medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.21.22279949; this version posted January 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The landscape of reported VUS in multi-gene panel and genomic testing: Time for a change

Heidi L Rehm, PhD[1,2,3], Joseph T Alaimo, PhD[4,5,6], Swaroop Aradhya, PhD[7,8], Pinar Bayrak-Toydemir, PhD[9,10], Hunter Best, PhD[9,10], Rhonda Brandon, MS[11], Jillian G Buchan, PhD[12], Elizabeth C Chao, MD[13], Elaine Chen, PhD[7], Jacob Clifford, PhD[14], Ana S Cohen, PhD[4,5,6], Laura K Conlin, PhD[15], Soma Das, PhD[16], Kyle W Davis, MA[17], Daniela del Gaudio, PhD[16], Florencia Del Viso, PhD[4], Christina DiVincenzo, BS[18], Marcia Eisenberg, PhD[19], Lucia Guidugli, PhD[20], Monia B Hammer, PhD[20], Steven M Harrison, PhD[21], Kathryn E Hatchell, PhD[7], Lindsay Havens Dyer, MS[22], Lily U Hoang, BA[14], James M Holt, PhD[23], Vaidehi Jobanputra, PhD[24], Izabela D Karbassi, PhD[18], Hutton M Kearney, PhD[25], Melissa A Kelly, PhD[23], Jacob M Kelly, BS[23], Michelle L Kluge, MS[25], Timothy Komala, BS[13], Paul Kruszka, MD[26], Lynette Lau, MSC[27], Matthew S Lebo, PhD[28,29,3], Christian R Marshall, PhD[27,30], Dianalee McKnight, PhD[7], Kirsty McWalter, MS[26], Yan Meng, PhD[31], Narasimhan Nagan, PhD[32], Christian S Neckelmann, BA[31], Nir Neerman, BS[33], Zhiyv Niu, PhD[25], Vitoria K Paolillo, PhD[4], Sarah A Paolucci, MS[12], Denise Perry, MS[34], Tina Pesaran, MA, MS[13], Kelly Radtke, PhD[21], Kristen J Rasmussen, MS[25], Kyle Retterer, MS[22], Carol J Saunders, PhD[4,35,6], Elizabeth Spiteri, PhD[36], Christine M Stanley, PhD[37], Anna Szuto, MSC[38], Ryan J Taft, PhD[39], Isabelle Thiffault, PhD[4,5,6], Brittany C Thomas, MS[39], Amanda Thomas-Wilson, PhD[24], Erin Thorpe, MS[39], Timothy J Tidwell, PhD[9], Meghan C Towne, MS[13], Hana Zouk, PhD[28,40], on behalf of the Medical Genome Initiative[41]

[1]Center for Genomic Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA, [2]Medical and Population Genetics, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA, [3]Pathology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA, [4]Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Children's Mercy Hospital, Kansas City, MO, USA, [5]Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, University of Missouri, Kansas City, MO, USA, [6]Center for Pediatric Genomic Medicine, Children's Mercy Hospital, Kansas City, MO, USA, [7]Global Medical Affairs, Invitae, San Francisco, CA, USA, [8]Department of Pathology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, CA, USA, [9]ARUP Laboratories, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, [10]Department of Pathology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, [11]Informatics, GeneDx, LLC, Gaithersburg, MD, USA, [12]Genetics Division, Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA, [13]Medical Sciences, Ambry Genetics, Aliso Viejo, CA, USA, [14]Advanced Analytics, Ambry Genetics, Aliso Viejo, CA, USA, [15]Genomic Diagnostics, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA, USA, [16]Human Genetics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA, [17]Marketing, Variantyx, Framingham, MA, USA, [18]Quest Diagnostics, Marlborough, MA, USA, [19]Womens Health and Genetics/Labcorp, Research Triangle Park, NC, USA, [20]Rady Children's Institute for Genomic Medicine, San Diego, CA, USA, [21]Clinical Operations, Ambry Genetics, Aliso Viejo, CA, USA, [22]GeneDx, LLC, Gaithersburg, MD, USA, [23]HudsonAlpha Clinical Services Lab, LLC, Huntsville, AL, USA, [24]Molecular Diagnostics, New York Genome Center, New York, NY, USA, [25]Division of Laboratory Genetics and Genomics, Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA, [26]Medical Affairs, GeneDx, LLC, Gaithersburg, MD, USA, [27]Division of Genome Diagnostics, Department of Paediatric Laboratory Medicine, The Hosptial for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada, [28]Laboratory for Molecular Medicine, Mass General Brigham, Cambridge, MA, USA, [29]Pathology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA, [30]Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada, [31]Curation, Fulgent Genetics, Temple City, CA, USA, [32]Molecular Genetics and Genomics, Women's Health and Genetics/Labcorp, Westborough, MA, USA, [33]Bioinformatics, Variantyx, Framingham, MA, USA,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.21.22279949; this version posted January 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

[34]Medical Genomics Research Dept, Illumina, Inc, San Diego, CA, USA, [35]Department of Pediatrics and Pathology, School of Medicine, University of Missouri, Kansas City, MO, USA, [36]Clinical Genomics, Department of Pathology, Stanford Medicine, Palo Alto, CA, USA, [37]Clinical Genomics, Variantyx, Framingham, MA, USA, [38]Clinical and Metabolic Genetics, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada, [39]Medical Genomics Research , Illumina, Inc, San Diego, CA, USA, [40]Pathology, Harvard Medical School, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA, [41]https://medgenomeinitiative.org

Abstract

Variants of uncertain significance (VUS) are a common result of diagnostic genetic testing and can be difficult to manage with potential misinterpretation and downstream costs, including time investment by clinicians. We investigated the rate of VUS reported on diagnostic testing via multi-gene panels (MGPs) and exome and genome sequencing (ES/GS) to measure the magnitude of uncertain results and explore ways to reduce their potentially detrimental impact. We collected data from over 1.5 million genetic tests from 19 clinical laboratories across the United States and Canada from during 2020-2021. We found a lower rate of inconclusive results due to VUS on ES/GS tests compared to MGPs (22.5% vs. 32.6%; p<0.001). For MGPs, the rate was positively correlated with the total number of genes. The use of trios (patient with parental samples) in ES/GS reduced the inconclusive report rate (18.9% vs 27.6%; p<0.001). The reduced rate of VUS in ES/GS testing compared to MGPs is best explained by current laboratory reporting practices of comprehensive VUS reporting for MGPs in contrast to clinical correlation and strength of pathogenicity evidence to inform which VUS are reported in ES/GS. We recommend changes in current practices to reduce the burden of VUS on providers and patients.

Variants of uncertain significance (VUS) are a common result of diagnostic genetic testing and can be difficult to manage with potential misinterpretation and downstream costs, including time investment by clinicians.[1] We investigated the rate of VUS reported on diagnostic testing via multi-gene panels (MGPs) and exome and genome sequencing (ES/GS) to measure the magnitude of uncertain results and explore ways to reduce their potentially detrimental impact.

De-identified summary data were collected on diagnostic MGPs and ES/GS tests performed at 19 clinical laboratories in North America during 2021-2022 (Supplemental Table 1). The data spanned 1,463,812 MGPs (96.8%), 42,165 ES tests (2.8%) and 6,329 GS tests (0.4%). MGP results were further subdivided by the number of genes per panel. ES/GS tests were categorized by exome versus genome and inclusion of family samples (trio versus less-than-trio). The rate of test results with at least one VUS in the absence of a causal etiology was significantly lower for ES/GS (22.5%; 10,933/48,494) than the rate from MGPs (32.6%; 477,617/1,463,812; p<0.001) (Fig. 1A). For MGPs, the rate of VUS results correlated with the number of genes tested, ranging from 6.0% for 287,811 panel tests of 2-10 genes to 76.2% for 84,316 panel tests >200 genes (Fig. 1B,C). The statistically significant difference in VUS rates between MGPs and ES/GS remained even after controlling for the higher positive yield seen among ES/GS versus MGPs (details in Supplement). When examining GS versus ES results, the use of trios led to significantly lower VUS rates (18.9% vs 27.6%; p<0.001) but there was no difference in the VUS rate between GS and ES (22.2% vs 22.6%, ns) (Supplemental Table 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.21.22279949; this version posted January 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Comparison of Rates of Inconclusive Results due to VUS by MGP versus ES/GS. Section A shows a statistically significant reduction in inconclusive rates due to VUS in ES/GS compared to MGP. Section B shows a breakdown in rates by panel size. Section C shows test volume for each panel bin.

The reason for higher VUS rates in MGPs is not due to technical differences but due to the standard practice to report all VUS, allowing follow-up investigations and the ability for patients to get updated reports in the future. MGPs have expanded in the range of diseases and gene content per test, thereby increasing VUS rates. With ES/GS testing, reporting all VUS is impractical and ineffective, and clinical correlation and strength of pathogenicity evidence inform which VUS are reported, leading to a reduced rate.[2] Limiting VUS results may reduce unnecessary follow-up and prevent mismanagement if VUS are misinterpreted as causal, particularly by clinicians with less genetics expertise[3] and may also reduce patient distress.[4,5] However, a subset of VUS, particularly those found in genes well-correlated with a patient's clinical presentation, have a higher chance of being causal, and reporting allows additional evidence to be gathered over time.

The high rate of VUS observed in diagnostic MGP testing warrants examining current variant reporting practices. We propose several approaches to reduce reported VUS rates, while directing clinician resources towards important VUS follow-up:

- Clinicians should supply more clinical information to laboratories when ordering MGP testing to enable appropriate clinical correlation during variant classification and reporting;
- Clinicians should include parental samples, when possible, for both large panels and ES/GS to improve interpretation and classification;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.21.22279949; this version posted January 10, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

- Laboratories should utilize VUS sub-tier classifications (see data in Supplement) to restrict which VUS are reported and clinicians should follow-up on only higher tier VUS;
- Laboratories should structure test reports with supplemental sections for listing variants with lower clinical significance to de-emphasize these variants in most testing situations;
- Laboratories should allow clinicians and patients to opt out of VUS reporting, particularly if there is a lower suspicion of a genetic etiology.

We recommend these changes as well as encourage further infrastructure development to support updated genetic test reports in health systems, and emphasize the critical partnership between clinicians and laboratories to support genetic and genomic testing.

References

1. Gould D, Walker R, Makari-Judson G, Seven M. Experiences of individuals with a variant of uncertain significance on genetic testing for hereditary cancer risks: a mixed method systematic review. *J Community Genet*. 2022;13(4):371-379.
2. Austin-Tse CA, Jobanputra V, Perry DL, Bick D, Taft RJ, Venner E, Gibbs RA, Young T, Barnett S, Belmont JW, Boczek N, Chowdhury S, Ellsworth KA, Guha S, Kulkarni S, Marcou C, Meng L, Murdock DR, Rehman AU, Spiteri E, Thomas-Wilson A, Kearney HM, Rehm HL; Medical Genome Initiative. Best practices for the interpretation and reporting of clinical whole genome sequencing. NPJ Genom Med. 2022 Apr 8;7(1):27.
3. Welsh JL, Hoskin TL, Day CN, Thomas AS, Cogswell JA, Couch FJ, Boughey JC. Clinical Decision-Making in Patients with Variant of Uncertain Significance in BRCA1 or BRCA2 Genes. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2017;24(10):3067-3072.
4. Skinner D, Roche MI, Weck KE, Raspberry KA, Foreman AKM, Strande NT, Berg JS, Evans JP, Henderson GE. "Possibly positive or certainly uncertain?": participants' responses to uncertain diagnostic results from exome sequencing. *Genet Med.* 2018;20(3):313-319.
5. Culver JO, Brinkerhoff CD, Clague J, Yang K, Singh KE, Sand SR, Weitzel JN. Variants of uncertain significance in BRCA testing: evaluation of surgical decisions, risk perception, and cancer distress. *Clin Genet*. 2013;84(5):464-72.