Practice-Based Insights into Adult Genetics: High Diagnostic Yield, Demographic Determinants, and Patterns of Test Utilization in Over 7,000 Patients

Jessica I Gold MD PhD[1,2], Yehuda Elkaim BS[3], Stephanie Asher MS CGC[4], Anna Raper MS CGC[4], Courtney Condit MS CGC[4,5], Zoe Bogus MS CGC[4], Isaac Elysee MS CGC[4], Laura Hennessy MS CGC[4], Emma Kennedy MS CGC[4], Teresa Chai MS CGC[4], Stacey Cohen MS CGC[4], Brielle N. Gehringer MS CGC[4], Shannon M Gray MS CGC[4], Ala Streater BS[4], Eamon Toye BS[3], Colleen Kripke DPT MSA[4], Katherine L Nathanson MD[4,6], Mersedeh Rohanizadegan MD[4], Staci Kallish DO[4], and Theodore G Drivas MD PhD[4,7,*]

[1] Division of Clinical Genetics, Department of Pediatrics, Cohen Children's Medical Center, Northwell Health, Great Neck, NY, 11021, USA

[2] Institute of Health System Science, Feinstein Institutes for Medical Research, Northwell Health, Manhasset, NY, 11030, USA

[3] Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, USA

[4] Division of Translational Medicine and Human Genetics, Department of Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, USA

[5] Kaiser Permanente, Tysons Corners Medical Center, McLean, VA, 22102, USA

[6] Abramson Cancer Center, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, USA

[7] Department of Genetics, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, 19104, USA

[*]Corresponding author:

theodore.drivas@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

https://bsky.app/profile/tdrivas.bsky.social

Mailing Address: 3400 Civic Center Boulevard, Smilow Center for Translational Research, Room 12-112, Philadelphia, PA 19104

Abstract

Precision medicine increasingly relies on genetic testing for individualized care, yet the practice patterns of genetic evaluation in adults remain under-characterized and few guidelines exist to inform appropriate testing. We analyzed eight years of electronic health record (EHR)-linked data from a high-volume adult genetics clinic (>8,000 visits) within a major academic health system to define referral patterns, test utilization, and genetic testing outcomes across indications and demographic groups. Genetic testing was ordered for 52% of all new patients, with significant indication-specific variation in ordering propensity. Overall, 24% of all tests returned a diagnostic result. Diagnostic yield differed markedly by testing modality: whole-exome sequencing yielded diagnoses in 41% of patients, whereas next-generation sequencing panels, the most frequently ordered testing type, yielded diagnoses in only 17%. Although diagnostic yield declined with increasing patient age it remained above 16% in every age stratum, with the yield of exome/genome sequencing remaining above 30% across all age groups. Outcomes varied significantly by referral indication, with some yielding high rates of pathogenic findings, and others more often yielding negative or uncertain results. Operational factors materially shaped practice: test type and laboratory utilization shifted significantly over time in step with payer and testing lab policy changes. Together, these practice-based data establish adult genetics as a high-yield and important clinical domain. Our findings provide actionable evidence to inform age- and indication-aware triage, guide workforce planning, promote adult-focused practice guidelines, and advance the integration of genomic medicine into routine adult patient care.

Introduction

Precision medicine, often contingent upon genetic diagnosis, is becoming increasingly common in adult clinical care.[1] Health systems are now ordering millions of genetic tests, from single-gene assays to exome and genome sequencing.[2] However, primary-care and internal-medicine-trained clinicians report lower preparedness than pediatric colleagues in interpreting genetic test results, the adult-focused genetics workforce is extremely limited, and adult-specific, evidence-based guidelines for genetics evaluation and testing are sparse.[3–6] This mismatch is compounded by limited systematic knowledge of the adult genetics landscape – who is seen, what is tested, and with what yield – hindering workforce planning, guideline development, and the effective integration of genetics into routine adult medical care.

Studies of genetic testing in the general adult patient population – principally through exome and genome sequencing – are still limited in number and size but consistently report meaningful diagnostic yields ranging from 17-30% across diverse settings and indications, comparable to those reported in pediatric populations.[7–10] In fact, in our recent study of critically ill young adults, genomic diagnoses were both common and actionable**,** with one quarter of adults aged 18-40 harboring a genetic diagnosis casual for their ICU presentation.[11] Together these studies highlight the diagnostic utility and actionability of genetic testing in adult patients, but only very few studies have documented how testing is actually deployed in routine adult practice.[3,6]

Against this backdrop, most of what we know about general adult genetics evaluation and testing practices comes from a very small number of longitudinal clinic series and workforce perspectives. The only two large single-center studies of adult genetics clinical practices published to-date describe scope and referral patterns but provide limited detail on testing behavior or diagnostic outcomes.[12,13] Additional service-delivery reports have documented pronounced wait times for adult genetics appointments and confirm unmet demand and operational strain, but they do not link who is seen to what is tested and what is found.[14,15]

Together, these observations underscore a pivotal moment for adult medical genetics: demand is rising and the clinical value is clear, yet we still lack a consolidated, practice-level picture of how adult genetics clinics organize care, deploy tests, and deliver results across indications. To address this gap, we analyze eight years of electronic health record (EHR)-linked data from a high-volume adult genetics clinic to map its catchment and patient mix, quantify testing use by

demographics and clinical indications, track the evolution of test modalities and laboratory partnerships in the context of payer policy, EMR integration, and telehealth adoption, and to connect these choices to genetic testing outcomes – pathogenic findings, variants of uncertain significance, and negative results. By tracing the full pathway from referral to result, we aim to generate the practice-level evidence needed to guide workforce planning, inform guideline development, and integrate genetics more effectively into routine adult clinical care.

Subjects, Materials, and Methods

Study population definition and data sources

This study was approved by the University of Pennsylvania's Institutional Review Board (protocol #850058). We obtained from the Epic Clarity database the complete list of all 8,355 patient visits at the UPHS Perelman Center for Advanced Medicine's Adult Genetics Clinic (Department Code 209) over an eight year period from 10/1/2016 to 9/30/2024, along with accompanying visit demographic information including patient age, EHR-reported gender, EHR-reported race and ethnicity, home address, and financial class for the visit. This information was joined with the internal clinical databases maintained by the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic documenting visit indications, whether genetic testing was sent, and the results of genetic testing. After joining, 2,749 patient visits had at least one missing data field, all of which were resolved by manual chart review. Clinical indications for patient visits were collapsed into 21 broad indication groups (**Table S1**) by a panel of genetics providers blinded to both patient demographic information and outcomes of genetic testing. Latitudes and longitudes were obtained from patient home addresses using the tool Geocodio.

Genetic Variant Classification

Genetic test results were classified as “pathogenic” if the variant identified was classified as pathogenic/likely pathogenic by the testing lab – for autosomal recessive conditions, two variants in the same gene were required with at least one classified as pathogenic/ likely pathogenic – and was consistent with the patient's presentation as determined by the clinical team at the time of result disclosure. Results were classified as “carrier” if a single pathogenic/likely pathogenic variant was identified in a gene associated with only autosomal recessive disease and no other pathogenic result had been reported. Results were classified as “candidate gene” if the testing lab had reported out only a variant in a candidate gene, i.e., a gene not definitively known to be associated with human disease, but suspicious enough to warrant reporting. Results were classified as variants of uncertain significance (VUS) if the lab reported only VUS(s). Lastly, genetic test reports that identified only likely-benign/benign variants or identified no causative variants, or whole exome sequencing (WES) and whole genome sequencing (WGS) results revealing only a secondary finding, were considered negative.

Definitions of race and ethnicity

Race and ethnicity of the study population were extracted as reported in the EHR. These data likely represent a combination of self-reported and clinician/staff-assigned identities. Prior studies suggest that, although inaccuracies exist, EHR-derived race and ethnicity is highly concordant with self-reported data.[16] Race and ethnicity represent two entirely separate demographic identifiers, however, due to small sample sizes, we chose to combine race and ethnicity identifiers as follows. Any patient with an EHR-derived ethnicity of "Hispanic or Latino," regardless of race, was collapsed into a single category, "Hispanic or Latino of any race" (n=281). For all patients without an EHR-derived ethnicity of "Hispanic or Latino," race/ethnicity categories were defined as follows. Patients with an EHR-derived race listed as "other" (n=136), "some other race" (n=70), "unknown" (n=679), or "patient declined" (n=45) were listed as "Other" (n=930). Patients with an EHR-derived race listed as "Black" (n=398) or "Black or African American" (n=217) were listed as "Black or African American" (n=615). Patients with an EHR-derived race listed as "American Indian" (n=6) or "American Indian or Alaskan Native" (n=11) were listed as "American Indian or Alaskan Native" (n=17). Patients with an EHR-derived race listed as "Pacific Island" (n=3) or "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" (n=1) were listed as "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" (n=4). Patients with an EHR-derived race listed as "Asian" (n=215) or "East Indian" (n=20) were listed as "Asian" (n=235). Patients with an EHR-derived race listed as "White" (n=6,246) were listed as "White" (n=6,246).

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out, as indicated, adjusting for covariates as described in the figure and table legends. For all analyses, two-sided p-values less than 0.05 were considered nominally significant. For analyses making multiple statistical comparisons, the Bonferroni-corrected p-value is reported, as described in the figure legends. All analyses were performed with R software, version 4.2.2.[17]

Results

Demographics of the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic

We first evaluated geographic and demographic characteristics of the 8,153 unique patient visits for 7,023 unique patients to the University of Pennsylvania Health System (UPHS) Adult Genetics Clinic between October 1, 2016, and September 30, 2024. The majority of patients originated from the greater Philadelphia metropolitan area (**Figure 1A**). While most patients clustered in or near Philadelphia, we observed substantial reach into surrounding regions, including parts of New Jersey, Delaware, and southeastern Pennsylvania. A smaller but notable number of patients traveled from further locations such as Baltimore, Washington D.C., and New York City, highlighting the clinic's regional draw. Patients ranged widely in age at time of visit, from adolescence to older adulthood, but the overall distribution skewed younger, with the highest density of visits occurring among adults under 50 years of age (**Figure 1B**). Two distinct peaks were observed: one around age 30 years and another around age 60 years, in both male and female patients, suggesting different referral patterns or clinical needs across the age spectrum.

The clinic saw more female than male patients overall (61.3% vs. 38.7%) (**Figure 1C**). The majority of patients self-identified as White (75%), with the next most frequent groups being "Other" (11.2%) and Black or African American (7.4%) (**Figure 1D**). Hispanic or Latino patients of any race comprised 3.4% of visits, followed by Asian patients (2.8%). Patients identifying as American Indian/Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander were rare (<0.3% combined). These proportions are consistent with known racial disparities in access to genetic services, as we have previously reported (manuscript under review), and highlight an ongoing need for improved outreach and equity in adult genetics care.

Most patients were commercially insured (75%), followed by those with Medicare (15.1%) and Medicaid (8.9%) (**Figure 1E**). Only 1% of visits were self-pay. The majority of visits were for new patient consultations, both in person or via telehealth, which together accounted for 86.4% of all encounters (**Figure 1F**). Follow-up visits comprised the remaining 13.6%, again including both in-person and telehealth formats. While most visits overall were conducted in person, telehealth accounted for 8.4% of all visits, with 5% of all visits being for new consultations by telehealth and 3.4% for follow-up by telehealth (**Figure 1F**). A sharp rise in telehealth visits was observed beginning in 2020, coinciding with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and local stay-at-home orders (**Figure S1**).[18] This rise was seen for both new patient and follow-up visits. Although

telehealth use declined in the years that followed, with most new patient visits returning to in-person formats, a small but substantial proportion of follow-up visits continued to be conducted via telehealth, highlighting its enduring role in the delivery of adult genetics care for established patients.

Distribution and temporal trends in indications for clinic visits

Patients were referred to the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic for a diverse array of clinical indications (**Figure 2A**). The most common categories included connective tissue disorders (19.2%), cancer genetics (18.4%), hypermobility (13.6%), multisystem disorders (12.1%), lysosomal storage disorders (6.5%), and vascular malformation disorders (5.3%). Referrals for hypermobility declined sharply and significantly over the study period (p<1e-04; OR 0.79 [0.77-0.80]), beginning in late 2019 (**Figure 2B**). This trend aligns with the implementation of new criteria for evaluation in our clinic in early 2020 which aimed to prioritize patients with more complex or multisystem presentations and reduce volume from lower-yield isolated hypermobility evaluations, for which there is no known genetic cause.[19] In contrast, as hypermobility referrals decreased, the clinic was able to accommodate patients with a broader range of referral indications. Significant increases were observed in referrals for cancer genetics (p<1e-04; OR 1.06 [1.05-1.07]), lysosomal storage disorders (p<1e-04; OR 1.06 [1.04-1.08]), chromosomal disorders (p<1e-04; OR 1.07 [1.04-1.10]), renal disorders (p<1e-04; OR 1.09 [1.06-1.13]), endocrine disorders (p=0.029; OR 1.06 [1.02-1.09]), lung disorders (p<1e-04; OR 1.10 [1.06-1.14]), and gastrointestinal disorders (p=7.6e-03; OR 1.14 [1.07-1.24]) during this time period. These increases suggest an intentional and effective broadening of the clinic's scope to better serve patients with diverse genetic conditions requiring evaluation by a genetics-trained provider.

Significant variation in patient age, race, and sex across clinical indication groups

Significant demographic differences were observed among patients referred for different clinical indications (**Figure 2C–F**). Patients referred for lysosomal storage disorders and lung disorders had the highest median ages (56 and 55 years, respectively), while those referred for hypermobility and cardiac disorders had the lowest (31 and 30 years, respectively, **Figure 2C**). After adjusting for EHR-reported sex, race, insurance class, and visit type, patients referred for cancer genetics (p<1e-04; beta 6.79 [5.46,8.12]), connective tissue disorders (p<1e-04; beta 2.10 [0.79,3.41]), lung disorders (p<1e-04; beta 5.97 [2.54,9.39]), lysosomal storage disorders (p<1e-04; beta 9.18 [7.10,11.25]), renal disorders (pe4.5e-03; beta 3.49 [0.74,6.24]), and vascular malformation disorders (3.0e-03; beta 2.70 [0.64,4.75]) were significantly older than the overall

clinic population. In contrast, patients referred for cardiac disorders (p=3.6e-02; beta -7.85 [-15.10,-0.61]), chromosomal disorders (p<1e-04; beta -6.35 [-9.07,-3.64]), general genetics (1.7e-04; beta -4.05 [-6.70,-1.40]), hypermobility (p<1e-04; beta -6.28 [-7.78,-4.78]), ID/DD/ASD (Intellectual Disability/Developmental Delay/Autism Spectrum Disorders, p<1e-04; beta -8.92 [-12.55,-5.28]), and multisystem disorders (p<1e-04; beta -2.47 [-3.98,-0.96]) were significantly younger than the overall clinic population, after correcting for multiple comparisons.

Examining EHR-reported patient race by indication group (**Figure 2D**), we found that patients evaluated for hypermobility were significantly more likely to have an EHR-reported race of Other (p<1e-04; OR 0.95[0.93-0.96]) and significantly less likely to have an EHR-reported race of Black or African American (p<1e-04; OR 1.09 [1.06-1.13]), by logistic regression after adjusting for EHR-reported sex, age, insurance class, visit type, and after correcting for multiple comparisons.

Significant differences in EHR-reported patient sex were also identified by indication group (**Figure 2E**). Patients referred for connective tissue disorders were significantly more likely to be male (p<1e-04; OR 1.55 [1.37–1.76]), while those referred for hypermobility were significantly less likely to be male (p<1e-04; OR 0.23 [0.19–0.28]), by logistic regression after adjusting for EHR-reported race, age, insurance class, visit type, and correcting for multiple comparisons.
Comparing visit type by indication group (**Figure 2F**) by logistic regression, adjusted for EHR-reported sex, race, age, and insurance class, we found that patients seen for certain clinical indications were significantly more likely to be seen for follow up visits (across both in person and telehealth visits) compared to the overall clinic population: lysosomal storage disorder (p<1e-04; OR 1.76[1.62-1.90]), metabolic disorder (p<1e-04; OR 1.28[1.19-1.38]), mitochondrial disease (p=5.7e-03; OR 1.31[1.17-1.47]), and multisystem disorders (p=0.043; OR 1.09[1.04-1.14). On the other hand, patients seen for hypermobility (p<1e-04; OR 1.10[1.07-1.12]), cancer genetics (p=6.7e-04; OR 1.07[1.04-1.09]), vascular malformation disorders (p=1.0e-03; OR 1.09[1.05-1.12]), lung disorders (p=4.4e-03; OR 1.12[1.07-1.18]), and renal disorders (p=0.015; OR 1.09[1.05-1.13]) were significantly more likely to be seen for new patient visits (both in person and telehealth) compared to the overall clinic population.

Higher genetic testing utilization among older patients and male patients

We next compared the likelihood of genetic testing being sent following evaluation. Overall, we found that genetic testing was completed in 52.1% of all new patients, and in 11.1% of all follow up patients during the study period (**Figure 3A**). Among new patient visits, male patients were

significantly more likely than females to undergo genetic testing (p=1.51e-03; OR 1.2[1.07-1.34]), even after adjusting for EHR-reported race, age, insurance class, and clinical indication (**Figure 3B**). Interestingly, we also found a significant positive correlation between patient age at time of new patient evaluation and likelihood of completing genetic testing (p=3.09e-10; OR 1.01[1.01-1.02], with the OR reflecting the per-year change in odds), even after adjusting for EHR-reported race, sex, insurance class, and clinical indication (**Figure 3C**). No significant differences were seen in genetic testing rates across different race/ancestry groups (**Figure 3D**).

Significant differences in genetic testing utilization by clinical indication group

Significant differences were seen across referral indications in the propensity to complete genetic testing after new-patient evaluation by logistic regression adjusted for age, race/ethnicity, sex, and insurance class (**Figure 3E**). Relative to the clinic-wide new-visit average, testing was more likely to be ordered for cancer genetics (p<1e-04; OR 1.56[1.34-1.81]), ID/DD/ASD (p=1.1e-03; OR 2.69[1.71-4.22]), and neuromuscular disorders (p=5.1e-04; OR 2.96[1.85-4.76]). In contrast, testing was less likely to be ordered for chromosomal disorders (p<1e-04; OR 0.36[0.26-0.49]), hypermobility (p<1e-04; OR 0.06[0.05-0.07]), lysosomal storage disorders (p<1e-04; OR 0.37[0.26-0.52]), and multisystem disorders (p<1e-04; OR 0.46[0.39-0.53]). Our data do not allow us to assess whether lower genetic test ordering rates in these groups reflects prior confirmatory testing obtained before referral to our clinic.

Distribution and temporal trends in testing modalities and testing lab utilization

Between October 1, 2016, and September 30, 2024, patterns of genetic testing modalities and laboratory utilization shifted (**Figure 4**). Of the 3,822 tests sent during this period, the most common type of test sent was NGS panels (63.29%), followed by single gene (15.25%), single site (10.33%), whole exome sequencing (3.64%), and chromosomal microarray (CMA, 2.9%). Over time, the ordering of NGS panels increased significantly (p<7.52e-08; OR 1.04 [1.03–1.06]), whereas significant decreases were observed in the ordering of CMA (p<1.10e-05; OR 0.91 [0.87–0.95]), single site testing (p<6.57e-07; OR 0.94 [0.92–0.96]), and metabolic testing (p<3.45e-05; OR 0.86 [0.81–0.92]).

Testing was sent to 34 different laboratories, with three laboratories performing 82.27% of all testing during the study period; 1,806 tests were performed at Invitae/Labcorp (47.29%), 738 were performed at Ambry Genetics (19.32%), and 598 were performed at GeneDx (15.66%). As with the types of tests ordered, shifts were also observed in which genetic testing laboratories were

used. Over the study period, the ordering of testing from Invitae/Labcorp increased significantly ($p<3.74e-06$; OR 1.03 [1.02–1.05]), while decreases in testing ordered from CTGT ($p<7.08e-06$; OR 0.60 [0.46–0.73]), ARUP ($p<2.25e-05$; OR 0.91 [0.87–0.95]), and metabolic laboratories ($p<2.33e-04$; OR 0.86 [0.80–0.93]) were observed. No statistically significant differences were observed in the utilization of other laboratories during this time.

Year-to-year shifts in testing laboratories closely tracked changes in billing, insurance, and ordering policies. For example, Blueprint Genetics introduced a $250 capped-cost policy for self-pay NGS panels in November 2018, which led to a sharp increase in orders, but discontinued the policy in February 2021, after which orders declined. Variantyx offered no-cost reflex from any NGS panel to genome sequencing between January 2022 and February 2023, producing a similar rise and fall in orders during that period. Ambry worked to integrate test ordering directly into the UPHS electronic medical record in January 2020, resulting in a large increase in testing volume, and GeneDx became in-network with Independence Blue Cross in February 2023, likewise driving a substantial increase in tests ordered.

High rate of positive findings across all patients

Overall, a high rate of pathogenic findings was observed across all testing sent during the study period (**Figure 5A**). 24.4% of the 3,822 tests sent between October 1, 2016 and September 30, 2024 resulted in a pathogenic, diagnostic finding. Another 3.8% returned pathogenic carrier results, and 14% returned inconclusive (VUS) results.

The percentage of patients receiving each testing result was stratified by EHR-reported sex (**Figure 5B**). The rate of pathogenic findings did not vary significantly between EHR-reported sex; 25.1% of females and 23.3% of males received a pathogenic result. However, males were significantly more likely than females to receive a VUS result, with 16% of testing sent in male patients and 12.5% of testing sent in female patients resulting with one or more VUSs ($p=0.0036$; OR 1.33 [1.10-1.62], results of logistic regression adjusted for age, sex, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type).

The percentage of patients receiving each testing result was also stratified by EHR-reported race and ethnicity (**Figure 5D**). The rate of pathogenic findings was 40.0% for American Indian or Alaskan Native patients (n=5), 39.6% among Hispanic or Latino patients (n=139), 26.9% for patients of Other race/ethnicity (n=353), 26.2% for Asian patients (n=122), 25.8% for Black or

African American patients (n=299), 23.0% for White patients (n=2,680), and 0% for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander patients (n=2). Hispanic or Latino of any race were significantly more likely to receive pathogenic results than White patients (p=0.007, OR 1.88[1.28-2.75]) by logistic regression adjusted for age, sex, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type; no other significant differences in pathogenic result rate were observed by EHR-reported race/ethnicity. The rate of VUS findings was 20.0% for American Indian or Alaskan Native patients, 5.6% among Hispanic or Latino patients, 14.4% for patients of other race/ethnicity, 15.4% for Asian patients, 16.1% for Black or African American patients, 14.2% for White patients, and 0% for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander patients. No significant differences were observed for VUS rate across patients of different racial/ethnic groups.

Significant decrease in positive testing rate with increasing patient age

When analyzing results of genetic testing by patient age, the percentage of patients receiving each testing result classification differed significantly (**Figure 5C**). Older patients were significantly less likely to receive a pathogenic result overall (p=1.23e-07; OR 0.98[0.98-0.99], results of linear regression adjusted for age, sex, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type, OR reflects the per-year change in odds). Pathogenic results were identified in 35.7% of patients aged 18-25 years (n=442), 31.1% of patients 26-35 years (n=808), 24.3% of patients 36-45 years (n=675), 16.8% of patients 46-55 years (n=554), 20% of patients 56-65 years (n=615), 17.7% of patients 66-75 years (n=423), and 16.3% of patients >75 years (n=92). Older patients were also significantly more likely to receive a VUS result (p=8.05e-03; OR 1.01[1,00-1.02], results of linear regression adjusted for age, sex, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type, OR reflects the per-year change in odds). VUS results were identified in 12.4% of patients aged 18-25 years, 11.4% of patients 26-35 years, 13.3% of patients 36-45 years, 17.3% of patients 46-55 years, 16.9% of patients 56-65 years, 15.1% of patients 66-75 years, and 6.5% of patients >75 years.

Variation in diagnostic yield across genetic testing modalities

Large differences in diagnostic yield was observed across different genetic testing modalities (**Figure 5E**). The testing modalities with the highest percentage of pathogenic findings were single site testing (43.9%, n=387), karyotype (43.9%, n=57), whole exome sequencing (WES, 41.3%, n = 138), single gene testing (36.3%, n=575), and chromosomal microarray (CMA, 30.6%, n=111). Next-generation sequencing (NGS) panels, by far the most common test ordered (n=2,354) had among the lowest pathogenic rates at 16.7%, followed only by methylation testing (16.7%

pathogenic rate, n=6) and metabolic testing (6.2% diagnostic rate, n=48). The rate of VUS results also varied between testing modalities. The testing types most likely to result in only VUSs were mitochondrial sequencing (20.0%), NGS panels (19.1%), whole exome sequencing (11.6%), and CMA (9.0%).

Significant indication-specific variation in genetic test outcomes

There were also significant differences in genetic testing results depending on the clinical indication for testing (**Figure 5F**). Indications with the highest likelihood of receiving a pathogenic result included ID/DD/ASD (52.3% pathogenic rate, n=65), chromosomal disorders (50.8% pathogenic rate, n=59), vascular malformation disorders (48.3% pathogenic rate, n=240), renal disorders (46.7% pathogenic rate, n=152), skin/tooth disorders (45.5% pathogenic rate, n=44), and multisystem disorders (44.2% pathogenic rate, n=330). Conversely, indications with the lowest likelihood of receiving a pathogenic result included hypermobility disorders (9.0% pathogenic rate, n=78), immune/hematologic disorders (9.8% pathogenic rate, n=112), and lung disorders (12.5% pathogenic rate, n=104). Additionally, certain clinical indications for testing were characterized by a high likelihood of receiving only VUS results. These included immune/hematologic disorders (38.4% VUS rate), connective tissue disorders (23.6% VUS rate, n=784), mitochondrial disease (22.2% VUS rate, n=27), and bone/skeletal disorders (20.7% VUS rate, n=121)

Genetic variants identified span a diverse set of genes

Forty-one unique chromosomal aneuploidies and variants in 397 unique single genes were identified in the patient cohort (**Figure 6**). The most frequently identified single-gene variants were in *ACVRL1* (60 pathogenic variants and 5 VUSs identified), *FBN1* (38 pathogenic variants, 28 VUSs), *NF1* (51 pathogenic variants, 4 VUSs); *ENG* (39 pathogenic variants, 7 VUSs), *SDHB* (34 pathogenic variants, 4 VUSs), *PKD1* (26 pathogenic variants, 11 VUSs), and *FLCN* (30 pathogenic variants, 6 VUSs). The only recurrent chromosomal aneuploidies identified were 45,X in 16 individuals, 47,XXY in 6 individuals, del(15)(q11.2) in 3 individuals, and del(15)(q11q13) and del(22)(q12.3q13.1) each in 2 individuals.

WES/WGS patients differ demographically from those receiving other tests

Altogether 148 individuals referred to our clinic during the study period ultimately underwent WES or WGS testing as part of their evaluation – these broad genetic testing modalities are often inaccessible to adult patients due to insurance denials [reference], and we sought to identify

differences in patient demographics between those patients undergoing WES/WGS (n=148) and those undergoing any other type of testing (n=3,440). Significant differences were observed in clinical indication for referral between the two groups (p=3.44e-81; χ^2 = 442.2, **Figure S3A-B**). By residual analysis, this difference was primarily driven by an overrepresentation of individuals referred for ID/DD/ASD and for general genetics evaluation among the WES/WGS group. No significant differences were observed in EHR-reported race or sex between the WES/WGS group and other testing group (**Figure S3C-F**). There was a significant difference seen in insurance classes between the two groups (p=5.23e-07; χ^2 = 32), with Medicaid insurance being overrepresented in the WES/WGS group by residual analysis (**Figure S3G-H**). Lastly, patients undergoing WES/WGS were significantly younger (median age 30.0 years) than those who underwent any other genetic testing (median age 43.4 years, p=5.91e-22 by Wilcoxon rank-sum test, **Figure S3I**).

High diagnostic yield of WES/WGS across all adult patient age groups

WES/WGS tests had a very high diagnostic yield overall (**Figure 7A**). Of the 148 WES/WGS tests completed in the study period, 40.5% returned with a pathogenic finding. 18.3% of completed WES/WGS returned inconclusive results, including variants of uncertain significance (10.8%), variants indicating unaffected carrier status (6.1%) and variants in candidate genes (1.4%). Altogether, only 41.2% of all WES/WGS tests were completely negative. The diagnostic yield of WES/WGS did differ based on EHR-reported sex, age, or race (**Figure 7B-D**). Specifically, we observed no significant differences in the odds of identifying pathogenic (p= 0.728; OR 1.01 [0.97–1.04]) or VUS (p=0.786; OR 1.01 [0.95–1.06]) results with increasing patient age, with diagnostic yield above 50% even in patients greater than 55 years old. Comparing the yield of WES/WGS by referral indication (**Figure 7E**), we observed a significantly increased likelihood of obtaining pathogenic results in patients undergoing WES/WGS for ID/DD/ASD compared to all other referral indications (p= 3.64e-03; OR 7.33 [2.70–22.45] by logistic regression).

Discussion

Even as precision and genomic medicine gain traction in adult care, the landscape of adult genetics practice – who is evaluated, how testing is deployed, and what diagnoses result – have remained poorly characterized. Our findings offer a practice-level view of adult medical genetics that spans the full path from referral to result. Across eight years, the clinic evaluated a wide range of adults, ranging in age from young to late life and presenting with diverse clinical indications. Testing was ordered for the majority of new patients and, critically, diagnostic yield was high across the lifespan; yield exceeded 16% in every age band and remained high even in older adults. Exome/genome sequencing was particularly informative, delivering consistently high diagnostic yield without attenuation with age. Together, these results counter the lingering perception that molecular genetic diagnosis is chiefly a pediatric enterprise and underscore the value of genomic evaluation in adult medicine when the prior probability is appropriate.

Beyond the overall yield of genetic testing demonstrated in our findings, results of testing varied systematically by indication. Intellectual disability/developmental delay/autism, chromosomal disorders, vascular malformations, renal disease, skin/tooth disorders, and multisystem presentations were significantly more likely to yield pathogenic findings on genetics testing; referrals for joint hypermobility were most likely yield negative testing results; immune/hematologic and connective tissue disorders were significantly more likely to yield uncertain findings. These differences support indication-aware testing pathways: there should be a low threshold to send panel-based testing for indications where we demonstrate a high likelihood of such testing to yield positive results. On the other hand, exome/genome-first (or rapid escalation to exome/genome) testing approaches are defensible for indications where broad genomic testing demonstrates high yields, while targeted panels or single-gene testing may be used, but judiciously, for lower-yield indications unless specific features raise the likelihood that a genetic condition may be present. The factors that make a genetic diagnosis more likely in these low-yield clinical indications remain to be worked out in future studies specifically examining this question. At the same time, the preponderance of inconclusive outcomes – e.g., higher VUS rates in connective tissue and immune/hematologic evaluations – offers a second design lever, highlighting where pretest counseling should anticipate indeterminate results to appropriately calibrate patient and referring-provider expectations and interpretations.

We also observed demographic differences by indication, a pattern not emphasized in previous adult genetics studies. Connective tissue disorder referrals were more common in older men, hypermobility referrals in younger women; older patients in general were more likely to be referred for single-organ-system dysfunction, while younger patients were more likely to be referred for disease affecting multiple organs. These differences likely reflect a mix of biology (age-dependent penetrance, sex-specific expression), referral heuristics, and specialty referral practices. Patient age also influenced testing behavior: the likelihood of genetic testing being ordered increased with patient age. This trend may reflect a higher referral threshold in older adults, such that testing is pursued only when suspicion for a genetic condition is already strong, or referrals for familial cascade testing in older patients, where older relatives are evaluated after a variant is identified in a younger family member; in both cases a high rate of genetic testing might be expected. Similarly, indication-specific effects on likelihood of testing were also apparent. For example, patients referred for intellectual disability or developmental delay were both very likely to undergo testing (80.9%) and very likely to obtain a positive result (52.3%), underscoring that many such patients likely remain under-referred and undiagnosed in the community, and that targeted efforts to increase referral for patients with this indication might be warranted. Together, these age- and indication-based patterns highlight practical opportunities to address referral biases – for example, clarifying appropriate referral triggers for multisystem disease in older adults or for high-yield indications such as ID/DD to ensure these patients are not being missed. These patterns also suggest that adult genetics clinics might benefit from a dual-track approach to patient evaluation, balancing resource-intensive evaluations for high-probability index cases, such as ID/DD or multisystem disease referrals, with streamlined pathways for high-yield but lower-complexity indications such as familial cascade testing.

Our experience with telehealth also provided important lessons. Utilization rose sharply during the COVID-19 pandemic and then stabilized in the post-pandemic era, particularly for follow-up visits. In this setting, virtual encounters proved well suited for counseling, result disclosure, and coordinating cascade testing across geographically dispersed relatives, and provided a more efficient means of following patients longitudinally, without the need for repeated in-person evaluation, after a diagnosis had been made. Combined with genetic counselor-led triage, hybrid virtual/in-person pathways could reduce wait times while preserving clinic capacity for more complex in-person evaluations. Realizing this potential, however, will require policy reforms, such as improved reimbursement for counselor-led telehealth and cascade testing, as well as licensure frameworks that permit cross-state genetics care. These changes could broaden the pool of

providers able to deliver genetics services, empower genetic counselors to independently manage appropriate cases, and mitigate the current urban concentration of adult genetics services that limits access for patients in rural areas.

Perhaps not surprisingly, operational and policy factors were powerful determinants of what genetic testing was ordered, and at what lab. Inflection points in laboratory choice tracked closely with payer and testing lab policies (e.g., capped costs, in-network changes), EMR integration, and reflex testing availability. These shifts illustrate how reimbursement and ordering infrastructure can steer utilization and highlight how dependent clinicians are on system-level policies to deliver consistent and appropriate care. The best path forward may be to align policies with clinical value: streamline access to exome/genome in indications with high, stable yield; deploy capped-cost or sponsored programs strategically for cascade testing and other high-impact scenarios; and use EHR order sets and integrations to standardize laboratory choices for specific clinical indications where costs can be guaranteed to empower non-genetics providers to order appropriate testing. The latter is currently being tested at UPHS to ensure equitable testing practices for all patients who meet criteria for genetic testing.[20]

Several limitations of our study warrant consideration. This was a single-center study at a large academic medical center and may not reflect community practice. Additionally, our health system routes certain neurogenetic, cardiac genetic, and many routine hereditary cancer cases to other specialty clinics outside of the general genetics clinic, such that the case-mix and yields we report reflect a general adult genetics clinic practice rather than the yield of genetic testing across the entire health system. Similarly, this study focused on patients seen for evaluation by genetics trained physicians or genetic counselors within our clinic; certain follow up patients, particularly those with genetic cancer syndromes, are seen by nurse practitioners within our division for continuity care and these visits are not reflected in our data. Importantly, regarding probability of undergoing genetic testing, our data only capture whether testing occurred, not why; we cannot distinguish patient preference, insurer denial, prior external testing, or logistical barriers. Lastly, prior genetic testing outside of our clinic is likely incompletely ascertained, potentially biasing some of our results. Overall, while these constraints may limit generalizability, they do not substantially diminish the practice-level signals we report.

Altogether, our findings suggest several actionable steps to improve the equitable and appropriate access to genetics evaluation and testing for adult patients. First, implement indication- and age-

aware triage and order pathways that focus resources where yield and actionability are highest, minimize the ordering of testing likely to return only inconclusive results where feasible and standardize exome/genome-first approaches in adults when benefit is clear. Second, embed decision support in the EHR, incorporating indication-specific yields, preferred labs, and payer rules, to reduce unwarranted variation in ordering practice and to support non-geneticist clinicians in pretest counseling and test selection. Third, use empiric yield and utilization data to engage payers on coverage, capped-cost programs, and reflex workflows. Finally, target referring clinician education to the indications and patient groups most likely to benefit, concentrating efforts where practice change is most attainable.

In sum, adult patients present with broad indications for genetics evaluation and testing and represent a heterogeneous population in which both utilization and diagnostic outcomes are shaped by indication, age, and policy/operational context. Clinically meaningful diagnoses are common across the adult lifespan, with exome/genome sequencing showing sustained utility from young adulthood into later life. By linking who is seen to how testing is used and what is found, this study fills a critical gap in the adult genetics evidence base and offers concrete guidance for triage design, staffing, payer engagement, and the development of adult-focused practice guidelines, key steps toward making precision and genomic medicine routine in adult patient care.

Declaration of Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgments

This study itself did not receive external funding. T.G.D. is supported in by the Burroughs Wellcome Fund. K.L.N is supported in part by the Breast Cancer Research Foundation, Basser Center for BRCA, the Gray Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health - R01 CA176785 and R01 CA192393.

Author Contributions

J.I.G. and T.G.D. conceived and planned the study and analysis plan. J.I.G., C.K., A.V., H.S and T.G.D. carried out the analyses. J.I.G., Y.E., N.B.G., S.A., A.R., C.C., Z.B., I.E., L.H., E.K., L.C.B., D.A.S., E.T., K.L.N., S.K. and T.G.D. contributed to data preparation and analysis. J.I.G., N.B.G., L.L., K.L.N., S.K., and T.G.D. contributed to the interpretation of the results. T.G.D. supervised the project. J.I.G. and T.G.D. took the lead in writing the manuscript. All authors provided critical feedback and helped shape the research, analysis and manuscript.

Data and Code Availability

The summary data supporting the findings of this study are available upon reasonable request. Individual-level data, aside from what has been included in the manuscript and supplemental materials, cannot be shared due to patient privacy concerns.

References

1. Ethical Considerations in Precision Medicine and Genetic Testing in Internal Medicine Practice: A Position Paper From the American College of Physicians - PubMed https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35878403/.

2. Bastarache, L., Tinker, R.J., Schuler, B.A., Richter, L., Phillips, J.A., Stead, W.W., Hooker, G.W., Peterson, J.F., and Ruderfer, D.M. (2025). Characterizing trends in clinical genetic testing: A single-center analysis of EHR data from 1.8 million patients over two decades. Am. J. Hum. Genet. *112*, 1029–1038. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2025.03.009.

3. Taylor, M.R.G., Edwards, J.G., and Ku, L. (2006). Lost in transition: challenges in the expanding field of adult genetics. Am. J. Med. Genet. C Semin. Med. Genet. *142C*, 294–303. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.c.30105.

4. Cooksey, J.A., Forte, G., Flanagan, P.A., Benkendorf, J., and Blitzer, M.G. (2006). The medical genetics workforce: an analysis of clinical geneticist subgroups. Genet. Med. Off. J. Am. Coll. Med. Genet. *8*, 603–614. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.gim.0000242307.83900.77.

5. Jenkins, B.D., Fischer, C.G., Polito, C.A., Maiese, D.R., Keehn, A.S., Lyon, M., Edick, M.J., Taylor, M.R.G., Andersson, H.C., Bodurtha, J.N., et al. (2021). The 2019 US medical genetics workforce: a focus on clinical genetics. Genet. Med. *23*, 1458–1464. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41436-021-01162-5.

6. Bengur, E.T., and Heeley, J. (2024). Genetics and Primary Care: Raising Awareness and Enhancing Cooperation. Mo. Med. *121*, 277–283.

7. Posey, J.E., Rosenfeld, J.A., James, R.A., Bainbridge, M., Niu, Z., Wang, X., Dhar, S., Wiszniewski, W., Akdemir, Z.H.C., Gambin, T., et al. (2016). Molecular diagnostic experience of whole-exome sequencing in adult patients. Genet. Med. Off. J. Am. Coll. Med. Genet. *18*, 678–685. https://doi.org/10.1038/gim.2015.142.

8. Shickh, S., Salazar, M.G., Zakoor, K.-R., Lázaro, C., Gu, J., Goltz, J., Kleinman, D., Noor, A., Khalouei, S., Mighton, C., et al. (2021). Exome and Genome Sequencing in Adults with Undiagnosed Disease: A Prospective Cohort Study. J. Med. Genet. *58*, 275–283. https://doi.org/10.1136/jmedgenet-2020-106936.

9. Walsh, M., West, K., Taylor, J.A., Thompson, B.A., Hopkins, A., Sexton, A., Ragunathan, A., Verma, K.P., Panetta, J., Matotek, E., et al. (2022). Real world outcomes and implementation pathways of exome sequencing in an adult genetic department. Genet. Med. *24*, 1536–1544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gim.2022.03.010.

10. Mainali, A., Athey, T., Bahl, S., Hung, C., Caluseriu, O., Chan, A., Eaton, A., Ghai, S.J., Kannu, P., MacPherson, M., et al. (2023). Diagnostic yield of clinical exome sequencing in adulthood in medical genetics clinics. Am. J. Med. Genet. A. *191*, 510–517. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.a.63053.

11. Gold, J.I., Kripke, C.M., Mansfield, A.J., Li, A., Lopez, A., Hawes, A., Averitt, A., Damask, A., Deubler, A., Ziyatdinov, A., et al. (2025). Exclusion-based exome sequencing in critically ill

adults 18–40 years old has a 24% diagnostic rate and finds racial disparities in access to genetic testing. Am. J. Hum. Genet. *0*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2025.06.007.

12. Eble, T.N., Nagamani, S.C.S., Franco, L.M., Plon, S.E., Blazo, M., and Dhar, S.U. (2013). The practice of adult genetics: a 7-year experience from a single center. Am. J. Med. Genet. A. *161A*, 89–93. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.a.35684.

13. Gay, E.A., Byers, P.H., Bennett, R.L., Bird, T.D., and Hisama, F.M. (2019). Trends over 42 years in the Adult Medical Genetics Clinic at the University of Washington. Genet. Med. *21*, 1457–1461. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41436-018-0329-5.

14. King, C., Nielsen, S., Schmanski, A., Abdul-Rahman, O., and Fishler, K.P. (2022). Evaluating a general pediatric/adult genetic counseling clinic in a Midwest medical center. J. Genet. Couns. *31*, 1282–1289. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgc4.1603.

15. Boothe, E., Land, M.E., Hendon, L., and Castro, M.D. (2023). O53: The wasteland within the desert: The status of adult genetic services in the Southeast Region of the United States*. Genet. Med. Open *1*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gimo.2023.100742.

16. Klinger, E.V., Carlini, S.V., Gonzalez, I., Hubert, S.S., Linder, J.A., Rigotti, N.A., Kontos, E.Z., Park, E.R., Marinacci, L.X., and Haas, J.S. (2015). Accuracy of race, ethnicity, and language preference in an electronic health record. J. Gen. Intern. Med. *30*, 719–723. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-014-3102-8.

17. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing | BibSonomy https://www.bibsonomy.org/bibtex/7469ffee3b07f9167cf47e7555041ee7.

18. Yilmaz, A., and Hermane, A. (2022). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Pennsylvania and its healthcare system. Health Sci. Rep. *5*, e615. https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.615.

19. Asher, S.B., Chen, R., and Kallish, S. (2018). Mitral valve prolapse and aortic root dilation in adults with hypermobile Ehlers–Danlos syndrome and related disorders. Am. J. Med. Genet. A. *176*, 1838–1844. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajmg.a.40364.

20. Raper, A.C., Weathers, B.L., Drivas, T.G., Ellis, C.A., Kripke, C.M., Oyer, R.A., Owens, A.T., Verma, A., Wileyto, P.E., Wollack, C.C., et al. (2024). Protocol for a type 3 hybrid implementation cluster randomized clinical trial to evaluate the effect of patient and clinician nudges to advance the use of genomic medicine across a diverse health system. Implement. Sci. IS *19*, 61. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-024-01385-5.

Figures



Figure 1. Demographics of the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic
Demographics information for all 8,153 unique patient visits to the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic are shown for the time period from October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2024. (A) A heatmap of patient home addresses is displayed over a geographic map of the Delaware Valley region, with major U.S. cities labeled for orientation. The inset provides a magnified view of the City of Philadelphia. The color scale indicates the number of unique patient visits per hexagonal unit. (B) Histogram illustrating the distribution of patient ages at time of visit, divided by EHR-reported sex. (C) EHR-reported patient sex for the study cohort. (D) EHR-reported patient race and ethnicity, for the study cohort defined as reported in **Subjects, Materials, and Methods**. (E) EHR-reported patient insurance class at time of visit for the study cohort. (F) Visit type, divided by new vs. follow up visit, and by in-person and telehealth, for each patient visit.



Figure 2. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics and Visit Types Across Clinical Indications

(A) Indications for all 8,153 unique patient visits to the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic from October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2024 are displayed. The percentage of each indication, relative to the total, is shown in the legend “Indication Group, Percent of Total”. (B) Patient visit indications are shown over time in 6-month intervals from October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2024. Indications are color-coded as shown in the legend “Indication Group, Percent of Total.” Indications with a significant decrease in their proportion over time (Hypermobility) are marked with a blue asterisk in the legend, while those with a significant increase (Cancer genetics, Lysosomal storage, Chromosomal disorder, Renal disorder, Endocrine disorder, Lung disorder, Gastrointestinal disorder) are marked with a red asterisk. Statistical significance was determined by logistic

regression accounting for multiple testing across all 21 indication groups. (C) Dot plots with overlaid boxplots show patient age at the time of visit for each indication group, ordered by median age, across the study period. Each dot represents an individual patient, while boxplots display the median (solid line) and interquartile range (box and whiskers). Indications with a mean patient age significantly above the clinic-wide average (Lysosomal storage disorder, Lung disorder, Cancer genetics, Vascular malformation, Connective tissue disorder, Renal disorder) are marked with red asterisks; those significantly below (cardiac disorders, chromosomal disorders, general genetics, hypermobility, ID/DD/ASD, and multisystem disorders) are marked with blue asterisks. Statistical significance was determined by linear regression adjusting for EHR-reported sex, race, insurance class, and visit type, with Bonferroni correction applied for multiple testing across all 21 indication groups. (D) Stacked bar charts display the EHR-reported race of patients for each indication group across the study period. Indications with a significantly higher proportion of a given racial group, compared to the overall clinic average, are marked with an asterisk. Statistical significance was determined by multinomial logistic regression, adjusting for sex, insurance class, visit type, and age at visit. After Bonferroni correction, only Hypermobility showed significant differences: Black patients were significantly underrepresented, and patients with an EHR-reported race of “Other” were significantly overrepresented. (E) Stacked bar charts display the proportion of male and female patients for each indication group across the study period. Indications with a significantly higher proportion of female patients compared to the overall clinic average (Hypermobility) are marked with an asterisk in the pink bar, while those with a significantly higher proportion of male patients compared to the overall clinic average (Connective tissue disorder) are marked with an asterisk in the blue bar. Statistical significance was determined by logistic regression, adjusting for age, race, insurance class, and visit type, with Bonferroni correction applied for multiple testing across all 21 indication groups. (F) Stacked bar charts display the proportion of new patient visits and follow-up visits, further subdivided by in-person and telemedicine encounters, for each indication group across the study period. Indications with a significantly higher proportion of follow up visits (in-person or telemedicine) compared to the overall clinic average (Lysosomal storage disorder, Mitochondrial disease, Metabolic disorder, Multisystem disorder), are marked with an asterisk in the orange bar, while those with a significantly higher proportion of new patient visits (in-person or telemedicine) compared to the overall clinic average (Cancer genetics, Renal disorder, Vascular malformation disorder, Hypermobility, Lung disorder) are marked with an asterisk in the purple bar. Statistical significance was determined by logistic regression, adjusting for EHR-reported sex, race, insurance class, and age at visit, with Bonferroni correction applied for multiple testing across all 21 indication groups.



Figure 3. Patterns of Genetic Testing Utilization by Visit Type, Demographics, and Clinical Indication

In all panels, bars indicate the proportion of visits for which testing was sent (green) versus not sent (pink). Percent labels, in green, above bars show the percent of visits for which testing was sent for each subgroup. Sample sizes for each subgroup are shown below the horizontal axis labels for panels B-E. (A) Marimekko plot showing the percent of visits during which genetic testing was sent or not sent by visit type (New Patient Visit vs. Follow-up). The height of each row represents the proportion of all visits accounted for by each visit type; the width of each column represents the percent of visits, within each visit type, with or without testing sent. A stacked bar plot to the left shows the overall distribution of visit types, for reference, with New Patient Visits in purple and Follow-up visits in orange. (B) Percent of new patient visits during which testing was sent, stratified by EHR-reported sex. The p-value indicates the result of logistic regression comparing the odds of testing sent by sex, adjusted for clinical indication group, age, race, and insurance class. (C) Percent of new patient visits during which testing was sent, stratified by patient age (plotted in discrete age ranges). The p-value indicates the association between age (modeled as a continuous variable) and the odds of testing being sent, from logistic regression adjusted for clinical indication group, race, sex, and insurance class. (D) Percent of new patient visits during which testing was sent, stratified by EHR-reported race. No significant differences were found when comparing each group to the largest group (EHR-reported White race) by logistic regression adjusted for indication group, sex, age, and insurance class, accounting for multiple testing across all 6 groups. (E) Percent of new patient visits during which testing was sent, stratified by clinical indication group. Indications with a significantly higher odds of testing compared to the overall clinic average (neuromuscular disorder, ID/DD/ASD, cancer genetics)

are marked with an asterisk in the green bar, while those with a significantly lower odds of testing compared to the overall clinic average (multisystem disorder, lysosomal storage disorder, chromosomal disorder, hypermobility) are marked with an asterisk in the pink bar. Statistical significance was determined by logistic regression, adjusting for age, race, sex, and insurance class, with Bonferroni correction applied for multiple testing across all 21 indication groups.



Figure 4. Patterns and Temporal Trends in Genetic Testing Modalities and Laboratory Utilization

(A) Type of testing sent for all 3,822 tests sent during the study period. Percentages relative to the total are shown in the legend "Testing Type, Percent of Total." (B) Type of testing sent is shown over time in 6-month intervals from October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2024. Testing types are color-coded as shown in the legend "Testing Type, Percent of Total." Testing types significantly increasing in utilization over time (NGS Panel) are marked with a red asterisk in the legend, while those significantly decreasing in utilization over time (Single Site, CMA, Metabolic) are marked with a blue asterisk. Statistical significance was determined using separate binary logistic regression models for each test type, comparing the odds of using that test type (versus all other tests) as a function of time, accounting for multiple testing across all 13 testing types. (C) Testing laboratories used for all 3,822 tests sent during the study period. Percentages relative to the total are shown in the legend "Lab Choice, Percent of Total." (D) Testing lab choice is shown over time in 6-month intervals from October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2024. Testing labs are color-coded as shown in the legend "Lab Choice, Percent of Total." Testing labs significantly increasing in utilization over time (Invitae) are marked with a red asterisk in the legend, while those significantly decreasing in utilization over time (CTGT, Prevention, Metabolic Testing, UAB, ARUP, Fulgent) are marked with a blue asterisk. Statistical significance was determined using

binary logistic separate regression models for each testing lab, comparing the odds of using that test type (versus all other labs) as a function of time, accounting for multiple testing across all 34 testing labs.



Figure 5. Genetic Testing Results by Patient and Test Characteristics

In all panels, bars indicate the percentage of patients with each genetic testing result classification: pathogenic (blue), variant of uncertain significance (VUS; orange), carrier (yellow), candidate gene (aqua), or negative (gray). Percent labels in blue above bars show the percent of patients who received a pathogenic result for each subgroup. Sample sizes for each subgroup are shown below the horizontal axis labels for panels B–F. (A) Pie chart showing the overall distribution of results for all 3,822 genetic tests sent during the study period. Percentages for each result classification are shown in the legend. (B) Percent of patients receiving each testing result classification, stratified by EHR-reported sex. The p-values indicate the result of logistic regression comparing the odds of receiving a pathogenic (in blue) or VUS (in orange) result by sex, adjusted for patient age, race, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type. No significant difference was found for pathogenic results; however, males were significantly more likely than females to receive a VUS result. (C) Percent of patients receiving each testing result classification, stratified by patient age at visit (plotted in discrete age ranges). The p-value

indicates the association between age (modeled as a continuous variable) and the odds of receiving a pathogenic (in blue) or VUS (in orange) result from logistic regression adjusted for sex, race, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type. Older patients were significantly less likely to receive a pathogenic result and significantly more likely to receive a VUS. (D) Percent of patients receiving each testing result classification, stratified by EHR-reported race. Hispanic or Latino patients of any race were significantly more likely to receive pathogenic results compared to patients of EHR-reported White race; no other significant differences were found for any racial group, relative to patients with EHR-reported White race, for the odds of receiving either a pathogenic (in blue) or VUS (in orange) result by logistic regression adjusted for age, sex, insurance class, clinical indication group, and visit type, accounting for multiple testing across all 6 groups. (E) Percent of patients receiving each testing result classification, stratified by type of testing, ordered by likelihood of receiving a pathogenic result. No formal statistical comparisons were performed for this panel. (F) Percent of patients receiving each testing result classification, stratified by clinical indication group, ordered by likelihood of receiving a pathogenic result. Indications where genetic testing had a significantly higher odds of identifying a pathogenic result compared to the overall clinic average (chromosomal disorder, vascular malformation disorder, renal disorder, multisystem disorder) are marked with an asterisk in the blue bar, while those with a significantly lower odds of identifying a pathogenic result compared to the overall clinic average (cancer genetics, general genetics, connective tissue disorder, immune/hematologic disorder, hypermobility) are marked with an asterisk in the grey bar. Indications where genetic testing had a significantly higher odds of identifying a VUS compared to the overall clinic average (connective tissue disorder, immune/hematologic disorder) are marked with a hash mark in the orange bar. Statistical significance was determined by logistic regression, adjusting for age, race, sex, and insurance class, with Bonferroni correction applied for multiple testing across all 21 indication groups.



Figure 6. Distribution of Variants Identified by Gene and Clinical Indication Group
Circular bar plot showing how often genetic testing identified a pathogenic variant (blue bars) or a variant of uncertain significance (VUS; red bars) in each gene, grouped and color-coded by clinical indication group. For each gene, the blue bar height above the baseline represents the total number of pathogenic variants reported, while the red bar height extending below the baseline represents the total number of VUSs. Each sector is shaded and labeled to show the clinical indication for the visit during which testing was ordered. Reference rings mark variant count intervals for both pathogenic and VUS counts, and gene names appear adjacent to their respective bars.



Figure 7. WES/WGS Results by Patient and Visit Characteristics

Results of all 148 WES/WGS tests sent over the study period, stratified by patient and visit characteristics. In all panels, bars indicate the percentage of pathogenic (blue), variant of uncertain significance (VUS; orange), carrier (yellow), candidate gene (aqua), or negative (gray) results. Percent labels in blue above bars show the percent of patients who received a pathogenic result for each subgroup. Sample sizes for each subgroup are shown below the horizontal axis labels for panels B-E. (A) Pie chart showing the overall distribution of results for all 148 patients who underwent WES/WGS during the study period. Percentages for each result classification are shown in the legend. (B) Percent of patients receiving each WES/WGS result classification, stratified by EHR-reported sex. No significant associations were found between sex and the odds of receiving a pathogenic (in blue) or VUS (in orange) result from logistic regression adjusted for age, race, insurance class, and clinical indication group. (C) Percent of patients receiving each WES/WGS result classification, stratified by patient age at visit (plotted in discrete age ranges). No significant associations were found between age (modeled as a continuous variable) and the odds of receiving a pathogenic (in blue) or VUS (in orange) result from logistic regression adjusted for insurance class and clinical indication group. (D) Percent of patients receiving each WES/WGS result classification, stratified by EHR-reported race. No significant differences were found for any racial group, relative to patients with EHR-reported White race, for the odds of receiving either a pathogenic (in blue) or VUS (in orange) result by logistic regression adjusted for age, insurance class, and clinical indication group, accounting for multiple testing across all 6 groups. (E) Percent

of patients receiving each WES/WGS result classification, stratified by clinical indication group, ordered by likelihood of receiving a pathogenic result. Indications where WES/WGS testing had a significantly higher odds of identifying a pathogenic result compared to the overall WES/WGS average (ID/DD/ASD) are marked with an asterisk. No significant differences were found for any indication group for the odds of receiving a VUS result. Significance was determined by logistic regression adjusted for age, sex, race, and insurance class, accounting for multiple testing across all 21 groups.

Supplemental Material



Figure S1. Visit types, over time

Type of visit (new patient vs follow up, in person vs telehealth) to the UPHS Adult Genetics Clinic is shown over time in 6-month intervals from October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2024. A sharp rise in telehealth visits is observed beginning in 2020, coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic and local stay-at-home orders.



Figure S2. Distribution of Patient Visits by Clinical Indication and Indication Group

Circular bar plot displaying the number of patient visits for each unique clinical indication, grouped and color-coded by indication group, across the study period. Indications are arranged around the circle by indication group, with each indication uniquely assigned to one group. Each blue bar represents a specific indication (e.g., “Marfan syndrome”), and bar height reflects the number of unique patient visits for that indication. For counts greater than 20, bar heights are transformed using the formula: height = 20 + (n)^0.333, where n is the visit count, to improve visualization. Reference rings denote visit counts, with breaks at 5, 10, 20, 25, 100, and 500. Indication names are shown adjacent to their respective bars.

Figure S3. Characteristics of Patients Who Received WES/WGS vs. Other Genetic Tests
Each panel shows the distribution of patient characteristics stratified by whether whole exome/genome sequencing (WES/WGS, n = 148) was sent (panels A, C, E, G, bottom half of I) or another type of genetic test was sent (n = 3,672, panels B, D, F, H, top half of I). Percentages for each subgroup are indicated in the adjacent legends. (A-B) Proportion of patients by clinical indication group for the visit. (C-D) Proportion of patients by EHR-reported race. (E-F) Proportion

of patients by EHR-reported sex. (G-H) Proportion of patients by financial class (insurance type) at the time of the visit. (I) Distribution of patient ages at time of visit. Chi-square analysis comparing WES/WGS to other genetic tests was performed for each patient characteristic in panels A-H. Significant differences were observed for clinical indication (panels A–B) and financial class (panels G–H) only. In those panels, asterisks in the WES/WGS figures indicate categories that were significantly overrepresented among WES/WGS patients, based on residual analysis. Differences in patient age distribution were assessed by Wilcoxon rank-sum test in panel I, where a significant difference was seen with patient ages skewing younger in the WES/WGS group.

Table S1. Indication to Indication Group Mappings, with Visit Counts

Indication	Indication Group	Count
Hypophosphatasia	Bone/Skeletal disorder	90
Osteopenia	Bone/Skeletal disorder	51
Skeletal dysplasia	Bone/Skeletal disorder	17
Klippel-Feil syndrome	Bone/Skeletal disorder	6
Craniosynostosis	Bone/Skeletal disorder	5
McCune Albright	Bone/Skeletal disorder	4
Tarlov cyst	Bone/Skeletal disorder	3
Heterotopic ossification	Bone/Skeletal disorder	2
Osteomalacia	Bone/Skeletal disorder	2
SHOX-related disease	Bone/Skeletal disorder	2
Short stature	Bone/Skeletal disorder	2
Avascular necrosis	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Clubfeet	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Fibrodysplasia Ossificans Progressiva	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Increased bone density	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Mandibuloacral dysplasia	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Osteopathia Striata	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Poland syndrome	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Ribbing disease	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Scoliosis	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Syndactyly	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Weill-Marchesani syndrome	Bone/Skeletal disorder	1
Melanoma	Cancer genetics	131
Paraganglioma	Cancer genetics	129
Renal cell carcinoma	Cancer genetics	121
Pheochromocytoma	Cancer genetics	98
Cancer predisposition syndrome	Cancer genetics	62
MEN1	Cancer genetics	60
Neuroendocrine tumor	Cancer genetics	59
Schwannomatosis	Cancer genetics	50
Cancer predisposition syndrome, SDHA-related	Cancer genetics	45
Cancer predisposition syndrome, SDHB-related	Cancer genetics	44
Hyperparathyroidism	Cancer genetics	41
Thyroid cancer	Cancer genetics	40
MEN2	Cancer genetics	34
Neurofibromatosis type 2	Cancer genetics	33

Lymphoma	Cancer genetics	31
Pituitary adenoma	Cancer genetics	30
Glioblastoma	Cancer genetics	29
Lung cancer	Cancer genetics	29
Meningioma	Cancer genetics	27
Multiple primary malignancies	Cancer genetics	27
Hypercalcemia	Cancer genetics	25
Astrocytoma	Cancer genetics	24
Cancer predisposition syndrome, DICER1-related	Cancer genetics	24
Cancer predisposition syndrome, POT1-related	Cancer genetics	22
Hereditary leiomyomatosis and renal cell cancer	Cancer genetics	21
Adrenocortical Carcinoma	Cancer genetics	17
Gorlin syndrome	Cancer genetics	17
Leukemia	Cancer genetics	16
Cancer predisposition syndrome, SDHC-related	Cancer genetics	14
Li Fraumeni syndrome	Cancer genetics	13
Basal cell carcinoma	Cancer genetics	10
Cancer predisposition syndrome, SDHD-related	Cancer genetics	10
Gastrointestinal stromal cell tumor	Cancer genetics	10
Hemangioblastoma	Cancer genetics	10
Mesothelioma	Cancer genetics	9
Myelodysplastic syndrome	Cancer genetics	9
Cancer predisposition syndrome, BAP1-related	Cancer genetics	8
Pancreatic cancer	Cancer genetics	8
Carcinoid tumor	Cancer genetics	7
Lipomatosis	Cancer genetics	7
Osteochondroma	Cancer genetics	7
Sarcoma	Cancer genetics	7
Breast cancer	Cancer genetics	6
Retinoblastoma	Cancer genetics	6
Brain cancer	Cancer genetics	5
Carney Complex	Cancer genetics	5
Multiple myeloma	Cancer genetics	5
Testicular cancer	Cancer genetics	5
Wilms tumor	Cancer genetics	5
Adrenal Adenoma	Cancer genetics	4
Cancer predisposition syndrome, FH-related	Cancer genetics	4
Gastrinoma	Cancer genetics	4
RET-related disease	Cancer genetics	4

Seminoma	Cancer genetics	4
Adenocarcinoma of the esophagus	Cancer genetics	3
Cancer predisposition syndrome, CDKN2A-related	Cancer genetics	3
Colon cancer	Cancer genetics	3
Ependymoma	Cancer genetics	3
Lynch syndrome	Cancer genetics	3
Renal angiomyolipoma	Cancer genetics	3
Cancer predisposition syndrome, GATA2-related	Cancer genetics	2
Cylindroma	Cancer genetics	2
Ganglioneuroma	Cancer genetics	2
Lymphangiomatosis	Cancer genetics	2
Osteoma	Cancer genetics	2
RUNX1-related disease	Cancer genetics	2
Squamous cell carcinoma	Cancer genetics	2
Thymoma	Cancer genetics	2
Angiomyolipoma	Cancer genetics	1
Cancer predisposition syndrome, ATM-related	Cancer genetics	1
Cancer predisposition syndrome, CHEK2-related	Cancer genetics	1
Cancer predisposition syndrome, DDX41-related	Cancer genetics	1
Cancer predisposition syndrome, FANCA-related	Cancer genetics	1
Cancer predisposition syndrome, MITF-related	Cancer genetics	1
Cancer predisposition syndrome, TMEM127-related	Cancer genetics	1
Cervical cancer	Cancer genetics	1
Chondrosarcoma	Cancer genetics	1
Chordoma	Cancer genetics	1
Colon polyps	Cancer genetics	1
Cystadenoma	Cancer genetics	1
Familial adenomatous polyposis	Cancer genetics	1
Hemangioendothelioma	Cancer genetics	1
Hepatocellular carcinoma	Cancer genetics	1
Inflammatory myofibroblastic tumor	Cancer genetics	1
Leiomyosarcoma	Cancer genetics	1
MEN4	Cancer genetics	1
Ovarian cancer	Cancer genetics	1
Prolactinoma	Cancer genetics	1
Prostate cancer	Cancer genetics	1
Renal oncocytoma	Cancer genetics	1
Rhabdomyosarcoma	Cancer genetics	1
Skin cancer	Cancer genetics	1

Trichoepitheliomas	Cancer genetics	1
Urothelial carcinoma	Cancer genetics	1
Uterine cancer	Cancer genetics	1
Congenital heart disease	Cardiac disorder	13
Bicuspid aortic valve	Cardiac disorder	6
Cardiomyopathy	Cardiac disorder	4
Holt Oram syndrome	Cardiac disorder	2
Aortic coarctation	Cardiac disorder	1
Mitral Valve Prolapse	Cardiac disorder	1
Patent foramen ovale	Cardiac disorder	1
Pulmonic valve stenosis	Cardiac disorder	1
Scimitar Syndrome	Cardiac disorder	1
Valvular heart disease	Cardiac disorder	1
Turner syndrome	Chromosomal disorder	80
22q11.2 deletion syndrome	Chromosomal disorder	59
Klinefelter syndrome	Chromosomal disorder	44
Chromosomal aneuploidy	Chromosomal disorder	33
Balanced translocation	Chromosomal disorder	5
Chromosomal translocation	Chromosomal disorder	5
Trisomy 21	Chromosomal disorder	3
Chromosomal inversion	Chromosomal disorder	2
Wolf-Hirschhorn syndrome	Chromosomal disorder	2
Trisomy 18	Chromosomal disorder	1
Trisomy 8	Chromosomal disorder	1
Aneurysmal disease	Connective tissue disorder	424
Marfan syndrome	Connective tissue disorder	422
Arterial dissection	Connective tissue disorder	181
Connective tissue disease	Connective tissue disorder	154
Osteogenesis imperfecta	Connective tissue disorder	106
Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, vascular	Connective tissue disorder	96
Loeys-Dietz syndrome	Connective tissue disorder	77
Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, classic	Connective tissue disorder	42
ACTA2-related disease	Connective tissue disorder	27
Stickler syndrome	Connective tissue disorder	19
MASS phenotype	Connective tissue disorder	17
Brain small vessel disease	Connective tissue disorder	5
Fibromuscular dysplasia	Connective tissue disorder	5
FBN2-related disease	Connective tissue disorder	4
PRKG1-related disease	Connective tissue disorder	4

FLNA-related syndrome	Connective tissue disorder	3
Moya-moya disease	Connective tissue disorder	3
Contractures	Connective tissue disorder	2
Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, musculocontractural	Connective tissue disorder	2
Multiple epiphyseal dysplasia	Connective tissue disorder	2
Bifid uvula	Connective tissue disorder	1
Dupuytren contractures	Connective tissue disorder	1
ELN-related disease	Connective tissue disorder	1
Ehlers-Danlos syndrome, kyphoscoliotic	Connective tissue disorder	1
Hernia	Connective tissue disorder	1
Spinal hygroma	Connective tissue disorder	1
Hearing loss	Ear/eye disorder	13
Retinal degeneration	Ear/eye disorder	8
Retinitis pigmentosa	Ear/eye disorder	7
Oculocutaneous albinisim	Ear/eye disorder	5
Hermansky Pudlak syndrome	Ear/eye disorder	3
Stargardt disease	Ear/eye disorder	3
Usher syndrome	Ear/eye disorder	3
Cataract	Ear/eye disorder	2
Axenfield-Reiger syndrome	Ear/eye disorder	1
Choroideremia	Ear/eye disorder	1
Occular albinism	Ear/eye disorder	1
Maturity onset diabetes of the young	Endocrine disorder	35
Congenital adrenal hyperplasia	Endocrine disorder	23
Hypogonadism	Endocrine disorder	17
Lipodystrophy	Endocrine disorder	13
Hyperlipidemia	Endocrine disorder	12
Hypoparathyroidism	Endocrine disorder	8
Familial hypercholesterolemia	Endocrine disorder	7
Premature ovarian failure	Endocrine disorder	7
Difference of sexual development	Endocrine disorder	6
Hypokalemia	Endocrine disorder	6
Familial hypocalciuric hypercalcemia	Endocrine disorder	5
Hyperaldosteronism	Endocrine disorder	4
Obesity	Endocrine disorder	4
Pseudohypoparathyroidism	Endocrine disorder	4
Thyroid hormone resistance syndrome	Endocrine disorder	3
Androgen insensitivity syndrome	Endocrine disorder	2
Cushing syndrome	Endocrine disorder	2

Hypocalcemia	Endocrine disorder	2
ACE Hyperactivity	Endocrine disorder	1
Calcinosis	Endocrine disorder	1
Endocrine disorder	Endocrine disorder	1
Hyperinsulinism	Endocrine disorder	1
Hypobetalipoproteinemia	Endocrine disorder	1
Pseudohypoaldosteronism	Endocrine disorder	1
Hemochromatosis	Gastrointestinal disorder	13
Pancreatitis	Gastrointestinal disorder	12
Cholestasis	Gastrointestinal disorder	2
GI dysmotility	Gastrointestinal disorder	2
Hirschsprung disease	Gastrointestinal disorder	2
Pancreatic insufficiency	Gastrointestinal disorder	2
Abdominal Pain	Gastrointestinal disorder	1
Cirrhosis	Gastrointestinal disorder	1
Hyperbilirubinemia	Gastrointestinal disorder	1
Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis	Gastrointestinal disorder	1
Genetic counseling	General genetics	68
Multiple congenital anomalies	General genetics	60
Carrier screening	General genetics	45
MTHFR, common variant	General genetics	24
Pharmacogenetics	General genetics	9
Complex medical history	General genetics	5
Infertility	General genetics	5
Multiple miscarriages	General genetics	4
Cleft palate	General genetics	3
Fatigue	General genetics	3
Goldenhar syndrome	General genetics	3
Overgrowth disorder	General genetics	3
Hemihypertrophy	General genetics	2
Hydrocephalus	General genetics	2
PHACE association	General genetics	2
Trichorhinophalangeal syndrome	General genetics	2
Aquagenic palm wrinkling	General genetics	1
Cyclic vomitting	General genetics	1
Dysmorphology syndrome	General genetics	1
Hyperhidrosis	General genetics	1
Swyer syndrome	General genetics	1
Testicular abnormalities	General genetics	1

Hypermobility of the joints	Hypermobility	1129
Intellectual disability	ID/DD/ASD	94
Autism Spectrum Disorder	ID/DD/ASD	17
Angelman syndrome	ID/DD/ASD	10
PHF8-related disease	ID/DD/ASD	2
KAT6A-related disease	ID/DD/ASD	1
Immunodeficiency	Immune/hematologic disorder	53
Immune dysregulation	Immune/hematologic disorder	17
Periodic fever syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	16
Autoimmune disease	Immune/hematologic disorder	12
Hypogammaglobulinemia	Immune/hematologic disorder	8
Common variable immunodeficiency	Immune/hematologic disorder	7
Hyper IgE syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	6
Recurrent mucocutaneous candidiasis	Immune/hematologic disorder	5
Hemophilia	Immune/hematologic disorder	4
G6PD deficiency	Immune/hematologic disorder	3
Neutropenia	Immune/hematologic disorder	3
Polycythemia vera	Immune/hematologic disorder	3
Porphyria	Immune/hematologic disorder	3
Recurrent infections	Immune/hematologic disorder	3
Bleeding diathesis	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Chronic granulomatous disease	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Hereditary angioedema	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Hidradenitis suppurativa	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Hyper IgM syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
PAPASH syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Thalassemia	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Wiskott-Aldrich syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	2
Anemia	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Beta thalassemia	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Blau syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Bruising	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Cytopenia	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Diamond Blackfan Anemia	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Hyperferritinemia	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Mast cell activation syndrome	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
TRAPS-related disease	Immune/hematologic disorder	1
Interstitial lung disease	Lung disorder	49

Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis	Lung disorder	41
Pneumothorax	Lung disorder	20
Cystic fibrosis	Lung disorder	15
Alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency	Lung disorder	9
Bronchiectasis	Lung disorder	4
Cystic lung disease	Lung disorder	3
Pulmonary hypertension	Lung disorder	3
Primary ciliary dyskinesia	Lung disorder	2
TERC-related disease	Lung disorder	1
Fabry disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	296
Gaucher disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	148
Pompe disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	70
Morquio syndrome	Lysosomal storage disorder	6
Maroteaux Lamy syndrome	Lysosomal storage disorder	5
Krabbe disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	4
Tay-Sachs disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	4
Niemann-Pick Type C	Lysosomal storage disorder	3
Hunter syndrome	Lysosomal storage disorder	2
Lysosomal storage disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	2
Sanfilippo syndrome	Lysosomal storage disorder	1
Scheie disease	Lysosomal storage disorder	1
Ornithine transcarbamylase deficiency	Metabolic disorder	25
Homocystinuria	Metabolic disorder	18
Glycogen storage disease	Metabolic disorder	15
Cystinosis	Metabolic disorder	13
Trimethylaminuria	Metabolic disorder	13
Alkaptonuria	Metabolic disorder	11
CPT-II deficiency	Metabolic disorder	9
Carnitine deficiency	Metabolic disorder	9
Hyperammonemia	Metabolic disorder	9
Metabolic disease	Metabolic disorder	9
MCAD deficiency	Metabolic disorder	8
Wilson disease	Metabolic disorder	6
Copper metabolism disorder	Metabolic disorder	5
Phenylketonuria	Metabolic disorder	4
Biotinidase deficiency	Metabolic disorder	3
CPS1 deficiency	Metabolic disorder	3
Citrullinemia	Metabolic disorder	3
Glutaric aciduria	Metabolic disorder	3

Methylmalonic acidemia	Metabolic disorder	3
Pseudoxanthoma elasticum	Metabolic disorder	3
Propionic acidemia	Metabolic disorder	2
Very long chain acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency	Metabolic disorder	2
11-beta hydroxylase deficiency	Metabolic disorder	1
ACAD9 deficiency	Metabolic disorder	1
B-ketothiolase deficiency	Metabolic disorder	1
Barth syndrome	Metabolic disorder	1
Butyrylcholinesterase deficiency	Metabolic disorder	1
Cerebrotendinous Xanthomatosis	Metabolic disorder	1
Cobalamin C deficiency	Metabolic disorder	1
Congenital Disorder of Glycosylation	Metabolic disorder	1
Fatty acid oxidation disorder	Metabolic disorder	1
GM1 gangliosidosis	Metabolic disorder	1
Galactosemia	Metabolic disorder	1
Glycerol Kinase Deficiency	Metabolic disorder	1
Hereditary fructose intolerance	Metabolic disorder	1
Hurler syndrome	Metabolic disorder	1
Hyperoxaluria	Metabolic disorder	1
Lesch Nyhan syndrome	Metabolic disorder	1
Multiple acyl-CoA dehydrogenase deficiency (MADD)	Metabolic disorder	1
Zellweger spectrum disorder	Metabolic disorder	1
Mitochondrial disease	Mitochondrial disease	36
Optic atrophy	Mitochondrial disease	8
POLG-related disease	Mitochondrial disease	8
Leber hereditary optic neuropathy	Mitochondrial disease	3
MELAS	Mitochondrial disease	3
Wolfram syndrome	Mitochondrial disease	3
Chronic progressive external ophthalmoplegia	Mitochondrial disease	2
Pyruvate dehydrogenase deficiency	Mitochondrial disease	2
C1QBP-related myopathy	Mitochondrial disease	1
Maternally inherited diabetes and deafness	Mitochondrial disease	1
Neurofibromatosis type 1	Multisystem disorder	456
Tuberous sclerosis complex	Multisystem disorder	134
von Hippel Lindau syndrome	Multisystem disorder	128
Birt-Hogg-Dube syndrome	Multisystem disorder	71
Cowden syndrome	Multisystem disorder	30
FMR1-related disease	Multisystem disorder	24
Noonan syndrome	Multisystem disorder	17

Dyskeratosis congenita	Multisystem disorder	15
MECP2-related disease	Multisystem disorder	11
Bardet Biedl syndrome	Multisystem disorder	10
Jacobsen syndrome	Multisystem disorder	9
Kallman syndrome	Multisystem disorder	8
Prader Willi syndrome	Multisystem disorder	6
Sensebrenner syndrome	Multisystem disorder	6
KBG syndrome	Multisystem disorder	5
LZTR1-related disease	Multisystem disorder	5
Noonan syndrome with multiple lentigines	Multisystem disorder	5
Rubenstein Taybi syndrome	Multisystem disorder	5
Waardenburg syndrome	Multisystem disorder	5
Kabuki syndrome	Multisystem disorder	4
Nail-Patella syndrome	Multisystem disorder	4
Phelan-McDermid Syndrome	Multisystem disorder	4
Williams syndrome	Multisystem disorder	4
Branchio-oto-renal syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
Camurati Engelmann syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
Cardiofaciocutaneous syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
Chondrodysplasia punctata	Multisystem disorder	2
Coffin-Siris syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
Heterotaxy	Multisystem disorder	2
Joubert syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
Potocki Lupski syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
Schwachman Diamond syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
TTR Amyloidosis	Multisystem disorder	2
Treacher-Collins syndrome	Multisystem disorder	2
ADNP-related disease	Multisystem disorder	1
Alagile syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Baraitser-Winter syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Beckwith-Wiedemann syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Cockayne syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Currarino syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Darier disease	Multisystem disorder	1
Fanconi Anemia	Multisystem disorder	1
Freeman-Sheldon syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Hajdu-Cheney syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Inherited systemic hyalinosis	Multisystem disorder	1
Kleefstra syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1

Legius syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Luscan-Lumish syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Opitz G/BBB Syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Rett Syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Rothmund-Thomson syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Sotos syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
VACTERL	Multisystem disorder	1
Weaver syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Werner syndrome	Multisystem disorder	1
Rhabdomyolysis	Neuromuscular disorder	16
Malignant hyperthermia	Neuromuscular disorder	13
Ischemic strokes	Neuromuscular disorder	11
Leukodystrophy	Neuromuscular disorder	11
Erythromelalgia	Neuromuscular disorder	8
RBCK1-related disease	Neuromuscular disorder	8
Spinomuscular atrophy	Neuromuscular disorder	6
Muscular dystrophy	Neuromuscular disorder	5
Frontotemporal dementia	Neuromuscular disorder	4
Myopathy	Neuromuscular disorder	4
Arthrogryposis	Neuromuscular disorder	3
Ataxia	Neuromuscular disorder	3
Dysautonomia	Neuromuscular disorder	3
Polymicrogyria	Neuromuscular disorder	3
Cerebral palsy	Neuromuscular disorder	2
Retinal vasculopathy with cerebral leukoencephalopathy	Neuromuscular disorder	2
Spasticity	Neuromuscular disorder	2
Agenesis of the corpus callosum	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Catatonia	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Charcot Marie Tooth	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Congenital Central Hypoventilation Syndrome	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Muscle hypertrophy	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Myotonia congenita	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Myotonic dystrophy	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Neuromuscular disease	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Neuropathy	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Psychosis	Neuromuscular disorder	1
ROBO4-related disorder	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Seizures	Neuromuscular disorder	1
Stroke	Neuromuscular disorder	1

Autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease	Renal disorder	123
Alport syndrome	Renal disorder	54
Chronic kidney disease	Renal disorder	17
Focal segmental glomerulosclerosis	Renal disorder	11
Renal dysplasia	Renal disorder	5
Hemolytic uremic syndrome	Renal disorder	4
Glomerulonephritis	Renal disorder	2
Liddle syndrome	Renal disorder	2
Nephrolithiasis	Renal disorder	2
Potter's sequence	Renal disorder	2
Autosomal dominant tubulointerstitial kidney disease	Renal disorder	1
Bartter syndrome	Renal disorder	1
Familial juvenile hyperuricaemic nephropathy	Renal disorder	1
Frasier syndrome	Renal disorder	1
Geller syndrome	Renal disorder	1
Minimal change disease	Renal disorder	1
Nephrocalcinosis	Renal disorder	1
PODXL-related disease	Renal disorder	1
Proteinuria	Renal disorder	1
Ectodermal Dysplasia	Skin/Tooth disorder	10
Hemangioma	Skin/Tooth disorder	10
Angiofibroma	Skin/Tooth disorder	8
Incontinentia pigmenti	Skin/Tooth disorder	5
Angioma	Skin/Tooth disorder	4
Epidermolysis bullosa	Skin/Tooth disorder	4
Ichthyosis	Skin/Tooth disorder	4
Palmoplantar keratoderma	Skin/Tooth disorder	3
Dental anomalies	Skin/Tooth disorder	2
Hypodontia	Skin/Tooth disorder	2
Piebaldism	Skin/Tooth disorder	2
Alopecia	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Anhidrosis	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Epidermal Inclusion Cysts	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Epidermodysplasia verruciformis	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Epidermolytic hyperkeratosis	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Erythrodysplasia verruciformis	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Keratoderma	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Lentigines	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Pruritis	Skin/Tooth disorder	1

Pustular psoriasis	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Trichothiodystrophy	Skin/Tooth disorder	1
Hereditary hemorrhagic telangiectasia	Vascular malformation disorder	364
Cerebral Cavernous Malformation	Vascular malformation disorder	31
Arteriovenous malformation	Vascular malformation disorder	13
Capillary malformation-arteriovenous malformation	Vascular malformation disorder	9
Lymphedema	Vascular malformation disorder	8
Klippel Trenaunay syndrome	Vascular malformation disorder	5
Lymphatic malformation	Vascular malformation disorder	4
Vascular malformation	Vascular malformation disorder	3
Venous malformation	Vascular malformation disorder	2
Blue rubber bleb nevus syndrome	Vascular malformation disorder	1
Carotid-Cavernous Fistula	Vascular malformation disorder	1
Maffucci syndrome	Vascular malformation disorder	1
Venous insufficiency	Vascular malformation disorder	1