The Impact of Molecular Diagnosis of Fetal Structural Anomalies **Using Exome Sequencing**

Rand Dubis¹, Suzanne Drury¹, Andrea Haworth¹, Nick Lench¹, Helen Savage¹, Eva Serra¹, John Filby¹, Natalie Trump¹, Louisa Ive¹, Basky Thilaganathan³, John Short², Charlene Crosby², Sahar Mansour², **Tessa Homfray² and Esther Dempsey²**

¹Congenica, Cambridge, UK, ²St. George's University of London, London, UK, ³Fetal Medicine Unit, St. George's Hospital, London, UK

Introduction

Fetal anomalies are found in 2-5% of pregnancies upon Ultrasound Screening (USS). A genetic aetiology is identified in ~40% of these cases using current testing strategies, leaving the majority undiagnosed.

Prenatal diagnosis provides information for prenatal, perinatal and postnatal management. It also provides an accurate assessment of recurrence in future pregnancies. Exome Sequencing (ES) has been shown to improve diagnostic rates in fetuses with structural anomalies. A review by Best et al (2018) has demonstrated diagnostic rates between 6.2% - 80%. As ES is typically offered after chromosomal microarray, there is a potential benefit in a single comprehensive test for single nucleotide variants (SNVs), indels and copy number variants (CNVs).

Roculte

| ACTG2ASPMB9D1BICD2CENPJCHD7COL1A1COLA12DHCR1EVCEVC2FAM111AFGFR3FREM2GNPTABKCNQ1LZTR1MLH1MYH3 (2)MYO7ANIPBLNR2F2 (2)OFD1P3H1 (2)PAFAH1B1 (2)PEX19PIEZO1 (2)POMGNT1 (2)PTPN11 (5)RAF1 (3)RBM8A TCF12RMRP TSC1SLC17A5 (2)SLC26A2 (2)SLC6A9 (2)SLC6A9 (2)Table 1: The 42 diagnostic genes identified in the positiveNegative molecular diagnoses were | exome sequencing impa es reviewed for managem |
|---|--|
| COLA12DHCR1EVCEVC2FAM111AFGFR3FREM2GNPTABKCNQ1LZTR1MLH1MYH3 (2)MYO7ANIPBLNR2F2 (2)OFD1P3H1 (2)PAFAH1B1PEX19 | ement implication |
| GNPTABKCNQ1LZTR1MLH1MYH3 (2)MYO7ANIPBLNR2F2 (2)OFD1P3H1 (2)PAFAH1B1PEX19PIEZO1 (2)POMGNT1 (2)PTPN11 (5)RAF1 (3)RBM8ARMRP (2)SLC17A5SLC26A2 (2)SLC6A9 (2)SOS1 (2)SUMF1TCF12TSC1TTNTUBA1A (2)UBE2ATable 1: The 42 diagnostic genes identified in the positive | |
| NR2F2 (2)OFD1P3H1 (2)PAFAH1B1PEX19PIEZO1 (2)POMGNT1 (2)PTPN11 (5)RAF1 (3)RBM8ARMRPSLC17A5SLC26A2 (2)SLC6A9 (2)SOS1 (2)SUMF1TCF12TSC1TTNTUBA1A (2)UBE2A (2)Negative molecular diagnoses were | |
| PTPN11 (5)RAF1 (3)RBM8ARMRPSLC17A5SLC26A2 (2)SLC6A9 (2)SOS1 (2)SUMF1TCF12TSC1TTNTUBA1A (2)UBE2A (2)UBE2A (2)Negative molecular diagnoses were trademented in the positive | |
| SOS1 (2) SUMF1 TCF12 TSC1 TTN TUBA1A (2) UBE2A Table 1: The 42 diagnostic genes identified in the positive | |
| Table 1: The 42 diagnostic genes identified in the positive Negative molecular diagnoses were | ■ Yes ■ No |
| prenatal cases. (n) = number of diagnoses if greater than 1. | re also informative for ma se studies below). |

Case 1 – Suspected Osteogenesis Imperfecta



- Short long bones and fractures observed at 20-week scan
- Compound heterozygous variants in the ALPL gene
- Treatment available for paediatric-onset hypophosphatasia with Asfotase alfa. Father has low Alkaline Phosphatase (ALP). Maternal ALP inaccurate in pregnancy and not tested
- Parents provided with access to rheumatology and dental services for surveillance as carriers can manifest symptoms

Case Studies – Impact of Diagnosis



- scan
- Targeted analysis of TSC1 and TSC2 genes did not detect any causal variants and pregnancy continued TSC1 and TSC2 account for 85% of Tuberous Sclerosis
- Complex (TSC) cases
- The child was born healthy and will continue to be monitored Low recurrence risk in future pregnancies (<1%)

Objectives

- of neonates.

icted management nent implications.

Methods

Cases of 163 fetal anomalies detected on US were referred to Clinical Genetics at St George's Hospital, London. Fetal DNA was extracted from CVS, amniotic fluid, fetal blood or post-mortem fetal tissue. Maternal cell contamination was exclued where relevant. DNA was enriched using Agilent SureSelect Clinical Research Exome V2 (CRE V2) or Nonacus ExomeCG and sequenced on Illumina NextSeq 500 or NovaSeq. Secondary and tertiary analysis of DNA sequences and review of SNVs and CNVs was undertaken using the Congenica clinical decision platform. Analysis of CNVs was performed only on DNA samples enriched with Nonacus ExomeCG. In 52 ongoing pregnancies, the impact of diagnosis on management was reviewed (PMID: 32981126).

Discussion

anagement (see

This study illustrates the utility of combined CNV and SNV calling in a rapid testing scenario and the impact of prenatal ES on pregnancy management, postnatal therapy and surveillance, reproductive decision making and additional implications for the wider family. Molecular diagnosis was not always concordant with the primary clinical diagnosis, emphasising both the challenge of reduced phenotype details in prenatal cases and the importance of expanding prenatal genotype-phenotype correlations.

Case 2 – Ventricular Septal Tumour

Isolated ventricular septal tumour upon 23-week ultrasound



1. To provide a genetic diagnosis for cases displaying fetal anomalies detected by USS using ES, with phenotypes derived from USS and/or post-mortem analysis. 2. To implement an improved ES assay for the analysis of SNVs, indels and CNVs. 3. To assess the clinical impact of prenatal ES on the management of pregnancy and treatment

Case 3 – Comprehensive Workflow

- Fetal hydrops, echogenic bowel and renal abnormalities identified at a 21-week US
- Compound heterozygous variants affecting SUMF1 gene detected: CNV and SNV
- The gene is associated with multiple sulfatase deficiency
- No treatment available
- The couple will have access to prenatal diagnosis in future pregnancies