

1 **Clinical and neurogenetic characterisation of autosomal recessive RBL2-associated**
2 **progressive neurodevelopmental disorder.**

3 Gabriel Aughey^{1*}, Elisa Cali^{2*}, Reza Maroofian^{2*}, Maha S Zaki³, Alistair T Pagnamenta⁴,
4 Fatima Rahman⁵, Lara Menzies⁶, Anum Shafique⁷, Mohnish Suri^{8,9}, Emmanuel Roze¹⁰,
5 Mohammed Aguenouz¹¹, Zouiri Ghizlane¹², Saadia Maryam Saadi¹³, Zafar Ali¹⁴, Uzma
6 Abdullah¹⁵, Huma Arshad Cheema¹⁶, Muhammad Nadeem Anjum¹⁶, Godelieve Morel¹⁷,
7 Robert McFarland^{18,19}, Umut Altunoglu²⁰, Verena Kraus²¹, Moneef Shoukier²², David
8 Murphy²³, Kristina Flemming²⁴, Hilde Yttervik²⁵, Hajar Rhouda¹², Gaetan Lesca²⁶, Bibi Nazia
9 Murtaza²⁷, Mujaddad Ur Rehman²⁷, SYNAPS Study Group², Genomics England
10 Consortium²⁸, Go Hun Seo²⁹, Christian Beetz³⁰, Hülya Kayserili²⁰, Yamna Krioulie¹², Wendy
11 K Chung³¹, Sadaf Naz⁷, Shazia Maqbool⁵, Joseph Gleeson^{32,33}, Shahid Mahmood Baig^{34,35},
12 Stephanie Efthymiou², Jenny C Taylor⁴, Mariasavina Severino³⁶, James EC Jepson^{1#}, Henry
13 Houlden^{2#}

14
15 **Author affiliations:**

- 16 1. Department of Clinical and Experimental Epilepsy, UCL Queen Square Institute of
17 Neurology, London, UK
- 18 2. Department of Neuromuscular diseases, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology,
19 London, UK
- 20 3. Department of Clinical Genetics, Human Genetics and Genome Research Institute,
21 National Research Centre, Dokki, Cairo 12622, Egypt
- 22 4. NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, Centre for Human Genetics, University of
23 Oxford, Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK
- 24 5. Department of Developmental-Behavioral Pediatrics, The Children's Hospital, University
25 of Child Health Sciences (UCHS-CH), Lahore 54600, Pakistan
- 26 6. Department of Clinical Genetics, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS
27 Foundation Trust, London, WC1N 3JH, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 28 7. School of Biological Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore 54590, Pakistan
- 29 8. UK National Paediatric Ataxia Telangiectasia Clinic, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS
30 Trust, Nottingham, UK
- 31 9. Nottingham Clinical Genetics Service, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust,
32 Nottingham, UK
- 33 10. Sorbonne University, INSERM, CNRS, Paris Brain Institute, Salpêtrière Hospital / AP-HP,
34 Paris, France
- 35 11. Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Messina, Messina, Italy.
- 36 12. Unit of Neuropediatrics and Neurometabolism, Pediatric Department 2, Rabat Children's
37 Hospital, BP 6527 Rabat, Morocco
- 38 13. Human Molecular Genetics Laboratory, NIBGE-PIEAS, Faisalabad, Pakistan
- 39 14. Centre for Biotechnology and Microbiology, University of Swat, Charbagh, Swat, Khyber
40 Pakhtunkhwa 19120, Pakistan
- 41 15. University Institute of Biochemistry and Biotechnology (UIBB), PMAS-Arid Agriculture
42 University Rawalpindi, Rawalpindi 46300, Pakistan
- 43 16. Department of Paediatric Gastroenterology Hepatology and Genetic diseases Children's
44 Hospital and University of Child Health Sciences Lahore Pakistan
- 45 17. Service de Génétique Médicale, CHU Felix Guyon, France
- 46 18. Wellcome Centre for Mitochondrial Research, Translational and Clinical Research
47 Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2
48 4HH, UK
- 49 19. NHS Highly Specialised Service for Rare Mitochondrial Disorders, Newcastle upon Tyne
50 Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK
- 51 20. Medical Genetics Department, School of Medicine (KUSoM), Koç University, Istanbul,
52 Turkey
- 53 21. Department of Pediatrics and Social Pediatrics, TUM School of Medicine, Munich,
54 Germany

- 55 22. Department of Molecular Genetics, Prenatal Medicine Munich, Munich, Germany.
- 56 23. Department of Clinical and Movement Neurosciences, UCL Queen Square Institute of
57 Neurology, University College London, United Kingdom
- 58 24. Department of Pediatric Rehabilitation, University Hospital Northern Norway
- 59 25. Department of Medical Genetics, University Hospital of North Norway, Tromsø, Norway
- 60 26. Genetics Department, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France; GENDEV Team, CRNL,
61 INSERM U1028, CNRS UMR 5292, UCBL1, Lyon, France
- 62 27. Abbottabad University of Science and Technology KP, Pakistan Government College
63 University (GCU), Lahore, Pakistan
- 64 28. Genomics England, London, UK.
- 65 29. 3billion inc, Seoul, South Korea
- 66 30. Centogene GmbH, Rostock, Germany
- 67 31. Department of Pediatrics, Boston Children's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston,
68 MA 02115, USA
- 69 32. Department of Neurosciences, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla 92093, USA.
- 70 33. Rady Children's Institute for Genomic Medicine, San Diego 92123, USA
- 71 34. Faculty of Life Sciences, Health Services Academy, Park Road, Islamabad, Pakistan
- 72 35. Department of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, Aga Khan University, Karachi,
73 Pakistan
- 74 36. UO Neuroradiologia, IRCCS Istituto Giannina Gaslini, Genoa, Italy
- 75
- 76 *These authors contributed equally to this work
- 77 #Correspondence to:
- 78 Prof. Henry Houlden
- 79 UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, Dept. of Neuromuscular Diseases, Queen Square,
80 London, UK WC1N 3BG
- 81 E-mail: h.houlden@ucl.ac.uk

82

83 Prof. James E.C. Jepson

84 UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, Dept. of Clinical and Experimental Epilepsy,

85 London, UK WC1N 3BG

86 E-mail: j.jepson@ucl.ac.uk

87

88 **Running title:** *RBL2*-linked neurodevelopmental disorder

89 **Keywords:** *RBL2*, cell-cycle, neurodevelopmental disorder, *Drosophila*, *Rbf*

90

91 **Abstract**

92 Retinoblastoma (RB) proteins are highly conserved transcriptional regulators that play
93 important roles during development by regulating cell-cycle gene expression. RBL2
94 dysfunction has been linked to a severe neurodevelopmental disorder. However, to date,
95 clinical features have only been described in six individuals carrying five biallelic predicted loss
96 of function (pLOF) variants. To define the phenotypic effects of *RBL2* mutations in detail, we
97 identified and clinically characterized a cohort of 28 patients from 18 families carrying LOF
98 variants in *RBL2*, including fourteen new variants that substantially broaden the molecular
99 spectrum. The clinical presentation of affected individuals is characterized by a range of
100 neurological and developmental abnormalities. Global developmental delay and intellectual
101 disability were uniformly observed, ranging from moderate to profound and involving lack of
102 acquisition of key motor and speech milestones in most patients. Frequent features included
103 postnatal microcephaly, infantile hypotonia, aggressive behaviour, stereotypic movements
104 and non-specific dysmorphic features. Common neuroimaging features were cerebral atrophy,
105 white matter volume loss, corpus callosum hypoplasia and cerebellar atrophy. In parallel, we
106 used the fruit fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*, to investigate how disruption of the conserved
107 RBL2 orthologue Rbf impacts nervous system function and development. We found that
108 *Drosophila Rbf* LOF mutants recapitulate several features of patients harboring *RBL2* variants,
109 including alterations in the head and brain morphology reminiscent of microcephaly, and
110 perturbed locomotor behaviour. Surprisingly, in addition to its known role in controlling tissue
111 growth during development, we find that continued *Rbf* expression is also required in fully
112 differentiated post-mitotic neurons for normal locomotion in *Drosophila*, and that adult-stage
113 neuronal re-expression of *Rbf* is sufficient to rescue *Rbf* mutant locomotor defects. Taken
114 together, this study provides a clinical and experimental basis to understand genotype-
115 phenotype correlations in an *RBL2*-linked neurodevelopmental disorder and suggests that
116 restoring *RBL2* expression through gene therapy approaches may ameliorate aspects of
117 *RBL2* LOF patient symptoms.

118 Introduction

119 Retinoblastoma (RB) proteins play well-defined roles in regulating cell-cycle gene expression
120 during development¹. The mammalian RB family consists of three members, RB1, RBL1 and
121 RBL2, which share overlapping functions and have some exclusive roles as well. RB proteins
122 antagonize the action of E2F transcription factors, which may result in the activation or
123 repression of gene expression depending on the genomic context, and variants of RB proteins
124 are linked to an array of disease states. For example, RB1 is a well-known tumor suppressor,
125 with loss-of-function (LOF) mutations associated with several types of neoplastic lesions
126 including retinoblastoma, prostate cancer, breast cancer, lung cancer and osteosarcoma²⁻⁷.
127 RBL1 acts as a tumor suppressor by inhibiting the activity of E2F transcription factors,
128 particularly E2F1, thereby preventing the inappropriate progression of cells through the cell
129 cycle. RBL2 similarly functions as a key regulator of cell division through interactions with
130 E2F4 and E2F5, and promotes senescence by repressing repair genes, controlling DNA
131 methylation, and influencing telomere length⁸⁻¹⁰.

132 RBL1 and RBL2 have also been found to regulate neuronal differentiation and the
133 survival of post-mitotic neurons¹¹. Correspondingly, pathogenic variants in *RBL2* have been
134 associated with severe developmental delay, dysmorphic features, microcephaly, and
135 behavioural abnormalities¹²⁻¹⁴. However, clinical features associated with *RBL2* pathogenic
136 variants have only been characterized in six individuals. Hence, a comprehensive
137 characterization of this disorder has yet to be performed. Furthermore, the cell-types in which
138 *RBL2* expression is required to promote neural development and function remain unclear.

139 To define the phenotypic effects of *RBL2* mutations in detail, we identified and clinically
140 characterized a cohort of 28 patients from 18 families carrying homozygous or compound
141 heterozygous predicted LOF (pLOF) *RBL2* variants. These studies have expanded the clinical
142 spectrum and identified the most common dysmorphic and neuroradiological features linked
143 to the disorder. Additionally, we have broadened the molecular spectrum by identifying

144 fourteen new disease-causing variants, providing additional support for *RBL2* LOF as basis of
145 this disorder.

146 *RBL2* null mice display embryonic lethality coupled with impaired neurogenesis and
147 enhanced apoptosis¹⁵. Therefore, we used the fruit fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*, to
148 investigate how disruption of the conserved *RBL2* orthologue Rbf impacts nervous system
149 function and development. We found that *Drosophila Rbf* LOF mutants recapitulate several
150 features of patients harboring *RBL2* variants, including alterations in the head and brain
151 morphology reminiscent of microcephaly, and perturbed locomotor behaviour. Surprisingly, in
152 addition to its known role in controlling tissue growth during development, we found that
153 continued Rbf expression is also required in fully differentiated post-mitotic neurons for normal
154 locomotion in *Drosophila*, and that adult-stage neuron-specific re-expression of Rbf is
155 sufficient to rescue *Rbf* mutant locomotor defects.

156 Collectively, our work provides a clinical and experimental foundation to understand
157 genotype-phenotype linkages in an *RBL2*-linked neurodevelopmental disorder, and suggests
158 that restoring *RBL2* expression in post-mitotic neurons through gene therapy approaches may
159 mitigate some of the morbidities caused by *RBL2* pLOF.

160

161 **Materials and methods**

162 **Patient identification and genetic investigation**

163 **Patient recruitment**

164 The affected individuals were identified through data sharing with collaborators and screening
165 databases of several diagnostic and research genetic laboratories worldwide, as well as using
166 GeneMatcher¹⁶. Informed consent forms allowing for participation were signed by all study
167 participants and/or their parents or guardians. Genome/exome sequencing (GS/ES) was
168 performed on genomic DNA extracted from blood in different diagnostic or research
169 laboratories worldwide, and if required, candidate variants were confirmed by Sanger
170 sequencing in the available samples from other members of the families.

171

172 **Clinical assessment**

173 Detailed clinical data and family history were collected for new and reported cases in the form
174 of completing a clinical proforma by the recruiting clinicians. Brain MRIs were reviewed by an
175 experienced pediatric neuroradiologist (M.S.). Video segments of seven patients were suitable
176 for fine analysis of the stereotypies by an experienced neurologist (E.F.). Facial photographs
177 and/or videos were reviewed for 24 patients from 15 families, including 18 new patients from
178 11 families and 6 previously published patients from 4 families¹²⁻¹⁴. Their dysmorphic features
179 were described based on the terminology recommended by Elements of Morphology¹⁷. Where
180 no term was available for a dysmorphic feature seen in a patient, HPO terminology was used
181 instead¹⁸.

182

183 ***Drosophila* studies**

184 ***Drosophila* husbandry**

185 All stocks and experimental crosses were raised on standard fly-food media and kept at 25 °C
186 with 12 h light: 12 h dark cycles. *Drosophila* strains used in this study are listed in
187 Supplementary Table 1. For behavioural experiments, isogenised lines (indicated in

188 Supplementary Table 1) were generated by outcrossing each mutation or transgene insertion
189 into the iso31 strain of *w¹¹¹⁸* for five generations¹⁹.

190

191 **Immuno-histochemistry**

192 Immunohistochemical experiments were performed as previously described²⁰. Briefly, adult or
193 larval brains were dissected in PBS, and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (MP biomedical) for
194 20 min at room temperature. Tissues were washed with PBST (PBS, 0.3% Triton X-100),
195 blocked in 1% goat serum in PBST and incubated in primary antibody overnight at 4 °C.
196 Following primary antibody incubation, tissues were washed a further three times in PBST and
197 incubated overnight in secondary antibody. Antibodies used in this study include mouse anti-
198 Elav (Developmental studies hybridoma bank - Elav-9F8A9)²¹, rabbit anti-cleaved DCP1 (Cell
199 signalling technology - #9578), and mouse anti-Repo (Developmental studies hybridoma bank
200 - 8D12)²².

201

202 ***Drosophila* behavioural analyses**

203 *Drosophila* activity was assayed using the *Drosophila* Activity Monitor system (DAM;
204 Trikinetics, MA, USA) as previously described^{23,24}. Briefly, individual flies obtained between 3-
205 5 days after eclosing were loaded into glass tubes containing 4% sucrose and 2% agar (w/v)
206 and sealed with cotton-wool plugs. Monitors were kept at 25°C with 12 h light: dark cycles for
207 two days to acclimatise. On the third day activity was recorded for 24 h. For measurements of
208 peak activity at ZT0-1 or ZT12-13 (ZT: zeitgeber), activity was taken from the hour after lights
209 on or off during the third day. DAM data was analysed using the Rethomics R package²⁵. Only
210 flies surviving for the full three days were included for analysis. For adult-specific knockdown
211 and rescue experiments, flies were raised at 18°C until 2 days post-eclosion, at which point
212 they were loaded into DAM monitors and moved to 29°C for 3 days (or remained at 18°C for
213 controls).

214 Larval locomotion assays were conducted by transferring wandering 3rd instar larvae
215 to a large arena containing 2% agar. The arena was placed into a 25°C incubator and larvae
216 were left to acclimatise for 30 s. Larval crawling was video recorded for 1 min. Video files were
217 analysed using ImageJ to calculate total distance travelled.

218 Negative geotaxis (climbing) assays were conducted as previously described²⁶. Briefly,
219 cohorts of 10 flies were transferred to clean glass measuring cylinders and left to acclimatise
220 for at least 20 mins. Flies were firmly tapped down 3-5 times and number of flies crossing an
221 8 cm vertical threshold in 12 s was recorded. Three technical replicates were included for each
222 genotype.

223

224 **Statistical analyses**

225 Statistical data analysis was performed using R or GraphPad Prism. Datasets were first
226 tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. Statistical analyses were
227 performed using a t-test with Welch's correction or one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple
228 comparisons post-hoc test if data were normally distributed; and Mann-Whitney U-test or
229 Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple correction if data were non-normally distributed.

230 **Results**

231 **Clinical profile of the study cohort**

232 The overall cohort comprises 13 females and 15 males, whose age at last evaluation ranged
233 between 2 and 36 years (median 11, IQR 11). An overview of the clinical findings can be found
234 in Figure 1A and Table 1. Detailed clinical information is available in Supplementary Table 2.
235 Consanguinity was reported in 15 families (83%). Pregnancy and delivery were unremarkable
236 for all the patients for whom information was available (24/24, 100%) and all newborns were
237 at term. Birth parameters of length and weight, when available, were within normal ranges for
238 all the infants, and only one presented with decreased head circumference at birth
239 (HP:0011451). Most of the newborns (26/28, 93%) manifested infantile hypotonia
240 (HP:0008947). Failure to thrive (HP:0001508) and feeding difficulties in the infantile period
241 were documented in 36% and 37% of those examined, respectively (5/14 and 7/19).

242 Global developmental delay (HP:0001263) and intellectual disability (HP:0001249)
243 were reported in all the affected individuals (28/28, 100%). All patients (28/28, 100%)
244 presented motor delay (HP:0001270): while most of the affected children only presented a
245 delay in the achievement of unsupported sitting (21/23 delayed, 2/23 not attained). The
246 majority never attained independent walking (19/27, 70%) and the remainder had delayed
247 acquisition. In the same way, most children (22/27, 81%) showed complete lack of
248 development of speech and expressive language abilities (HP:0001344), while in the
249 remaining individuals (5/27, 19%) development of speech was delayed (HP:0000750) and
250 involved the use of just a few words (Figure 1B). Regression of motor and cognitive abilities
251 (HP:0002376) was reported in three patients (3/22, 14%). When formal cognitive assessment
252 was performed, degree of intellectual disability ranged from moderate (3/27), severe (17/27),
253 to profound (7/27) (Figure 1C). Behavioural abnormalities (24/28, 86%) included stereotypies
254 (15/25, 60%), aggressive behaviour (12/15, 80%), autism (6/21, 28%) and, when data were
255 available, sleep disturbance (5/5). Video segments of seven patients were suitable for fine
256 analysis of the stereotypies. The stereotypies usually involved the cervico-facial area (head

257 and/or orofacial region) along with the distal part of the upper limbs, typically in the form of
258 hand claspings/squeezing and mouthing, and finger wringing (Video 1). Seizures occurred in
259 36% of the individuals (10/28). Age of onset of the seizures ranged from 1 to 20 years (median
260 age 8 years, IQR 7). Patients mostly presented a generalized seizure(HP:0002197) (n=6)
261 onset, while focal onset (HP:0007359) occurred in two patients, one with secondary
262 generalization. Seizure types were variable and included tonic-clonic (n=3), myoclonic (n=2),
263 and tonic (n=1). Where EEG was available, abnormalities were documented in 7/10 patients
264 examined (70%), including one patient with no clinical seizures, and included focal, multifocal,
265 and diffuse epileptiform discharges, slowing of background activity and subcortical changes.

266 Neurological examination showed increased tendon reflexes (HP:0001347) (10/17,
267 59%), muscle weakness (HP:0001324) (12/22, 55%), axial hypotonia (HP:0008936) (10/21,
268 47%) and spasticity (HP:0001257) (11/25,44%). Ophthalmological evaluation revealed
269 presence of abnormal findings in half of the cases (14/27, 52%), including strabismus
270 (HP:0000486) (7/19, 37%), nystagmus (HP:0000639) (6/26, 23%), refractive defects
271 (3/25,12%), poor vision (6/26, 23%), optic disc anomalies (4/24, 17%) and orbital mass (2/26,
272 8%).

273 At last evaluation, 74% of the patients (20/27) were microcephalic (HP:0000252)
274 (Figure 2A). Dysmorphic features were described in 70% of the cases and included, based on
275 photographic assessment, low anterior hairline (50%), narrow forehead/bifrontal/bitemporal
276 narrowing (83.3%), full or broad nasal tip (77.8%), thick/full lower lip vermilion (66.7%) and
277 broad or tall pointed chin (77.8%) (Figure 2B, Supplementary Table 3).

278

279 **Neuroradiological features of *RBL2* patients**

280 Brain MRIs were available for review in 12/28 cases (mean age at MRI 7 years, range 8
281 months – 17 years). The most frequent neuroimaging finding was a mild-to-moderate cerebral
282 atrophy with antero-posterior gradient and thin corpus callosum (10/12, 83.3%) (Figure 3).
283 Reduced white matter volume with ventricular enlargement was associated in 8/10 cases. In

284 9 subjects (75%), we found white matter signal abnormalities, including faint to marked focal
285 signal changes at the level of forceps minor (8/9), delayed myelination (2/9), and multiple
286 patchy frontal signal changes (1/9). Mild-to-moderate cerebellar atrophy was noted in 7/12
287 individuals (58.3%), with dentate signal changes in 3 cases and clear progression in one
288 subject with a follow-up MRI; in one individual there were also bilateral widespread subcortical
289 signal changes. In 4 other subjects (33%) there was hypoplasia of the inferior portion of the
290 cerebellar hemispheres and/or vermis, with associated foliar anomalies in 1 case. Optic nerve
291 thinning was detected in 5/12 (41%) individuals. Calcifications in the basal ganglia were found
292 in 2/12 (16.6%) cases. Finally, expansile lesions were found in 2 subjects: a large mass
293 extending from the III ventricular floor to the prepontine cisterns (hypothalamic hamartoma
294 versus ectopic cerebellar tissue) in P6 and a cystic mandibular lesion in P23 (Supplementary
295 Table 4).

296

297 **Molecular spectrum of *RBL2* variants**

298 A total of 19 *RBL2* variants are included in this study (Figure 4A), 14 of which are newly
299 reported variants not described in the literature. Within the cohort of newly reported families
300 (Figure 3B), only one affected family carried a previously reported variant (c.556C>T,
301 p.Arg186Ter). Molecular findings are shown schematically in Figure 4 and described in detail
302 in Supplementary Table 5. The variants were inherited from unaffected heterozygous parents:
303 23 patients inherited the variant in the homozygous state and 4 in compound heterozygous
304 state. All variants were either absent or found at very low allele frequencies in multiple variant
305 frequency databases (range 0.0-0.00002). The molecular spectrum hereby described includes
306 truncating (n=5), frameshift (n=6) splice (n=6) and large deletions (n=2) (Figure 4C).

307 According to the American College of Medical Genetics (ACMG) classification, six
308 were classified as pathogenic and thirteen as likely pathogenic. All identified variants were
309 predicted as damaging across a suite of in silico tools and expected to lead to LOF of the

310 protein. Our findings therefore confirm a clear link between biallelic pLOF mutations in *RBL2*
311 and a multifaceted neurodevelopmental disorder.

312

313 **A *Drosophila* model of RBL2-linked pathology recapitulates morphological patient**
314 **phenotypes.**

315 The *Drosophila melanogaster* genome encodes two Rb proteins: Rbf and Rbf2. Of these, Rbf
316 shares the greater similarity to RBL2 (39% similarity and 25% identity; compared to 35%
317 similarity and 20% identity for Rbf2). Indeed, fourteen distinct databases of orthology
318 relationships place Rbf as the closest *Drosophila* orthologue of RBL2, and RBL2 was the
319 closest match for Rbf in a reverse orthology search
320 (<https://flybase.org/reports/FBgn0015799#orthologs>).

321 Similar to RBL2, prior work has shown *Drosophila* Rbf interacts with and negatively
322 regulates E2F transcription factor activity to repress cell-cycle gene expression²⁷⁻²⁹. Thus,
323 human RBL2 and *Drosophila* Rbf exhibit functional as well as amino-acid conservation.
324 Published single-cell RNAseq data further indicate that *Rbf* is widely expressed throughout
325 the *Drosophila* nervous system, whereas *Rbf2* is not (Supplementary Fig. 1A, B)³⁰⁻³¹. Hence,
326 we investigated how loss of Rbf function impacted neural development and behaviour in
327 *Drosophila*.

328 We first set out to determine the extent to which *Drosophila* *Rbf* loss of function
329 phenotypes resemble *RBL2* patient symptoms. Initially, we examined male and female flies
330 hemizygous or homozygous respectively for a hypomorphic allele of *Rbf* (*Rbf*^{f120a}) to determine
331 whether partial loss of Rbf function in flies recapitulated morphological and behavioural
332 phenotypes observed in *RBL2* patients. While a previous study suggested that eye
333 morphology in *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes was relatively normal³², we noticed that the size of the eye
334 was significantly smaller in hemizygous *Rbf*^{f120a} males compared to control flies, although the
335 highly organised ommatidial structure appeared unaffected (Figure 5A, B). We also examined
336 the eye-size of female *Rbf*^{f120a} homozygotes and females trans-heterozygote for *Rbf*^{f120a} and

337 the *Rbf^{f14}* null allele (note that adult *Rbf^{f14}* homozygotes are embryonic lethal)³³. Both *Rbf^{f120a}*
338 homozygote and *Rbf^{f120a}/Rbf^{f14}* trans-heterozygous females also displayed smaller eyes
339 compared to wild-type control and *Rbf^{f120a}/+* or *Rbf^{f14}/+* heterozygote flies (Figure 5C).

340 Since microcephaly is a clinical feature of *RBL2* patients, we next examined whether
341 brain size was also reduced in *Drosophila Rbf* mutants (Figure 5D-G). While overall brain size
342 was not significantly smaller in *Rbf^{f120a}* hemizygote males (Figure 5E), we observed a
343 significant reduction in the size of *Rbf^{f120a}* hemizygote optic lobes, visual processing centres
344 that contain > 60% of all neurons in the fly brain³⁴ (Figure 5F). In contrast, the central brain
345 region of *Rbf^{f120a}* hemizygotes was unaltered (Figure 5G).

346 Rb proteins have been linked to apoptosis in human³⁵ and *Drosophila*³⁶, with *Rbf^{f120a}*
347 mutants displaying increased apoptosis in the eye imaginal disc (the developmental precursor
348 to the adult eye³²). We therefore reasoned that decreased brain size in *Rbf* mutants might be
349 driven by an increase in cell death. To determine the amount of apoptosis in the brains of
350 *Rbf^{f120a}* mutants, we stained tissues with anti-DCP1, which recognises the cleaved version of
351 a caspase protein involved in apoptotic cell death. Examination of adult *Rbf^{f120a}* brains
352 indicated minimal apoptosis, as was similarly observed in control adult brains (Figure 5H).
353 However, examination of larval brains, in which most neurons are in a more immature state,
354 revealed significantly greater numbers of apoptotic cells in *Rbf^{f120a}* mutants than controls
355 (Figure 5I, J). This suggests that neuronal precursors and immature neurons are more
356 sensitive to the induction of apoptosis when Rbf is depleted, in agreement with previous
357 observations of the developing eye³². Overall, the morphological phenotypes we observe in
358 the adult head and brain are consistent with the microcephaly seen in *RBL2* patients,
359 indicating a conserved function for the *RBL2* and *Rbf* proteins in controlling head morphology
360 during development.

361

362 ***Drosophila Rbf* mutants display locomotor defects.**

363 Since profound motor delay was observed in all patients homozygous for *RBL2* variants, we
364 also tested whether *Drosophila Rbf* mutants exhibited motor defects. To do so, we utilised the
365 *Drosophila* Activity Monitor (DAM) system²³, which quantifies spontaneous activity by
366 recording the number of times individual flies interrupt an infra-red beam bisecting a glass tube
367 housing each fly (Figure 6A). *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes showed significantly lower locomotor activity
368 compared to controls both over a 12 h light: 12 h dark period (Figure 6B) and during a one-
369 hour window following lights-on (ZT0-1; ZT – zeitgeber time) that corresponds to a period of
370 peak activity (Figure 6C). We observed a similar effect in female *Rbf*^{f120a} homozygotes and
371 *Rbf*^{f120a}/*Rbf*^{f14} trans-heterozygotes, but not in females that are heterozygous for either allele
372 (Figure 6D), thus confirming that the above alterations in locomotor activity were caused by
373 mutations in *Rbf*. To further characterise these behavioural abnormalities, we conducted
374 negative geotaxis (climbing) assays²⁶. *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygote males displayed significantly lower
375 climbing ability compared to control animals (Supplementary Figure 1C, D), further indicating
376 that *Rbf* LOF induces significant motor defects in flies. Thus, *Drosophila Rbf* mutants
377 recapitulate morphological and behavioural phenotypes observed in patients harbouring *RBL2*
378 mutations.

379

380 ***Rbf* is highly expressed in adult neurons.**

381 Given the strong phenotypic similarities between humans and fruit flies harbouring *RBL2/Rbf*
382 LOF mutations, we tested whether we could utilise *Drosophila* to probe the mechanistic basis
383 of *RBL2*-linked neurodevelopmental defects. Rb proteins are well-known for their role in
384 transcriptional repression of cell-cycle related genes at the G1/S phase transition³⁷. Hence, it
385 is expected that *Rbf* would be expressed in the developing brain. However, it is unclear
386 whether *Rbf* also continues to play a role in fully differentiated neurons following cell-cycle
387 exit. To investigate which cells in the nervous system express *Rbf*, we took advantage of a
388 CRISPR-mediated insertion of a Gal4 cassette (CRIMIC insertion) in an *Rbf* intron, which
389 results in expression of Gal4 under control of *Rbf* regulatory sequences (termed *Rbf*-Gal4

390 hereafter)³⁸ (Figure 6E). Crossing these flies to a UAS-*mCherry-nls* line yields expression of
391 nuclear mCherry as a reporter of *Rbf* expression. Examination of *Rbf*-Gal4 activity in larval
392 brains revealed widespread expression, indicating that *Rbf* is indeed broadly expressed in the
393 developing brain (Supplementary Figure 1E). More surprisingly, adult brains – which do not
394 display appreciable neurogenesis under normal conditions – also exhibited widespread *Rbf*-
395 driven mCherry expression that co-localised with the neuronal marker Elav (Figure 6F and
396 Supplementary Figure 1F). Hence, *Rbf* expression persists in neurons long after terminal cell-
397 cycle exit. In contrast, only a small population of Repo-labelled glial cells expressed mCherry
398 under the control of *Rbf*-Gal4 (Figure 6F). These findings are consistent with published single-
399 cell RNAseq data showing that *Rbf* is preferentially expressed in post-mitotic neurons relative
400 to glia (Supplemental Figure 1A).

401

402 **Rbf knockdown in neurons causes severe behavioural defects.**

403 To directly test for an underappreciated role of Rbf in fully differentiated post-mitotic cells, we
404 examined whether reducing Rbf expression in post-mitotic neurons resulted in locomotor
405 defects similar to those observed in constitutive *Rbf* hypomorph flies. To do so, we used
406 transgenic RNAi to deplete *Rbf* specifically in fully differentiated neurons using the *nSyb*-Gal4
407 driver. Strikingly, using the DAM system once more, we found that pan-neuronal knockdown
408 of *Rbf* with a previously verified shRNA-expressing line³⁹ severely reduced peak movement in
409 adult flies (Figure 6G). To rule out off-target effects, we repeated these experiments using two
410 additional RNAi lines targeting *Rbf* mRNA. Both constructs similarly reduced peak movement
411 when expressed in post-mitotic neurons (Supplementary Figure 2A, B). In contrast to neuronal
412 knockdowns, RNAi-mediated depletion of *Rbf* in glial cells did not significantly reduce peak
413 locomotor activity (Figure 6H), in accordance with the above observation that *Rbf* expression
414 is less abundant in glia than neurons (Figure 6F).

415 We next used climbing assays to quantify stimulus-induced negative geotaxis. These
416 assays further indicated that flies with reduced Rbf expression in neurons have severe motor

417 defects, showing significantly reduced climbing ability compared to controls (Supplementary
418 Figure 2C). Interestingly, larval locomotion was unchanged in either *Rbf* hypomorphs or
419 following knockdown of *Rbf* in post-mitotic neurons, suggesting that larval neuronal lineages
420 have a differential requirement for *Rbf* compared to their adult counterparts (Supplementary
421 Figure 2D, E). Importantly, *Rbf* knockdown in adult post-mitotic neurons did not reduce optic
422 lobe size nor induce a measurable increase in neuronal apoptosis (Supplementary Figure 2F,
423 G). Taken together, these data suggest that *Rbf* plays important neuron-autonomous roles
424 that are essential for adult locomotor behaviour and which are independent of neuronal
425 viability.

426

427 **Multiple neuronal subtypes are affected by *Rbf* knockdown.**

428 To identify which cell-types in the post-mitotic brain are affected by *Rbf* knockdown, we used
429 specific drivers to restrict *Rbf* shRNA expression to genetically defined subsets of neurons.
430 We knocked down *Rbf* in discrete neuronal subtypes, including cholinergic, GABAergic, and
431 glutamatergic neurons. Of these, *Rbf* knockdown in glutamatergic neurons (which include
432 *Drosophila* motoneurons) yielded the most significant decline in locomotor activity, as
433 measured using the DAM system (Figure 6I and Supplementary Figure 3). *Rbf* knockdown in
434 GABAergic and cholinergic neurons did not significantly decrease overall activity across 24 h
435 (Supplementary Figure 3). However, in the one-hour period following lights-on (ZT0-1), during
436 which control flies exhibit a peak period of locomotor activity, both cholinergic and GABAergic
437 *Rbf* knockdown flies showed significantly reduced activity (Figure 6I), indicating a partial
438 perturbation of locomotor capacity. We further tested the motor defect of these flies by
439 conducting climbing assays. These experiments confirmed that reduced *Rbf* expression in
440 glutamatergic, cholinergic, or GABAergic neurons, resulted in significantly decreased climbing
441 ability compared to controls (Supplementary Figure 2C). In contrast, *Rbf* knockdown in
442 peptidergic neurons did not perturb overall or peak locomotor activity (Figure 6I and
443 Supplementary Figure 3). These data demonstrate that *Rbf* acts in several post-mitotic

444 neuronal subtypes to modulate movement, with glutamatergic neurons representing a
445 particularly relevant cellular locus.

446

447 **Post-mitotic restoration of Rbf rescues locomotor defects in *Rbf* hypomorphs.**

448 Since *Rbf* mutants display morphological phenotypes consistent with cell-cycle defects and
449 apoptosis during development, but also behavioural abnormalities that can be induced by
450 knockdown of *Rbf* in post-mitotic neurons, we questioned whether locomotor phenotypes in
451 constitutive *Rbf* hypomorphs were due to developmental defects or reduced *Rbf* expression
452 post-neurogenesis (i.e. in post-mitotic neurons). To address this question, we expressed Rbf
453 solely in fully differentiated neurons in the *Rbf* hypomorph background. Interestingly, this
454 manipulation fully rescued the reduced peak activity of *Rbf*^{f120a} hypomorphs, while over-
455 expression of *Rbf* in a wild-type background had no effect on peak locomotor activity (Figure
456 7A).

457 To more precisely interrogate whether Rbf LOF affects adult behaviour due to
458 developmental perturbations or cell-autonomous activity in adult neurons, we performed
459 complementary adult-stage neuron-specific knockdown and rescue experiments. To do so we
460 utilised *tub*-Gal80^{ts}, a globally expressed temperature-sensitive inhibitor of Gal4-mediated
461 transgene expression⁴⁰. In concert with the *nsyb*-Gal4 driver and *Rbf* shRNA or transgenes,
462 this construct allowed us to examine the effects of both adult neuron-specific *Rbf* knockdown
463 in an otherwise wild-type background (Figure 7B, C), and adult neuron-specific re-expression
464 of Rbf in an *Rbf* hypomorph background (Figure 7B, D). We first found that, as expected, peak
465 locomotion in wild-type flies did not significantly differ from controls when *Rbf* shRNA
466 expression in post-mitotic neurons was constitutively repressed at 22°C by active Gal80^{ts}
467 (Figure 7B, Ci). In contrast, inducing adult-stage neuronal knockdown of *Rbf* by shifting mature
468 experimental flies to 29°C (Gal80 inactive, *Rbf* shRNA expressed) significantly reduced peak
469 locomotion compared to control flies expressing an irrelevant shRNA (Figure 7B, Cii).

470 In the converse experiment, *Rbf* hypomorphs expressing transgenic Rbf in post-mitotic
471 neurons (*Rbf*^{f120}, *nsyb* > *Rbf*) showed significantly higher peak locomotion at 22°C compared
472 to flies of the same genotype but harbouring the repressive *tub*-Gal80^{ts} construct (Figure 7B,
473 Di; Gal80 active, transgenic Rbf not expressed). However, when flies were raised at 22°C and
474 then moved to a permissive temperature of 29°C at the adult stage (Figure 7B, Dii; Gal80
475 inactive, Rbf expressed), we observed no difference in peak activity between these two
476 genotypes, suggesting that adult-specific restoration of Rbf expression in post-mitotic neurons
477 was sufficient to rescue locomotor defects in *Rbf* hypomorphs. By extension, these findings
478 suggest that defects in post-mitotic neuronal function may contribute to morbidities in RBL2
479 patients, particularly those associated with motor dysfunction.

480

481 Discussion

482 The findings presented in this study shed light on a rare recessive neurodevelopmental
483 disorder associated with mutations in the *RBL2*. Alongside the other RB family members (RB1
484 and RBL1), RBL2 acts as a crucial transcriptional regulator, particularly influencing neuronal
485 differentiation and the survival of post-mitotic neurons. Unlike RB1 and RBL1, RBL2 is
486 uniquely associated with a neurodevelopmental phenotype, however, only six individuals have
487 been documented so far¹²⁻¹⁴. The limited number of patients, along with the isolated nature of
488 the reports without comparative analysis, restricted the possibility of defining the phenotypic
489 and genotypic spectrum of this disorder.

490 To address this gap, we have identified and clinically characterized a cohort of twenty-
491 eight patients from eighteen families carrying homozygous or compound heterozygous
492 predicted loss of function variants in *RBL2*. Within this cohort, we identified fourteen novel
493 variants, bringing the total count of disease-associated pathogenic variants to nineteen. All
494 variants are predicted to cause LOF, suggesting that the disease phenotype is primarily
495 caused by total loss of protein function rather than alteration of defined active sites or protein
496 interactions. However, it is essential to acknowledge potential limitations, such as the
497 possibility of missing rare novel missense variants in specific domains that could be associated
498 with milder forms of the disease.

499 The clinical presentation of affected individuals is characterized by a range of
500 neurological and developmental abnormalities. Notably, global developmental delay, and
501 intellectual disability were uniformly observed in the cohort. Interestingly, most of the patients
502 lacked acquisition of key milestones, like walking and speech development, highlighting the
503 disease severity from very early stages of the disorder. Postnatal microcephaly was observed
504 in a considerable proportion of patients, while head circumference was normal in almost all
505 the patients at birth, suggesting a progressive disorder. Remarkably, the vast majority of
506 patients presented stereotypies, variably associated with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and

507 aggressive behaviour. Whilst the present cohort of patients did have facial dysmorphism, our
508 analysis did not suggest a recognizable facial ‘gestalt’.

509 Common neuroimaging features included cerebral atrophy with an antero-posterior
510 gradient variably associated with white matter volume loss and corpus callosum hypoplasia.
511 In addition, cerebellar atrophy was noted in the majority of *RBL2* patients. Considering the
512 presence of postnatal microcephaly in most cases, these findings suggest that
513 neurodegeneration is an important feature of this disorder. As further confirmation, we also
514 noted in most cases bilateral faint-to-marked signal changes at the level of the forceps minor,
515 in keeping with an “ear-of-the-lynx” sign. This neuroimaging feature has been reported in
516 hereditary spastic paraplegias (SPG7, 11 and 15)^{41,42} and other neurodegenerative disorders,
517 including those related to variants in the *LNPK*, *CAPN1*, and *ATP13A2*⁴³⁻⁴⁵. Indeed, a
518 neurodegenerative component is consistent with our *Drosophila* data, which suggest that the
519 decreased brain size observed in *Rbf* hypomorphs is driven by an increase in cell death, most
520 likely arising from cell-cycle defects in neuronal precursors and immature neurons.

521 Additionally, a total of three affected individuals were found to have expansile lesions:
522 one orbital mass, one cystic mandibular lesion, and a large mass extending from the III
523 ventricular floor to the prepontine cisterns. This is in line with previous studies that pointed to
524 the potential role of *RBL2* dysfunction in the evolution of cancer⁴⁶ and confirms the dual role
525 of *RBL2* in both tumor suppression and neuronal differentiation and survival, thus providing
526 further connection between tumorigenic processes and neurodevelopmental disorders⁴⁷.
527 Overall, both the clinical and neuroradiological findings underscored substantial intrafamilial
528 and interfamilial variations in phenotypic expressions and severity, revealing considerable
529 complexity within and between families.

530 To investigate the mechanisms linking *RBL2* to neuronal development and function,
531 we turned to the fruit fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*. Reductions in eye and optic lobe size, in
532 *Drosophila Rbf* mutants are analogous to the microcephaly, brain atrophy and optic nerve
533 hypoplasia seen in *RBL2* patients. Furthermore, the presence of apoptotic cells in the

534 *Drosophila* developing brain is consistent with these phenotypes and points towards a model
535 in which cell death during development leads to the atrophy observed in patient brains. The
536 movement phenotypes we observe in mutant animals also seem to recapitulate aspects of the
537 patient symptoms (e.g. gait abnormalities).

538 The similarities between *Drosophila* and patient phenotypes, coupled with the
539 conserved sequence and molecular interactors of Rbf, support the use of *Drosophila Rbf*
540 mutants as a model to understand the patho-mechanisms underlying *RBL2*-linked disorders
541 and mammalian neural Rb function more broadly. Indeed, we uncovered an unexpected
542 movement-promoting role for *Drosophila Rbf* in adult post-mitotic neurons. How Rbf influences
543 gene expression in post-mitotic neurons is unclear. In some post mitotic cells, Rbf has been
544 shown to modulate gene expression outside of its canonical function in repressing cell-cycle
545 genes (for example in controlling muscle differentiation)⁴⁸. Therefore, it is conceivable that Rbf
546 also coordinates undefined gene expression programmes in mature neurons. Alternatively,
547 Rbf neuronal-knockdown phenotypes may arise from the canonical action of Rbf on cell-cycle
548 gene promoters – for example, in sustaining the epigenetic environment that maintains cell-
549 cycle gene repression. Defining how Rbf and *RBL2* influence gene regulatory networks in the
550 mature fly and mammalian nervous system will thus be productive lines of future enquiry.

551 Our *Drosophila* studies advocate a model in which Rbf – and by extension *RBL2* – acts
552 sequentially in neural precursors and post-mitotic neurons to promote normal brain
553 morphology and locomotor activity respectively (Figure 7E). Taken together, our work provides
554 a clinical and experimental foundation to understand genotype-phenotype linkages in an
555 *RBL2*-linked neurodevelopmental disorder and suggests that restoring *RBL2* expression
556 through gene therapy approaches may mitigate some of the multifaceted morbidities caused
557 by *RBL2* pLOF. While our study illustrates parallels between human and fly Rb protein function
558 in the nervous system, it is possible that some divergence in function has occurred between
559 the two species. The human genome contains three Rb genes and eight genes encoding
560 interacting E2F transcription factors⁴⁹. Therefore, the greater complexity of the RB/E2F

561 network in humans could result in altered biological outcomes. However, the similarities
562 observed between RBL2 patient phenotypes and *Drosophila Rbf* mutant phenotypes indicates
563 that RBL2/Rbf protein function in the CNS is likely to be conserved across metazoan species.
564 Future studies in *Drosophila* may thus yield further insights into the mechanisms underlying
565 *RBL2* pathology and inform therapeutic directions.

566

567

568

569 **Data availability**

570 The authors declare that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the
571 paper and its supplementary information files.

572

573 **Acknowledgements**

574 We would like to thank the patients and the families for their participation in this study. We
575 would like to thank members of the Jepson and Houlden groups for their feedback and support
576 on this project. We also thank Diego Sainz de La Maza and the Amoyel lab (University College
577 London) for fly stocks and helpful advice.

578

579 **Funding**

580 This study was supported by the Wellcome Trust (WT093205MA and WT104033AIA to H.H.),
581 Medical Research Council (H.H.), European Community's Seventh Framework Programme
582 (FP7/2007-2013, under grant agreement No. 2012-305121 to H.H.), the National Institute for
583 Health Research (NIHR), University College London Hospitals, Biomedical Research Centre,
584 and Fidelity Foundation. This work was also funded by MRC Senior Non-Clinical Fellowship
585 (MR/V03118X/1) to J.E.C.J. WKC was funded by P50HD109879.

586

587 **Competing interests**

588 C.B. is an employee of Centogene. G.H.S is an employee of 3billion. L.M. has received
589 personal fees for ad hoc consultancy from Mendelian Ltd, a rare disease digital healthcare
590 company. The remaining authors report no competing interests.

591

592 **Ethical declarations**

593 Individuals and/or their legal guardians recruited for this study gave informed consent for their
594 participation. This study received approval from the Review Boards and Bioethics Committees
595 at University College London Hospital (project 06/N076). Permission for inclusion of their

596 anonymized medical data in this cohort, including photographs, was obtained using standard
597 forms at each local site by the responsible referring physicians.

598

599

600

601

602

603 **Figure legends.**

604 **Figure 1. *RBL2*-related disorder is characterized by a range of neurological, behavioural**

605 **and developmental abnormalities. A.** Representation of the most frequent clinical features

606 observed in the *RBL2* patients (Y axis: clinical features, X axis: number of patients). **B.**

607 Timeline-style schematic outlining the acquisition of key developmental milestones observed

608 in the affected individuals. Most of the individuals did not attain independent sitting, walking or

609 speech development (blue bar indicates range at last evaluation), while the others presented

610 delayed acquisition (orange, line indicates median age). Normal range is indicated in green.

611 **C.** Schematic depiction of the degree of intellectual disability observed in the patients (number

612 of patients indicated in bottom line). The spectrum ranged from moderate (left) to profound

613 (right).

614

615 **Figure 2. *RBL2* patients present postnatal microcephaly and dysmorphic features,**

616 **without a recognizable facial ‘gestalt’.** **A.** Schematic representation of head circumference

617 measurements, expressed in standard deviations (SD). Head circumference was within

618 normal ranges at birth, while reduced at last examination (left panel). The right panel illustrates

619 age at last follow-up and measurements in SD. **B.** Facial features of the patients.

620

621 **Figure 3. Molecular spectrum of loss-of-function variants in *RBL2*.** **A.** Schematic

622 representation of variants location on the *RBL2* gene. Upper part: newly reported variants.

623 Lower part: previously reported variants. **B.** Pedigrees of the newly reported patients. Solid

624 black, affected. Genotype, where indicated, represent results of segregation. **C.**

625 Classification of variants according to type.

626

627 **Figure 4. Neuroimaging features of *RBL2*-related disorder.** Sagittal T1-weighted image

628 (first image), axial T2-weighted or FLAIR image (central image), coronal T1 or T2-weighted or

629 FLAIR image (last image). Most subjects have an enlargement of the cerebral CSF spaces

630 with an antero-posterior gradient associated with thinning of the corpus callosum, particularly
631 in the anterior portions. There is additional cerebellar atrophy in P10, P12, P20, P22, and P23.
632 Bilateral mild-to-moderate signal changes are noted at the level of the forceps minor in P6,
633 P19, P20, P21, P22, and P23. Note the large prepontine lesion in P10.

634

635 **Figure 5. Loss of Rbf activity reduces neuronal growth in *Drosophila*.** **A.** Representative
636 images of adult eyes in control (iso31) and *Rbf*^{f120a} hypomorphs. Scale bars = 0.3 mm. **B.**
637 Quantification of eye sizes in male *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes (n = 16) compared to controls (n = 9).
638 **C.** Quantification of eye sizes in female *Rbf* allelic combinations (n = 5-8). **D.** Representative
639 images of adult brains in control and *Rbf*^{f120a} adult males. Scale bars = 50 μm. **E-G.**
640 Measurements of brain morphology in control and *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes adult males (n = 10
641 brains, 10 central brains, and 20 optic lobes, per genotype). **H.** Quantification of apoptotic
642 (DCP1 positive) cells in control and *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes adult male brains (n = 6 per
643 genotype). **I.** Representative images of DCP1-labelled control (n = 9) and *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygote
644 (n = 6) third instar larval nervous system. Nuclei are counterstained with DAPI. Scale bars =
645 20 μm. **J.** Quantification of apoptosis in control and *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes third instar larval
646 brains. Error bars: SEM. * p< 0.05, ** p<0.005, *** p< 0.0005, ns – p> 0.05, unpaired t-test
647 with Welch's correction (B, E, F), one-way ANOVA with Dunnett post-doc test (C), Mann-
648 Whitney U-test (G, H, J).

649

650 **Figure 6. Rbf acts in post-mitotic neurons to promote movement in *Drosophila*.** **A.**
651 Schematic representation of the *Drosophila* Activity Monitor (DAM) system. **B-C.** DAM activity
652 in *Rbf*^{f120a} hemizygotes (n = 38) and controls (iso31; n = 31) across a 24 h period (B) or during
653 zeitgeber time (ZT) 0-1, a period of peak activity (C). **D.** DAM activity in adult females
654 harbouring trans-heterozygote or heterozygote *Rbf* allelic combinations, and wild type iso31
655 controls during ZT0-1. n = 16-20. **E.** Schematic representation of the CRIMIC insertion in the
656 *Rbf* locus, which allows for *Rbf*-dependent Gal4 reporter expression. **F.** *Rbf*-Gal4 driven

657 nuclear mCherry expression in the adult central brain. Neurons and glia are counterstained
658 with antibodies against ELAV and REPO respectively. Scale bar = 20 μ m. **G.** Pan-neuronal
659 post-mitotic knockdown of *Rbf* severely reduces peak locomotor activity during ZT0-1. n = 20-
660 54. **H.** Knockdown of *Rbf* in glial cells (using *repo*-Gal4 to express *Rbf* shRNA) does not
661 significantly reduce peak locomotor activity during ZT0-1 compared to both driver and
662 transgene alone controls (n = 18-24). **I.** Knockdown of *Rbf* in cholinergic, glutamatergic, and
663 GABAergic neurons, reduces peak activity during ZT0-1 in adult males. n = 11-41. Upper
664 significance notation is relative to *Rbf* shRNA alone controls, lower significance notation is
665 relative to Gal4 driver alone controls. Error bars: SEM. * p< 0.05, ** p<0.005, *** p< 0.0005,
666 ns – p> 0.05, unpaired t-test with Welch's correction (B), Mann-Whitney U-test (C), one-way
667 ANOVA with Dunnett post-doc test (D, H, I), or Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's post-hoc test
668 (G).

669

670 **Figure 7. Adult-stage neuronal expression of Rbf rescues locomotor defects in Rbf**

671 **hypomorphs. A.** Effects of post-mitotic, neuron-specific *Rbf* expression on peak locomotor
672 activity in either wild-type or *Rbf*^{f120a} hypomorph backgrounds. Data are from adult males. n =
673 15-21. **B.** Experimental paradigm for temperature-induced knockdown and rescue
674 experiments shown in panels C and D. **C.** Quantification of peak activity for control adult male
675 flies kept at (i) non-permissive temperature: *mCherry* (n = 33) or *Rbf* (n = 23) shRNA
676 expression – repressed; and (ii) experimental adult male flies maintained at a permissive
677 temperature: *mCherry* (n = 24) or *Rbf* (n = 16) shRNA expression – permitted. **D.** (i)
678 Constitutive suppression of neuronal RBF expression via *tub*-Gal80^{ts} significantly decreases
679 peak locomotor activity in *Rbf*^{f120a}; *nsyb* > *Rbf* adult males. *Rbf*^{f120a}, *nsyb* > *Rbf*: n = 13; *Rbf*^{f120a},
680 *tub*-Gal80^{ts}, *nsyb* > *Rbf*: n = 10. (ii) Peak activity in adult male flies that robust RBF expression
681 solely permitted in adult-stage post-mitotic neurons is not significantly different from *Rbf*^{f120a}
682 hypomorphs with constitutive post-mitotic neuronal expression of RBF. *Rbf*^{f120a}, *nsyb* > *Rbf*: n
683 = 15; *Rbf*^{f120a}, *tub*-Gal80^{ts}, *nsyb* > *Rbf*: n = 13. **E.** Model of dynamic changes in RBF function

684 in developing and adult neurons. Error bars: SEM. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.005$, *** $p < 0.0005$, ns –
685 $p > 0.05$, Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's post-hoc test (A), unpaired t-test with Welch's
686 correction (Ci, Cii, Di, Dii).

687

688 **Supplementary Figure 1. A-B.** Single-cell RNAseq-derived t-distributed stochastic neighbor
689 embedding (t-SNE) plots showing *Rbf* (A) and *Rbf2* (B) expression, alongside markers for glial
690 cells (*repo*) and post-mitotic neurons (*nsyb*), in the adult fly brain. Gene expression across
691 adult brain cells is illustrated using *SCope* [1]. **C.** Schematic showing protocol to assess
692 climbing ability in adult flies. **D.** Number of flies (out of $n = 10$) passing a given threshold (see
693 Materials and Methods) as a measure of climbing ability. Control adult males: $n = 5$ replicates,
694 *Rbf^{f20a}* hemizygotes: $n = 6$ replicates. Error bars: SEM. ** $p < 0.005$, unpaired t-test with Welch's
695 correction. **E-F.** *Rbf*-Gal4 driven nuclear mCherry expression in the *Drosophila* larval (E) and
696 adult (F) brain. Adult neuronal nuclei are counterstained with an antibody against ELAV in (F).
697 Scale bar = 100 μm .

698
699 **Supplementary Figure 2. A-B.** Expression in post-mitotic neurons of two distinct shRNAs
700 (denoted as 330256 (A) and 65929 (B)) targeting *Rbf* mRNA reduces peak activity in adult
701 *Drosophila* males. A: $n = 20-37$. B: $n = 27-35$. **C.** Number of flies (out of $n = 10$) passing a
702 given threshold as a measure of climbing ability. $n = 6-20$ replicates. **D-E.** Crawling ability in
703 control or *Rbf^{f20a}* hypomorph 3rd instar larvae (D) or larvae subject to *Rbf* knockdown in post-
704 mitotic neurons versus driver/transgene alone controls (E). D: $n = 10$ per genotype. E: $n = 6-$
705 9. **F-G.** Mean optic lobe size (F) and number of apoptotic (DCP1-positive) cells in adult male
706 brains subject to *Rbf* knockdown in post-mitotic neurons versus driver/transgene alone
707 controls. F: $n = 8-14$. G: $n = 5-7$. Error bars: SEM. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.005$, *** $p < 0.0005$, ns –
708 $p > 0.05$, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett post-doc test (A, B, G), Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's
709 post-hoc test (C, E, F), or unpaired t-test with Welch's correction (D).

710

711 **Supplementary Figure 3.**

712 Knockdown of *Rbf* in glutamatergic neurons, reduces total activity during ZT0-24 in adult
713 males. $n = 11-41$. Upper significance notation is relative to *Rbf* shRNA alone controls, lower

714 significance notation is relative to Gal4 driver alone controls. Error bars: SEM. * $p < 0.05$, **
715 $p < 0.005$, *** $p < 0.0005$, ns – $p > 0.05$, Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's post-hoc test.

716

717 **Video legend**

718 Video illustrating the stereotypies observed in patients with a neurodevelopmental
719 encephalopathy due to biallelic *RBL2* pathogenic variants. Segment 1 (patient from family F3)
720 shows orofacial stereotypies with teeth grinding associated with hand clasping stereotypies.
721 Segment 2 (from family F11) shows multiple hands stereotypies comprising hand squeezing,
722 hand mouthing, finger wiggling and finger tapping, and multiple orofacial stereotypies with a
723 prominent involvement of the tongue.

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731 **References**

- 732 1. Harbour JW, Dean DC. Rb function in cell-cycle regulation and apoptosis. *Nat Cell*
733 *Biol.* 2000;2(4):E65-E67. doi:10.1038/35008695
- 734 2. Yao Y, Gu X, Xu X, Ge S, Jia R. Novel insights into RB1 mutation. *Cancer Lett.*
735 2022;547:215870. doi:10.1016/j.canlet.2022.215870
- 736 3. Chai P, Luo Y, Yu J, et al. Clinical characteristics and germline mutation spectrum of
737 RB1 in Chinese patients with retinoblastoma: A dual-center study of 145 patients. *Exp Eye*
738 *Res.* 2021;205:108456. doi:10.1016/j.exer.2021.108456
- 739 4. Wadayama B, Toguchida J, Shimizu T, et al. Mutation spectrum of the retinoblastoma
740 gene in osteosarcomas. *Cancer Res.* 1994;54(11):3042-3048.
- 741 5. Berge EO, Knappskog S, Geisler S, et al. Identification and characterization of
742 retinoblastoma gene mutations disturbing apoptosis in human breast cancers. *Mol Cancer.*
743 2010;9:173. Published 2010 Jul 1. doi:10.1186/1476-4598-9-173
- 744 6. Sharma A, Yeow WS, Ertel A, et al. The retinoblastoma tumor suppressor controls
745 androgen signaling and human prostate cancer progression. *J Clin Invest.*
746 2010;120(12):4478-4492. doi:10.1172/JCI44239
- 747 7. Niederst MJ, Sequist LV, Poirier JT, et al. RB loss in resistant EGFR mutant lung
748 adenocarcinomas that transform to small-cell lung cancer. *Nat Commun.* 2015;6:6377.
749 Published 2015 Mar 11. doi:10.1038/ncomms7377
- 750 8. Hijmans EM, Voorhoeve PM, Beijersbergen RL, van 't Veer LJ, Bernards R. E2F-5, a
751 new E2F family member that interacts with p130 in vivo. *Mol Cell Biol.* 1995;15(6):3082-3089.
752 doi:10.1128/MCB.15.6.3082
- 753 9. Fiorentino FP, Symonds CE, Macaluso M, Giordano A. Senescence and p130/Rb12: a
754 new beginning to the end. *Cell Res.* 2009;19(9):1044-1051. doi:10.1038/cr.2009.96
- 755 10. Kong LJ, Meloni AR, Nevins JR. The Rb-related p130 protein controls telomere
756 lengthening through an interaction with a Rad50-interacting protein, RINT-1. *Mol Cell.*
757 2006;22(1):63-71. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2006.02.016

- 758 11. Liu DX, Nath N, Chellappan SP, Greene LA. Regulation of neuron survival and death
759 by p130 and associated chromatin modifiers. *Genes Dev.* 2005;19(6):719-732.
760 doi:10.1101/gad.1296405
- 761 12. Brunet T, Radivojkov-Blagojevic M, Lichtner P, Kraus V, Meitinger T, Wagner M.
762 Biallelic loss-of-function variants in RBL2 in siblings with a neurodevelopmental disorder. *Ann*
763 *Clin Transl Neurol.* 2020;7(3):390-396. doi:10.1002/acn3.50992
- 764 13. Samra N, Toubiana S, Yttervik H, et al. RBL2 bi-allelic truncating variants cause severe
765 motor and cognitive impairment without evidence for abnormalities in DNA methylation or
766 telomeric function. *J Hum Genet.* 2021;66(11):1101-1112. doi:10.1038/s10038-021-00931-z
- 767 14. Rips J, Abu-Libdeh B, Koplewitz BZ, et al. Orbital nodular fasciitis in child with biallelic
768 germline RBL2 variant. *Eur J Med Genet.* 2022;65(6):104513.
769 doi:10.1016/j.ejmg.2022.104513
- 770 15. LeCouter JE, Kablar B, Hardy WR, et al. Strain-dependent myeloid hyperplasia, growth
771 deficiency, and accelerated cell cycle in mice lacking the Rb-related p107 gene. *Mol Cell Biol.*
772 1998;18(12):7455-7465. doi:10.1128/MCB.18.12.7455
- 773 16. Sobreira N, Schiettecatte F, Valle D, Hamosh A. GeneMatcher: a matching tool for
774 connecting investigators with an interest in the same gene. *Hum Mutat.* 2015;36(10):928-930.
775 doi:10.1002/humu.22844
- 776 17. Allanson JE, Cunniff C, Hoyme HE, McGaughran J, Muenke M, Neri G. Elements of
777 morphology: standard terminology for the head and face. *Am J Med Genet A.* 2009;149A(1):6-
778 28. doi:10.1002/ajmg.a.32612
- 779 18. Robinson PN, Mundlos S. The human phenotype ontology. *Clin Genet.*
780 2010;77(6):525-534. doi:10.1111/j.1399-0004.2010.01436.x
- 781 19. Ryder E, Blows F, Ashburner M, et al. The DrosDel collection: a set of P-element
782 insertions for generating custom chromosomal aberrations in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
783 *Genetics.* 2004;167(2):797-813. doi:10.1534/genetics.104.026658

- 784 20. Simon A. Lowe, Abigail D. Wilson, Gabriel Aughey, Animesh Banarjee, Talya Goble,
785 Nell Simon-Batsford, Angelina Sanderson, Patrick Kratschmer, Maryam Balogun, Hao Gao,
786 Sherry S. Aw, James E.C. Jepson, bioRxiv 2023.09.20.558625; doi:
787 10.1101/2023.09.20.558625
- 788 21. O'Neill EM, Rebay I, Tjian R, Rubin GM. The activities of two Ets-related transcription
789 factors required for *Drosophila* eye development are modulated by the Ras/MAPK pathway.
790 *Cell*. 1994;78(1):137-147. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(94)90580-0
- 791 22. Alfonso TB, Jones BW. *gcm2* promotes glial cell differentiation and is required with
792 glial cells missing for macrophage development in *Drosophila*. *Dev Biol*. 2002;248(2):369-383.
793 doi:10.1006/dbio.2002.0740
- 794 23. Pfeiffenberger C, Lear BC, Keegan KP, Allada R. Locomotor activity level monitoring
795 using the *Drosophila* Activity Monitoring (DAM) System. *Cold Spring Harb Protoc*.
796 2010;2010(11):pdb.prot5518. Published 2010 Nov 1. doi:10.1101/pdb.prot5518
- 797 24 Kratschmer P, Lowe SA, Buhl E, et al. Impaired Pre-Motor Circuit Activity and
798 Movement in a *Drosophila* Model of KCNMA1-Linked Dyskinesia. *Mov Disord*.
799 2021;36(5):1158-1169. doi:10.1002/mds.28479
- 800 25. Geissmann Q, Garcia Rodriguez L, Beckwith EJ, Gilestro GF. Rethomics: An R
801 framework to analyse high-throughput behavioural data. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(1):e0209331.
802 Published 2019 Jan 16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0209331
- 803 26. Manjila SB, Hasan G. Flight and Climbing Assay for Assessing Motor Functions in
804 *Drosophila*. *Bio Protoc*. 2018;8(5):e2742. Published 2018 Mar 5. doi:10.21769/BioProtoc.2742
- 805 27. Du W, Vidal M, Xie JE, Dyson N. RBF, a novel RB-related gene that regulates E2F
806 activity and interacts with cyclin E in *Drosophila*. *Genes Dev*. 1996;10(10):1206-1218.
807 doi:10.1101/gad.10.10.1206
- 808 28. Taylor-Harding B, Binné UK, Korenjak M, Brehm A, Dyson NJ. p55, the *Drosophila*
809 ortholog of RbAp46/RbAp48, is required for the repression of dE2F2/RBF-regulated genes.
810 *Mol Cell Biol*. 2004;24(20):9124-9136. doi:10.1128/MCB.24.20.9124-9136.2004

- 811 29. Weng L, Zhu C, Xu J, Du W. Critical role of active repression by E2F and Rb proteins
812 in endoreplication during *Drosophila* development. *EMBO J.* 2003;22(15):3865-3875.
813 doi:10.1093/emboj/cdg373
- 814 30. Leader DP, Krause SA, Pandit A, Davies SA, Dow JAT. FlyAtlas 2: a new version of
815 the *Drosophila melanogaster* expression atlas with RNA-Seq, miRNA-Seq and sex-specific
816 data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2018;46(D1):D809-D815. doi:10.1093/nar/gkx976
- 817 31. Davie, K., et al., *A Single-Cell Transcriptome Atlas of the Aging Drosophila Brain.* *Cell,*
818 2018. **174**(4): p. 982-998 e20.
- 819 32. Popova MK, He W, Korenjak M, Dyson NJ, Moon NS. Rb deficiency during *Drosophila*
820 eye development deregulates EMC, causing defects in the development of photoreceptors
821 and cone cells. *J Cell Sci.* 2011;124(Pt 24):4203-4212. doi:10.1242/jcs.088773
- 822 33. Du W, Dyson N. The role of RBF in the introduction of G1 regulation during *Drosophila*
823 embryogenesis. *EMBO J.* 1999;18(4):916-925. doi:10.1093/emboj/18.4.916
- 824 34. Nériec N, Desplan C. From the Eye to the Brain: Development of the *Drosophila* Visual
825 System. *Curr Top Dev Biol.* 2016;116:247-271. doi:10.1016/bs.ctdb.2015.11.032
- 826 35. Pentimalli F, Forte IM, Esposito L, et al. RBL2/p130 is a direct AKT target and is
827 required to induce apoptosis upon AKT inhibition in lung cancer and mesothelioma cell lines.
828 *Oncogene.* 2018;37(27):3657-3671. doi:10.1038/s41388-018-0214-3
- 829 36. Moon NS, Di Stefano L, Dyson N. A gradient of epidermal growth factor receptor
830 signaling determines the sensitivity of rbf1 mutant cells to E2F-dependent apoptosis. *Mol Cell*
831 *Biol.* 2006;26(20):7601-7615. doi:10.1128/MCB.00836-06
- 832 37. Giacinti C, Giordano A. RB and cell cycle progression. *Oncogene.* 2006;25(38):5220-
833 5227. doi:10.1038/sj.onc.1209615
- 834 38. Lee PT, Zirin J, Kanca O, et al. A gene-specific T2A-GAL4 library for *Drosophila*. *Elife.*
835 2018;7:e35574. Published 2018 Mar 22. doi:10.7554/eLife.35574

- 836 39. Sainz de la Maza D, Hof-Michel S, Phillimore L, Bökel C, Amoyel M. Cell-cycle exit
837 and stem cell differentiation are coupled through regulation of mitochondrial activity in the
838 *Drosophila testis*. *Cell Rep.* 2022;39(6):110774. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110774
- 839 40. McGuire SE, Le PT, Osborn AJ, Matsumoto K, Davis RL. Spatiotemporal rescue of
840 memory dysfunction in *Drosophila*. *Science.* 2003;302(5651):1765-1768.
841 doi:10.1126/science.1089035
- 842 41. Sáenz-Farret M, Lang AE, Kalia L, et al. Spastic Paraplegia Type 7 and Movement
843 Disorders: Beyond the Spastic Paraplegia. *Mov Disord Clin Pract.* 2022;9(4):522-529.
844 Published 2022 Apr 1. doi:10.1002/mdc3.13437
- 845 42. Pascual B, de Bot ST, Daniels MR, et al. "Ears of the Lynx" MRI Sign Is Associated with
846 SPG11 and SPG15 Hereditary Spastic Paraplegia. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 2019;40(1):199-
847 203. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A5935
- 848 43. Accogli A, Zaki MS, Al-Owain M, et al. Lunapark deficiency leads to an autosomal
849 recessive neurodevelopmental phenotype with a degenerative course, epilepsy and distinct
850 brain anomalies. *Brain Commun.* 2023;5(5):fcad222. Published 2023 Aug 17.
851 doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcad222
- 852 44. Agarwal A, Oinam R, Goel V, et al. "Ear of the Lynx" Sign in Hereditary Spastic
853 Paraparesis (HSP) 76. *Mov Disord Clin Pract.* 2022;10(1):120-123. Published 2022 Nov 17.
854 doi:10.1002/mdc3.13606
- 855 45. Estiar MA, Leveille E, Spiegelman D, et al. Clinical and genetic analysis of ATP13A2 in
856 hereditary spastic paraplegia expands the phenotype. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.*
857 2020;8(3):e1052. doi:10.1002/mgg3.1052
- 858 46. Claudio PP, Howard CM, Baldi A, et al. p130/pRb2 has growth suppressive properties
859 similar to yet distinctive from those of retinoblastoma family members pRb and p107. *Cancer*
860 *Res.* 1994;54(21):5556-5560.
- 861 47. Qi H, Dong C, Chung WK, Wang K, Shen Y. Deep Genetic Connection Between Cancer
862 and Developmental Disorders. *Hum Mutat.* 2016;37(10):1042-1050. doi:10.1002/humu.23040




- 863 48. Zappia MP, Rogers A, Islam ABMMK, Frolov MV. Rbf Activates the Myogenic
864 Transcriptional Program to Promote Skeletal Muscle Differentiation. *Cell Rep.* 2019;26(3):702-
865 719.e6. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2018.12.080
- 866 49. Trimarchi JM, Lees JA. Sibling rivalry in the E2F family. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.*
867 2002;3(1):11-20. doi:10.1038/nrm714
- 868

Table 1 Overview of the clinical features observed in the cohort.


Family ID	HPO codes	F1	F1	F2	F3	F3	F4	F5	F5	F6	F7	F8	F8	F9	F9	F9	F10	F11	F11	F12	F12	F13	F14	Literature review	Total
Patients		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14	P15	P16	P17	P18	P19	P20	P21	P22	P23-28	P1-P28
Gender		F	M	F	F	F	F	M	M	M	F	M	M	M	M	M	M	F	F	F	M	F	M	3F, 3M	12F, 15M
Age range (years)		16-20	16-20	10-15	16-20	10-15	0-5	6-10	0-5	0-5	10-15	21-25	26-30	16-20	10-15	0-5	6-10	16-20	6-10	0-5	6-10	10-15	0-5	6-36	2-36
Feeding difficulties	HP:0011968	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	+	+	n/a	+	n/a	7/19
FTT	HP:0001508	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	1/1	5/14
Microcephaly	HP:0005484	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	n/a	+	+	-	-	+	-	4/6	20/27
Hypotonia in infancy	HP:0008947	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	6/6	26/28
GDD	HP:0001270	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	6/6	28/28
Non-ambulatory	HP:0002540	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	n/a	+	+	4/5	20/26
Gait abnormalities	HP:0001288	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3/3	8/11
Absent speech	HP:0001344	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	n/a	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	4/6	22/27
ID +Moderate ++Severe +++ Profound	HP:0001249	++	++	+++	+++	+++	+	+	+	n/a	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+++	+++	++	++	++	+++	++ 5/6 +++ 1/6	+ 3/27 ++ 17/27 +++ 7/27
Muscle weakness	HP:0001324	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	n/a	12/22
Hypotonia	HP:0001252	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	n/a	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	n/a	10/21
Hypertonia	HP:0001276	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	n/a	6/21
Dystonia	HP:0001332	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	-	-	+	+	-	+	n/a	7/21
Tremor	HP:0001337	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	-	-	-	-	+	-	n/a	6/21
Behavioural abnormalities	HP:0000708	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	6/6	24/28
Stereotypies	HP:0100022	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	3/3	15/25
Seizures	HP:0001250	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	3/6	10/28
Brain	HP:0410263	+	+	+	+	+	+	n/a	+	-	+	-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	4/5	16/23

Abnormalities

Ophthalmic features	HP:0000478	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	n/a	5/6	14/27
----------------------------	------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----	-------















A



B

Patient images redacted as per MedRxiv policy



A**B****C**

