

1 **TITLE: Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT) Results for Participants of the**  
2 **eXtraordinary Babies Study: Screening, Counseling, Diagnosis, and Discordance**

3  
4 **AUTHORS:** Susan Howell<sup>1,2</sup>, Shanlee M Davis<sup>2,3</sup>, Talia Thompson<sup>1</sup>, Mariah Brown<sup>2,3</sup>, Tanea  
5 Tanda<sup>1,2</sup>, Karen Kowal<sup>4,5</sup>, Amanda Alston,<sup>4,5</sup> Judith Ross<sup>4,5</sup>, Nicole R Tartaglia<sup>1,2</sup>

6  
7 **INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS:**

- 8 (1) Developmental Pediatrics, Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado School of Medicine,  
9 Aurora, CO  
10 (2) eXtraordinary Kids Clinic and Research Program, Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, CO  
11 (3) Endocrinology, Department of Pediatrics, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora,  
12 CO  
13 (4) Department of Pediatrics, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
14 (5) Department of Pediatrics, Nemours DuPont Hospital for Children, Wilmington, Delaware

15 **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

16 Susan Howell, MS, CGC, MBA; [susan.howell@childrenscolorado.org](mailto:susan.howell@childrenscolorado.org);  
17 13123 East 16th Ave B140, Aurora, CO 80045; Ph 720-777-8361; Fax 720-777-7868

18  
19 **KEYWORDS:** sex chromosome, Klinefelter, genetic counseling

20  
21 **SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

22 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NIH/NICHHD) R01HD42974  
23 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NIH/NICHHD), K23HD092588  
24 National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NIH/NINDS), K23NS070337  
25 National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NIH/NCATS) Colorado CTSA  
26 UL1TR002535

27  
28 **DISCLOSURE SUMMARY:** The authors have nothing to disclose.

29  
30 **ABSTRACT**

31 Sex chromosome aneuploidies (SCAs), including 47,XXY, 47,XXX, 47,XYY, and  
32 supernumerary variants, occur collectively in approximately 1/500 livebirths. Clinical  
33 phenotypes are highly variable resulting in previous ascertainment rates have been estimated to  
34 be only 10-25% during a lifetime. Historically, prenatal SCA diagnoses were incidental findings,  
35 accounting for  $\leq 10\%$  of cases, with the majority of diagnoses occurring postnatally during  
36 evaluations for neurodevelopmental, medical, or infertility concerns. The initiation of  
37 noninvasive prenatal testing (NIPT) in 2012 and adoption into standardized obstetric care  
38 provides a unique opportunity to significantly increase prenatal ascertainment of SCAs.  
39 However, the impact NIPT has had on ascertainment of SCAs is understudied, particularly for  
40 those who may defer diagnostic testing until after birth. This study evaluates the timing of  
41 diagnostic testing following positive NIPT in 152 infants with SCAs and potential factors  
42 influencing this decision. Eighty-seven (57%) elected to defer diagnostic testing after a positive  
43 NIPT until birth, and 8% (7/87) of those confirmed after birth were found to have discordant  
44 results on postnatal diagnostic testing, most of which would have influenced genetic counseling.

## 46 INTRODUCTION

47 Sex chromosome aneuploidies (SCAs), including Klinefelter syndrome/47,XXY,  
48 Trisomy X/47,XXX, 47,XYY syndrome, and 48,XXYY syndrome, are the most prevalent  
49 supernumerary chromosomal conditions, occurring collectively in approximately 1/500  
50 livebirths. Clinical phenotypes are highly variable in these conditions, often with mild  
51 dysmorphic features or neurodevelopmental involvement, resulting in only 10-25% lifetime  
52 ascertainment (Abramsky & Chapple, 1997). Historically, prenatal SCA diagnoses accounted for  
53 10% or less of SCA cases and were often incidental findings following CVS or amniocentesis for  
54 advanced maternal age, and the majority of SCA diagnoses occurred in the postnatal period  
55 during clinical evaluations for neurodevelopmental, medical, or infertility concerns (Bojesen,  
56 Juul, & Gravholt, 2003). The initiation of cell-free fetal DNA screening, commonly referred to as  
57 noninvasive prenatal testing (NIPT), in 2012 and subsequent adoption into standardized obstetric  
58 care, has drastically changed the landscape for prenatal identification of chromosomal  
59 abnormalities. This has provided a unique opportunity to identify SCAs prenatally (Wilson et al.,  
60 2013). Beginning in 2016, and most recently updated in 2020, the American College of  
61 Obstetrics and Gynecology issued a position statement recommending that NIPT be universally  
62 offered to all pregnant women, regardless of a priori risk, as it is a superior screening test to other  
63 alternatives citing the highest level of evidence (Gregg et al., 2016; "Screening for Fetal  
64 Chromosomal Abnormalities: ACOG Practice Bulletin Summary, Number 226," 2020). These  
65 guidelines also state that all patients with a positive NIPT should receive genetic counseling and  
66 be offered diagnostic testing via chorionic villus sampling or amniocentesis to confirm these  
67 screening results.

68           With the utilization and growing adoption of NIPT, prenatal ascertainment rates of SCAs  
69   and subsequent number of infants known to have SCAs, are logically anticipated to rise. This  
70   opportunity led to the development of the eXtraordinary Babies Study, a prospective natural  
71   history study of infants prenatally identified and subsequently diagnosed with SCA designed to  
72   examine trajectories of neurodevelopment and physical health from birth through the first few  
73   years of life as well as psychosocial factors including quality of life and parental experiences.  
74   Funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and in  
75   collaboration with the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) Newborn  
76   Screening Translational Research Network (NBSTRN) (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT03396562), the  
77   eXtraordinary Babies Study enrolls infants between 2 and 12 months of age with a prenatal  
78   result (NIPT or diagnostic) of SCA, with longitudinal evaluations conducted at two sites  
79   including University of Colorado/Children's Hospital Colorado and Nemours-Dupont Hospital  
80   for Children. While the eXtraordinary Babies Study aims to prospectively describe and compare  
81   the natural history of SCA conditions, identify predictors of outcomes in SCA, and build a rich  
82   data set linked to a biobank for future study, much has also been learned about diagnostic testing  
83   outcomes following NIPT results positive for SCA.

84           Historically, most studies evaluating outcomes following NIPT often limit follow up to  
85   the gestational period. One report found that NIPT has not increased the prevalence of infants  
86   known to have SCAs at birth, although this study only included cases with confirmed prenatal  
87   diagnostic genetic testing (Howard-Bath, Poulton, Halliday, & Hui, 2018). Given maternal  
88   pregnancy history, procedural risks inherent in prenatal diagnostic testing and other factors,  
89   women may elect to defer diagnostic testing until after birth. As such, studies evaluating the

90 overall impact NIPT has made to increasing ascertainment of SCAs need to include both pre-  
91 and postnatal diagnostic testing results following an NIPT result positive for SCA.

92 Prenatal genetic counseling for SCA-positive NIPT results is challenged by relatively  
93 poor positive predictive values for SCAs in NIPT, highly variable phenotypic outcomes, and  
94 historic peer-reviewed publications inherently biased by ascertainment (Mennuti,  
95 Chandrasekaran, Khalek, & Dugoff, 2015; Petersen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2020). While NIPT  
96 has been demonstrated to have high sensitivity and specificity in identification of other  
97 chromosomal conditions, such as Trisomy 21/Down syndrome, the positive predictive values  
98 (PPV) for the detection of SCAs have varied from 25-89% and many companies fail to include  
99 these test statistics for SCAs on their result reports entirely (Lu et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2021;  
100 Skotko et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2020). Phenotypes among SCAs range widely from mild  
101 dysmorphisms and tall stature to increased rates of cognitive impairment, medical conditions and  
102 psychological features. Furthermore, genetic counseling for SCAs is reliant upon peer-reviewed  
103 literature publications, the majority of which include data from individuals who were postnatally  
104 ascertained due to presenting neurodevelopmental, medical or fertility problems. As such,  
105 parental decision making for pursuing prenatal diagnostic testing at the time of an NIPT result  
106 may be overshadowed by anxiety and psychological distress balanced by decisional conflict,  
107 especially in consideration of inherent prenatal diagnostic procedural risks (Labonte, Alsaid,  
108 Lang, & Meerpohl, 2019; Lewis, Hill, & Chitty, 2016). In one retrospective study of 61 cases  
109 with positive NIPT for trisomy SCAs, only 24% elected to have prenatal diagnostic testing  
110 (Ramdaney, Hoskovec, Harkenrider, Soto, & Murphy, 2018). Factors affecting the decision for  
111 timing of diagnostic testing rely upon the personal history of the mother as well as information  
112 provided at the time of the result. The professional providing information and whether the

113 identified condition was discussed prior to testing may also influence this decision (Fleddermann  
114 et al., 2019; Marteau et al., 2002; Riggan, Close, & Allyse, 2020; Sadlecki, Grabiec,  
115 Walentowicz, & Walentowicz-Sadlecka, 2018). This is especially important to consider for the  
116 SCA conditions, as most SCAs are often not discussed during pretest consent and even more  
117 surprising due to lower public knowledge of SCT compared to Down syndrome.

118 Counseling for NIPT results positive for SCA are typically directed to the condition  
119 reported, yet given the complexities of interpretation in SCA NIPT, discordant abnormal  
120 diagnostic results should be considered in counseling as well (Ramdaney et al., 2018). This  
121 paper aims to report on 152 participants from the eXtraordinary Babies Study with SCA initially  
122 identified by NIPT, the parental decisions for diagnostic testing, and parent perceptions of  
123 providers' knowledge and quantity of information presented following a positive NIPT result.  
124 We also report a series of abnormal discordant diagnostic outcomes to further inform prenatal  
125 genetic counseling for NIPT results positive for SCAs.

126

## 127 **METHODS**

128 Participants of this study provided informed written consent for the eXtraordinary Babies Study  
129 (Colorado COMIRB#17-0118; Nemours Office of Human Subjects Protection #1151006;  
130 NIH/NICHD# R01HD42974; ClinicalTrials.gov# NCT03396562). Inclusion in the  
131 eXtraordinary Babies Study requires prenatal identification of an SCA either by NIPT or  
132 diagnostic prenatal testing, with confirmatory cytogenetic testing conducted prenatally and/or  
133 postnatally if NIPT, and enrollment between 6 weeks and 13 months of age. Exclusion criteria  
134 include birth <34 weeks, presence of an additional genetic or metabolic disorder with  
135 neurodevelopmental or endocrine involvement, presence of a congenital malformation (not

136 previously described with SCA), or neonatal complications such as hypoxic-ischemic brain  
137 injury or neonatal meningitis. This analysis includes participants of the eXtraordinary Babies  
138 Study who were prenatally identified by NIPT with subsequent diagnostic cytogenetic testing  
139 (prenatal and/or postnatal) and who had provided reports from both tests for review. Participants  
140 were excluded from this analysis if either NIPT reports or diagnostic test results could not be  
141 obtained, or if their prenatal diagnosis was first identified by amniocentesis or CVS. A total of  
142 152/255 total participants enrolled in the eXtraordinary Babies Study were included in this  
143 analysis. Data abstracted from the eXtraordinary Babies Study included demographic  
144 information (socioeconomic, race, ethnicity, state of residence to identify geographic region),  
145 family history (maternal date of birth to calculate age at delivery, maternal height and maternal  
146 pre-pregnancy weight to calculate pre-pregnancy BMI) and birth history (date of birth,  
147 gestational age, birth weight). NIPT reports were reviewed and abstracted by a board certified  
148 genetic counselor (SH) to record commercial lab, date of sample collection (which was then used  
149 to calculate gestational age at the time of sample collection based on gestational age at the date  
150 of birth), date of NIPT result report, fetal fraction, and sensitivity, specificity, and positive  
151 predictive value for SCA (if reported). A one-page questionnaire was completed by 102/152  
152 parents of participants, self-reporting date and child's age at the time of questionnaire completion  
153 and the following additional information:

- 154 – Gestational age at the time of SCA identified/diagnosed
- 155 – Type(s) of prenatal testing which identified the diagnosis
- 156 – Reason(s) prenatal testing was performed
- 157 – Medical provider's specialty who ordered prenatal screening/testing
- 158 – If the mother was informed about possible SCA diagnosis at the time of NIPT consent
- 159 – What provider(s) informed mother about the SCA diagnosis

- 160 – If the mother met with a genetic counselor after receiving results (NIPT and/or prenatal
- 161 diagnostic testing)
- 162 – How and what type of information about the SCA was provided
- 163 – The perceived amount of information provided
- 164 – If the provider was perceived to be well-informed about the SCA condition
- 165 – If the diagnosis was confirmed after birth and if so, were the results the same as prenatally
- 166 identified.

167 Analysis of these results were conducted by descriptive statistics and SPSS utilizing chi-square  
168 analysis or r-value (for continuous variables) to calculate *p* values for significance ( $p < 0.05$ ).

169

## 170 **RESULTS**

171 Demographics for the 152 infants analyzed in this cohort (104 XXY, 27 XXX, 15 XYY,  
172 and 6 XXYY) are shown in Table 1. Over half (57%) delayed diagnostic testing until after birth,  
173 of which 85% (postnatally confirmed) occurred prior to 2 months of age. We found no difference  
174 between timing of diagnostic testing based on maternal age, race, ethnicity, geographic region,  
175 self-reported indications for pursuing NIPT, maternal health history, family history, abnormal  
176 ultrasound findings, SCA karyotype result, or PPV for NIPT results. Participants earning less  
177 than \$100k were less likely to pursue prenatal confirmatory testing than those in higher income  
178 brackets ( $> \$250k$ ,  $p = .010$ ;  $\$150 - \$250k$ ,  $p = .017$ ), although differences were not statistically  
179 significant after adjustments were made for multiple comparisons. Of the 43% ( $n = 65/152$ ) of  
180 participants who pursued prenatal diagnostic testing following NIPT, 80% elected an  
181 amniocentesis procedure. Details of elected procedures, timing of diagnostic testing,  
182 comparisons of characteristics between those deferring to postnatal testing, and prenatal  
183 counseling experience questionnaire results are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

184           Eleven (7%) diagnostic results were discordant with NIPT results. Of these, 2 participants  
185 were found to be mosaic with a typical cell line, while 9 participants had a different SCA  
186 condition altogether. Seven of these 9 participants with discordant results had deferred diagnostic  
187 testing until birth. Details regarding fetal fraction on NIPT, maternal age at delivery, maternal  
188 pre-pregnancy BMI, and diagnostic test pursued for these 11 participants with NIPT results  
189 discordant from diagnostic results are presented in Table 4.

190           Of the 152 total participants included for this study, 102 participants completed a one-  
191 page questionnaire self-reporting reasons for NIPT, experiences with prenatal genetic counseling  
192 and potential counseling factors influencing diagnostic testing decisions (see Table 3). The top  
193 two indications reported for pursuing NIPT were maternal age (58%) and elective/gender  
194 discovery/doctor offered (48%). The majority of participants consulted with a genetic counselor  
195 (90%) after receiving their results (NIPT and/or prenatal diagnostic test results) and those who  
196 pursued prenatal diagnostic testing were more likely to have received genetic counseling  
197 ( $p=.017$ ) Participants who were informed of the possibility of SCA prior to NIPT were  
198 significantly more likely to defer to postnatal diagnostic testing ( $p=.03$ ). While we found no  
199 difference in diagnostic timing based on perceptions of the amount of information provided or  
200 how well-informed providers counseling were about the SCA, less than half of participants felt  
201 their provider(s) were “well-informed” about the SCA discussed and participants who endorsed  
202 their provider was “well-informed” reported receiving significantly more information than those  
203 who endorsed their provider was not well-informed ( $p<.001$ ).

204

205 **DISCUSSION**

206           The majority of studies on NIPT results positive for SCA focus on the analytical  
207 performance of the test limited to prenatal outcomes. In this study, we present 152 cases of NIPT  
208 results positive for SCA with their diagnostic testing results, identifying over half of these  
209 parents delayed diagnostic testing until after birth. However, 7% (11/152) of NIPT results  
210 positive for SCA were discordant with the diagnostic test result, with 9 of these 11 results  
211 warranting different genetic counseling than what would be indicated based on the NIPT results  
212 alone (i.e trisomy SCA versus tetrasomy SCA). Further, 7 of these 9 discordant results elected to  
213 defer to postnatal diagnostic testing, likely based on counseling provided in conjunction with  
214 additional fetal anatomy ultrasound (Fleddermann et al., 2019). However, sex chromosome  
215 trisomies are infrequently associated with second trimester ultrasound findings, so it is unlikely  
216 that ultrasound markers to modify the PPV will be recognized (De Vigan et al., 2001). This study  
217 highlights that NIPT results positive for SCA are often deferred for diagnostic testing  
218 postnatally, that families benefit from receiving more information which results in feeling that  
219 the provider counseling is well-informed about the SCA condition being discussed, and that  
220 counseling for NIPT results should address the possibility of discordance among NIPT and  
221 diagnostic SCA potential results.

222           A 2018 international population-based study concluded that while SCAs contribute to a  
223 higher percentage of confirmed prenatal diagnoses secondary to NIPT, the decline in prenatal  
224 diagnostic testing leads to a relatively steady prevalence of prenatally confirmed SCAs (Howard-  
225 Bath et al., 2018). The findings of our study demonstrate that less than 50% of pregnancies with  
226 NIPT results positive for SCA pursue prenatal diagnostic testing but the majority rather defer  
227 diagnostic testing to the postnatal period. Other studies have shown even lower percentages (25-  
228 34%) of mothers who pursue prenatal diagnostic testing after an NIPT result positive for SCA

229 (Ramdaney et al., 2018; Riggan et al., 2020). These high rates of deferral to postnatal diagnostic  
230 testing emphasize that estimates of the impact from NIPT on the ascertainment of SCAs should  
231 include both prenatal and postnatal diagnostic testing. As the study by Howard-Bath et al in 2018  
232 demonstrated a steady birth prevalence of SCAs based on prenatal diagnostic testing after NIPT,  
233 based on our results and similar studies suggesting 60-80% of those receiving positive NIPT  
234 results will have diagnostic testing shortly after birth, it can be estimated that introduction of  
235 NIPT has increased the overall SCA ascertainment in infancy by at least two to three-fold.  
236 Anecdotally, we appreciate this in our clinical practice, however additional population-based  
237 studies are needed to confirm these assumptions.

238 While we collected a limited data set of potential factors influencing the decision to defer  
239 to postnatal diagnostic testing, our study did identify a significant difference in deferral to  
240 postnatal confirmation when SCA was discussed prior to NIPT. This finding could be attributed  
241 to implicit framing effects during pre-NIPT genetic counseling, especially in context of  
242 counseling for all possible NIPT outcomes, which could precipitate post-NIPT decision making  
243 (van der Steen et al., 2019). In addition, we also found a difference approaching significance in  
244 deferral to postnatal testing when mothers reported an annual household income less than \$100k,  
245 which warrants further investigation. While our study did not inquire as to how or why  
246 socioeconomic factors influenced diagnostic decision making, previous research has  
247 demonstrated socioeconomic disparities in prenatal genetic screening and informed decision  
248 making due to limited access to care or information provided during counseling (Khoshnood,  
249 Blondel, de Vigan, & Breart, 2004). We did not find any differences in our results based on race  
250 or ethnicity, however our study sample size is limited and further investigation is warranted as  
251 previous research evaluating racial/ethnic groups with NIPT results positive for SCAs identified

252 that African American women were the most likely to decline prenatal diagnostic testing, while  
253 Asian women were the most likely to elect for prenatal diagnostic testing (Ramdaney et al.,  
254 2018). These collective findings and insights highlight the need for future research further  
255 investigating disparities in prenatal genetic counseling and testing for SCAs, possible reasons for  
256 these disparities, and how to minimize them.

257 A unique aspect of prenatal genetic counseling following an NIPT result positive for  
258 SCA is the presentation, interpretation and often calculation of the positive predictive value  
259 (PPV). The PPV for NIPT results regarding SCAs is inherently variable among laboratories with  
260 published values ranging from 20-86% (Lu et al., 2021; Petersen et al., 2017; Ramdaney et al.,  
261 2018; Shi et al., 2021). A 2019 review of 10 NIPT laboratory reporting methods concluded  
262 recommendations that laboratory reports visibly and clearly state the detection rate (DR),  
263 specificity (SPEC), positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV) for all  
264 conditions being screened in order to assist patients and providers in making decisions and  
265 interpreting results (Skotko et al., 2019). As noted in the review, no commercial labs published  
266 their PPV on the respective reports (at that time). While some improvements have been made to  
267 various lab reports since this 2019 publication, there continues to be significant variability in  
268 what information is disclosed on NIPT result reports industrywide and many omit PPV values.  
269 Recognizing the importance of these variables for clinical interpretation and informed  
270 counseling, a taskforce was established, including members of the National Society of Genetic  
271 Counselors and the Perinatal Quality Foundation, to review the medical literature and build  
272 consensus regarding best estimates to develop algorithms and ultimately the publication of the  
273 NIPT/cffDNA Predictive Value Calculator  
274 (<https://www.perinatalquality.org/Vendors/NSGC/NIPT/>). When estimates of sensitivity and

275 specificity are not provided on the lab report, this calculator utilizes estimates based on a meta-  
276 analysis of available studies (Gil, Quezada, Revello, Akolekar, & Nicolaides, 2015). Today, the  
277 NIPT/cffDNA Predictive Value Calculator published by the PerinatalQuality Foundation and the  
278 National Society of Genetic Counselors (NSGC; [www.perinatalquality.org](http://www.perinatalquality.org)) provides genetic  
279 counselors with a tool to estimate the PPV when faced with an NIPT result positive for SCA.  
280 While this calculator is intended to facilitate informed decision making, counseling for SCAs  
281 commonly results in setting expectations of a false positive if PPV is below 50%, in which  
282 mothers perceive diagnostic lab outcomes more likely to be normal. While we did not find any  
283 difference in timing of diagnostic testing based on PPV (provided by the lab or calculated  
284 online), further studies evaluating mothers' expectations based on presented PPV may be useful  
285 to improve genetic counseling when NIPT results are positive for SCA given the relatively poor  
286 PPVs.

287 While consent for NIPT testing may be influenced by various factors ranging from desire  
288 of early fetal gender identification to experiences of previous pregnancy outcomes, NIPT results  
289 positive for SCA may have a pivotal psychological impact on the expectant mother. In a 2013  
290 study by Lalatta et al., the importance of utilizing a framework in genetic counseling, including  
291 the potential findings for SCAs, prior to prenatal diagnosis was supported to help reduce the  
292 emotional devastation with unexpected results of SCA given the relatively high incidence of  
293 these conditions compared to other aneuploidies (Lalatta & Tint, 2013; Riggan et al., 2020).

294 While women who receive an NIPT result positive for SCA are recommended to receive genetic  
295 counseling regarding diagnostic testing options, the approach to prenatal genetic counseling for  
296 SCAs still continues to be far from standardized (Gregg et al., 2016). In a 2019 study surveying  
297 176 genetic counselors to evaluate genetic counseling practices throughout the United States

298 following an NIPT result positive for SCA, significant discrepancies were identified that  
299 highlighted the need to establish professional guidelines in order to provide consistencies in care  
300 for NIPT results positive for SCA (Fleddermann et al., 2019).

301 Effective prenatal genetic counseling is fundamental in providing accurate, unbiased, and  
302 updated information alongside nondirective psychological support for families faced with an at-  
303 risk or confirmed prenatal genetic diagnosis. As such, it is imperative to evaluate the prenatal  
304 genetic counseling experiences and diagnostic timing decisions in parents who continued  
305 pregnancies following NIPT results positive for SCAs. The majority of participants in our study  
306 reported that they met with a genetic counselor after receiving results (NIPT or diagnostic), yet  
307 less than 50% of participants felt their provider was “well-informed” about SCAs. We found no  
308 difference in decisions in timing of diagnostic testing based on the amount of information  
309 provided about the SCA. Our study results did demonstrate that consultation with a genetic  
310 counselor after results were received was associated higher likelihood of prenatal diagnostic  
311 testing, and the amount of information provided during genetic counseling was positively and  
312 significantly associated with mothers’ perceptions that providers were well-informed ( $r_{pb} = .598$ ,  
313  $n=101$ ,  $p<.001$ ). These findings are consistent with previous publications reporting that even  
314 genetic providers feel poorly equipped to provide adequate support at the time of SCA  
315 counseling based on limited time during appointments, lack of knowledge regarding SCAs and  
316 few educational resources available (Farrell, Agatista, Mercer, Mitchum, & Coleridge, 2016;  
317 Riggan et al., 2020). Our study promotes future comprehensive education programs regarding  
318 SCA for genetic counselors and the importance of extensive information regarding SCA be  
319 provided to mothers at the time of counseling in order to appropriately support informed decision  
320 making.

321           Importantly, our study presents a series of 11 participants (7% of our total sample) in  
322    which NIPT SCA results were discordant with the final SCA diagnosis, of which 9 participants  
323    were diagnosed with a different condition and would have been counseled inaccurately if  
324    counseled based upon the NIPT result condition alone. Discordance between NIPT result and  
325    fetal karyotype has been well established to be attributed by various factors including, but not  
326    limited to, confined placental mosaicism, maternal copy number variation (CNVs), maternal X  
327    chromosome aneuploidy and/or mosaicism, maternal malignancy, vanishing twin, and technical,  
328    bioinformatics, or human errors (Hartwig, Ambye, Sorensen, & Jorgensen, 2017). For these and  
329    other reasons, NIPT remains classified as a screening, non-diagnostic test with standard  
330    recommendations that any positive NIPT result be followed by confirmatory diagnostic testing  
331    (Devers et al., 2013; Hartwig et al., 2017). However, five of our 9 discordant results showed an  
332    NIPT result for a sex chromosome trisomy (XXY or XYY) and parents elected to defer to  
333    postnatal diagnostic testing, which subsequently resulted in an unexpected diagnosis of a  
334    tetrasomy, 48,XXYY. Similarly, a retrospective study of 27 NIPT screens positive for XXY had  
335    discordant results with other SCAs (XYY, XXYY, and XXXXY) upon diagnostic testing  
336    (Ramdaney et al., 2018). While postnatal recall of prenatal counseling experiences has inherent  
337    limitations and biases, routine counseling for NIPT results of XXY or XYY does not routinely  
338    provide in-depth information regarding a possible diagnosis of 48,XXYY (or other tetrasomy  
339    outcomes to facilitate informed decision making. Traditionally, genetic counseling for NIPT  
340    results is based upon the presenting NIPT lab report. These 5 discordant results represent the  
341    imperative need for prenatal genetic counseling on NIPT results positive for SCAs to also  
342    include the possibility for an SCA diagnosis that is abnormal but discordant with the NIPT lab  
343    result. In a recent study this concern is articulated specific to NIPT results positive for 47,XXY,

344 with the authors underlining the importance of a definitive diagnosis not only for excluding a  
345 false positive but also excluding other chromosomal variations which may have a different and  
346 more severe phenotype (Ronzoni et al., 2020). Our study findings reinforce the importance of  
347 counseling regarding possible other SCAs as there are significant phenotypic differences  
348 associated with higher risks of medical complexity and neurodevelopmental involvement when  
349 comparing sex chromosome trisomies vs. pentasomies, such as 48,XXYY (Raznahan et al.,  
350 2018; Skuse, Printzlau, & Wolstencroft, 2018; N. Tartaglia, Ayari, Howell, D'Epagnier, &  
351 Zeitler, 2011; N. R. Tartaglia, Ayari, Hutaff-Lee, & Boada, 2012). By providing comprehensive  
352 counseling regarding interpretation of NIPT results and possible outcomes, couples are able to  
353 make a more-informed decision in context of additional factors that impact the PPV in NIPT  
354 results positive for SCA including the potential for a discordant SCA diagnosis and associated  
355 outcomes.

356         Limitations in this study included only pregnancies which were continued after NIPT  
357 screening and confirmed to have an SCA condition, timing of postnatal testing may have been  
358 influenced by the desire to meet inclusion criteria of the eXtraordinary Babies Study  
359 (confirmatory diagnosis of SCA prior to 13 months of age), and intentional or unintentional  
360 prenatal recall bias on postnatal questionnaires.

361         In consideration of future areas of research, investigation of possible reasons for  
362 disparities in prenatal genetic testing in SCA and how to minimize these disparities is warranted.  
363 Additionally, studies are needed to better inform genetic counselors about SCA and potential  
364 discordant outcomes when NIPT results are positive. Recognizing the phenomenon of some  
365 mothers pursuing prenatal diagnostic testing, while other mothers defer testing to after birth,  
366 results in a two-tier ascertainment impact from NIPT screening in SCA. Future areas of research

367 could further investigate if the postnatal outcomes in the children or if the parental experiences,  
368 such as attachment, differ significantly among these two cohorts. Additional areas for future  
369 research could include investigation into the long-term emotional health of parents raising a child  
370 with an SCA initially identified by NIPT, including discordant results, and prenatal genetic  
371 counseling factors that impacted these parental outcomes.

372 In conclusion, our study supports that the majority of NIPT results positive for SCA are  
373 confirmed postnatally, that NIPT has increased the ascertainment of SCAs two-to three-fold  
374 when accounting for both prenatal and postnatal diagnostic tests, and that prenatal counseling for  
375 NIPT results positive for SCA should include providing extensive information regarding the  
376 SCA and discussion regarding possible abnormal but discordant diagnostic outcomes in order for  
377 mothers to feel well-informed and able to make an informed decision regarding diagnostic  
378 testing.

379

#### 380 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

381 The authors wish to thank the study participants in the eXtraordinary Babies Study and their  
382 families. This work was also supported by NIH/NCATS Colorado CTSA Grant Number UL1  
383 TR002535, NIH/NINDS K23NS070337, NIH/NICHD K23HD092588, and NIH 2RO1-  
384 HD42974. Contents are the authors' sole responsibility and do not necessarily represent official  
385 NIH views.

386

#### 387 DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

388 Deidentified data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding  
389 author upon reasonable request.

390

391 REFERENCES

392

393

REFERENCES

394

395 Abramsky, L., & Chapple, J. (1997). 47,XXY (Klinefelter syndrome) and 47,XYY: estimated rates of and  
396 indication for postnatal diagnosis with implications for prenatal counselling. *Prenat Diagn*, *17*(4),  
397 363-368. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0223(199704)17:4<363::aid-pd79>3.0.co;2-o

398 Bojesen, A., Juul, S., & Gravholt, C. H. (2003). Prenatal and postnatal prevalence of Klinefelter syndrome:  
399 a national registry study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*, *88*(2), 622-626. doi:10.1210/jc.2002-021491

400 De Vigan, C., Baena, N., Cariati, E., Clementi, M., Stoll, C., & Group, E. W. (2001). Contribution of  
401 ultrasonographic examination to the prenatal detection of chromosomal abnormalities in 19  
402 centres across Europe. *Ann Genet*, *44*(4), 209-217. doi:10.1016/s0003-3995(01)01091-7

403 Devers, P. L., Cronister, A., Ormond, K. E., Facio, F., Brasington, C. K., & Flodman, P. (2013). Noninvasive  
404 prenatal testing/noninvasive prenatal diagnosis: the position of the National Society of Genetic  
405 Counselors. *J Genet Couns*, *22*(3), 291-295. doi:10.1007/s10897-012-9564-0

406 Farrell, R. M., Agatista, P. K., Mercer, M. B., Mitchum, A. G., & Coleridge, M. B. (2016). The use of  
407 noninvasive prenatal testing in obstetric care: educational resources, practice patterns, and  
408 barriers reported by a national sample of clinicians. *Prenat Diagn*, *36*(6), 499-506.  
409 doi:10.1002/pd.4812

410 Fleddermann, L., Hashmi, S. S., Stevens, B., Murphy, L., Rodriguez-Buritica, D., Friel, L. A., & Singletary, C.  
411 (2019). Current genetic counseling practice in the United States following positive non-invasive  
412 prenatal testing for sex chromosome abnormalities. *J Genet Couns*, *28*(4), 802-811.  
413 doi:10.1002/jgc4.1122

414 Gil, M. M., Quezada, M. S., Revello, R., Akolekar, R., & Nicolaides, K. H. (2015). Analysis of cell-free DNA  
415 in maternal blood in screening for fetal aneuploidies: updated meta-analysis. *Ultrasound Obstet*  
416 *Gynecol*, *45*(3), 249-266. doi:10.1002/uog.14791

417 Gregg, A. R., Skotko, B. G., Benkendorf, J. L., Monaghan, K. G., Bajaj, K., Best, R. G., . . . Watson, M. S.  
418 (2016). Noninvasive prenatal screening for fetal aneuploidy, 2016 update: a position statement  
419 of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. *Genet Med*, *18*(10), 1056-1065.  
420 doi:10.1038/gim.2016.97

421 Hartwig, T. S., Ambye, L., Sorensen, S., & Jorgensen, F. S. (2017). Discordant non-invasive prenatal  
422 testing (NIPT) - a systematic review. *Prenat Diagn*, *37*(6), 527-539. doi:10.1002/pd.5049

423 Howard-Bath, A., Poulton, A., Halliday, J., & Hui, L. (2018). Population-based trends in the prenatal  
424 diagnosis of sex chromosome aneuploidy before and after non-invasive prenatal testing. *Prenat*  
425 *Diagn*, *38*(13), 1062-1068. doi:10.1002/pd.5363

426 Khoshnood, B., Blondel, B., de Vigan, C., & Breart, G. (2004). Socioeconomic barriers to informed  
427 decisionmaking regarding maternal serum screening for down syndrome: results of the French  
428 National Perinatal Survey of 1998. *Am J Public Health*, *94*(3), 484-491. doi:10.2105/ajph.94.3.484

429 Labonte, V., Alsaid, D., Lang, B., & Meerpohl, J. J. (2019). Psychological and social consequences of non-  
430 invasive prenatal testing (NIPT): a scoping review. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*, *19*(1), 385.  
431 doi:10.1186/s12884-019-2518-x

432 Lalatta, F., & Tint, G. S. (2013). Counseling parents before prenatal diagnosis: do we need to say more  
433 about the sex chromosome aneuploidies? *Am J Med Genet A*, *161A*(11), 2873-2879.  
434 doi:10.1002/ajmg.a.36226

- 435 Lewis, C., Hill, M., & Chitty, L. S. (2016). Women's Experiences and Preferences for Service Delivery of  
436 Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing for Aneuploidy in a Public Health Setting: A Mixed Methods Study.  
437 *PLoS One*, *11*(4), e0153147. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0153147
- 438 Lu, X., Wang, C., Sun, Y., Tang, J., Tong, K., & Zhu, J. (2021). Noninvasive prenatal testing for assessing  
439 foetal sex chromosome aneuploidy: a retrospective study of 45,773 cases. *Mol Cytogenet*, *14*(1),  
440 1. doi:10.1186/s13039-020-00521-2
- 441 Marteau, T. M., Nippert, I., Hall, S., Limbert, C., Reid, M., Bobrow, M., . . . abnormality, D. S. G. D.-m. a. d.  
442 o. f. (2002). Outcomes of pregnancies diagnosed with Klinefelter syndrome: the possible  
443 influence of health professionals. *Prenat Diagn*, *22*(7), 562-566. doi:10.1002/pd.374
- 444 Mennuti, M. T., Chandrasekaran, S., Khalek, N., & Dugoff, L. (2015). Cell-free DNA screening and sex  
445 chromosome aneuploidies. *Prenat Diagn*, *35*(10), 980-985. doi:10.1002/pd.4639
- 446 Petersen, A. K., Cheung, S. W., Smith, J. L., Bi, W., Ward, P. A., Peacock, S., . . . Breman, A. M. (2017).  
447 Positive predictive value estimates for cell-free noninvasive prenatal screening from data of a  
448 large referral genetic diagnostic laboratory. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*, *217*(6), 691 e691-691 e696.  
449 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.10.005
- 450 Ramdaney, A., Hoskovec, J., Harkenrider, J., Soto, E., & Murphy, L. (2018). Clinical experience with sex  
451 chromosome aneuploidies detected by noninvasive prenatal testing (NIPT): Accuracy and  
452 patient decision-making. *Prenat Diagn*, *38*(11), 841-848. doi:10.1002/pd.5339
- 453 Raznahan, A., Parikshak, N. N., Chandran, V., Blumenthal, J. D., Clasen, L. S., Alexander-Bloch, A. F., . . .  
454 Geschwind, D. H. (2018). Sex-chromosome dosage effects on gene expression in humans. *Proc*  
455 *Natl Acad Sci U S A*, *115*(28), 7398-7403. doi:10.1073/pnas.1802889115
- 456 Riggan, K. A., Close, S., & Allyse, M. A. (2020). Family experiences and attitudes about receiving the  
457 diagnosis of sex chromosome aneuploidy in a child. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet*, *184*(2),  
458 404-413. doi:10.1002/ajmg.c.31781
- 459 Ronzoni, L., Bedeschi, M. F., Silibello, G., Accurti, V., Di Segni, M., Nicotra, V., . . . Lalatta, F. (2020).  
460 Increased RISK for 47,XXY on cell-free DNA screen: Not always Klinefelter syndrome. *Prenat*  
461 *Diagn*. doi:10.1002/pd.5890
- 462 Sadlecki, P., Grabciec, M., Walentowicz, P., & Walentowicz-Sadlecka, M. (2018). Why do patients decline  
463 amniocentesis? Analysis of factors influencing the decision to refuse invasive prenatal testing.  
464 *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*, *18*(1), 174. doi:10.1186/s12884-018-1812-3
- 465 Screening for Fetal Chromosomal Abnormalities: ACOG Practice Bulletin Summary, Number 226. (2020).  
466 *Obstet Gynecol*, *136*(4), 859-867. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000004107
- 467 Shi, Y., Li, X., Ju, D., Li, Y., Zhang, X., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Efficiency of Noninvasive Prenatal Testing for Sex  
468 Chromosome Aneuploidies. *Gynecol Obstet Invest*, *86*(4), 379-387. doi:10.1159/000518002
- 469 Skotko, B. G., Allyse, M. A., Bajaj, K., Best, R. G., Klugman, S., Leach, M., . . . Gregg, A. R. (2019).  
470 Adherence of cell-free DNA noninvasive prenatal screens to ACMG recommendations. *Genet*  
471 *Med*, *21*(10), 2285-2292. doi:10.1038/s41436-019-0485-2
- 472 Skuse, D., Printzlau, F., & Wolstencroft, J. (2018). Sex chromosome aneuploidies. *Handb Clin Neurol*, *147*,  
473 355-376. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-63233-3.00024-5
- 474 Tartaglia, N., Ayari, N., Howell, S., D'Epagnier, C., & Zeitler, P. (2011). 48,XXYY, 48,XXXY and 49,XXXXY  
475 syndromes: not just variants of Klinefelter syndrome. *Acta Paediatr*, *100*(6), 851-860.  
476 doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2011.02235.x
- 477 Tartaglia, N. R., Ayari, N., Hutaff-Lee, C., & Boada, R. (2012). Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder  
478 symptoms in children and adolescents with sex chromosome aneuploidy: XXY, XXX, XYY, and  
479 XXYY. *J Dev Behav Pediatr*, *33*(4), 309-318. doi:10.1097/DBP.0b013e31824501c8
- 480 van der Steen, S. L., Houtman, D., Bakkeren, I. M., Galjaard, R. H., Polak, M. G., Busschbach, J. J., . . .  
481 Riedijk, S. R. (2019). Offering a choice between NIPT and invasive PND in prenatal genetic

482 counseling: the impact of clinician characteristics on patients' test uptake. *Eur J Hum Genet*,  
483 27(2), 235-243. doi:10.1038/s41431-018-0287-z  
484 Wang, Y., Li, S., Wang, W., Dong, Y., Zhang, M., Wang, X., & Yin, C. (2020). Cell-free DNA screening for  
485 sex chromosome aneuploidies by non-invasive prenatal testing in maternal plasma. *Mol*  
486 *Cytogenet*, 13, 10. doi:10.1186/s13039-020-0478-5  
487 Wilson, K. L., Czerwinski, J. L., Hoskovec, J. M., Noblin, S. J., Sullivan, C. M., Harbison, A., . . . Singletary, C.  
488 N. (2013). NSGC practice guideline: prenatal screening and diagnostic testing options for  
489 chromosome aneuploidy. *J Genet Couns*, 22(1), 4-15. doi:10.1007/s10897-012-9545-3  
490 Zheng, Y., Wan, S., Dang, Y., Song, T., Chen, B., & Zhang, J. (2020). Clinical experience regarding the  
491 accuracy of NIPT in the detection of sex chromosome abnormality. *J Gene Med*, 22(8), e3199.  
492 doi:10.1002/jgm.3199

493

494

495

496

<b>Table 1: Subject Demographics</b>	
	<b>Total (N= 152)</b>
<b>Race</b>	
Caucasian	138 (91%)
Asian	11 (7%)
Native American	3 (2%)
African American	2 (1%)
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
Non-Hispanic	134 (88%)
Hispanic	18 (12%)
<b>Annual Household Income</b>	
<\$100k	42 (29%)
\$100k-\$150k	36 (25%)
\$150k-\$250k	39 (27%)
>\$250k	23 (16%)
<b>Gestational age at NIPT (wks)</b>	13 ± 5.4
<b>Fetal Fraction on NIPT (%)</b>	9.2 ± 3.9
<b>Maternal pre-pregnancy BMI</b>	26 ± 6.0
<b>Reason reported for NIPT</b>	
Maternal Age	59 (57.8%)
Abnormal Ultrasound	5 (4.9%)
Routine / Elective / Learn Gender	43 (42.1%)
Other (family history, prior pregnancy loss)	10 (9.8%)
<b>Prenatal Diagnostic testing (CVS or Amniocentesis)</b>	65 (43%)
<b>Final Karyotype Result</b>	
47,XXY	104 (68%)
47,XXX	27 (18%)
47,XYY	15 (10%)
48,XXYY	6 (4%)
<b>Birthweight (kg)</b>	3.25 ± 0.7
<b>Gestational age at Delivery (wks)</b>	38.7 ± 1.4
<b>Maternal Age at Delivery (yrs)</b>	35.3 ± 4.8
<b>Geographic Region<sup>†</sup></b>	
Northeast	31 (20%)
Midwest	24 (16%)
South	42 (28%)
West	53 (35%)
International	2 (1%)

<sup>†</sup>US Geographic Regions as designated by the US Census Bureau: Northeast: CT, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT; Midwest: IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI; South: AL, AR, DC, DE, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV; West: AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR, UT, WA WY  
 Note: Data are mean ± standard deviation (SD) or n (%)

497

<b>Table 2: Karyotypes Stratified by Timing of Diagnostic Testing</b>				
<b>Diagnostic Karyotype</b>	<b>Full cohort of NIPT Positive for SCA† (n=152)</b>	<b>CVS Prenatal Diagnostic Testing (n=13)</b>	<b>Amnio Prenatal Diagnostic Testing (n=52)</b>	<b>Deferred to Postnatal Diagnostic Testing (n=87) ‡</b>
<b>47,XXY</b>	104 (68%)	10 (10%)	37 (36%)	57 (55%)†
<b>47,XXX</b>	27 (18%)	1 (4%)	11 (41%)†	15 (56%)
<b>47,XYY</b>	15 (10%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	10 (67%)
<b>48,XXYY</b>	6 (4%)	-	1 (17%)†	5 (83%) †
<b>All SCAs</b>	152 (100%)	13 (9%)	52 (34%)	87 (57%)

† Includes Discordant NIPT vs. Diagnostic Results, see Table 4

‡ 85% of all diagnostic confirmations deferred to after birth were conducted prior to 2 months of age and were confirmed in cord blood or peripheral blood

498

<b>Table 3: Participant Characteristics Stratified by Timing of Confirmatory Diagnostic Testing</b>			
	<b>Pursued Prenatal Testing N=65 (43%)</b>	<b>Deferred to Postnatal Testing N=87 (57%)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Demographics</b>			
Maternal age (years): M ± SD	35.4 ± 5.04	46 (5.05)	0.737
Annual Household Income			<b>.022*</b>
<\$100k	12 (26.7)	33 (73.3)	
\$100k-\$150k	15 (39.5)	23 (60.5)	
\$150k-\$250k	22 (52.4)	20 (47.6)	
>\$250K	15 (60)	10 (40)	
<b>Race / Ethnicity: N (%)</b>			
Racial Minority (non-Caucasian)	6 (46.2)	7 (53.8)	1
Hispanic	7 (41.2)	10 (58.8)	
Under Represented Minority (combined race & ethnicity)	12 (42.9)	16 (57.1)	
<b>Geographic Region<sup>†</sup></b>			
Northeast	15 (48.4)	16 (51.6)	1.08
Midwest	14 (58.3)	10 (41.7)	
South	15 (35.7)	27 (64.3)	
West	19 (35.8)	34 (64.2)	
<b>SCA result on NIPT report</b>			
47,XXY	46 (44.2)	58 (55.8)	0.66
47,XXX	11 (40.7)	16 (59.3)	
47,YYY	6 (33.3)	12 (66.7)	
<b>Calculated PPV:<sup>‡</sup> M ± SD</b>	<b>49.52 ± 23.19</b>	<b>50.88 ± 25.45</b>	<b>0.732</b>
<b>Prenatal Experience Questionnaire Results Stratified by Timing of Confirmatory Diagnostic Testing (N=102)</b>			
	<b>Pursued Prenatal Testing N=49 (48%)</b>	<b>Deferred to Postnatal Testing N=53 (52%)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Self-Reported Indication for NIPT</b>			
Maternal Age	28 (57.1%)	31 (58.5%)	1.0
Abnormal ultrasound findings	2 (4.1%)	3 (5.7%)	1.0
Gender Discovery / Elective / Doctor Offered	21 (42.9%)	22 (41.5%)	1.0
Other (family history, prior pregnancy loss)	7 (14.3%)	3 (5.7%)	0.189

<b>Counseling Experience</b>			
Informed about possibility of SCT prior to NIPT ("yes", %)	9 (18.4%)	20 (38.5%)	<b>0.03*</b>
Consulted with a genetic counselor after receiving NIPT results ("yes", %)	48 (98.0%)	44 (83.0%)	<b>0.017*</b>
Impression that providers were well informed about condition ("yes",%)	20 (41.7%)	20 (37.7%)	0.839
Perceived Amount of Information Provided (scale:0-100) M ± SD	58.4 ± 27.98	47.74 ± 23.5	0.287

Note: Data are mean ± standard deviation (SD) or n (%)

\*  $p < .05$

†US Geographic Regions as designated by the US Census Bureau: Northeast: CT, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT; Midwest: IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, SD, WI; South: AL, AR, DC, DE, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV; West: AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR, UT, WA WY

‡ PPV calculations were taken from report or if not available, calculated utilizing the perinatal quality foundation PPV calculator (<https://www.perinatalquality.org/Vendors/NSGC/NIPT/>)

499

<b>Table 4: Discordant Results Between NIPT and Diagnostic Karyotype</b>					
<b>NIPT Result</b>	<b>Fetal Fraction per NIPT report (%)</b>	<b>Maternal Age Range at Delivery (yrs)</b>	<b>Maternal BMI (kg/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>Diagnostic Test Pursued</b>	<b>Diagnostic Test Result</b>
45,X	NR	35-39	23.9	amnio	47,XXX
47,XXX	10.7	35-39	29.4	amnio	47,XXX[6] / 46,XX[9]
47,XYY	6.3	35-39	21.2	postnatal	47,XXY
increased risk for trisomy 13/18/triploidy	3.2	35-39	29.8	postnatal	47,XXY
inconclusive	6	30-34	36.5	amnio	47,XXY
47,XXY	6.9	30-34	29.4	amnio	47,XXY[91%]/46,XX[9%]
47,XXY	6	20-24	20.5	postnatal	48,XXYY
47,XXY	NR	30-34	22.3	amnio	48,XXYY
47,XYY	11.8	20-24	24	postnatal	48,XXYY
47,XXY	7	30-34	26.4	postnatal	48,XXYY
47,XYY	6.1	30-34	30.2	postnatal	48,XXYY
47,XXY	4	35-39	36.6	postnatal	48,XXYY

NR=not reported

500