The yield on re-interpretation of genetic variants in pediatric cardiomyopathy

Short title: Variant reclassification in cardiomyopathy

Takanori Suzuki, MD, PhD[1,] Robert Lesurf, PhD[1], Rajadurai Akilen, PhD[1], Xiaoqiao Xu, MHSc[2], Eva Maria Batke[3, 4], Vinay J Rao, MSc[5, 6], Rebekah Jobling, MD[7-9], Laura Zahavich, MSc[10], Natasha Henden, MSc[11], Jodie Ingles, MSc[11], Edgardo Alania Torres, MD[12], Keichi Hirono, MD, PhD[13], Nathalie Roux-buisson, MD, PhD[14, 15], Perundurai S Dhandapany, PhD[5], Christoph Sandmann, MD, PhD[3, 4], Seema Mital, MD[1,7,16*]

[1]Genetics and Genome Biology Program, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[2]The Centre for Computational Medicine, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[3]Department of Internal Medicine III (Cardiology, Angiology, and Pneumology), Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany

[4]German Center for Cardiovascular Research, Partner Site Heidelberg/Mannheim, Heidelberg, Germany

[5]Cardiovascular Development and Disease Mechanisms, Institute for Stem Cell Science and Regenerative Medicine (DBT-inStem), Bengaluru, India

[6]The University of Trans-Disciplinary Health Sciences and Technology, Yelahanka, Bangalore, India

[7]Ted Rogers Centre for Heart Research, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada

[8]Clinical and Metabolic Genetics, Department of Pediatrics, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada

[9]Genome Diagnostics, Department of Pediatric Laboratory Medicine, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada

[10]Department of Genetic Counselling, Hospital for Sick Children, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

[11]Garvan Institute of Medical Research, Sydney, Australia

[12]Denia Hospital, Alicante, Spain

[13]Toyama University Hospital, Toyama, Japan

[14]Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inserm, CHU Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble Institute Neurosciences, Grenoble, France

[15]GCS AURAGEN, Lyon, France

[16]Division of Cardiology, Department of Pediatrics, The Hospital for Sick Children, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Short title: Variant reinterpretation in pediatric cardiomyopathy

Corresponding Author:

Seema Mital, MD

Hospital for Sick Children,

555 University Avenue,

Toronto, Ontario M5G 1X8, Canada.

Tel: 416-813-7418; Fax: 416-813-5857

*Email: seema.mital@sickkids.ca

Twitter: @seema_mital

Linkedin: https://www.linkedin.com/in/seema-mital-970989b/

Word count: 3751

ABSTRACT

Background: Variant interpretation can change over time as new knowledge emerges. Our aim was to determine the frequency and causes of variant reinterpretation on systematic re-evaluation in pediatric patients with cardiomyopathy.

Methods: Overall, 227 unrelated pediatric patients with cardiomyopathy enrolled in the Heart Centre Biobank harbored a pathogenic/likely pathogenic (P/LP) variant and/or a variant of uncertain significance (VUS) on clinical genetic testing (2005-2022). Variant pathogenicity was re-evaluated using the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) guidelines. Additional extension cohorts (n=4547, cases) were analyzed to assess variant burden in cases versus controls (gnomAD 4.1.0).

Results: 382 variants (110 P/LP, 272 VUS) in 227 patients were re-evaluated. Forty-nine variants in 49 patients (21.6%) changed classification. Twelve (10.9%) P/LP variants were downgraded to VUS in 14 patients. Leading criteria were high population allele frequency and variant not located in mutational hotspot or critical functional gene domain. Thirty-seven (13.6%) VUS were upgraded to P/LP in 35 patients. Leading criteria were variant location in mutational hotspot for gene, and deleteriousness on in silico prediction. Only 8 reclassified variants had been reported back by the clinical genetic testing laboratory at the time of the study. Ten of the 37 VUS upgraded to P/LP were significantly enriched in cardiomyopathy cases (n=4796) versus controls.

Conclusions: One in five patients with cardiomyopathy had a clinically relevant change in variant pathogenicity on systematic re-evaluation that would require modifying family clinical screening and cascade genetic testing. These findings underscore the clinical importance of regular variant re-interpretation on follow-up.

Keywords: Cardiomyopathy, genetic testing, pathogenic variants, variants of uncertain significance, variant reinterpretation

Abbreviations:

ACM, Arrhythmogenic ventricular cardiomyopathic; AMP, The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics/Association for Molecular Pathology; B/LB, Benign/Likely benign; CI, Confidence interval; DCM, Dilated cardiomyopathy; HCM, Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy; LVNC, Left ventricular noncompaction cardiomyopathy; OR, Odds ratio; pLI, probability of loss-of-function intolerant; P/LP, Pathogenic/Likely pathogenic; RCM, Restrictive cardiomyopathy; VUS, Variant of uncertain significance

INTRODUCTION

Cardiomyopathy is primarily a genetic disorder and a common cause of childhood heart failure **[1]**. Cardiomyopathy phenotypes include arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy (ACM), dilated cardiomyopathy (DCM), hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM), restrictive cardiomyopathy (RCM), and left ventricular non-compaction cardiomyopathy (LVNC). Dozens of genes are implicated in causing the disease, with most genotype-positive cases being autosomal dominant and caused by a rare DNA variant **[1]**, and with considerable overlap in the genes associated with different cardiomyopathy subtypes **[1, 2]**.

The genotype of a patient informs cascade clinical and genetic screening of first-degree relatives. Genotype-positive patients i.e., patient harbors a pathogenic/likely pathogenic (P/LP) variant in a cardiomyopathy gene, especially those with P/LP variants in sarcomeric and other cardiomyopathy-associated genes, tend to have a worse prognosis and their genotype may offer clinically meaningful insights for risk stratification and treatment decisions [**3**]. Importantly, when a patient is genotype-positive, family members are offered cascade testing for the variant, and only genotype-positive family members require ongoing echocardiographic screening for cardiomyopathy [**4**]. When a patient is genotype-negative i.e., does not harbor a P/LP variant, then all family members are recommended serial echocardiographic screening [**4**]. A previous study in HCM reported that, among 1,361 probands with non-benign variants, 917 (67.3%) harbored P/LP variants and 444 (32.6%) harbored only variants of uncertain significance (VUS), the latter reflecting incomplete or conflicting evidence for pathogenicity **[5]**. However, variant interpretation can change over time as new knowledge, additional functional validation data, and more accurate computational prediction tools emerge. A change in variant interpretation can change family screening recommendations. The 2024 American Heart Association & American College of Cardiology guidelines for HCM and the European Society of Cardiology

guidelines for cardiomyopathies emphasize the importance of periodic variant re-evaluation **[6, 7].** To improve the efficiency of variant re-evaluation, clinicians are advised to document the date when the genetic test results were initially assessed and to consider any new medical and scientific information that has become available since that time **[8]**. Small pediatric cardiomyopathy cohort studies have reported variant reclassification rates ranging from 8.9%-10.3% **[9, 10]**. Here we performed a real-world systematic reevaluation of variants in a larger cohort of unrelated pediatric cardiomyopathy cases to identify the frequency and criteria for clinically 'actionable' variant reclassification on follow-up.

METHODS

Study cohort

The study cohort included 227 unrelated patients with primary cardiomyopathy <18 years old, enrolled through the Heart Centre Biobank Registry at the Hospital for Sick Children (Toronto, Ontario, Canada) (**Table 1 and Supplementary Table S1**). Patients who harbored a P/LP variant or a VUS on clinical genetic testing were included. Patients with secondary cardiomyopathy caused by chromosomal malformations, neuromuscular disorders, mitochondrial or metabolic disorders, congenital heart defects, or reversible causes were excluded. Patient demographics, diagnosis, type of clinical testing (panel, exome), year of clinical genetic testing, the original (and updated) variant classification by the genetic testing laboratory were captured. In addition, to perform case control burden analysis for relevant reclassified variants, data was accessed from an extension cohort of 4547 cases derived from international studies and published literature (**Supplementary Table S2**). The gnomAD (v4.1.0 genome dataset) was used to assess allele frequencies (n= 76,215) for variant re-interpretation, but for case-control burden analysis, we used gnomAD (v4.1.0, exome dataset) (n= 730,947) to avoid any bias

related to using overlapping patients as controls. The study was approved by the Institutional Research Ethics Boards and written informed consent was obtained from all patients and/or their parents/legal guardians and the study protocol adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki.

Re-evaluation of variant pathogenicity

Variants identified as P/LP or VUS on clinical genetic testing were reinterpreted for pathogenicity using the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics/Association for Molecular Pathology (ACMG/AMP) guidelines for interpretation of variant pathogenicity. Using these criteria, a variant can be interpreted as pathogenic, likely pathogenic (P/LP), VUS, likely benign (LB), or benign (B) **[11, 12]**. For variants with multiple isoforms, the Matched Annotation from NCBI and EMBL-EBI transcript (MANE Select and MANE Plus Clinical) was used to annotate and evaluate variant effects in standardized and clinically relevant gene transcripts. A clinically actionable variant reclassification was defined as either the upgrading of a VUS to P/LP, or the downgrading of a P/LP variant to a non-pathogenic variant i.e., VUS or B/LB variant.

Several criteria were applied for variant re-interpretation including confirmation of patient phenotype, the current association between gene and cardiomyopathy phenotype on the most recent ClinGen version 11 curation **[13]**, updated ClinVar records (2024-01-29 Web Release), literature evidence, control population allele frequencies, and prediction scores derived from computational tools. When available, the results of clinical genetic tests from parents or siblings were utilized to ascertain *de novo* status and to perform segregation analysis for a familial variant. Reclassifications were verified by our

Return of Research Results committee comprising pediatric cardiologists, clinical geneticists, genetic counselors, and bioinformaticians **[14].**

A detailed approach to variant reinterpretation is described below. Of note, all eligible variants reported on clinical testing were single nucleotide variants and small insertions-deletions.

1) PVS1 criterion was applied to loss-of-function variants in haploinsufficiency-intolerant genes using gnomAD 4.1.0, defined as a probability of loss-of-function intolerant (pLI) score ≥0.9. PVS1 criterion was not applied to *MYH7* variants as per ClinGen guidelines because the contribution of loss-of-function variants in this gene to inherited cardiomyopathy remains incompletely understood **[15]**. *TTN* variants were only considered pathogenic if they were protein-truncating variants (frameshift, nonsense, canonical splice site) predominantly in the A-band and I-band regions and isoforms **[16, 17].**
2) The PS2 criterion was applied when the variant was confirmed through genetic testing to be *de novo* with parentage confirmed and no family history of cardiomyopathy.
3) The PS4 criterion of higher variant burden in cases compared to controls i.e., gnomAD (v4.1.0, exome dataset; n= 730,947) was conducted by jointly analyzing cases from our cohort and additional cases from extension cohorts (n = 4,796).
4) The PM1 criterion was applied if the variant was located in a mutational hotspot or critical functional domain for the gene. This was determined using DiscoVari, the Cardiomyopathy Variant Curation Expert Panel from ClinGen, and/or literature evidence **[18, 19]**. For *MYH7*, the relevant transcripts analyzed were ENST00000355349 and NM_000257.4, covering codons 167 to 931. In the case of *MYBPC3*, the analysis focused on transcripts ENST00000545968 and NM_000256.3, specifically targeting codons 485 to 502 and 1248 to 1266. For *TNNI3*, the key

transcripts used were ENST00000344887 and NM_000363.5, covering codons 141 to 209. For *TNNT2*, the transcripts ENST00000367318 (codons 79 to 179), and ENST00000656932.1/NM_001276345.2 (codons 89 to 189) were included in the analysis.

5) PM2 criterion was applied if population variant allele frequency in gnomAD 4.1.0 (genome dataset) was <0.0001 for autosomal dominant and <0.01 for recessive inheritance, while accounting for Grpmax filtering allele frequencies (95% confidence) as ancestry-specific allele frequencies **[20]**.
6) The PM5 criterion was applied when the variant incorporated a novel missense change at an amino acid residue where a different missense change is determined to be pathogenic in ClinVar or Leiden Open Variation Database v.3.0 supported by literature **[12, 21]**.
7) The PP1 criterion was applied when the variant segregated with disease amongst family members. According to the ClinGen guidelines, in cardiomyopathies with reduced penetrance, PP1 is applied depending on the number of affected individuals demonstrating co-segregation with the variant (not including the proband). Specifically, PP1 supporting is applied when co-segregation is observed in a single affected family member, PP1 moderate for 2-3 affected members, and PP1 strong for ≥4 affected members **[22]**.
8) The PP2 criterion was defined as a missense variant in a gene with a low rate of benign missense variation, where missense variants are a known mechanism of disease. Based on ClinGen Cardiomyopathy Expert Panel Specifications to the ACMG/AMP Variant Interpretation Guidelines in the Criteria Specification Registry for cardiomyopathy **[19]**, PP2 was applied only to variants in the gene *TPM1*.
9) The PP3 criterion for missense variants which requires multiple lines of computational evidence supporting a deleterious effect on the gene was applied when all three pathogenicity scores

(CADD v1.7, REVEL, and AlphaMissense.v2023.hg38) reached pre-defined thresholds [**23-25**] These thresholds were adopted from the ClinGen recommendations for CADD (>25.3) and REVEL (>0.644) **[26]**. As the threshold for AlphaMissense was not specified in this recommendation, it was derived from the original publication as a score >0.564 **[24]**.

Statistical Analysis

Frequency of variant reclassification was compared using Fisher exact test by year of clinical testing (before vs. after 2015 i.e., publication of ACMG guidelines), cardiomyopathy phenotype (HCM vs. DCM), ancestry (European vs. non-European), sex (male vs. female) and type of genetic test (single gene testing/single targeted panel vs. multiple panels/exome sequencing). Patients with LVNC, ACM, or RCM were excluded from subgroup analysis due to limited sample size. The proportion of variants reclassified from VUS to P/LP and from P/LP to VUS was also compared using Fisher exact test. A p-value <0.05 was considered significant. Burden analysis was performed by comparing the frequency of each variant in cases versus controls, with allele count and allele number extracted for each variant from gnomAD v4.1.0 exome dataset. Fisher exact test was used to assess the difference in allele frequencies between cases and the gnomAD v4.1.0 exome dataset used as controls. Following the guidelines of the Cardiomyopathy Variant Curation Expert Panel from ClinGen, the strength of evidence was classified based on the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval (CI) for the odds ratio (OR), with strong evidence requiring a lower bound of ≥20, moderate evidence requiring ≥10, and supporting evidence requiring ≥5, and anything below 5 considered not met.

RESULTS

Study cohort characteristics

The baseline characteristics of the study cohort (n=227) are summarized in **Table 1**. Among the participants, 133 (59%) were male; 64% were of European descent, 25% were of Asian descent, 10% were of African descent, and 1% were of mixed descent or other ancestries. Of 227 participants, 203 underwent one or more gene panel testing, 4 underwent whole exome sequencing (WES), and 20 underwent other types of genetic tests. The 227 patients harbored a total of 382 variants (110 P/LP, 272 VUS) (**Supplementary Table S1**). 105 participants (46.3%) harbored at least one P/LP variant, 122 (53.7%) harbored only VUS, and 34 (15%) harbored a combination of P/LP variants and VUS. Three variants that were found in two families each - *MYBPC3* (c.442G>A, p.Gly148Arg), *MYH7* (c.1759G>A, p.Asp587Asn) and *LMNA* (c.868G>A, p.Glu290Lys) were reported differently for each family by the clinical laboratory i.e., P/LP for one family and VUS in another family.

Reinterpretation of variant pathogenicity

Reclassification of P/LP variants: After reinterpretation, 12 of 110 P/LP (10.9%) variants were downgraded to VUS in 14 of 227 patients (6.2%) **(Table 2)**. Genes affected by the downgrade included *MYH7* (5 variants), *MYBPC3* (4 variants), and one variant each in *LMNA*, *DSG2*, and *RRAGD*. Notably, the *MYBPC3* c.3628-41_3628-17del (Δ25bp) variant was identified in six South Asian cases. The criteria primarily contributing to downgrading of P/LP variants were an allele frequency higher than expected in gnomAD (n=7), the variant not being in a mutational hotspot or critical functional gene domain (n=5), the variant not being predicted as deleterious by *in silico* tools (n=4), the variant recently reported as VUS in ClinVar (n=3), and failure to meet *MYH7*-specific ACMG/AMP criteria (n=1) (**Figure 1a**).

Reclassification of VUS: 37 of 272 VUS (13.6%) were upgraded to P/LP in 35 of 227 patients (15.4%) (**Table 3**). Genes affected by the upgrade included *ACTC1* (1 variant), *ACTN2* (2 variants), *LMNA* (1 variant), *MYBPC3* (2 variants), *MYH7* (13 variants), *NEXN* (3 variants), *PLN* (1 variant), *TNNC1* (1 variant), *TNNI3* (2 variants), *TNNT2* (4 variants), *TPM1* (3 variants), *TTN* (1 variant), and *VCL* (2 variants). The primary criteria contributing to upgrading of VUS to P/LP were variant location in a mutational hotspot for the gene (n=23), variant interpretation as deleterious by modern *in silico* prediction tools (n=19), a novel missense change occurring at an amino acid residue where a different pathogenic missense change had been observed before (n=11), a change in the gene association with cardiomyopathy according to ClinGen (n=8), published experimental findings suggesting that the variant affects gene function (n=7), co-segregation with disease in multiple affected family members (n=6), the variant being *de novo* (n=4), the variant being recently reported as pathogenic in ClinVar (n=2), and the finding of a different variant that results in the same amino acid change being recently reported as pathogenic in ClinVar (n=1) (**Figure 1b**). 47 VUS were downgraded to B/LB variants, but these were not further evaluated since they do not reflect a clinically actionable change. An overview of variant reclassification frequency is provided in **Figure 2a**.

Variant burden analysis

Among the 37 variants that were upgraded from VUS to P/LP **(Supplementary Table 3)**, 11 distinct variants (in 27 cases) were identified across several extension cardiomyopathy cohorts (n=4,547) **(Table 2)**. Burden analysis confirmed 10 out of the 37 reclassified variants also met ACMG PS4 criterion for higher burden in cases compared to controls (gnomAD v4.1.0, exome dataset) (**Table 2**). The burden analysis yielded strong evidence for six variants, moderate evidence for three variants, and supporting

evidence for one variant. Variants that were reclassified from P/LP to VUS were not included in the burden analysis, as the majority were downgraded due to high population allele frequency.

Patient level reclassification: Overall, the variant reclassifications affected 49 of 227 patients (21.6%) (**Figure 2b**). 15.5% of patients with only P/LP variants had one or more variants downgraded to a VUS. 23.8% of patients with only VUS had one or more variants upgraded to P/LP. 26.5% of patients with a combination of P/LP variants and VUS had either a downgrade of their P/LP variants and/or upgrade of their VUS in the same patient resulting in a change in affected gene.

Of note, only 8 reclassified variants (*MYBPC3* c.3628-41_3628-17del, *MYH7* c.1759G>A, p.Asp587Asn, *MYH7* c.3667G>A p.Glu1223Lys, *MYH7* c.4276G>A p.Glu1426Lys, *MYH7* c.2683C>G p.Gln895Glu, *NEXN* c.1473+1G>T, *ACTN2* c.784-2A>G and *MYBPC3* c.442G>A, p.Gly148Arg) in 12 patients had been previously reported back by the clinical genetic testing laboratory at the time of our study. Among these variants, the *MYH7* c.3667G>A p.Glu1223Lys reclassification was initiated by the clinical laboratory, and *ACTN2* c.784-2A>G reclassification was prompted by the patient's clinical team. For the remaining variants, the reasons triggering reclassification were not available.

Frequency of variant reclassification by subgroups

The year of clinical testing was known for 358 variants. In this group, frequency of variant reclassification did not vary by year of clinical testing i.e. before or after 2015 (**Figure 3a and 3b).** Additionally, there were no significant differences in the frequency of variant reclassification based on cardiomyopathy phenotype (HCM vs. DCM), ancestry (European vs. non-European descent), or sex

(male vs. female) (all $p > 0.05$; **Figure 4)**. Variants identified using single gene/single targeted panel testing however showed a higher likelihood of being downgraded from P/LP to VUS compared to variants identified using multiple panels or exome sequencing ($p = 0.01$).

DISCUSSION

We conducted a systematic reinterpretation of variants identified on clinical genetic testing in a real-world cohort of 227 pediatric cardiomyopathy patients. The frequency of clinically actionable variant reclassification was 12.8% affecting 21.6% patients. This included downgrading of 10.9% P/LP variants to VUS and upgrading of 13.6% VUS to P/LP variants. Previous pediatric studies have reported a rate of variant reclassification ranging from 8.9%-10.3% in 71-128 patients **[9, 10].** Our study with a larger cohort size reveals a somewhat higher reclassification rate and reinforces the importance of routine reinterpretation of variants on follow-up.

A detailed description of evaluation of variant pathogenicity is important to guide confidence in pathogenicity predictions **[27]**. In our study, we examined the criteria predominantly affecting the change in pathogenicity of the variants based on the ACMG evaluation methodology. The most common criterion for reclassification of a variant from P/LP to VUS was a higher-than-expected population allele frequency. The increase in genome sequencing including those of previously under-represented populations has enabled more accurate assessment of variant frequencies in the general population **[28, 29]**. Further, population-specific databases are increasingly being utilized **[30]**, which continues to improve the accuracy of variant frequency assessments across different ancestries and will continue to enhance the precision of pathogenicity evaluation with time. The most common criterion for

reclassification of a variant from VUS to P/LP was location of the variant in a mutational hotspot for the gene. Often the evaluation of a hotspot involves determining whether a variant is located within a constitutive domain of the protein or assessing the role of the domain in which the variant is located, based on literature and experimental data. In this study, reclassification was carried out using the hotspots defined by DiscoVari, the Cardiomyopathy Variant Curation Expert Panel from ClinGen, and published literature where hotspots had been identified [**18, 19**]. The number of genes with defined hotspots is still limited, and future efforts may enable the accurate assessment of variant hotspots in additional genes. Segregation analysis of the variant in family members and re-evaluation of inheritance contributed to a change in pathogenicity in 10 out of 81 variants (12.3%). This constitutes a substantial proportion, and as recommended in the ACMG statement **[8]**, reclassification should include a reassessment of familial phenotype and variant inheritance on follow-up.

An important strength of our analysis was the ability to leverage several additional independent and diverse cohorts with detailed clinical annotation not routinely available in ClinVar and other public databases that helped us confirm that several of the reclassified VUS were in fact enriched in cases compared to controls on burden analysis (PS4 criterion). Therefore, it is crucial to flag variants with the potential for reclassification and to document the criteria that have the potential to change over time. It is equally important to revisit not just variant pathogenicity but also the availability of updated gene testing panels that may capture disease-associated genes that were not captured at the time of previous genetic testing. The ClinGen curation of the literature and new evidence serve an important role in informing the size and nature of gene panels.

In our study, the *MYBPC3* c.3628-41_3628-17del (Δ25bp) intronic deletion was reclassified from pathogenic to a VUS. This 25-base pair deletion is located within intron 32 of the *MYBPC3* gene and is observed in 4% to 8% of individuals of South Asian ancestry **[31, 32]**. Given its allele frequency which exceeds the incidence of pediatric cardiomyopathy, this variant was reclassified to a VUS (BS1 criterion). It is now known that this variant alone without *MYBPC3* c.1224-52G>A as part of a haplotype is not sufficient to produce a phenotype **[33]**, although in the adult population, it has been associated with myocardial diastolic dysfunction **[34]**.

There were no significant differences in the proportion of patients reclassified before and after 2015, when the ACMG/AMP guidelines were first published. Of note, 2 of 11 variants (18%) identified on clinical testing in 2022, the most recent year included, showed a change in pathogenicity within 2 years of clinical reporting. The downgrading of *RRAGD* c.289_303del p.Thr97_Cys101del from LP to VUS was based on the application of in silico tools (PP3), which indicated that the variant was not deleterious. Conversely, the upgrading from VUS to LP of *MYH7* c.1423C>A p.Gln475Lys was because of evidence of a mutational hotspot at the codon (PM1) and a differential missense change at the same codon (*MYH7* c.1425G>T p.Gln475His), which had been previously reported as pathogenic (PM5) in 2022, further supported by in silico analysis using AlphaMissense issued in 2023 (PP3). Hence, it is important to reevaluate variants every few years due to rapid advances in genomic characterization of cases and controls. In this regard, there remains a gap in regular reinterpretation of genetic variants by testing labs. Only 8 of the 49 variants reclassified by us were reported back to the clinical team by the original testing laboratory. The ACMG and the other reports recommend that clinical laboratories reevaluate variants at least every three to five years and the costs of recontacting physicians can be built into original testing

costs **[8, 35, 36]**. The Canadian College of Medical Geneticists recommends that laboratories reanalyze variants when a healthcare provider initiates the request [**37**]. This is important because laboratories do not always have access to updated family phenotype information. This emphasizes that periodic reinterpretation should, where feasible, be built into the ongoing clinical care of patients by their healthcare providers. The ACMG in its most recent policy statement emphasizes that "re-contact is a shared responsibility" **[38]**, indicating that both clinicians and clinical laboratories should take on an increasing role in assessing and communicating variant reinterpretations to patients. In addition, patients and families should be advised to notify their physician if family genotype or phenotype information changes on follow-up.

The present analysis revealed that variants identified using single gene / single targeted panel showed a significantly higher reclassification rate compared to multiple panels, primarily driven by a greater proportion of variants that were downgraded from P/LP to VUS. Given the high degree of genetic heterogeneity with overlap in genetic etiology between different cardiomyopathies, this finding suggests that comprehensive genetic testing is more likely to identify true P/LP variants with fewer false-positives compared to targeted gene panels. In the future, it may be useful to consider developing a framework that considers the type of genetic test performed when determining which cases should be prioritized for variant reinterpretation.

It is important to acknowledge as a limitation that we were not privy to the exact rationale and criteria for the original variant classification used by the clinical laboratory (especially for ACMG criteria that were only published in 2015) or their threshold for recontacting physicians with updated reclassifications.

Clinical significance

The findings of a meaningful change in variant pathogenicity in 21.6% patients has clinical implications. The 14 patients in whom P/LP variants were downgraded will require all previously genotype-negative family members to return for ongoing clinical screening. For the 35 patients in whom VUS were upgraded to P/LP, family members can now be offered cascade genetic testing to determine who is at risk and needs ongoing clinical surveillance and who is genotype-negative and can be discharged from follow-up. Providing timely feedback to patients regarding changes in variant classification can lead to changes in follow-up protocols and may improve prognosis for other family members. A re-evaluation system for a broad range of variants, including those that emerge as children transition into adulthood is essential given the long-term prognosis of pediatric patients.

Conclusions

One in 5 patients with childhood onset cardiomyopathy had a clinically actionable change in variant pathogenicity on follow-up that impacts clinical and genetic family screening recommendations. This highlights the importance of serial reevaluation of variant pathogenicity by clinical providers as well as by clinical genetic testing laboratories.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the patients and families participating in the Labatt Family Heart Centre Biobank at the Hospital for Sick Children for access to study data. Part of this research was made possible through access to the data generated by the 2025 French Genomic Medicine Initiative.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

This project received support from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research's Canadian Heart Function Alliance Network Grant (HFN 181992) (SM), the Ted Rogers Centre for Heart Research (SM, RJ), and the Heart & Stroke Foundation of Canada / Robert M Freedom Chair of Cardiovascular Science (SM). TS was funded by the Japan Heart Foundation Research Grant, Canadian Heart Function Alliance, and Philip Witchel Research Fellowship in Heart Failure at the Hospital for Sick Children. CS was funded by the German Cardiac Society, the German Centre for Cardiovascular Research, and the Dr. Rolf M. Schwiete Foundation. PSD was funded by the Department of Biotechnology (BT/PR45262/MED/12/955/2022). VJR was funded by ICMR-SRF (3/1/1 (8)/CVD/2020-NCD-1).

DISCLOSURES

SM is on the Scientific Advisory Board of Bristol Myers Squibb, Rocket Pharmaceuticals, and Tenaya Therapeutics. The remaining authors declare that they have no competing interests.

ETHICS APPROVAL

The study was approved by the Institutional Research Ethics Board of The Hospital for Sick Children. Written informed consent to participate was obtained from all patients and/or their parents/legal guardians. The study protocol adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki.

DATA AVAILABILITY

De-identified data analyzed in this study are available in the main and supplemental tables, and additional data are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

TS, RL, and SM conceptualized and planned the study, performed data analysis, drafted the initial manuscript, and made significant revisions. RA collected the clinical data. PX, LZ and RJ assisted with bioinformatics and clinical data analysis. CS, EMB, KH, NRB, EAT, PSD, VJR, JI, and NH contributed variant data interpretation from their respective cardiomyopathy cohorts. SM secured funding for the project. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

REFERENCES

1. Watkins H, Ashrafian H, Redwood C. Inherited cardiomyopathies. N Engl J Med. 2011;364:1643–1656.

2. Morimoto S. Sarcomeric proteins and inherited cardiomyopathies. Cardiovasc Res. 2008;77:659–666.

3. Miron A, Lafreniere-Roula M, Steve Fan C-P, Armstrong KR, Dragulescu A, Papaz T, Manlhiot C, Kaufman B, Butts RJ, Gardin L, et al. A Validated Model for Sudden Cardiac Death Risk Prediction in Pediatric Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. Circulation. 2020;142:217–229.

4. Lafreniere-Roula M, Bolkier Y, Zahavich L, Mathew J, George K, Wilson J, Stephenson EA, Benson LN, Manlhiot C, Mital S. Family screening for hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: Is it time to change practice guidelines? Eur Heart J. 2019;40:3672–3681.

5. Alfares AA, Kelly MA, McDermott G, Funke BH, Lebo MS, Baxter SB, Shen J, McLaughlin HM, Clark EH, Babb LJ, et al. Results of clinical genetic testing of 2,912 probands with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy: expanded panels offer limited additional sensitivity. Genet Med. 2015;17:880–888.

6. Ommen SR, Ho CY, Asif IM, Balaji S, Burke MA, Day SM, Dearani JA, Epps KC, Evanovich L, Ferrari VA, et al. 2024 AHA/ACC/AMSSM/HRS/PACES/SCMR Guideline for the Management of Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy: A Report of the American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. Circulation. 2024;149:e1239–e1311.

7. Arbelo E, Protonotarios A, Gimeno JR, Arbustini E, Barriales-Villa R, Basso C, Bezzina CR, Biagini E, Blom NA, de Boer RA, et al. 2023 ESC Guidelines for the management of cardiomyopathies. Eur Heart J. 2023;44:3503–3626.

8. Deignan JL, Chung WK, Kearney HM, Monaghan KG, Rehder CW, Chao EC, ACMG Laboratory Quality Assurance

Committee. Points to consider in the reevaluation and reanalysis of genomic test results: a statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). Genet Med. 2019;21:1267–1270.

9. Westphal DS, Pollmann K, Marschall C, Wacker-Gussmann A, Oberhoffer-Fritz R, Laugwitz K-L, Ewert P, Wolf CM. It Is Not Carved in Stone-The Need for a Genetic Reevaluation of Variants in Pediatric Cardiomyopathies. J Cardiovasc Dev Dis. 2022;9:41.

10. Cherny S, Olson R, Chiodo K, Balmert LC, Webster G. Changes in genetic variant results over time in pediatric cardiomyopathy and electrophysiology. J Genet Couns. 2021;30:229–236.

11. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D, Das S, Gastier-Foster J, Grody WW, Hegde M, Lyon E, Spector E, et al. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17:405–424.

12. Arbustini E, Behr ER, Carrier L, van Duijn C, Evans P, Favalli V, van der Harst P, Haugaa KH, Jondeau G, Kääb S, et al. Interpretation and actionability of genetic variants in cardiomyopathies: a position statement from the European Society of Cardiology Council on cardiovascular genomics. Eur Heart J. 2022;43:1901–1916.

13. Rehm HL, Berg JS, Brooks LD, Bustamante CD, Evans JP, Landrum MJ, Ledbetter DH, Maglott DR, Martin CL, Nussbaum RL, et al. ClinGen--the Clinical Genome Resource. N Engl J Med. 2015;372:2235–2242.

14. Papaz T, Liston E, Zahavich L, Stavropoulos DJ, Jobling RK, Kim RH, Reuter M, Miron A, Oechslin E, Mondal T, et al. Return of genetic and genomic research findings: experience of a pediatric biorepository. BMC Med Genomics. 2019;12:173.

15. Kelly MA, Caleshu C, Morales A, Buchan J, Wolf Z, Harrison SM, Cook S, Dillon MW, Garcia J, Haverfield E, et al. Adaptation and validation of the ACMG/AMP variant classification framework for

MYH7-associated inherited cardiomyopathies: recommendations by ClinGen's Inherited Cardiomyopathy Expert Panel. Genet Med. 2018;20:351–359.

16. Inoue S, Ko T, Shindo A, Nomura S, Yamada T, Jimba T, Dai Z, Nakao H, Suzuki A, Kashimura T, et al. Association Between Clonal Hematopoiesis and Left Ventricular Reverse Remodeling in Nonischemic Dilated Cardiomyopathy. JACC: Basic to Translational Science. 2024;S2452302X24001839.

17. Jolfayi AG, Kohansal E, Ghasemi S, Naderi N, Hesami M, MozafaryBazargany M, Moghadam MH, Fazelifar AF, Maleki M, Kalayinia S. Exploring TTN variants as genetic insights into cardiomyopathy pathogenesis and potential emerging clues to molecular mechanisms in cardiomyopathies. Sci Rep. 2024;14:5313.

18. Kurzlechner LM, Kishnani S, Chowdhury S, Atkins SL, Moya-Mendez ME, Parker LE, Rosamilia MB, Tadros HJ, Pace LA, Patel V, et al. DiscoVari: A Web-Based Precision Medicine Tool for Predicting Variant Pathogenicity in Cardiomyopathy- and Channelopathy-Associated Genes. Circ Genom Precis Med. 2023;16:317–327.

19. Walsh R, Mazzarotto F, Whiffin N, Buchan R, Midwinter W, Wilk A, Li N, Felkin L, Ingold N, Govind R, et al. Quantitative approaches to variant classification increase the yield and precision of genetic testing in Mendelian diseases: the case of hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Genome Med. 2019;11:5.

20. Walsh R, Thomson KL, Ware JS, Funke BH, Woodley J, McGuire KJ, Mazzarotto F, Blair E, Seller A, Taylor JC, et al. Reassessment of Mendelian gene pathogenicity using 7,855 cardiomyopathy cases and 60,706 reference samples. Genet Med. 2017;19:192–203.

21. Fokkema IFAC, Kroon M, López Hernández JA, Asscheman D, Lugtenburg I, Hoogenboom J, den Dunnen JT. The LOVD3 platform: efficient genome-wide sharing of genetic variants. Eur J Hum Genet. 2021;29:1796–1803.

22. Biesecker LG, Byrne AB, Harrison SM, Pesaran T, Schäffer AA, Shirts BH, Tavtigian SV, Rehm HL, ClinGen Sequence Variant Interpretation Working Group. ClinGen guidance for use of the PP1/BS4 co-segregation and PP4 phenotype specificity criteria for sequence variant pathogenicity classification. Am J Hum Genet. 2024;111:24–38.

23. Kircher M, Witten DM, Jain P, O'Roak BJ, Cooper GM, Shendure J. A general framework for estimating the relative pathogenicity of human genetic variants. Nat Genet. 2014;46:310–315.

24. Cheng J, Novati G, Pan J, Bycroft C, Žemgulytė A, Applebaum T, Pritzel A, Wong LH, Zielinski M, Sargeant T, et al. Accurate proteome-wide missense variant effect prediction with AlphaMissense. Science. 2023;381:eadg7492.

25. Ioannidis NM, Rothstein JH, Pejaver V, Middha S, McDonnell SK, Baheti S, Musolf A, Li Q, Holzinger E, Karyadi D, et al. REVEL: An Ensemble Method for Predicting the Pathogenicity of Rare Missense Variants. Am J Hum Genet. 2016;99:877–885.

26. Pejaver V, Byrne AB, Feng B-J, Pagel KA, Mooney SD, Karchin R, O'Donnell-Luria A, Harrison SM, Tavtigian SV, Greenblatt MS, et al. Calibration of computational tools for missense variant pathogenicity classification and ClinGen recommendations for PP3/BP4 criteria. Am J Hum Genet. 2022;109:2163–2177.

27. Harrison SM, Rehm HL. Is "likely pathogenic" really 90% likely? Reclassification data in ClinVar. Genome Med. 2019;11:72.

28. 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Auton A, Brooks LD, Durbin RM, Garrison EP, Kang HM, Korbel JO, Marchini JL, McCarthy S, McVean GA, et al. A global reference for human genetic variation. Nature. 2015;526:68–74.

29. Liu Y, Wang H, Wang X, Liu J, Li J, Wang X, Zhang Y, Bai Z, Zhou Q, Wu Y, et al. Prevalence and reclassification of BRCA1 and BRCA2 variants in a large, unselected Chinese Han breast cancer cohort. J Hematol Oncol. 2021;14:18.

30. Tadaka S, Kawashima J, Hishinuma E, Saito S, Okamura Y, Otsuki A, Kojima K, Komaki S, Aoki Y, Kanno T, et al. jMorp: Japanese Multi-Omics Reference Panel update report 2023. Nucleic Acids Res. 2024;52:D622–D632.

31. Dhandapany PS, Sadayappan S, Xue Y, Powell GT, Rani DS, Nallari P, Rai TS, Khullar M, Soares P, Bahl A, et al. A common MYBPC3 (cardiac myosin binding protein C) variant associated with cardiomyopathies in South Asia. Nat Genet. 2009;41:187–191.

32. Bazrafshan S, Sibilia R, Girgla S, Viswanathan SK, Puckelwartz MJ, Sangha KS, Singh RR, Kakroo M, Jandarov R, Harris DM, et al. South Asian-Specific MYBPC3 Δ25bp Deletion Carriers Display Hypercontraction and Impaired Diastolic Function Under Exercise Stress. Front Cardiovasc Med. 2021;8:766339.

33. Harper AR, Bowman M, Hayesmoore JBG, Sage H, Salatino S, Blair E, Campbell C, Currie B, Goel A, McGuire K, et al. Reevaluation of the South Asian MYBPC3Δ25bp Intronic Deletion in Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy. Circ Genom Precis Med. 2020;13:e002783.

34. Viswanathan SK, Puckelwartz MJ, Mehta A, Ramachandra CJA, Jagadeesan A, Fritsche-Danielson R, Bhat RV, Wong P, Kandoi S, Schwanekamp JA, et al. Association of Cardiomyopathy With MYBPC3 D389V and MYBPC3Δ25bpIntronic Deletion in South Asian Descendants. JAMA Cardiol. 2018;3:481–488.

35. Richards CS, Bale S, Bellissimo DB, Das S, Grody WW, Hegde MR, Lyon E, Ward BE, Molecular Subcommittee of the ACMG Laboratory Quality Assurance Committee. ACMG recommendations for standards for interpretation and reporting of sequence variations: Revisions 2007. Genet Med. 2008;10:294–300.

36. Stranneheim H, Lagerstedt-Robinson K, Magnusson M, Kvarnung M, Nilsson D, Lesko N, Engvall M, Anderlid B-M, Arnell H, Johansson CB, et al. Integration of whole genome sequencing into a healthcare setting: high diagnostic rates across multiple clinical entities in 3219 rare disease patients. Genome Med. 2021;13:40.

37. Hume S, Nelson TN, Speevak M, McCready E, Agatep R, Feilotter H, Parboosingh J, Stavropoulos DJ, Taylor S, Stockley TL, et al. CCMG practice guideline: laboratory guidelines for next-generation sequencing. J Med Genet. 2019;56:792–800.

38. David KL, Best RG, Brenman LM, Bush L, Deignan JL, Flannery D, Hoffman JD, Holm I, Miller DT, O'Leary J, et al. Patient re-contact after revision of genomic test results: points to consider-a statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). Genet Med. 2019;21:769–771.

Table 1. Baseline study cohort characteristics

Characteristics	N=227 (%)
Male	133 (58.6%)
Ancestry	
European	140 (61.7%)
Asian/South Asian	56 (24.7%)
African	22 (9.7%)
Mixed	5 (2.2%)
Unknown	4 (1.8%)
Cardiomyopathy phenotype	
DCM	104 (45.8%)
HCM	76 (33.5%)
LVNC	20 (8.8%)
RCM	10 (4.4%)
ACM	9 (4.0%)
Mixed type	8 (3.5%)
Type of test	
DCM panel	25 (11.0%)
HCM panel	54 (23.8%)
Multiple panels	124 (54.6%)
Whole exome sequencing	4 (1.8%)
Others	3 (1.3%)
Unknown	17 (7.5%)
Variants identified	
P/LP	110 (28.8%)
VUS	272 (71.2%)
Patient genotype	
Harbored P/LP variant	71 (31.2%)
Harbored VUS	122 (53.7%)
Harbored P/LP variant and VUS	34 (15.0%)

ACM; arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy, DCM; dilated cardiomyopathy, HCM; hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, LVNC; left ventricular non-compaction, RCM; restrictive cardiomyopathy, VUS; variant of uncertain significance.

Table 2. Pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants reclassified to VUS

Participant ID	Cardiomyopathy phenotype	Year of clinical test	Affected Gene	CDS Change	Amino Acid Change	Current ACMG criteria	Final variant classification
95	RCM	2016	*DSG2*	c.3039C>A	p.Tyr1013*	PVS1, BS1	VUS
216	DCM	2009	*LMNA*	c.1912G>A	p.Gly638Arg	PM1, PM2	VUS
73	DCM	2013	*MYBPC3*	c.1654G>T	p.Ala552Ser	PM2, PP1 (supporting)	VUS
26/76/101/116/145/175	DCM (3), RCM/HCM, HCM (2)	2010/2010/2013/2017/2018/2020	*MYBPC3*	c.3628-41_3628-17del	NA	PP1 (supporting), PP5, BS1	VUS*
59	HCM	2009	*MYBPC3*	c.3548T>G	p.Phe1183Cys	PM2, PP1 (supporting), PP3 (moderate)	VUS
211	HCM	2009	*MYBPC3*	c.2170C>T	p.Arg724Trp	PM1, PM2	VUS
62	DCM	2010	*MYH7*	c.1322C>G	p.Thr441Arg	PM1, PM2	VUS
67	DCM	2009	*MYH7*	c.5507C>T	p.Ser1836Leu	PM2	VUS
168	HCM	2009	*MYH7*	c.1003G>T	p.Ala335Ser	PM1, PM2	VUS
16	LVNC	Unknown	*MYH7*	c.732+1G>A	NA	PM2, PP5	VUS
209	LVNC/DCM	2021	*MYH7*	c.5395G>A	p.Glu1799Lys	PM2, PP3 (moderate)	VUS
12	DCM/RCM	2022	*RRAGD*	c.289_303del	p.Thr97_Cys101del	PM2, PM4	VUS

** One variant was reclassified by the clinical laboratory*
ACM; arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy, ACMG; American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics, CDS; coding sequence, CMP; cardiomyopathy, DCM; dilated cardiomyopathy, HCM; hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, LVNC; left ventricular non-compaction, RCM; restrictive cardiomyopathy, VUS; variant of uncertain significance.

Table 3. VUS reclassified to pathogenic or likely pathogenic

Participant ID	Cardiomyopathy phenotype	Year of clinical test	Affected Gene	CDS Change	Amino Acid Change	Current ACMG criteria	Final variant classification	ACMG PS4 criteria (supporting, moderate, strong, not met)
207	LVNC/DCM	2014	*ACTC1*	c.809G>A	p.Gly270Asp	PS2, PM1, PM2, PP3 (moderate)	Pathogenic	NA
150	DCM	2018	*ACTN2*	c.784-2A>G	NA	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic*	NA
167	DCM	Unknown	*ACTN2*	c.36C>G	p.Tyr12*	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	NA
87	DCM	2012	*LMNA*	c.868G>A	p.Glu290Lys	PS2, PM2, PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic†	Strong
213	HCM	2007	*MYBPC3*	c.442G>A	p.Gly148Arg	PM2, PP1 (strong), PP5	Likely pathogenic*†	Not met
217	HCM	2010	*MYBPC3*	c.1828G>A	p.Asp610Asn	PS3, PM1, PM2, PM5, PP3 (supporting)	Pathogenic	Strong
31	DCM	2011	*MYH7*	c.2171T>A	p.Ile724Asn	PS1, PM1, PM2, PP3 (moderate), PP5	Pathogenic	NA
57	DCM	2016	*MYH7*	c.5158A>G	p.Asn1720Asp	PM1, PM2, PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic	NA
115	DCM	2019	*MYH7*	c.3667G>A	p.Glu1223Lys	PM1, PM2, PM5, PP3 (supporting)	Likely pathogenic*	NA
126	DCM	2019	*MYH7*	c.4276G>A	p.Glu1426Lys	PS3, PM2, PP3 (moderate), PP5	Likely pathogenic*	NA

197	DCM	2022	*MYH7*	c.1423C>A	p.Gln475Lys	PM1, PM2, PM5, PP3 (supporting)	Likely pathogenic	NA
222	DCM	2009	*MYH7*	c.2683C>G	p.Gln895Glu	PM1, PM2, PP1 (strong)	Likely pathogenic*	NA
84	HCM	2017	*MYH7*	c.4136C>A	p.Ala1379Asp	PM1, PM2, PP1 (supporting), PP3 (supporting)	Likely pathogenic	Strong
151	HCM	Unknown	*MYH7*	c.530C>T	p.Thr177ile	PM1, PM2, PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic	Moderate
205	HCM	2006	*MYH7*	c.1759G>A	p.Asp587Asn	PM1, PM2, PM5	Likely pathogenic*†	Strong
221	HCM	2010	*MYH7*	c.1220G>T	p.Gly407Val	PM1, PM2, PM5, PP3 (supporting), PP5	Likely pathogenic	Strong
179	LVNC	2021	*MYH7*	c.1118C>A	p.Ala373Glu	PM1, PM2, PM5, PP3 (supporting)	Likely pathogenic	NA
202	LVNC	2015	*MYH7*	c.532G>A	p.Gly178Arg	PM1, PM2, PP1 (moderate), PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic	NA
79	LVNC/DCM	2015	*MYH7*	c.1180G>A	p.Asp394Asn	PM1, PM2, PM5	Likely pathogenic	NA
126	DCM	2019	*NEXN*	c.1473+1G>T	NA	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic*	NA
210	DCM	2015	*NEXN*	c.373C>T	p.Arg125*	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	NA
209	LVNC/DCM	2021	*NEXN*	c.201G>A	p.Trp67*	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	NA
54	HCM	2015	*PLN*	c.2T>C	p.Met1	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	NA
104	DCM	2018	*TNNC1*	c.376G>A	p.Glu126Lys	PS2, PM2	Likely pathogenic	Strong

5	RCM	2011	*TNNC1*	c.23C>T	p.Ala8Val	PS3, PM2, PP3 (supporting), PP5	Pathogenic	Supporting
117	DCM	2008	*TNNI3*	c.550G>A	p.Glu184Lys	PS2, PM1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	NA
76	RCM/HCM	2013	*TNNI3*	c.484C>T	p.Arg162Trp	PM1, PM2, PM5, PP5	Likely pathogenic	Moderate
14	DCM	Unknown	*TNNT2*	c.481C>T	p.Arg161Cys	PM1, PM2, PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic	NA
89	DCM	2016	*TNNT2*	c.552G>T	p.Lys184Asn	PM1, PM2, PP1 (supporting), PP3 (supporting)	Likely pathogenic	NA
137	DCM	2020	*TNNT2*	c.316G>A	p.Glu106Lys	PS3, PM1, PM2, PP3 (moderate), PP5	Pathogenic	NA
215	LVNC/DCM	2014	*TNNT2*	c.862C>T	p.Arg288Cys	PS3, PM1, PM5, PP5	Likely pathogenic	NA
28	DCM	2009	*TPM1*	c.45G>T	p.Lys15Asn	PS3, PM1, PM2, PP2, PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic	NA
151	HCM	Unknown	*TPM1*	c.413A>G	p.Glu138Gly	PM2, PM5, PP2, PP3 (strong)	Likely pathogenic	NA
161	HCM	2020	*TPM1*	c.560A>T	p.Glu187Val	PM1, PM2, PM5, PP2, PP3 (moderate)	Likely pathogenic	NA
106	DCM	2012	*TTN*	c.16353C>G	p.Tyr5451*	PVS1, PM2, PP1 (supporting)	Likely pathogenic	NA
101	DCM	2010	*VCL*	c.2949del	p.Gln971Profs*	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	NA
122	DCM	2018	*VCL*	c.313C>T	p.Arg105*	PVS1, PM2	Likely pathogenic	Strong

** Seven variants were reclassified by the clinical laboratory*

†3 variants were reported as P/LP in one family and as VUS in another family by the clinical testing laboratories.

ACM; arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy, ACMG; American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics, CDS; coding sequence, DCM; dilated cardiomyopathy, HCM; hypertrophic cardiomyopathy, LVNC; left ventricular non-compaction, NA; Not applicable, RCM; restrictive cardiomyopathy, VUS; variant of uncertain significance.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Criteria for variant reclassification. (a) Downgrading P/LP variants to VUS, **(b)** Upgrading VUS to P/LP variants.

ACMG, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; P/LP, Pathogenic/Likely pathogenic; VUS, variants of uncertain significance.

Figure 2. Variant and patient level reclassification: (**a**) ***Variant level reclassification***: Of 110 P/LP variants, 12 were downgraded to VUS (10.9%). Of 272 VUS, 37 were upgraded to P/LP (13.6%). In addition, 47 VUS were downgraded to B/LB. (**b**) ***Patient level reclassification***: Of 71 patients harboring only P/LP variants, 11 patients were downgraded to having only VUS. Of 122 patients harboring only VUS, 16 patients were upgraded to having only P/LP variants and 13 patients were upgraded to P/LP+VUS. Of 34 patients harboring both P/LP+VUS, 2 patients were downgraded to only VUS, 3 patients were upgraded to only P/LP variants and *4 patients had a change in the gene harboring a P/LP variant.

B/LB, Benign/Likely benign; P/LP, Pathogenic/Likely pathogenic; VUS, variant of unceratin significance.

Figure 3. Variant reclassification by year of clinical testing. The graphs show the **(a)** frequency of variants reclassified by year of clinical testing (2005-2022); **(b)** percentage of variants reclassified by year of clinical testing. Year of testing was known for 358 variants. The average annual reclassification rate was 15%.

Figure 4. Proportion of variants reclassified by year of clinical testing, cardiomyopathy phenotype, ancestry, and sex. Proportion of variants reclassified did not differ by year of testing (before and after 2015), cardiomyopathy phenotype (HCM vs DCM), ancestry (European vs non-European descent), and sex (males vs females) ($p > 0.05$). Variants identified using single gene/targeted panels showed a higher frequency of P/LP variants being downgraded to VUS compared to variants identified using multiple panels or exome sequencing ($p = 0.01$). Blue bar = % of VUS upgraded to P/LP; black bar = % of P/LP variants downgraded to VUS.

DCM, dilated cardiomyopathy; HCM, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table S1 All cardiomyopathy variants reevaluated (n=382)

Table S2 Reclassified VUS observed in extension cohorts

Table S3 Burden analysis for upgraded VUS in extension cohorts

Figure 1.

a.


Number of criteria for downgrading P/LP variants to VUS
Allele frequency higher than expected (BS1)
Variant not in mutational hotspot or critical functional gene domain (PM1)
Variant not deleterious using silico prediction (PP3)
Variant reported as VUS by ClinVar (PP5)
MYH7-specific ACMG criteria not met
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

b.


Number of criteria for upgrading VUS to P/LP variants
Variant in mutational hotspot for gene (PM1)
Variant classified as deleterious using in silico prediction (PP3)
Novel missense change at an amino acid residue where a different missense change previously determined to be pathogenic (PM5)
Change in gene association with cardiomyopathy by ClinGen (PVS1)
Experimental studies have shown that this variant affects gene function (PS3)
Co-segregation with disease in multiple affected family members (PP1)
Variant is de novo (PS2)
Variant recently reported as pathogenic by ClinVar (PP5)
Variant results in the same amino acid change as a previously established pathogenic variant regardless of nucleotide change (PS1)
0
5
10
15
20
25

Figure 2.

a.


Variant reinterpretation
110 P/LP variants
272 VUS
37 VUS to P/LP
12 P/LP to VUS
47 VUS to B/LB

b.


Variant reinterpretation
71 patients (P/LP variants)
34 patients (P/LP+VUS)
122 patients (VUS)
19 patients (VUS to P/LP)
13 patients (VUS to P/LP+VUS)
4 patients*
13 patients (P/LP to VUS)

Figure 3.

a.


Variants reclassified
Variants not reclassified
Number of variants
50
40
30
20
10
0
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
Year of genetic testing

b.


% variants reclassified
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%
0%
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
Year of genetic testing

Figure 4.


20%
15%
10%
5%
0%
% variants reclassified
Before 2015
After 2015
HCM
DCM
European descent
Non-European descent
Male
Female
Single panels
Multiple panels
% variants reclassified (Upgrade)
% variants reclassified (Downgrade)