health care professionals and the public should be developed using input from people living with CF and their families and from people from diverse racial and ethnic groups. Additionally, genetic counseling services must be accurate and provide balanced information to afford individuals the opportunity to make autonomous decisions. Every attempt should be made to protect individual rights, genetic and medical privacy rights, and to prevent discrimination and stigmatization. It is essential that the offering of CF carrier testing be phased in over a period to ensure that adequate education and appropriate genetic testing and counseling services are available to all persons being tested.

Arch Intern Med. 1999;159:1529-1539

GENETIC TESTING is available for a variety of diseases and will soon be available for many more. Furthermore, genetic predispositions to common diseases are becoming known and potentially will affect large segments of the population. This consensus conference considered cystic fibrosis (CF), a well-characterized, serious genetic disease for which testing is becoming available, and a series of recommendations for genetic testing in the population is presented. The analysis and recommendations may prove relevant to genetic testing in other situations.

At the beginning of this decade, a test was developed that could identify individuals who carry the genetic mutation associated with CF. Concerned that this test might be inappropriately or prematurely used, several genetic and health care pro-

fessional organizations issued recommendations on its use. These groups considered the circumstances under which the tests should be offered, and the populations that would potentially benefit. Almost all of their recommendations were against using the test for large-scale, population-based screening until more sensitive tests were developed and until more had been learned about the risks and benefits of genetic testing for individuals and their families. Several statements called for additional support for research on the educational, laboratory, counseling, ethical, and cost-benefit issues associated with the delivery of population-based screening for

This article is also available on our Web site: www.ama-assn.org/internal

NIH Consensus Development Conferences are convened to evaluate available scientific information and resolve safety and efficacy issues related to biomedical technology. The resultant NIH Consensus Statements are intended to advance understanding of the technology or issue in question and to be useful to health professionals and the public. See the acknowledgments section on page 1538 for additional information about NIH Consensus Statements.

CF. Since that time, new research has yielded a large body of data on these issues.

This conference brought together the research investigators, health care providers, epidemiologists, geneticists, ethicists, and other experts, as well as representatives of the public, to present and discuss the latest data.

Following 1½ days of presentations by experts and audience discussion, an independent, nonfederal consensus panel composed of experts in the fields of genetics, obstetrics, internal medicine, nursing, social work, epidemiology, pediatrics, psychiatry, genetic counseling, bioethics, health economics, health services research, law, and the public weighed the scientific evidence and developed a draft statement in response to the following 5 key questions:

1. What is the current state of knowledge regarding natural history, epidemiology, genotype-phenotype correlations, treatment, and genetic testing of CF in various populations?

2. What has been learned about genetic testing for CF regarding (public and health professional) knowledge and attitudes, interest and demand, risks and benefits, effectiveness, cost, and impact?

3. Should CF-carrier testing be offered to (1) individuals with a family history of CF, (2) adults in the preconception or prenatal period, and/or (3) the general population?

4. What are the optimal practices for CF genetic testing (setting, timing, and the practices of education, consent, and counseling)?

5. What should be the future directions for research relevant to genetic testing for CF and, more broadly, for research and health policies related to genetic testing?

The primary sponsors of this meeting were the National Human Genome Research Institute and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Medical Applications of Research. The conference was cosponsored by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases; the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; the National Institute of Child Health and Human

Development; the NIH Office of Rare Diseases; the National Institute of Mental Health; the National Institute of Nursing Research; the NIH Office of Research on Women's Health; the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research; and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

1. WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE REGARDING NATURAL HISTORY, EPIDEMIOLOGY, GENOTYPE-PHENOTYPE CORRELATIONS, TREATMENT, AND GENETIC TESTING OF CF IN VARIOUS POPULATIONS?

Cystic fibrosis is a multisystem genetic disease in which defective chloride transport across membranes causes dehydrated secretions. This leads to tenacious mucus in the lungs, to mucus plugs in the pancreas, and to the characteristically high sweat chloride levels. Intelligence and cognitive function are typically normal. A survey in 1995 reported that 35% of young adults with CF worked full-time and almost 90% had completed a high school education. More than 25 000 Americans have CF, with approximately 850 cases newly diagnosed each year. Cystic fibrosis is inherited as an autosomal recessive disorder. The responsible gene, the CF transmembrane conductance regulator (*CFTR*), was mapped to chromosome 7 and identified in 1989.

Natural History

Cystic fibrosis has a highly variable presentation and course. Median age at diagnosis is 6 to 8 months; nearly two thirds of individuals are diagnosed as having CF before 1 year of age. Some individuals have severe pulmonary and/or gastrointestinal disease, whereas others have relatively mild disease with presentation during adolescence and young adulthood. Outcomes range from early death from pulmonary complications to mild atypical disease in the second and third decades and a rare normal length of life. Although median survival increased from 18 years in 1976 to 30.1 years in 1995, there has been little life span

extension between 1990 and 1995. Survival has improved, thus far, through aggressive management of pulmonary, pancreatic, and intestinal complications. Despite advances in treatment, there is no cure for CF.

Severity of lung disease is the key to the quality of and length of life. Ninety percent of persons who have CF die from pulmonary complications. Pulmonary function tests, especially forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV_1), are predictive of mortality: when the FEV_1 is 30%, mortality is 50% in 2 years. Poor prognosis is related to respiratory complications before 1 year of age, malnutrition, and denial of the condition. Better prognosis is indicated from mild symptoms at diagnosis, pancreatic sufficiency, and atypical presentation. There are suggestions in the literature that early diagnosis and treatment may result in improved growth of young children; however, data are limited about whether early treatment decreases morbidity as measured by hospitalizations and pulmonary function tests, and, ultimately, mortality rates.

Treatment

The major goals of traditional treatment for CF are to improve pulmonary, gastrointestinal, and pancreatic outcomes. Pulmonary treatment is focused on physical therapy to decrease obstruction of the airways, antibiotics to decrease colonization by *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs to decrease the inflammatory cascade and resulting tissue damage. Gastrointestinal and pancreatic treatments include high protein-high energy diets, pancreatic enzymes, and fat-soluble vitamins.

New modalities include the use of inhaled deoxyribonuclease, which breaks down the DNA from neutrophils and pharmacological modification of ion transport to loosen secretions. Pharmacological activation of mutant *CFTR* (cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator) protein to stimulate chloride channel activity is being investigated. Double-lung transplantation extends life but is not curative.

Characteristics of Cystic Fibrosis in Specific Ethnic Groups*

Group	Incidence, No./Total	Carrier Frequency, No./Total	Mutation $\Delta F508$, %	Common White Alleles, %	Group-Specific Alleles, %	Sensitivity, %
Whites	1/3300	1/29	70	13		80
Hispanics	1/8000-9500	1/46	46	11		57
Ashkenazi Jews		1/29	30	67		97
American Indians						
Pueblo	1/3970		0	25	69	94
Zuni	1/1580					
African Americans	1/15300	1/60-65	48	4	23	75
Asian Americans	1/32100	1/80	30			30

*Source: Modified with permission from Cutting GR. Genetic epidemiology and genotype-phenotype correlations. In: Program and abstracts of the National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference on Genetic Testing for Cystic Fibrosis; April 14-16, 1997; Bethesda, Md. Abstract 106. Ellipses indicate data not applicable.

There are new findings regarding human β -defensin 1, a factor responsible for innate immunity. The natural bactericidal activity of human β -defensin 1 is inhibited on CF epithelia because of high extracellular sodium chloride, and correction of the sodium chloride concentration of extracellular fluid holds promise for therapy in CF. Finally, although the feasibility of gene therapy is currently under investigation, this potential "cure" is not anticipated in the near future.

Epidemiology

Cystic fibrosis is one of the most common genetic diseases in whites, with an incidence of about 1 in 3300. The disease also has a fairly high incidence among Hispanics, 1 in 9500. Cystic fibrosis is a rare disorder in native Africans and native Asians, estimated to occur in less than 1 in 50 000, but higher incidences are observed in American populations of these ethnic groups (1 in 15 300 and 1 in 32 100, respectively), suggesting white admixture. Recent surveys of some American Indian populations also indicate high incidences: 1 in 3970 in the Pueblo people and 1 in 1580 among the Zuni. These data are summarized in the **Table**. The relatively high incidence and concomitant high frequency of carriers motivate the proposal of population-based screening.

CF Mutation Analysis

Since the identification of the gene and the major mutation responsible for CF, more than 600 muta-

tions and DNA sequence variations have been identified in the *CFTR* gene. The $\Delta F508$ mutation is represented in almost all populations, although its relative frequency varies among different geographic locations. The highest frequency is observed in white populations, where it accounts for approximately 70% of the CF alleles (Table). The $\Delta F508$ mutation accounts for large portions of the alleles in other racial/ethnic groups: 48% in African Americans, 46% in Hispanics, and 30% in Asian Americans and Ashkenazi Jews. Some 15 to 20 other "common" mutations account for 2% to 15% of CF alleles, depending on the ethnic composition of the patient group studied. Most of the remaining mutations are rare.

The proportion of detectable mutations is an important indicator of the utility of a population-screening program. Combining detection of the $\Delta F508$ with other mutations common to specific ethnic groups, it appears that there are several populations for which 90% to 95% sensitivity can now be achieved with the current technology: Ashkenazi Jews, Celtic Bretons, French Canadians from Quebec, and some American Indians. In US whites, it is feasible to approach 90% sensitivity at the current time. The detection rate in African Americans is about 75%. Despite the relatively high incidence in Hispanics, the detectable alleles account for only 57% of the CF mutations in this group. The promise appears to be weak in Asian Americans, at 30% sensitivity. Because the remaining mutations are rare, expanding the

panel of screened mutations is expected to achieve only marginal gains in sensitivity.

Genotype-Phenotype Correlations

The discovery of the gene has enabled evaluation of specific mutations in relation to the observed clinical heterogeneity. The correlation of genotype with phenotype is substantial for pancreatic function; however, identification of the specific *CFTR* mutation has not been highly predictive of the severity and course of pulmonary disease, which is the major factor affecting patient quality of life and longevity. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest a role for modifier genes and environmental factors that are as yet unidentified.

Virtually all males with classic CF have congenital bilateral absence of the vas deferens (CBAVD). However, there is a population of otherwise healthy males with CBAVD who have a high frequency of CF mutations. It appears that more than half of these males have 1 or 2 specific mutations, which identifies these genotypes as the most common cause of CBAVD. Some women with these genotypes are healthy or develop chronic sinusitis or bronchitis as the extent of their morbidity. It is unclear whether such mildly affected individuals can be reliably identified by their genotype.

Thus, it appears that knowledge of the genotype is as yet of limited value in making predictions about the anticipated course of disease in an individual, although re-

search to identify genotypes associated with relatively mild presentation such as CBAVD may prove useful in informed decision making.

Genetic Testing in Various Populations

Genetic testing has been performed for CF carriers in various racial and ethnic groups, mass and focused screening, and different types of organized medical settings. At this time, there is limited spontaneous public request for this testing. Although testing has not met with enthusiasm, there has been little or no group opposition to offering testing to African Americans, Asian Americans, whites, Hispanics, American Indians, and persons of Jewish ancestry. Most experience has been gained with whites and Ashkenazi Jews, where incidence is highest. Mass screening has resulted in the least response. Pregnant patients appear to be motivated to obtain genetic information. Nonpregnant patients and those with a family history have exhibited only moderate acceptance rates. In the United States, mass screening of newborns has occurred in only 2 states, Colorado and Wisconsin; otherwise, newborn testing has been limited to those with a family history. The logistics of testing have been successfully implemented in various settings, such as health maintenance organizations and primary care settings, including fee-for-service settings. With the exception of one fee-for-service setting and the newborn state programs, all testing has been free of charge. Direct provider recruitment has proven more effective than less personal approaches.

2. WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED ABOUT GENETIC TESTING FOR CF REGARDING (PUBLIC AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL) KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES, INTEREST AND DEMAND, RISKS AND BENEFITS, EFFECTIVENESS, COST, AND IMPACT?

Knowledge and Attitudes Toward CF and Genetic Testing

As with most genetic diseases, the public's knowledge is very low re-

garding CF, its genetic basis and variable course, and prognosis and understanding of genetic testing is poor. Moreover, among those who have heard of CF, inaccurate impressions often exist, because people are generally not familiar with the progress in treating the disease during the past 40 years. Understanding genetic testing for CF involves learning complex concepts such as test sensitivity, carrier status, patterns of inheritance, risk/probability, and genotype-phenotype correlations. These gaps in the public's genetic knowledge suggest that genetic testing programs must include written informed consent and educational and counseling components.

There are only approximately 2000 genetic professionals nationally, so implementation of widespread genetic testing must rely heavily on primary care providers and prenatal providers. Some research efforts, however, have shown that many office-based physicians are not interested in participating in genetic testing programs involving CF because of lack of familiarity and concerns with unreimbursed time. Medical practitioners need to become more knowledgeable about genetics, genetic testing, and nondirective counseling as genetic tests become more widely available.

Public Interest and Demand

Notwithstanding the limits of public understanding of genetics and genetically related diseases, prospective parents have enormous interest in the health and well-being of children to be. In an Office of Technology Assessment survey of a decade ago, 83% of Americans said they would take a genetic test before having children, if it would tell them whether their children would likely inherit a fatal genetic disease. Many genetic counselors and nurse geneticists report that they are frequently asked about DNA-based CF tests. However, studies have shown that interest in CF genetic testing is limited in the general population and that agreement to participate in genetic education and testing procedures occurs primarily among pregnant women and persons with family histories of genetic disorders.

In the prenatal testing context, participation rates have varied widely in studies to date because of variability of methods used, with acceptance of offers for testing ranging from about 50% to a high of 78% in one health maintenance organization population. Participation has been affected by factors relating to convenience, education, cost, views regarding abortion, concerns about the low sensitivity of the test, and the manner of presentation of the testing opportunity. Concerns about confidentiality and insurability are often mentioned in the genetic testing context. There also is evidence of reluctance to engage in carrier testing on the psychological grounds of "not wanting to know," as has occurred in studies where some people with family histories of genetic disorders chose not to participate.

The reasons for interest in prenatal genetic testing are diverse. Some participants in studies have sought information in anticipation of a decision about pregnancy termination in the case of a fetus with CF. Others wished to know only their carrier status, perhaps to make emotional and practical plans for parenting a child with CF.

Risks

Research has assessed initial concerns among providers of genetic services that genetic testing might have adverse psychological consequences, such as anxiety and depression caused by the difficulty of conveying the uncertainties inherent in genetic testing or the challenge of adjusting to identification as a carrier. The research to date has shown such problems to be transitory; the topic, nevertheless, may warrant additional research incorporating comprehensive psychological assessment tools. The risks of misinformation or misunderstanding highlight the need for a high level of competence in conveying the results and meaning of information derived from genetic testing. Problems retaining complex genetic concepts highlight the need for broad-based public education.

Another concern is the fear that disclosure of genetic test results might affect one's family relation-

ships, employment, education, or other opportunities, or ability to maintain or obtain health insurance. This is a more general problem and needs to be addressed at a broader level to ensure patient access to genetic services and other opportunities without threat of harmful consequences.

Impact and Effectiveness

The effectiveness of genetic testing can be judged in terms of its ability to convey information that patients find useful. The experience to date reports high levels of patient satisfaction after undergoing genetic testing for CF. In the prenatal situation, because of the rarity of the disease, more than 99% of couples tested receive reassuring information regarding the improbability of having a child with CF.

Several studies have reported significant increases in knowledge of CF among couples who have undergone genetic testing and participated in the educational programs connected with it. Although there was some drop in knowledge after several years, knowledge levels still were higher than in the pretesting period. A decline in understanding has been reported in some research, where a considerable portion of the individuals who were carriers did not retain the meaning of the test results. In some instances, this meant that people incorrectly believed they were no longer at risk for having children with CF.

In addition to the educational and psychological benefits of CF testing, the effectiveness of testing can be judged in terms of how the information is used. This is most germane in situations in which a test produced a positive result. Most couples in whom the woman was found to be a carrier chose to have the partner tested as well. The inability of current DNA-testing technology to detect all possible mutations and the difficulty in conveying the concept of residual risk temper these positive effects.

Another indicator of impact occurs in the rare instances in which a fetus with CF is identified. In the limited studies to date, most couples with no family history of genetic dis-

orders in this circumstance choose to terminate the pregnancy. It should be noted that some couples do not undergo final stages of testing because of their intention to continue the pregnancy.

Cost

Assessment of the costs associated with testing, screening, and treatment of CF is challenging because technology and treatment modalities are changing rapidly. Nonetheless, there is general agreement about the magnitude of many of the key cost variables and the likely future direction of change in these costs.

In terms of treatment, options of care for many individuals with CF have expanded during the past decade with implications for the average cost of care. Although the Office of Technology Assessment estimated in 1992, based on 1989 data, that the annual treatment costs were approximately \$10 000 per year per individual with CF, current estimates exceed \$40 000 per year in direct medical costs and \$9000 per year in ancillary costs. Using a 3% discount rate, this implies a net present value of approximately \$800 000 for direct and ancillary costs associated with a CF birth.

The technology and cost of DNA diagnostic testing for a CF mutation are changing rapidly. At present, the cost of DNA diagnostic testing for CF is between \$50 and \$150 per test, testing for between 6 and 72 CF mutations. Rapid progress is being made in cost of testing, however, because of improvements in instrumentation. These costs will likely decline and the number of mutations screened will quickly increase.

In terms of the cost of prenatal testing, the costs of informed consent procedures, educational and counseling services, associated administrative costs, and so forth must be added to the laboratory testing costs per se. These costs will vary as a function of the level of various educational and counseling services accompanying the testing according to evolving professional standards for genetic-testing procedures.

Regarding cost savings from neonatal testing, currently no de-

finitive data demonstrate medical benefit and cost savings associated with population-based neonatal screening. However, there is suggestive evidence that differences in height, weight, and nutrition of youngsters with CF are a function of whether they had neonatal screening and early diagnoses. These may well translate into future health outcomes and treatment savings, but the magnitude of such benefits is not known.

Broader assessment of the costs of a voluntary, broad-based prenatal screening program depends on variables such as the number of individuals deciding to participate in the test, the incidence of CF carriers in the population involved, the testing method (eg, sequential or couple based), the proportion of couples with an affected fetus who choose to terminate the pregnancy, and the number of children the couples wish to have. Although assumptions about these variables differed, studies showed that the cost per identified CF fetus averted ranged from \$250 000 to \$1 250 000 for a white population of northern European ancestry. Estimates on the high end of this range come down substantially if one considers couples who plan to have more than one child or if identified carriers inform siblings and other relatives.

A broad educational effort is essential to create a level of genetic literacy in the population and among health care professionals that will allow individuals to use genetic and other information in making important life decisions. An estimate of the costs of this effort is not available.

3. SHOULD CF-CARRIER TESTING BE OFFERED TO (1) INDIVIDUALS WITH A FAMILY HISTORY OF CYSTIC FIBROSIS, (2) ADULTS IN THE PRECONCEPTION OR PRENATAL PERIOD, AND/OR (3) THE GENERAL POPULATION?

The first 2 sections of this report summarized the knowledge base for the recommendations that follow. Objectives for CF testing and reasons for and against testing are different for each population, but, in all cases, in-

dividuals' testing must be entirely voluntary. Each population is considered separately.

1. Individuals with a family history of CF and partners of those with CF should be offered genetic testing. As a group, individuals with a family history have relatively high frequencies of mutations in the *CFTR* gene. Members of this group have increased awareness of their risk of being carriers, as well as increased familiarity with the disease and its impact on the family. Testing can be helpful with regard to reproductive decision making and informative regarding family health.

2. Cystic fibrosis genetic testing should be offered to the prenatal population and couples currently planning a pregnancy, particularly those in high-risk populations. Data indicate that a significant level of interest in CF testing exists in this group. Because this is a vulnerable population and because of the inherent time constraints, it is particularly important that they receive adequate and balanced information. The information includes, but is not limited to, sensitivity of the test, a description of the range of severity of the disease, and risks. The offer of testing should be made to enable couples who wish to avoid the birth of a child with CF to do so, without influencing those who do not. Care should be taken to ensure that the decision to have testing is completely voluntary.

3. Cystic fibrosis testing for the general population is not advocated. Given the low incidence and prevalence of CF and the demonstrable lack of interest in the general population, there is little justification for testing.

Routine genetic screening for CF in newborns is not advocated, based on available data. Studies have not provided sufficient evidence that identifying CF patients earlier than the current average age of diagnosis improves outcomes. The panel recommends that studies of *CFTR* screening in newborns be developed to provide a foundation for assessment of benefits of early therapy.

Genetic testing for CF should begin with education concerning CF. It should be clear that the patient has

received the material and has had an opportunity for questions to be answered before testing is undertaken. Development of model educational and consent forms for genetic testing, as well as education programs for providers, is encouraged. All persons undergoing genetic testing should give written informed consent for the test, receive culturally sensitive educational materials, and demonstrate an understanding of the test and test results.

It is essential that the offering of CF carrier testing be phased in over time to ensure that adequate education and appropriate genetic testing and counseling services are available to all persons being tested. Genetic testing and counseling for CF in the populations identified by the panel's recommendations should be eligible for payment by insurers.

4. WHAT ARE THE OPTIMAL PRACTICES FOR CF GENETIC TESTING (SETTING, TIMING, AND THE PRACTICES OF EDUCATION, CONSENT, AND COUNSELING)?

The goal of genetic testing for CF is to provide individuals with information that will permit them to make informed reproductive and other decisions. Testing is of benefit only if there is access to the necessary comprehensive health services and resources that ensue from case/carrier detection. Components of a testing program should include education, counseling, and the use of medical facilities to improve health outcomes.

The setting must provide access for provision of comprehensive services. Whether it is based in a medical center or in a primary care setting, a professional interdisciplinary team should address the individual's genetic, medical, emotional, and reproductive health needs. The services should not be administered in isolation, but in association with tertiary care centers.

The complexity of DNA diagnostic data and the vast number of mutations in CF mandate sophisticated laboratory capability (or access to it) as an integral component. Laboratories providing molecular diagnostic capability

should use tests that achieve a mutation detection rate of approximately 90% or better for whites or a detection rate for African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics, Ashkenazi Jews, American Indians, and others comparable with that available at present.

Timing for Testing Depends on Targeted Group

- In adults with a positive family history of CF, genetic testing should be provided at any time requested.
- Newborn siblings of patients with CF as well as other siblings who exhibit atypical symptoms should be tested. However, testing of minors for the purpose of identifying carrier status is not recommended.
- Carrier detection in pregnant couples with a family history of CF should be provided in an expeditious manner. Similarly, the request by a couple with known carrier status for prenatal diagnosis must be addressed promptly to facilitate access to all needed services so as to provide an optimal opportunity to make an informed decision.
- Couples in the prenatal population (ie, those not in a high-risk group) should be offered the opportunity for carrier detection as early as possible to provide them time to consider the full range of informed reproductive decisions.
- The rationale for offering testing to couples currently planning a pregnancy is predicated on timely provision of balanced, accurate information about CF, including natural history of the disease, relative frequency in different ethnic and racial groups, variability of disease manifestation, and availability of highly sensitive and specific tests to determine carrier status.
- Although most males who have CF are sterile, partners of persons with CF should be tested on request for carrier status. The highest practical level of sensitivity of the DNA test should be used to maximize detection of at-risk couples.

Education

Genetic testing should be provided in response to the needs of patients. Thus, programs must provide information relating to genetics in general, such as basic inheritance patterns, variable nature of disease expression, risk of occurrence, and diagnostic and therapeutic options. In the case of CF testing programs, balanced information should be presented and regularly updated. The elements that must be included are the following:

1. Natural history of the disease
2. Range of severity
3. Improvement in survival rates
4. Quality of life for patients and families
5. Full range of therapeutic modalities
6. Reproductive options, including adoption, use of artificial reproductive modalities, and continuation or termination of pregnancy.

Educating patients and families can be accomplished by using a wide variety of printed materials and media, including videos and interactive online systems. At present, information content is presented in a variable manner. It is recommended that effort be directed to develop model information that highlights the positive as well as the negative aspects of living with CF, using input from people living with the disease, their families, and members from diverse racial/ethnic groups.

Every attempt should be made to ascertain the level of understanding and cultural background of the person being tested. Follow-up assessment to determine retention of knowledge is an essential ingredient of any educational program.

Informed Consent

To ensure informed choice, it is imperative that the informed consent process demonstrate that the individual has fully understood the multiple options and implications that ensue from genetic testing. It is also important to ensure that those who decline to be tested do so knowledgeably, although this is typically not

documented. Informed consent must include a clear description of the disease, of the limitations of the genetic testing methods, and of the voluntary participation of the individual giving consent. Individuals must be assured that although every effort will be made to ensure the confidentiality of their medical and genetic data, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

Counseling

Provision of accurate genetic counseling, particularly when the results are provided to the patient or when the intervention strategies are discussed, is essential. The implications of genetic testing, its limitations and strengths, and the risks of ensuing potential therapies and interventions mandate that individuals knowledgeable in genetics provide these services. The counseling skills required must combine respect for a patient's right to make an autonomous decision with an appropriate level of support to facilitate the decision-making process.

Any strategy attempting to provide these services to the public carries with it a responsibility to enhance the educational process for physicians and other health care providers. Rapid changes in the methods of molecular diagnosis, and therapeutic options that result from them, mandate continuing education and involvement of genetic specialists in the process of translating these developments into practical and beneficial terms. Cystic fibrosis centers should make counseling available to minor siblings, who often have a need for information that goes unaddressed.

Nondiscrimination

Pivotal to individual autonomy is the guarantee that genetic data not be used for discrimination with reference to insurability, employment and educational opportunities, and social stigmatization.

Federal and state statutes currently in place to address nondiscriminatory practices against any carrier, person with a genetic disorder, or family member need to be enforced. However, these laws pro-

vide limited protection from discriminatory practices. Additional federal and state statutes are needed to broaden protection from harm based on genetic status from educational, health care, and other organizations that may affect and restrict immediate and long-term opportunities. Special attention to expand the understanding and awareness of the legal, insurance, health care, and educational professions about discriminatory practices should be undertaken.

In spite of laws that are put into place to protect people from external discrimination, less visible or more subtle harm may occur. For example, families may perceive differently a member found to be a carrier or found to be affected with a genetic disorder. These families may marginalize or ostracize the identified person. No laws can be passed to provide protection from this practice; however, future research is needed to understand the parameters of this problem and the moderating impact of education and counseling.

5. WHAT SHOULD BE THE FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH RELEVANT TO GENETIC TESTING FOR CF AND, MORE BROADLY, FOR RESEARCH AND HEALTH POLICIES RELATED TO GENETIC TESTING?

- What are the impacts on medical costs, ancillary costs, and quality of life associated with CF, as treatment options and screening technologies change? What are the cost-effective approaches to treatment and screening in different settings?
- What is the actual incidence of discrimination and stigmatization with respect to carriers, persons with genetic disorders, and their families? How does fear or anticipation of discrimination affect decision making by some persons with identified genetic disorders?
- What is the most effective mechanism to educate health professionals about the current state of genetic disorders, genetic testing, and management of genetic disorders?

R. Rodney Howell, MD, Conference and Panel Chairperson, Professor and Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.; Ingrid Borecki, PhD, Research Associate Professor, Division of Biostatistics, School of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Mary E. Davidson, MSW, LCSW-C, Executive Director, Alliance of Genetic Support Groups, Chevy Chase, Md.; Ezra C. Davidson, Jr, MD, Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, King Drew Medical Center, and Charles R. Drew, University of Medicine and Science, Los Angeles, Calif.; James P. Evans, MD, PhD, Clinical Associate Professor, Internal Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Internist and Geneticist, Carolina Permanente Medical Group, Durham, NC; Bonnie J. Flick, MD, Assistant Professor, Departments of Pediatrics and Psychiatry, University of Utah Health Sciences Center, Salt Lake City; Bradford H. Gray, PhD, Director, Division of Health and Science Policy, New York Academy of Medicine, New York; Mark S. Kamlet, PhD, Dean and H. John Heinz III Professor of Economics and Public Policy, H. John Heinz School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Elizabeth R. McAnamey, MD, Professor and Chair, Department of Pediatrics, University of Rochester School of Medicine, Rochester, NY; Vicki Michel, MA, JD, Consultant and Mediator in Bioethics and Law, and Adjunct Professor, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; Robb E. Moses, MD, Chair, Department of Molecular and Medical Genetics, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland; Owen M. Rennert, MD, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Pediatrics, Georgetown University Medical Center, Washington, DC; Stephanie C. Smith, MS, Genetic Associate, Genetics Services Coordinator, Division of Medical Genetics, Department of Preventive Medicine, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson; Janet K. Williams, PhD, RN, Associate Professor, College of Nursing, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Speakers

David A. Asch, MD, MBA, "Carrier Screening for Cystic Fibrosis: Costs and Clinical Outcomes," Assistant Professor of Medicine, Senior Fellow, Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics, Department of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; Arthur L. Beaudet, MD, "Making the Case for Offering Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Testing on a Population Basis," Henry and Emma Meyer Professor and Acting Chairman, Department of Molecular and Human Genetics, Baylor College of Medicine, Investigator, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Houston, Tex.; Barbara A. Bernhardt, MS, "Offering Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening to an HMO Population: Utilization, Knowledge, and Factors Influencing the Decision to Be Tested," Assistant Professor, Genetic Counselor, Department of Pediatrics, Division of Genetics and Public Policy Studies, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore; Thomas F. Boat, MD, "Cystic Fibrosis in the Post-CFTR Era," Professor and Chair, Department of Pediatrics, University of Cincinnati, and Director, Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio; Preston W. Campbell III, MD, "Cystic Fibrosis Therapy," Associate Professor, Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; Garry R. Cutting, MD, "Genetic Epidemiology and Genotype/Phenotype Correlations," Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore; Richard A. Doherty, MD, "Prenatal Couple Screening for Cystic Fibrosis in Primary Care Settings," Director, Southern Maine Regional Genetics Program, Department of Genetics, Foundation for Blood Research, Scarborough; Christine M. Eng, MD, "Prenatal Genetic Carrier Screening: Experience With Multiple Option Screening in the Ashkenazi Jewish Population," Assistant Professor, Department of Human Genetics, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York; Joanna H. Fanos, PhD, "Carrier Testing for Adult Cystic Fibrosis Siblings: The Importance of Not Knowing," Senior Scientist, Departments of Pediatrics, Medicine, and Psychiatry, California Pacific Medical Center, Research Institute, San Francisco; Theresa A. Grebe, MD, "Cystic Fibrosis Among Native Americans of the Southwest," Assistant Professor of Clinical Pediatrics, Division of Medical and Molecular Genetics, Department of Pediatrics, University of Arizona College of Medicine, Phoenix; Wayne W. Grody, MD, PhD, "Cystic Fibrosis Mutation Screening and Counseling," Associate Professor, Divisions of Medical Genetics and Molecular Pathology, and Director, Diagnostic Molecular Pathology Laboratory, Departments of Pathology, Laboratory Medicine, and Pediatrics, University of California Los Angeles, School of Medicine; Neil A. Holtzman, MD, MPH, "A Standard of Care for Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening: Satisfying Equity and Autonomy," Director, Genetics and Public Policy Studies, Department of Pediatrics, The Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Baltimore; Katherine W. Klinger, PhD, "Genetic Testing Technologies," Vice President, Science, Genzyme Genetics, Framingham, Mass.; Tracy Lieu, MD, MPH, "Cost-effectiveness of Prenatal Carrier Screening for Cystic Fibrosis," Physician Investigator, Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente of Northern California, Oakland; Theresa M. Marteau, PhD, "Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Testing in the Population: A UK Perspective," Professor of Health Psychology, Director, Psychology and Genetics Research Group, United Medical and Dental Schools of Guy's and St Thomas's, University of London, London, England; John A. Phillips III, MD, "Efficacy of Education for and Interest in Population-Based Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Screening," David T. Karzon Professor of Pediatrics and Professor of Biochemistry, Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville; Michael J. Rock, MD, "Newborn Screening," Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, Division of Pediatric Pulmonology, Department of Pediatrics, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Peter T. Rowley, MD, "Prenatal Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Population Screening: Lessons From a Regional Trial," "Economic Evaluation of Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Population Screening," Professor of Medicine, Pediatrics, Genetics, Division of Genetics, University of Rochester School of Medicine, Rochester; James R. Sorenson, PhD, "Carrier Testing Among First, Second, and Third Degree Relatives of Cystic Fibrosis Patients," Professor, Department of Health Behavior and Education, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Benjamin S. Willford, MD, "Normative Issues in Developing Public Policy for Cystic Fibrosis Carrier Testing," Assistant Professor, Department of Pediatrics, University of Arizona Health Science Center, Tucson; David R. Witt, MD, "Prenatal Cystic Fibrosis Heterozygote Screening of 5161 Women in a Large HMO," Chief, Genetics Department, Kaiser Permanente Medical Group, San Jose, Calif.

Planning Committee

Elizabeth Thomson, MS, RN, Chairperson, Assistant Director, Clinical Genetics Research, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; Susan Banks-Schlegel, PhD, Senior Scientific Adviser, Airway Biology and Diseases Program, Division of Lung Diseases, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, NIH, Bethesda; Joy Boyer, Program Analyst, Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications Office, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; Elsa A. Bray, Program Analyst, Office of Medical Applications of Research, NIH, Bethesda; Sharon A. Durham, Public Affairs Specialist, Office of Policy Coordination, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; John H. Ferguson, MD, Director, Office of Medical Applications of Research, NIH, Bethesda; Judith Fradkin, MD, Chief, Endocrinology and Metabolic Diseases Program Branch, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, NIH, Bethesda; Steven C. Groft, PharmD, Director, Office of Rare Diseases, Office of the Director, NIH, Bethesda; William H. Hall, Director of Communications, Office of Medical Applications of Research, NIH, Bethesda; R. Rodney Howell, MD, Conference and Panel Chairperson, Professor and Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Fla; Elke Jordan, PhD, Deputy Director, Office of the Director, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; David Lanier, MD, Medical Officer, Center for Primary Care Research, Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, Rockville, Md; June Lunney, PhD, RN, National Institute of Nursing Research, NIH, Bethesda; Monique K. Mansoura, PhD, Postdoctoral Fellow, Laboratory of Gene Transfer, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; Eric Meslin, PhD, Chief, Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications Office, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; Steven O. Moldin, PhD, Chief, Genetics Research Program, National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, Rockville; Robert F. Murray, Jr, MD, Professor and Chief, Division of Medical Genetics, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC; Melissa A. Rosenfeld, MD, Acting Chief, Vector Development Section, Laboratory of Gene Transfer, National Human Genome Research Institute, NIH, Bethesda; Karen Rothenberg, JD, Marjorie Cook Professor of Law, Director, Law and Health Care Program, University of Maryland, Baltimore; Charles R. Sherman, PhD, Deputy Director, Office of Medical Applications of Research, NIH, Bethesda; Ellen Sidransky, MD, Chief, Unit on Clinical Genetics, Clinical Neuroscience Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, Bethesda; Hilary Sigmom, PhD, RN, National Institute of Nursing Research, NIH, Bethesda; Judy A. Small, PhD, Health Science Administrator, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, NIH, Bethesda; Suzanne P. Tomlinson, JD, Cystic Fibrosis Consumer, Alexandria, Va; Judith M. Whalen, Associate Director for Science Policy Analysis and Communication, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NIH, Bethesda; Benjamin S. Wilfond, MD, Assistant Professor, Department of Pediatrics, University of Arizona Health Science Center, Tucson.

Conference Sponsors

Office of Medical Applications of Research, NIH, John H. Ferguson, MD, Director, National Human Genome Research Institute, Francis S. Collins, MD, Director.

Conference Cosponsors

Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, John Eisenberg, MBA, MD, Administrator; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, David Satcher, MD, Director; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Duane F. Alexander, MD, Director; National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, Phillip Gordon, MD, Director; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, Claude Lenfant, MD, Director; National Institute of Mental Health, Steven E. Hyman, MD, Director; National Institute of Nursing Research, Patricia A. Grady, RN, PhD, Director; NIH Office of Rare Diseases, Steven C. Groft, PharmD, Director; NIH Office of Research on Women's Health, Vivian W. Pinn, MD, Director.

- What are effective educational strategies to educate the public and specific populations about genetics and genetic testing?
- What are patients' expectations of pretest education, genetic reproductive risk counseling, genetic evaluations, and transmittal of test results?
- Do early diagnosis and treatment of newborns with CF modify the morbidity as indicated by pulmonary function tests, maturation status, rates of infection, hospitalization, and mortality rates?
- What types of screening strategies should be used (eg, sequential vs couple screening)? A systematic literature review should be undertaken, and, if warranted, a randomized controlled trial should be initiated to assess

the relative merits of these strategies.

- What are goals for the future? Certain specific mutations appear to result in limited phenotypes, such as CBAVD. A goal of future research should be to continue to identify additional mutations, modifier genes, and environmental factors and correlate these with the phenotype.
- How to define mutations of genes? Because CF is characterized by multiple mutations of the *CFTR* gene, this disease would be the prototype for the assessment of multiple methods to define numerous allelic mutations of a large gene.
- What should be studied? The optimal system for delivery of genetic services in rural and nonaca-

demic settings should be studied.

- What are long-term effects of pregnancy termination or continuation on high-risk couples?

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Active research should continue on improved treatments for people with CF, enhanced molecular diagnosis of CF, and better understanding of the pathophysiology of CF.

- During the past 2 decades, aggressive management of the pulmonary manifestations of CF and new treatment modalities have resulted in much longer survival.
- More than 90% of CF mutations can be identified in certain populations. Although generally good correlations exist between cer-

tain CF mutations and penetrant status, it is known that CF mutations are not robust predictors of severity of disease and longevity.

- The goal of genetic testing is to provide individuals with information that will permit them to make informed decisions.
- Cystic fibrosis genetic testing should be offered to adults with a family history of CF, to partners of people with CF, to couples currently planning a pregnancy, and to couples seeking prenatal care.
- Comprehensive educational programs are recommended, using a variety of media, for health care professionals and the public.
- Counseling services must be accurate and provide balanced information to afford individuals the opportunity to make autonomous decisions. Every attempt should be made to protect individual rights and genetic and medical privacy rights and to prevent discrimination and stigmatization.
- Access to genetic testing in the prenatal setting enhances the ability of couples to make reproductive choices, as shown by their interest in and use of the information they gain. The cost is reasonable in relation to the benefits obtained.
- Offering CF genetic testing to the general population or to newborn infants is not recommended.
- Genetic testing for many additional conditions will be available in the future. Some of the principles considered for CF genetic testing might well have broader application.
- It is essential that the offering of CF carrier testing be phased in over time to ensure that adequate education and appropriate genetic testing and counseling services are available to all persons being tested.

Accepted for publication November 8, 1998.

NIH Consensus Statements are prepared by a nonadvocate, nonfederal panel of experts, based on (1) presentations by investigators working in areas relevant to the consensus ques-

tions during a 2-day public session, (2) questions and statements from conference attendees during open discussion periods that are part of the public session, and (3) closed deliberations by the panel during the remainder of the second day and morning of the third.

This statement is an independent report of the panel and is not a policy statement of the NIH or the federal government.

This abstract is prepared by the conference organizers and added to the consensus panel's statement as a service for the Archives readers.

This Consensus Development Conference was held on April 14-16, 1997, and the Consensus Statement was posted on the NIH Web site on April 17, 1997.

Preparation and distribution of this statement is the responsibility of the Office of Medical Applications of Research of the NIH. Free copies of this statement and bibliographies prepared by the National Library of Medicine are available from the Office of Medical Applications of Research, NIH, or the NIH Consensus Program Information Center by 24-hour voice mail. In addition, free copies of all other available NIH Consensus Statements and NIH Technology Assessment Statements may be obtained from the following resources: NIH Consensus Program Information Center, PO Box 2577, Kensington, MD 2089; (888) NIH-CONS (888-644-2667); fax: (301) 816-2494; or NIH Office of Medical Applications of Research, 31 Center Dr, MSC-2082, Bethesda, MD 20892-9120; NIH Consensus Web site, <http://consensus.nih.gov>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The speakers listed on page 1536 identified the following key references in developing their presentations for the consensus conference. A more complete bibliography prepared by the National Library of Medicine at NIH, along with the references below, were provided to the consensus panel for their consideration. The full bibliography is available at the following Web site: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/cbm/cystic_fibrosis.html.

Asch DA, Hershey JC, Pauly MV, Patton JP, Jedrzewski MK, Mennuti MT. Genetic screening for reproductive planning: methodologic and conceptual issues in policy analysis. *Am J Public Health*. 1996;86:684-690.

Asch DA, Mennuti MT. Evolving policy questions in the use of genetic tests. *IEEE Technol Soc*. 1996;15:4-11.

Asch DA, Patton JP, Hershey JC, Mennuti MT. Reporting the results of cystic fibrosis carrier screening. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1993;168:1-6.

Axworthy D, Brock DJH, Bobrow TM, Marteau TM. Psychological impact of population-based carrier testing for cystic fibrosis: three year follow-up. *Lancet*. 1996;347:1443-1446.

Beaudet AL. Carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1990;47:603-605.

Bekker H, Modell M, Dennis G, et al. Uptake of cystic fibrosis carrier testing in primary care: supply push or demand pull? *BMJ*. 1993;306:1584-1586.

Bernhardt BB, Chase GA, Faden RR, et al. Educating patients about cystic fibrosis carrier screening in a primary care setting. *Arch Fam Med*. 1996;5:336-340.

Botkin JR. Fetal privacy and confidentiality. *Hastings Cent Rep*. 1995;25:32-39.

Brock DJH. Prenatal screening for cystic fibrosis: 5 years' experience reviewed. *Lancet*. 1996;347:148-150.

Callanan N, Bloom D, Sorenson J, DeVellis B, Chevront B. CF carrier testing: experience of relatives. *J Gen Couns*. 1995;4:83-95.

Chase GA, Bernhardt BA, Faden RR, Geller G, Tambor ES, Holtzman NA. Confirmation of a finding on tolerance for test uncertainty (TTU) in cystic fibrosis carrier screening. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1995;57(suppl 4):A29.

Chevront B, Sorenson J, Callanan N, Stearns S, DeVellis B. Psychosocial and educational outcomes associated with home- and clinic-based pretest education and cystic fibrosis carrier testing among a population of at-risk relatives. *Am J Med Genet*. 1998;75:461-468.

Chillon M, Casals T, Mercier B, et al. Mutations in the cystic fibrosis gene in patients with congenital absence of the vas deferens. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;332:1475-1480.

Clayton EW, Hannig VH, Pfothenauer JP, Parker RA, Campbell PW III, Phillips JA III. Teaching about cystic fibrosis carrier screening by using written and video information. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1995;57:171-181.

Clayton EW, Hannig VH, Pfothenauer JP, Parker RA, Campbell PW III, Phillips JA III. Lack of interest by non-pregnant couples in population-based cystic fibrosis carrier screening. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1996;58:617-627.

Congress of the United States, Office of Technology Assessment. *Cystic Fibrosis and DNA Tests: Implications of Carrier Screening*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office; August 1992. Publication OTA-BA-532.

Cotton RGH. Current methods of mutation detection. *Mutat Res*. 1993;285:125-144.

Cystic Fibrosis Genetic Analysis Consortium. Population variation of common cystic fibrosis mutations. *Hum Mutat*. 1994;4:167-177.

Davis PB, Drumm M, Konstan MW. Cystic fibrosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1996;154:1229-1256.

Doherty RA, Bradley LA, Haddow JE. Prenatal screening for cystic fibrosis: an updated perspective. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1997;176:268-270.

Doherty RA, Palomaki GE, Kloza EM, Erickson JL, Haddow JE. Couple-based prenatal screening for cystic fibrosis in primary care settings. *Prenat Diagn*. 1996;16:397-404.

Doksum T, Bernhardt BA. Population-based carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. *Clin Obstet Gynecol*. 1996;39:763-771.

Fang CY, Dunkel-Schetter C, Tatsugawa ZH, et al. Attitudes toward genetic carrier screening for cystic fibrosis in pregnant women: the role of health beliefs and avoidant coping style. *Womens Health*. 1997;3:31-51.

Fanos JH. *Sibling Loss*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1996.

Fanos JH. Developmental tasks of childhood and adolescence: implications for genetic testing. *Am J Med Genet*. 1997;71:22-28.

Fanos JH, Johnson JP. Perception of carrier status by cystic fibrosis siblings. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1995;57:431-438.

Fanos JH, Johnson JP. Barriers to carrier testing for adult siblings: the importance of not knowing. *Am J Med Genet*. 1995;59:85-91.

Farrell PM, Aronson RA, Hoffman G, Laessig RH.

M, Marteau TM. Psychological carrier testing for cystic fibrosis. *Lancet*. 1996;347:347-348.

Farrell PM, Mischler EH. Newborn screening for cystic fibrosis. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1992;51:736-740.

Grebe TA, Doane WW, Richter SF, et al. Mutation analysis of the cystic fibrosis transmembrane regulator gene in Native American populations of the Southwest. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1992;51:736-740.

Gregg RG, Simantel A, Farrell PM, et al. Newborn screening for cystic fibrosis in Wisconsin: comparison of biochemical and molecular methods. *Pediatrics*. 1997;99:819-824.

Gregg RG, Wilfond BS, Farrell PM, Laxova A, Hassemer D, Mischler EH. Application of DNA analysis in a population-screening program for neonatal diagnosis of cystic fibrosis (CF): comparison of screening protocols. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1993;52:616-626.

Grody WW, Dunkel-Schetter C, Tatsugawa ZH, et al. PCR-based screening for cystic fibrosis carrier mutations in an ethnically diverse pregnant population. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1997;60:935-947.

Grody WW, Kronquist KE, Lee EU, Edmond J, Rome LH. PCR-based cystic fibrosis carrier screening in a first-year medical student biochemistry laboratory. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1993;53:1352-1355.

Hacia JG, Brody LC, Chee MS, Fodor SPA, Collins FS. Detection of heterozygous mutations in *BRCA1* using high density oligonucleotide arrays and two-color fluorescence analysis. *Nat Genet*. 1996;14:441-447.

Haddow JE, Palomaki GE. Similarities in women's decision making in the US and UK during prenatal screening for Down's syndrome. *Prenat Diagn*. 1996;16:1161-1162.

Hamosh A, Fitzsimmons SC, Macek MJ, Knowles MR, Rosenstein BJ, Cutting GR. Comparison of the clinical manifestations of cystic fibrosis in black and white patients. *J Pediatr*. 1998;132:255-259.

Lemna WK, Feldman GL, Kerem Bat-sheva, et al. Mutation analysis for heterozygote detection and the prenatal diagnosis of cystic fibrosis. *N Engl J Med*. 1990;322:291-296.

Levenkron JC, Loader S, Rowley PT. Carrier screening for cystic fibrosis: test acceptance and one year follow-up. *Am J Med Genet*. 1997;73:378-386.

Lieu TA, Watson SE, Washington AE. The cost-effectiveness of prenatal carrier screening for cystic fibrosis. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1994;84:903-912.

Loader S, Caldwell P, Kozyra A, et al. Cystic fibrosis carrier population screening in the primary care setting. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1996;59:234-247.

Martea TM. Psychological consequences of cystic fibrosis heterozygote screening. In: Dodge J, Widdicombe J, Brock D, eds. *Current Topics in Cystic Fibrosis*. Vol 3. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc; 1993:165-180.

Martea TM, Dundas R, Axworthy D. Long-term cognitive and emotional impact of genetic testing for carriers of cystic fibrosis: the effects of gender and test result. *Health Psychol*. 1997;16:51-62.

Mercier B, Raguénès O, Estivill X, et al. Complete detection of mutations in cystic fibrosis of Native American origin. *Hum Genet*. 1994;94:629-632.

Myers MF, Bernhardt BA, Tambor ES, Holtzman NA. Involving consumers in the development of an educational program for cystic fibrosis carrier screening. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1994;54:719-726.

Ramsey BW. Management of pulmonary disease in patients with cystic fibrosis. *N Engl J Med*. 1996;335:179-188.

Rosenfeld MA, Collins FS. Gene therapy for cystic fibrosis. *Chest*. 1996;109:241-252.

Rowley PT, Loader S, Kaplan RM. Prenatal screening for cystic fibrosis carriers: an economic evaluation. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1998;63:1160-1174.

Rowley PT, Loader S, Levenkron JC, Phelps CE. Cystic fibrosis carrier screening: knowledge and attitudes of prenatal care providers. *Am J Prev Med*. 1993;9:261-266.

Rozmahel R, Wilschanski M, Matin A, et al. Modulation of disease severity in cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator deficient mice by a secondary genetic factor. *Nat Genet*. 1996;12:280-287.

Shuber AP, Michalowsky LA, Nass GS, et al. High throughput analysis of hundreds of patient samples for more than 100 mutations in multiple disease genes. *Hum Mol Genet*. 1997;6:337-347.

Smith JJ, Travis SM, Greenberg EP, Welsh MJ. Cystic fibrosis airway epithelia fail to kill bacteria because of abnormal airway surface fluid. *Cell*. 1996;85:231-236.

Sorenson J, Chevront B, Bruning A, et al. Proband and parent assistance in identifying relatives for cystic fibrosis carrier testing. *Am J Med Genet*. 1996;63:419-425.

Sorenson J, Chevront B, DeVellis B, et al. Acceptance of home and clinic based cystic fibrosis carrier education and testing by first, second, and third degree relatives of cystic fibrosis patients. *Am J Med Genet*. 1997;70:121-129.

Tambor ES, Bernhardt BA, Chase GA, et al. Offering cystic fibrosis carrier screening to an HMO population: factors associated with utilization. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1994;55:626-637.

Tatsugawa Z, Fox MA, Fang C, et al. Education and testing for large-scale cystic fibrosis carrier screening. *J Genet Couns*. 1994;3:279-289.

Wald NJ. Couple screening for cystic fibrosis. *Lancet*. 1991;338:1318-1319.

Welsh MJ, Tsui L-C, Boat TF, Beaudet AL. Cystic fibrosis. In: Scriver CR, Beaudet AL, Sly WS, Valle D, eds. *The Metabolic and Molecular Bases of Inherited Disease*. 7th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co; 1995:3799-3876.

Wilfond BS, Fost N. The cystic fibrosis gene: medical and social implications for heterozygote detection. *JAMA*. 1990;263:2777-2783.

Wilfond BS, Fost N. The introduction of cystic fibrosis carrier screening into clinical practice: policy considerations. *Milbank Q*. 1992;70:629-659.

Wilfond BS, Nolan K. National policy development for the clinical application of genetic diagnostic technologies: lessons from cystic fibrosis. *JAMA*. 1993;270:2948-2954.

Witt DR, Schaefer C, Hallam P, et al. Cystic fibrosis heterozygote screening in 5161 pregnant women. *Am J Hum Genet*. 1996;58:823-835.