

A Questionnaire-based Study to Comprehensively Assess the *Status Quo* of Rare Disease Patients and Care-givers in China

Xuefeng Li

Guangzhou Medical University

Meiling Liu

Guangzhou Medical University

Bingzhe Li

Oklahoma State University Stillwater

Xiangyu Zhang

University of Minnesota

Shu Zhang

Kunming Medical University

Zijuan Lu

Tongji University

Jianyong Zhang

Jinhaishiji

Jincheng Zhou

Amgen Inc

Li Ou (✉ ouxxx045@umn.edu)

University of Minnesota Twin Cities <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7743-5649>

Research Article

Keywords: rare disease, orphan drug, patient organizations, questionnaire

Posted Date: March 16th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-304330/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases on July 22nd, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13023-021-01954-7>.

Abstract

Background: There are over 16.8 million rare disease patients in China, representing a large community that should not be neglected. To provide a basis for policy-makers to better understand the status quo of rare disease patients and care-givers in China and to devise some new policies, a comprehensive analysis of the status quo, unmet needs, difficulty caused by the rare disease is essential.

Methods: A questionnaire-based study of patients and care-givers (usually family members) was performed. The questionnaire was composed of 116 questions, such as the diagnosis process, treatment access, financial burden, views on patients' organizations, and a series of standardized tests to assess the quality of their life, including the SF-36, PHQ-9, PHQ-15, GAD-7, and PSQI. To examine the influence of age, disease type, and relationship to patients on the scores in these tests, statistical analysis with a general linear model was conducted.

Findings: A total of 1,959 patients and care-givers participated in the survey, representing 104 rare diseases, such as lysosomal storage diseases, hemophilia, and muscular dystrophy diseases. The diagnosis was delayed for 1.4 ± 3.0 years, and patients experienced 1.6 ± 3.8 misdiagnoses between 3.2 ± 2.4 hospitals. The hospitals where diagnoses were made were highly concentrated in 10 large hospitals (43.8%) and 5 big cities (42.1%), indicating a significant inequality of medical resources. The disease often led to difficulty in social life, education, and employment, as well as financial burden that was seldom covered by medical insurance. A battery of standardized tests demonstrated poor health status, depression, somatization, anxiety, and sleeping issues among both patients and care-givers ($p < 0.05$).

Statistical analysis of the questionnaire also showed that poor health, anxiety, depression, somatization, and sleeping problems were more prevalent in patients than in care-givers, and more prevalent in more severe diseases (e.g., hemophilia, Dravet) or undiagnosed than in other diseases.

Interpretations: This study identified the lack of rare disease awareness and legislative support as the major challenge to rare diseases in China, and makes key recommendations for policy-makers, including legislating orphan drug act, raising rare disease awareness, and protecting rights in education and employment.

Introduction

A rare disease is any disease that affects a relatively small number of people. There is no universal definition of rare diseases, and definitions vary in different countries. In America, a rare disease is defined as a disease affecting less than 200,000 persons (or prevalence is less than 0.64‰) each year, while in Europe it is a disease which affects less than 5 in 10,000 persons ¹. Besides, Japan stipulates that rare diseases are those affecting less than 50,000 people (prevalence $< 0.39\text{‰}$) ², while Taiwan takes the incidence rate of less than 1/10000 as the standard for rare diseases ³. There are between 5,000–8,000 rare diseases ⁴, affecting a total of 400 million patients worldwide ⁵. Together, rare diseases affect

approximately 6–10% of the population and 3–4% of births⁶, thus rare diseases pose a significant challenge to the healthcare systems. Approximately 80% of rare diseases are genetic, many of which are life-threatening⁷. Most rare disease patients are children, and 30% of patients die before the age of 5 years⁸. Delayed diagnosis and misdiagnosis are common, resulting in inappropriate treatment and poor outcomes⁹. Approximately 95% of rare diseases have no treatment options⁸. Even if treatments exist, the availability and affordability of treatment are often poor, especially in developing countries. Awareness and knowledge of rare diseases are often lacking, rendering many patients struggling to find adequate information. Consequently, the emotional, psychological, and financial impact of a rare disease on patients and care-givers is also considerable.

There is still no official definition of rare diseases in China; therefore, the total number of rare disease patients in China is unknown. It was previously estimated to be 16.8 million¹⁰. However, this may be a significant underestimate considering the population of 1.4 billion.

Since the count of rare disease patients in China is enormous and cannot be ignored, the Chinese government has realized to take measures to improve the situation and life quality of rare disease patients in recent years. Excitingly, five Chinese government departments jointly officially issued the first list of rare diseases of China on May 22, 2018¹¹. According to the actual situation of rare diseases in China and the learning from international experiences, the list which includes 121 rare diseases such as hemophilia, albinism and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, is selected by authoritative experts in different fields in accordance with certain working procedures. To further promote measures to combat rare diseases, in February 2019, the National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China announced the establishment of the "National Network to Collaborate on Diagnosis and Treatment of Rare Diseases" and formally issued the Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Rare Diseases (2019), which is the first national guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of rare diseases^{12,13}.

In fact, medical insurance plays an important role in relieving the financial burden of illness in a large population. Nowadays, basic health insurance in China consists of the Urban Employee Basic Medical Insurance, the New Rural Cooperative Medical Scheme and the Urban Resident Basic Medical Insurance¹⁴. Since the first revision of the National Essential Medicines List (NEML), composed of 307 essential medicines, was issued by government in 2009, the latest NEML (2018) has increased the drugs to 685, which contains a large number of drugs for general diseases¹⁵. Residents can demand reimbursement for medical expenses according to different types of medical insurance, although the cost of most rare diseases are excluded. In order to improve the medical insurance coverage of rare diseases, some local governments and non-governmental organizations have focused on the local rare diseases and take efforts to promote the implement of relevant beneficial policies for several years. In 2012, Qingdao issued the Opinions on Establishing the Medical Assistance System for Urban Serious Diseases (Trial), which clearly included rare diseases into the medical security system for serious diseases for the first time. In 2016, Zhejiang Provincial Government issued the Notice on strengthening medical security for rare diseases, which initially established a rare disease security mechanism in Zhejiang. In 2016, the List of

Major Rare Diseases in Shanghai (2016), released by Shanghai Municipal Health and Family Planning Commission, clearly took 56 rare diseases on board ¹⁶. Based on different local policies of medical insurance for rare diseases, patients can ask for reimbursement of medical expenses to some extent.

In some degree, the central government and local government do have paid attention to improving the current situation of rare diseases in recent years. However, compared with general healthcare resources, there still lacks legislation or medical insurance coverage of treatments for rare diseases in China, resulting in low interest in orphan drug development by the pharmaceutical industry. The rare disease field is largely underdeveloped due to the lack of rare disease awareness, legislation, pharmaceutical development, and insurance coverage in China. It is essential to have an in-depth understanding of this field to provide a basis for legislation. Therefore, this study aims to comprehensively assess the status quo of patients and care-givers, including the diagnostic process, financial and social stress, psychological impact, and quality of life, as well as their perspectives on relevant issues. Key recommendations to support patients, motivate orphan drug development, and improve rare disease awareness, are made based on the questionnaire results. The results will provide the basis for considerations of policy-makers. This is the first large-scale study to assess the diagnosis process, treatment access, financial stress, physical and mental health, and viewpoints on policies of patients and care-givers of rare diseases in China.

Materials And Methods

Ethics statement

The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Guangzhou Medical University. By the assistance of Seven Pansy Rare Diseases Platform, we recruited the potential participants (patients or care-givers, 18 years old or above) to finish the online questionnaire via network link on 'zhihu' website. And the respondents were encouraged to invite their friends with rare diseases to complete the survey. Care-givers are family members who take care of the patients. Those who are not rare disease patients or care-givers were not included in the analysis. Only those who signed the informed consent participated in this study between March and May 2020. The questionnaire was composed of 116 questions such as diagnosis process, treatment access, financial burden, views on patients' organizations, and a series of standardized tests to assess the quality of their life, including the SF-36, PHQ-9, PHQ-15, GAD-7, and PSQI. All of the questions were designed in Chinese. The data received were stored in excel, and the missing data in the questions of assessment instruments were performed whole abandonment, then we analyzed the complete data in classification statistically. For example, if any data were missing in the part of assessment instruments, these respondents' whole responses in evaluating their quality of life would be also excluded. All the participants acknowledged; 1) that they would participate in this study anonymously; 2) that they could decline to answer any of the questions; 3) that they could quit the study at any time; 4) that the results would be published in a scientific journal without seeking their approval of the manuscript; and 5) that they would not be paid for participating in this study.

Assessment instruments

The Short Form (36) Health Survey is a 36-item, self-reported survey on the status of health¹⁷. SF-36 includes 8 domains: physical function (PF), role limitations due to physical problems (RP), bodily pain (BP), general health (GH), vitality (VT), social function (SF), role limitations due to emotional problems (RE), mental health (MH). The score of each domain ranges from 0 to 100, and a low score indicates poor health. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI) is a screening tool for sleeping difficulty. PSQI consists of 19 items that can be categorized into 7 domains, including subjective sleep quality (SQ), sleep latency (SL), sleep duration (SD), habitual sleep efficiency (SE), sleep disturbance (Dis), sleep medication use (SM), and daytime dysfunction (DD)¹⁸. The total score of PSQI ranges from 0 to 21, and a high score indicates poor sleep quality. Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) is a 9-item screening tool for depression¹⁹. PHQ-9 measures the frequency of depression symptoms over the last 2 weeks. The total score of PHQ-9 ranges from 0 to 27, and scores of ≥ 5 , ≥ 10 , and ≥ 15 , represent mild, moderate, and severe depression. PHQ-15 is a screening tool for somatization²⁰. PHQ-15 measures the severity of individual somatic symptoms during the past 4 weeks. The total score of PHQ-15 ranges from 0 to 30, and scores of ≥ 5 , ≥ 10 , ≥ 15 represent mild, moderate, and severe somatization, respectively. Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale (GAD-7) is a screening tool for anxiety²¹. Each item describes one of the typical anxiety symptoms and measures the frequency of each symptom over the past 2 weeks. The reliability and validity of the Chinese version of SF-36, PSQI, PHQ-9, PHQ-15, and GAD-7 have been confirmed²²⁻²⁶.

Data analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0) was used to analyze data, and a p value < 0.05 (two-tailed tests) denotes statistical significance. The scores of the SF-36, PHQ-9, PHQ-15, GAD-7, and PSQI largely met normal distribution, therefore, a general linear model was applied. For SF-36, PHQ-9, PHQ-15, GAD-7, and PSQI, only those who completed all questions of each test were included in the quantitative analysis. Mean \pm standard deviations and 95% confidence interval (CI) were used to describe continuous outcomes.

Results

Demographic information

A total of 1,959 individuals signed informed consent and participated in completing the questionnaire. The demographic information of participants is listed in Table 1. These participants represent 104 rare diseases and those diseases remaining undiagnosed after repeatedly visiting the hospital. The average onset age is 36.8 ± 85.1 months, while the average diagnosis age is 56.5 ± 110.0 months (95% CI 51.6 to 61.4). The diagnosis was delayed for 16.2 ± 35.4 months (95% CI 14.6 to 17.8). Interestingly, 497 patients (26.1%) were diagnosed through newborn screening. When patients diagnosed through newborn screening were excluded, the diagnosis was delayed for 24.3 ± 41.8 months (95% CI 22.1 to 26.5), with the onset age being 48.6 ± 95.0 months (95% CI 43.6 to 53.6), and diagnosis age being 77.9 ± 122.7

months (95% CI 71.5 to 84.3). During the diagnosis odyssey, patients visited 3.2 ± 2.4 hospitals (95% CI 3.1 to 3.3), and experienced 1.6 ± 3.8 misdiagnoses (95% CI 1.4 to 1.8). A total of 1,770 participants provided information about 139 hospitals where the diagnoses were made. The hospitals that diagnosed more than 20 participants of this study were listed in Fig. 1A. The top 10 hospitals on the list diagnosed 777 patients (43.8% of total), and they were all located in big cities (Fig. 1B). The top 5 cities diagnosed a combined total of 745 patients (42.1%). There is a clear inequality of medical resources in China. As shown in Fig. 1C, most respondents (79.0%) believed that diagnosis helped to figure out treatment and management options, while 1,530 (78.6%) believed that diagnosis helped to understand the disease cause and progression. Interestingly, 290 individuals (14.9%) thought that diagnosis had negative impacts (depression, anxiety, guilt, denial, discrimination, and financial stress). As shown in Fig. 1D, 687 of 1,831 respondents (37.5%) had received genetic counseling and believed it to be helpful, 146 (8.0%) believed it to be not helpful, while 227 (12.4%) believed it to be moderately helpful. A total of 560 patients (30.6%) had never received genetic counseling. Most respondents (72.6%) believed that their doctors did not have sufficient information about rare diseases. Most respondents (82.1%) deemed newborn screening to be extremely important.

Orphan drugs and medical cost

As shown in Fig. 2, most respondents (57.7%) rated the availability of orphan drugs as extremely poor, and 456 individuals (23.7%) rated it as poor. As to the affordability of orphan drugs, most respondents (72.3%) rated it as extremely poor (43.0%) or poor (29.3%). Most respondents (50.4%) had spent 5-50% of their annual family income on the medical cost of rare diseases, 526 respondents (27.7%) had spent 50-100% of income, and 231 (12.2%) had spent >100% of income. These results indicate that rare diseases caused a significant financial burden. As to the specific types of medical insurance, most respondents (59.6%) had Basic Medical Insurance Systems for Urban and Rural Residents, 404 (20.8%) had Medical/Social Insurance Program for Children, and 112 (5.8%) had no medical insurance. However, only 0.8% (16/1,913) of the individuals had orphan drug costs fully covered by insurance, 50.2% individuals had partial coverage, while the medical cost of 48.1% individuals was not covered by insurance at all. Out of 1,936 respondents, 877 (45.3%) recommended to implement special insurance program for rare diseases, 847 (43.8%) recommended to include rare diseases into Critical Illness Insurance Program, a national medical insurance program. Only 8 individuals (0.4%) believed that the current insurance system is sufficient. These results demonstrate that there lacks sufficient support from the medical insurance system.

Difficulty in life, education, and employment

Patients and care-givers are also often disadvantaged in employment, education, and social life²⁷. In this study, only 37.6% of respondents did not need any assistance, while the remaining 62.4% needed different levels of assistance. However, 83.0% of patients had no disability certificates, which are issued by the government to provide benefits and protection. Out of 1,830 respondents, 725 (39.8%) found no available barrier-free facilities, and 490 (26.9%) found very few such facilities. Only 61 (3.4%) and 277

(15.2%) believed that available barrier-free facilities could completely or largely meet their needs, respectively. Most respondents (59.7%) had experienced difficulty in education. As to the main financial source of patients, 69.6% of respondents relied on the income of their family members, and only 215 (11.4%) relied on their own income. Only 88 (4.7%), 23 (1.2%) and 65 (3.5%) of patients had full-time, part-time jobs, or free-lancers, respectively. A total of 823 patients (43.8%) were children or retired, 549 (29.2%) were in college and continuing education, and 333 (17.7%) were unemployed. Most respondents (62.0%) believed that patients had experienced difficulty in finding jobs. Regarding the specific challenges in finding jobs, 340 out of 1,024 respondents (33.2%) attributed it to 'insufficient opportunities', 264 (25.8%) chose 'discrimination', 233 (22.8%) chose 'lack of skillsets', and 178 (17.4%) chose 'lack of special employment agencies'.

Needs and activities

Most respondents (75.4%) had joined patient organizations. As shown in Fig. S1A, among these individuals, 1,351 (94.1%) listed 'communicate disease information' as a major reason to join such organizations, and 1,000 (69.6%) mentioned 'obtain support and guidance from organizations'. Out of 1,889 respondents, 693 (36.7%) rated the performance of patient organizations as 'very good, but can be improved', and 687 (36.4%) rated them as 'extremely good', indicating a general approval of the work of patient organizations. The 968 individuals who did not rate patient organizations as 'extremely good' were questioned on how to improve the work of patient organizations (Fig. S1B). A total of 616 individuals (63.6%) suggested these organizations should 'obtain more philanthropic support', 614 (63.4%) suggested they could 'provide more disease-related information and guidance', 601 (62.1%) suggested 'advocacy for legislations', 579 (59.8%) suggested 'raise rare disease awareness', 424 (43.8%) suggested 'protect patient rights', and 267 (27.6%) suggested 'maintain an equal and respectful environment for communication'. The information needs of patients and care-givers were also assessed (Fig. S1C). Out of 1,923 respondents, 1,538 (80.0%) selected information about 'treatment', 1,429 (74.3%) selected 'research progress', 1,282 (66.7%) selected 'medical insurance', and 1,089 (56.6%) selected 'contact information of experts'. Currently, most respondents (70.1%) obtained relevant information through social media, 1,074 (54.8%) through physicians, 864 (44.1%) through websites, 675 (34.5%) through patient meetings. As to the preference of information source, 1,419 out of 1,911 respondents (74.3%) mentioned social media, 1,334 (69.8%) selected physicians, and 1,207 (63.2%) selected websites. There is clearly a discrepancy between information obtained and information the patient hoped to obtain from physicians. Participants also made recommendations for policy-makers on how to help rare disease patients (Fig. S1D). Out of 1,924 respondents, 1,725 (89.7%) recommended 'support orphan drug development', and 1,681 (87.4%) recommended 'appropriate medical insurance for rare disease patients'.

Quality of life

A battery of standardized surveys was employed to assess the quality of life, health status, and psychological status of patients and care-givers. Firstly, results using the SF-36, patients and care-givers had remarkably lower scores in all domains than healthy populations (Table 2). With the PHQ-9, patients

had an average score of 12.1 (95% CI: 11.4 to 12.8), while care-givers had an average score of 9.5 (95%CI: 9.1 to 9.9) (Table 3). The scores of patients and care-givers were higher than normative values and were in the category of moderate and mild depression, respectively. As to GAD-7, patients had an average score of 9.0 (95% CI: 8.3 to 9.6), and care-givers had an average score of 7.7 (95% CI: 7.4 to 8.0) (Table 3). Both patients and care-givers were in the category of (mild anxiety), and their average scores were significantly higher than normative values from the healthy population. With regard to PHQ-15, the average score of patients was 10.3 (95% CI: 9.6 to 11.0), higher than the cut-off value of medium somatic symptom severity. The average score of care-givers was 8.1 (95% CI: 7.6 to 8.5). The scores of patients and care-givers were markedly higher than normative values in healthy populations. Results from the PSQI showed that the average score of patients and care-givers were 8.5 (95% CI: 8.0, 8.9) and 6.9 (95% CI: 6.7, 7.2), respectively. These scores were also higher than normative values, indicating severe sleeping problems. There was a significant correlation between all seven domains of PSQI (Table S1), and Cronbach's alpha was 0.798, indicating a good internal consistency. Together, these results demonstrate that the disease burden led to poor health, anxiety, depression, somatization, and sleeping problems in patients and care-givers.

Furthermore, correlations between PHQ-9, PHQ-15, GAD-7, PSQI, and subscales of SF-36 were analyzed (Table S2). Moreover, the impact of age, disease types, and gender on scores in these tests were analyzed by a general linear model. Relationship (patients or care-givers) only had an impact on the scores of PHQ-15, PSQI, and GH of SF-36. Specifically, patients had a higher score in PHQ-15 than care-givers (difference= 2.541, adjusted p=0.004), indicating more severe somatic symptoms. Patients had a higher score in PSQI than care-givers (difference= 1.829, adjusted p=0.002), indicating more severe sleeping problems in patients. Patients had a significantly lower score in GH of SF-36 than care-givers (difference=-11.327, adjusted p=0.001), indicating that the disease burden significantly affected the general health of patients. Disease had an impact on the scores of PHQ-9, PHQ-15, GAD-7, PSQI, and subscales of SF-36 (Table S3). Generally speaking, poor health, anxiety, depression, somatization, and sleeping problems were more severe in patients and care-givers of more severe diseases (e.g., DMD, hemophilia, Dravet) or undiagnosed.

Discussion

Delayed diagnosis and misdiagnosis is common and can lead to delayed and improper treatment, as well as accelerating the deterioration of the disease²⁸. As a result, unnecessary tests and treatments are often conducted, resulting in significant cost to patients and the healthcare system [19]. A previous study in 2013 reported that it took 5–7 years and 2–3 misdiagnoses in the USA and UK²⁹. Interestingly, the duration between onset and diagnosis in China was 1.4 years, and there were only 1.8 misdiagnoses. This may be because of the increased application of newborn screening over the years in China³⁰. It may be also because social media has increased avenues for relevant information and communication between patients. One major reason for the difficulty in diagnosis is the limited rare disease awareness among patients, families, and physicians. Similar to a previous study in Europe³¹, as believed by patients

and care-givers in this study, physicians did not have sufficient awareness and knowledge about rare diseases. A recent study among physicians in China also showed a lack of rare disease awareness³². Therefore, there is a critical need to include rare disease content in medical education and training. Further, a Chinese information hub of rare diseases was suggested to provide reliable, up-to-date, and 'peer-reviewed' information and guidance.

As shown in this study, many patients were facing various challenges in life, education and employment. Firstly, 725 (39.8%) of 1,830 respondents found no available barrier-free facilities in public places, and 59.7% of patients had confronted difficulties in education. The lack of barrier-free facilities may result from the insufficient attention and awareness to rare diseases in public, while difficulties in education may due to deficient equipment or staffs from public organizations and departments to help the disabled to learn. Worse, most of respondents suffered great financial hardship. Compared with employment status in Europe that 61% of rare disease patients and care-givers had experienced interruptions in their professional activities³³, this situation in China seemed to be even more severe. Only 176 (9.4%) of 1881 patients had their own jobs and 69.6% of respondents relied on the earning of their family members. From the above results, there existed employment discriminations towards rare disease patients, which was not only on account of the patients' poor health, but also due to the lack of employment opportunity and assistances from the government.

Additionally, this study also suggested that the majority of patients and care-givers were most interested in information about treatment. Orphan drug development is always expensive and time-consuming, ultimately affecting patients' access to new treatments. Witnessing the success of orphan drug acts in other countries^{34,35}, there was high support for an orphan drug act in China. Another relevant factor is the low medical insurance coverage, significantly affecting the viability of orphan drugs in the Chinese market. This not only affects the orphan drug development in China, but also affects the import of orphan drugs from abroad. Based on the aforementioned results and discussions which reflected the stress and need of most rare disease patients, our team, in the perspective of investigators, proposed some key recommendations that outline top priorities for policymakers in China to consider, and suggestions are listed as follows:

1. Pass an Orphan Drug Act to stimulate orphan drug development;
2. Official definition or suggested threshold of rare diseases;
3. Improve rare disease awareness among medical professionals and the general public;
4. Improve the medical insurance coverage of treatments and care for rare diseases;
5. Improve the availability and affordability of prenatal screening, newborn screening, and genetic counseling;
6. Prevent discrimination against rare disease patients in education and employment;
7. Accelerate in importing orphan drugs.

Limitations

This online survey was invited to patients or care-givers (age 18 or above) through social media. Given the legal age of the adult in China is 18, which indicates they are the individuals with full capacity for civil conduct and can think independently as well as earn their livings, the potential participants of the questionnaire were the adults. The adults can better understand the questions and better know about their own health and financial stress than minors, so that the results could be more true and valid. Nevertheless, some actual medical content could not be verified by our quality criteria. It is assumed that the high percent of female participants to the study is over-representative, which may bias the survey findings. This may be because most care-givers are women, and they are more likely to respond to surveys. There are 904 million (64.5%) internet users in China by March 2020, but some patients and care-givers from remote mountainous region still could not be invited to complete this survey because of underdeveloped network, leading to biased evaluation of status quo of rare diseases to some extent.

Conclusions

This is the first large-scale study that quantitatively investigates the current status of rare disease patients in China. This study identifies poor health status, depression, somatization, anxiety, and sleeping issues among both patients and care-givers through standardized test, highlighting the need of psychological and medical support. Also, this study also observes difficulties in social life, education, and employment, as well as financial burden. More importantly, the most urgent and critical need of these patients are treatment/orphan drugs. Therefore, a list of action items is recommended to the policy-makers, which include legislating an orphan drug act, raising rare disease awareness, and preventing discrimination.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of the Guangzhou Medical University, China. All interviewees signed the informed consent and agreed to participate this study voluntarily.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The raw data are not publicly available due to the agreement between the investigators and the participants.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

Dr. Xuefeng Li is sponsored by National Natural Science Foundation of China (81972204), Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province (2019A1515011097), Innovation Program of Shenzhen (Grant No. JCYJ20180508165208399), Science and Technology Planning Project of Guangzhou (201904010089), China Postdoctoral Science Foundation: 2018M640834, 2019T120756, the grant from the State Key Lab of Respiratory Disease, Guangzhou Medical University (SKLRD-Z-202002), and the 111 Project (D18010) from the Ministry of Education of China. All other coauthors did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization, Resources: X. Li, M. Liu, L. Ou. Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis: B. Li, X. Zhang, S. Zhang, Z. Lu, J. Zhang, J. Zhou. Project Administration: X. Li, L. Ou. Corresponding author, Supervision, Data Curation: L. Ou. The author(s) read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the patients and their families, who showed great support during the studies. We thank the supervising pediatricians and general practitioners for their cooperation and their support.

References

1. Bax, B. E. Biomarkers in Rare Diseases. *Int J Mol Sci* **22**, doi:10.3390/ijms22020673 (2021).
2. Gong, S. *et al.* The availability and affordability of orphan drugs for rare diseases in China. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases* **11**, 20, doi:10.1186/s13023-016-0392-4 (2016).
3. Chu, S. Y. & Weng, C. Y. [Introduction to Genetic/Rare Disease and the Application of Genetic Counseling]. *Hu li za zhi The journal of nursing* **64**, 11-17, doi:10.6224/jn.000063 (2017).
4. Pariser, A. R. & Gahl, W. A. Important role of translational science in rare disease innovation, discovery, and drug development. *Journal of general internal medicine* **29 Suppl 3**, S804-807, doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2881-2 (2014).
5. *Rare diseases - World Health Organization*. https://www.who.int/medicines/areas/priority_medicines/Ch6_19Rare.pdf?ua=1 (accessed 10 August 2020).
6. Rajasimha, H. K. *et al.* Organization for rare diseases India (ORDI) - addressing the challenges and opportunities for the Indian rare diseases' community. *Genetics research* **96**, e009, doi:10.1017/s0016672314000111 (2014).
7. Melnikova, I. Rare diseases and orphan drugs. *Nature reviews. Drug discovery* **11**, 267-268, doi:10.1038/nrd3654 (2012).
8. *Global Genes. RARE Facts*. <https://globalgenes.org/rare-facts/> (accessed 10 August 2020).

9. Schadewald, A., Kimball, E. & Ou, L. Coping Strategies, Stress, and Support Needs in Caregivers of Children with Mucopolysaccharidosis. *JIMD reports* **42**, 89-97, doi:10.1007/8904_2017_87 (2018).
10. Song, P., He, J., Li, F. & Jin, C. Innovative measures to combat rare diseases in China: The national rare diseases registry system, larger-scale clinical cohort studies, and studies in combination with precision medicine research. *Intractable & rare diseases research* **6**, 1-5, doi:10.5582/irdr.2017.01003 (2017).
11. He, J., Kang, Q., Hu, J., Song, P. & Jin, C. China has officially released its first national list of rare diseases. *Intractable & rare diseases research* **7**, 145-147, doi:10.5582/irdr.2018.01056 (2018).
12. He, J. *et al.* Incidence and prevalence of 121 rare diseases in China: Current status and challenges. *Intractable & rare diseases research* **8**, 89-97, doi:10.5582/irdr.2019.01066 (2019).
13. Ren, Q. & Wang, J. Network established to collaborate on diagnosis and treatment of rare diseases in China: A strategic alliance backed by tiered healthcare is the key to the future. *Intractable & rare diseases research* **8**, 78-79, doi:10.5582/irdr.2019.01024 (2019).
14. Tao, W. *et al.* Towards universal health coverage: lessons from 10 years of healthcare reform in China. *BMJ global health* **5**, e002086, doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002086 (2020).
15. He, J. *et al.* China issues the National Essential Medicines List (2018 edition): Background, differences from previous editions, and potential issues. *Bioscience trends* **12**, 445-449, doi:10.5582/bst.2018.01265 (2018).
16. Mengning Lv, Y. Y., Feng Chang. Analysis on Problems and Countermeasures of Medical Insurance for Rare Diseases in China under the International Environment . *[J] Chinese Journal of Medical Guide* **19**, 846-851, doi:10.3969/j.issn.1009-0959. ((2017) in Chinese).
17. Ware, J. E., Jr. & Sherbourne, C. D. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical care* **30**, 473-483 (1992).
18. Buysse, D. J., Reynolds, C. F., 3rd, Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R. & Kupfer, D. J. The Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry research* **28**, 193-213, doi:10.1016/0165-1781(89)90047-4 (1989).
19. Löwe, B. *et al.* Validation and standardization of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder Screener (GAD-7) in the general population. *Medical care* **46**, 266-274, doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e318160d093 (2008).
20. Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L. & Williams, J. B. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of general internal medicine* **16**, 606-613, doi:10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x (2001).
21. Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. & Löwe, B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of internal medicine* **166**, 1092-1097, doi:10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092 (2006).
22. Guo, S., Sun, W., Liu, C. & Wu, S. Structural Validity of the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index in Chinese Undergraduate Students. *Frontiers in psychology* **7**, 1126, doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01126 (2016).
23. Zhang, Y., Qu, B., Lun, S. S., Guo, Y. & Liu, J. The 36-item short form health survey: reliability and validity in Chinese medical students. *International journal of medical sciences* **9**, 521-526,

- doi:10.7150/ijms.4503 (2012).
24. Li, L., Wang, H. M. & Shen, Y. Chinese SF-36 Health Survey: translation, cultural adaptation, validation, and normalisation. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* **57**, 259-263, doi:10.1136/jech.57.4.259 (2003).
 25. Wang, W. *et al.* Reliability and validity of the Chinese version of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) in the general population. *General hospital psychiatry* **36**, 539-544, doi:10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2014.05.021 (2014).
 26. Tong, X., An, D., McGonigal, A., Park, S. P. & Zhou, D. Validation of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) among Chinese people with epilepsy. *Epilepsy research* **120**, 31-36, doi:10.1016/j.epilepsyres.2015.11.019 (2016).
 27. Forman, J. *et al.* The need for worldwide policy and action plans for rare diseases. *Acta paediatrica (Oslo, Norway : 1992)* **101**, 805-807, doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2012.02705.x (2012).
 28. *The Voice of 12,000 Patients.*
https://www.eurordis.org/IMG/pdf/voice_12000_patients/EURORDISCARE_FULLBOOKr.pdf
(accessed 10 August 10, 2020).
 29. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament.*
https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_threats/non_com/docs/rare_com_en.pdf (accessed 10 August 10, 2020).
 30. Rare Disease Impact Report. <https://globalgenes.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/ShireReport-1.pdf> (accessed 10 August 10, 2020).
 31. Li, X. *et al.* The urgent need to empower rare disease organizations in China: an interview-based study. *Orphanet journal of rare diseases* **15**, 282, doi:10.1186/s13023-020-01568-5 (2020).
 32. *Estudio ENSERio.* https://enfermedades-raras.org/images/stories/documentos/Estudio_ENSERio.pdf
(accessed 10 August 2020).
 33. Li, X. *et al.* *Rare disease awareness and perspectives of physicians in China: a questionnaire-based study.* (2020).
 34. *Orphan Drug Act of 1983.* <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-96/pdf/STATUTE-96-Pg2049.pdf> (accessed 10 August 2020).
 35. Groft, S. C. Rare diseases research: expanding collaborative translational research opportunities. *Chest* **144**, 16-23, doi:10.1378/chest.13-0606 (2013).

Tables

Table 1. Demographic information of participants of the questionnaire for patients and care-givers. Only provinces/districts with more than 100 participants were shown. Only diseases with more than 20 participants were shown. Mean \pm standard deviations.

Relationship	Patients (n=340, 17.4%)
	Care-givers (n=1,599, 81.6%)
Gender	Male (n=575, 29.6%)
	Female (n=1,369, 70.4%)
Age	Respondents (33.9±7.4 years)
	Patients (10.6±12.6 years)
	Care-givers (34.4±6.7 years)
Locations	Shandong (n=164)
	Sichuan (n=144)
	Hubei (n=140)
	Henan (n=134)
	Guangdong (n=128)
	Hunan (n=109)
	Beijing (n=103)
	Other (n=999)
Disease	CAH (n=419)
	PKU (n=246)
	Hemophilia (n=243)
	Dravet (n=153)
	DMD (158)
	Neurofibromatosis (n=69)
	Pompe (n=40)
	MPS (n=71)
	AHC (n=28)
	Addison' disease (n=26)
	SCA (n=38)
	Undiagnosed (n=193)
	Other (n=275)

Table 2. Scores of patients and care-givers in SF-36.

	Respondents				Healthy populations			
	Patients		Care-givers		Hubei ²⁷	Shanghai ²⁸	USA ²⁹	Canada ³⁰
	n=259		n=1,061		n=2,249	n=919	n=2,474	n=9,423
	Mean (SD)	95% CI	Mean (SD)	95% CI	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
PF	52.5 (34.8)	48.3, 56.6	70.2 (31.1)	68.4, 72.1	90.6 (15.4)	89.7 (14.8)	84.2 (23.3)	85.8 (20.0)
RP	26.8 (39.6)	21.0, 31.6	57.6 (46.0)	55.8, 60.3	79.5 (34.7)	92.8 (22.6)	81.0 (34.0)	82.1 (33.2)
BP	65.5 (32.0)	61.6, 69.3	82.7 (28.1)	81.0, 84.4	85.6 (18.4)	94.6 (13.8)	75.2 (23.7)	75.6 (23.0)
GH	32.6 (21.3)	30.0, 35.1	46.2 (22.7)	44.9, 47.6	69.6 (21.3)	68.8 (19.4)	72.0 (20.3)	77.0 (17.7)
VT	35.6 (22.5)	32.9, 38.3	46.2 (22.7)	44.9, 47.6	70.3 (17.1)	71.8 (18.3)	60.9 (21.0)	65.8 (18.0)
SF	33.3 (43.0)	28.2, 38.5	63.3 (25.1)	61.8, 64.8	86.9 (17.3)	94.3 (12.1)	83.3 (22.7)	86.2 (19.8)
RE	33.0 (42.8)	27.7, 38.2	55.8 (47.1)	53.0, 58.6	76.5 (38.5)	95.1 (20.6)	81.3 (33.0)	84.0 (31.7)
MH	41.4 (23.6)	38.6, 44.3	49.6 (22.1)	48.3, 50.9	72.7 (16.8)	81.8 (14.7)	74.7 (18.0)	77.5 (15.3)

Table 3. Scores of patients and care-givers in PHQ-9, GAD-7, PHQ-15, and PSQI.

	Patients			Care-givers			Normative level		
	n	Mean (SD)	95% CI	n	Mean (SD)	95% CI	n	Mean (SD)	References
PHQ-9	305	12.1 (6.5)	11.4, 12.8	1,258	9.5 (6.8)	9.1, 9.9	1,003	3.3 (4.1)	16
GAD-7	304	9.0 (6.0)	8.3, 9.6	1,256	7.7 (5.9)	7.4, 8.0	5,030	3.0 (3.4)	10
PHQ-15	290	10.3 (6.1)	9.6, 11.0	1,194	8.1 (6.5)	7.6, 8.5	9,250	5.5 (3.9)	31
							5,031	3.8 (4.1)	32
PSQI	286	8.5 (3.9)	8.0, 8.9	1,184	6.9 (4.0)	6.7, 7.2	9,284	5.0 (3.4)	33
							629	4.9 (2.4)	13

Figures




Figure 1

Information about diagnosis. (A) A list of hospitals where the most patients in this study were diagnosed. (B) A list of cities where the most patients in this study were diagnosed. (C) The meaning of diagnosis to patients and care-givers. (D) The information about genetic counseling.




Figure 2

Attitude of patients and care-givers towards orphan drugs, newborn screening, and medical insurance. (A) The respondents' viewpoints on availability of orphan drugs. (B) The respondents' views on affordability of orphan drugs. (C) The respondents' attitude towards newborn screening. (D) The opinions and suggestions of patients and care-givers about medical insurance.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Supplementary.docx](#)