Impact of Gene-Disease Validity on Variant of Unknown Significance Rates in Hereditary Cancer Panels

Elyse Ryan, MS, CGC^{1,2}; Jessica Grzybowski, MS, CGC¹; Devon Thrush, MS, CGC¹; Daniel Kostecki, MS, MEng¹; Carrie Horton, MS, CGC¹.

¹ Ambry Genetics. 1 Enterprise, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656 ² Author contact: eryan@ambrygen.com

Introduction **Methods** Gene-Disease Validity (GDV) indicates the strength of evidence that exists to support an association Theoretical versions of past EX-P iterations were generated using present day GDVs, excluding any between a gene and a specific condition. These scores guide genetic testing panel design, as well as gene now considered Disputed; These genes were referred to as Removed Genes (RGs). how variants may be classified and reported. Over time, with new data, GDVs often change. Comparison approach: Analyses were made to theoretical versions of each EX-P iteration, not the Here, we review three iterations of an expanded-phenotype hereditary cancer panel (EX-P) to evaluate current version, to account for changes in gene content and test methodologies which inherently have how rates of Variants of Unknown Significance (VUS) change with new knowledge, updated GDVs, and an impact on overall positive and VUS rates. The population of patients being tested for hereditary changes to panel content. Over the time of this study, 8 genes had GDVs downgraded to "Disputed", cancer predisposition is also known to have shifted over time, which has an impact positive and VUS indicating that there was enough evidence to refute previously believed cancer associations. rates. **Results & Discussion** MRE11A & BLM, FANCC, GALNT12, BLM FANCC GALNT12 MRE11A NBN RAD50 RECOL XRCC2 Gene: RECQL added RAD50 removed NBN, RECOL, XRCC2 removed Breast Breast Breast Disputed cancer Breast Breast Colorectal Breast Breast 2021 association(s): Colorectal Prostate Ovarian 2018 2019 2022 202 Version 2 Version 1 Version 3 ↑ Figure 2. Removed Genes (RGs) and their previously believed associations with cancer predisposition conditions. V1 Tests run: 18,371 V2 Tests run: 40,172 V3 Tests run: 751 Table 1. Lower theoretical overall VUS Theoretical VUS Rate Effect of RG Removal EX-P True VUS Positive rate: 14.8% Positive rate: 15.4% 13.6% Positive rate: rates equate to thousands of patients who Version Rate with RGs Removed on Overall VUS Rate VUS count: 6,379 VUS count: 14,918 VUS count: 1,775 would have not received a VUS result, VUS rate: 34.7% VUS rate: 37.1% VUS rate: 32.2% Version 1 34.7% 28.9% -5.8% which are notoriously complicated for Version 2 37.1% 33.4% -3.7% Included both patient understanding and provider Included RGs Contributio RGs Contributio counseling. BLM 250 BLM 504 No RGs on panel FANCC 112 FANCC 219 **Take Home Points** GALNT12 150 GALNT12 407 MRE11A 183 250 NBN NBN 105 RECOL 285 230 RAD50 XRCC2 110 1. Individual genes require continuous evaluation to maintain accurate XRCC2 33 1,775 VUSs 1,063 VUSs GDVs. 2. Hereditary cancer panels require continuous curation to maintain RGs contributed 12% RGs contributed 17% of VUS results maximum clinical utility. of VUS results 3. Removal of genes with disputed GDVs lowers overall VUS rates of ↑ Figure 1. EX-P timeline with pertinent information regarding the differences in RG content, hereditary cancer panels. number of tests run, and positive/VUS rates for each iteration. RGs contributed a Renetics significant proportion of VUS results for both V1 and V2.