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Challenges rare kidney diseases (1)

- **Unknown genetic causes:**
  - 30-40% monogenic disease unsolved
  - Diagnostic odyssey
  - Limitations for genetic counseling, prenatal diagnosis, etc.

- **Data on prognosis limited:**
  - Loose/absent genotype-phenotype correlations
  - Absence of prognostic markers

- **Insufficient ontology:**
  - Heterogeneity
  - Imperfect prognostic value
Challenges rare kidney diseases (2)

- **Treatment**: for many only symptomatic

- **Carrier status**:
  - Females of X-linked diseases may be (severely) affected
  - Living-related kidney transplantation?

- **Health policy issues**:
  - Rare diseases
  - Access to expertise centres and genetic testing
  - Insurance coverage
Potential of genetic testing for diagnostics and research of rare kidney diseases

- Accelerate diagnostic process
- Change classical diagnostic paradigm “from phenotype to genotype”
- Discover novel disease genes
- Discover new diseases
- Better understanding of biological basis of diseases
- Shift in phenotypic boundaries and reclassification of some kidney diseases /improve disease ontology
- Clues for prognosis and treatment
Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) changing paradigm of clinical genetic testing

From one test per gene to one test for all (involved) genes

- Disease-specific multi-gene panels
- Whole Exome sequencing (WES: all genes)
- Whole Genome sequencing (WGS: complete DNA)
Predicted clinical utility NGS for rare kidney diseases

- Establish diagnosis:
  - End diagnostic odyssey in puzzling cases
  - Bringing peace of mind to family
  - Avoiding further expensive and fruitless testing
  - Reversed/deep phenotyping
  - Improving diagnostics for genetically heterogeneous disorders (nephrotic syndrome, ciliopathies, etc)
  - Mode of inheritance ➔ cascade testing
  - Enables genetic counseling, prenatal diagnosis, PGD etc.
  - Benefits for carrier testing (living-related donors)

- “Genetics first” approach
  - No need for other diagnostic procedures such as renal biopsy?
  - Exome first” approach may be economically feasible and may even become cost-saving (Shashi et al., Gen Med 2014; Monroe et al., Genet Med 2016)
Predicted clinical utility NGS for rare kidney diseases

- Broadening phenotypic spectrum gene mutations
  - Shift in phenotypic boundaries
  - Reclassifications of some kidney diseases

- Therapeutic/Prognostic value:
  - Response to eculizumab in aHUS
  - Response immunosuppressive therapy & risk post-transplant disease recurrence in steroid-resistant nephrotic syndrome
  - Identify new targets for therapy
Clinical Whole-Exome Sequencing for the Diagnosis of Mendelian Disorders
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Causative genetic defect identified in 25-35% of patients with a suspected genetic disorder
Cost-effectiveness WES: HTA study UMC Utrecht

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>No. (median)</th>
<th>No. (mean)</th>
<th>Costs (median)</th>
<th>Costs (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health-care visits</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>3,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaging</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,745</td>
<td>6,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>2,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemical investigations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day admission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,153</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,409</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are given in USD.

Average costs entire traditional diagnostic trajectory: **$16,409** (range: $6,343 to $47,841)

Largest proportion of costs: previous genetic tests

**Trio WES:** diagnostic yield 35%, costs **$3,972**

WES: average cost savings $3,547 for genetic & metabolic investigations in diagnosed patients
Conclusion HTA-WES

- Implementation “WES first” approach in diagnostics may be cost-efficient.

- “WES first” approach may decrease total time diagnostic process.

- We also need to perform long term HTA (POST-WES).
NGS in patients with presumed genetic renal disorders revealed “unexpected” gene mutations

Broadening phenotypic spectrum across and within current kidney disease categories

- **COL4A3-5** genes (Alport syndrome) mutations in patients presenting with FSGS
- **PAX-2** mutations (renal-coloboma syndrome) in patients presenting with FSGS
- **DGKE** mutations in SRNS, MPGN and aHUS
- Phenotypic heterogeneity ciliopathies

*Stokman et al., Nat Rev Nephrol 2016, in press*

**New aetiological insights**
May have implications for management
NGS limitations

- Costs, workforce, training, throughput

- Differences in access to diagnostic testing and insurance coverage

- Technical challenges: likely to be solved with improving technology

- Interpretation difficulties: Ability to interpret the disease implications of individual variants has not kept pace with the ease with which we find them

- Legal/social/ethical difficulties
Interpretation difficulties: how to define pathogenicity of identified variants?

- In silico tools for predicting pathogenicity (i.e. SIFT, Polyphen) < 80% accuracy

- Databases of common variants in “healthy” individuals (dbSNP, 1000 Genomes project, Exome Aggregation Consortium (ExAC), Exome Sequencing Project (ESP)/ underrepresentation certain ethnicities

- Human genomes contain ~100 highly penetrant disease-causing mutations, with 20 genes completely inactivated (MacArthur et al., Science 2012)

- Mutation and variation databases: lots of differences in annotation of variants (McCarthy et al., Genome Med 2014)

- Pathogenicity previously reported mutations called into question (Piton et al., AJHG 2013, Nicolaou et al., KI 2015) upon reanalysis because they have relatively high frequency in control Exomes/genomes
Interpretation difficulties

Complexity of variant interpretation

Many Variants of Unknown Significance (VUS)

- Segregation analysis
- Functional studies
- Data sharing !!!

Range of VUS results

Suspected Benign  
Significance Unknown  
Suspected Pathogenic
NGS: legal/social/ethical/ issues

- Ownership, storage and access to data
- Data sharing/confidentiality and privacy
- Genome sequencing (including bioinformatic analysis) is still too expensive for routine use in research/diagnostics
- Differences in access to diagnostic testing and insurance coverage
- Informed consent: impossible to counsel patients about full range of findings that might result from WES/WGS sequencing
WES/WGS: unsolicited findings (UFs)

- Unanticipated findings not related to initial reason for genetic analysis
  - Rate reportable UFs range from 1 to 8.8%
  - IFs may also have important implications for unaffected family members
- Disagreement on release of UFs
  - What information should be returned?

Amendola et al., Genome Res 2015
There is still room for single gene testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal locus heterogeneity</td>
<td>\textit{CTNS} for cystinosis \textit{FN1} for Glomerulopathy with fibronectin deposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive features (i.e. family history, biochemistry, biopsy...) point to one gene</td>
<td>\textit{AVPR2} in X-linked NDI \textit{KCNJ10} in EAST syndrome \textit{LMX1B} in Nail-Patella syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigenetic abnormalities</td>
<td>Beckwith Wiedemann syndrome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When to consider NGS-based multi-gene disease panels?

Genetic heterogeneity

- **Alport syndrome**: COL4A5, COL4A3, COL4A4
  Turnaround time from 6 months to 6 days (Artuso et al., EJHG 2012)

- **Nephrotic syndrome**: 27 known genes
  Disease-associated variants in 30% of screened NS patients (Sadowski et al, JASN 2014)

Disorders with overlapping phenotypes

- **Bartter/Gitelman syndrome**: SLC12A1, KCNJ1, BSND, CLCNKB, SLC12A3, HNF1B

Disorders associated with genes from common pathway or structure

- **Renal ciliopathies** (Nephronophptisis, BBS, Joubert, OFD, …….)
When to consider WES/WGS?

Phenotype indistinct, no clear hypothesis about underlying cause but suggestive of genetic condition

- i.e. unexplained CKD

Gene panel testing revealed no causative mutations (second tier)

- discover new genes/unexpected genetic variants
### WES in clinical practice is time-consuming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Evaluation</th>
<th>Test Selection</th>
<th>Test Approval</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Evaluate Results</th>
<th>Return of Results: Diagnosis Found</th>
<th>Return of Results: No Diagnosis Found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Define phenotype through history and exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Differential diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Match phenotype to test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider diagnostic yield, cost, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institutional review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Insurance prior authorization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss limitations, possible results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discuss option to receive secondary findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Check databases, review literature, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Re-evaluate phenotype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delivery of genetic diagnosis to patient/family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Return of secondary findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide support for coping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider management: assess need for additional testing, change in therapies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Genetic counseling for family planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inform about negative results, including explanation of any candidate variants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide support for coping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider further options for evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offer reassessment of exome data: research basis or future clinical reanalysis (if available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O’Donnel-Luria et al., Hum Genet 2016*
Diagnostic paradigm for rare inherited renal diseases & potential use of research technologies.

Joly et al., KI 2015
Diagnosis on clinical grounds/genetic evidence or both?

NGS panel sequencing reclassifies primary disease diagnoses in young CKD/ESRD

Confirmed clinical diagnoses

15% detection rate
7% revised diagnoses!

Albertien van Eerde
Conclusions

- NGS techniques have found their place in clinical practice of renal disorders, with implications for diagnosis, therapeutic decisions, genetic counseling, prenatal diagnosis, PGD

- NGS techniques have unraveled surprising, novel insights into phenotypic spectrum of gene mutations/ may lead to reclassification of some rare kidney diseases

- Important challenges in establishing pathogenicity of identified mutations by NGS techniques remain

- Data sharing initiatives are imperative to establish clinically useful genotype– phenotype correlations and to maximize the benefit of genetic testing

- Exome/Genome sequencing raises important ethical issues; especially how to deal with unsolicited findings
Conclusions

NGS diagnostics as part of routine diagnostic work-up

Stokman et al., Nat Rev Nephrol 2016, in press