It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.03.23292187;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.03.23292187) this version posted July 3, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint<br>(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted med



- 
- 

48 specificity=99.93.97%). Subsequent screening commination via PCR for C90172 led to a 2% risk<br>49 of developing ALS as a result of the reduced penetrance (44%).<br>50 **Conclusions and Relevance:** We show that risk following 49 Conclusions and Relevance: We show that risk following a pos<br>
50 Conclusions and Relevance: We show that risk following a pos<br>
52 can be strikingly low for rare neurological diseases. Accordingly<br>
53 screening, it is vi

50 57<br>58<br>59

Sa Conclusions and Relevance: We show that risk following a positive screening test result<br>can be strikingly low for rare neurological diseases. Accordingly, to maximise the utility of<br>screening, it is vital to prioritise 53 screening, it is vital to prioritise protocols of very high sensitivity and specificity, careful<br>selection of markers for screening, giving regard to clinical interpretability, actionability,<br>high penetrance, and second selection of markers for screening, giving regard to clinical interpretability, actionability,<br>thigh penetrance, and secondary testing to confirm positive findings.<br>56<br>Keywords: genetic screening, genomic, next generation Fight penetrance, and secondary testing to confirm positive findings.<br>55 high penetrance, and secondary testing to confirm positive findings.<br>57 Keywords: genetic screening, genomic, next generation sequencing, health info 55 https://www.facture.org/windows/windows/2015-56<br>57 https://www.facture.org/windows/secondary/windows/windows/mathematical model, Bayesian probability tools<br>59 mathematical model, Bayesian probability tools

58<br>59<br>1 59 mathematical model, Bayesian probability tools<br>
The mathematica 59 mathematical model, Bayesian probability tools

60 **Introduction**<br>61 Single nucleotid<br>62 genotyped in ne<br>63 genotyping larg<br>64 validity of seque<br>65 challenges rema<br>66 Widened availa<br>68 genetic factors<br>69 for healthcare a 62 genotyped in next-generation sequencing data with over 99% accuracy (1-3), while<br>63 genotyping larger, structural, variants is often less reliable (4). For clinical purposes, t<br>64 validity of sequencing for small genet 63 genotyping larger, structural, variants is often less reliable (4). For clinical purposes,<br>64 validity of sequencing for small genetic variations is considered a solved problem, w<br>65 challenges remain for structural var of a saidity of sequencing for small genetic variations is considered a solved problem, while<br>
challenges remain for structural variants.<br>
66<br>
Widened availability of sequencing data has favoured our understanding of the r challenges remain for structural variants.<br>
66 Widened availability of sequencing data has favoured our understanding of the role of<br>
67 Widened availability of sequencing data has favoured our understanding of the role of

66<br>
66 Widened availability of sequencing data h<br>
68 genetic factors in various phenotypes (5-8<br>
69 for healthcare and gained popularity amo<br>
70 from trained clinicians to guide interpreta<br>
71 Interest has recently risen a 66690123777777777 genetic factors in various phenotypes (5-8). Genetic testing has therefore become values<br>for healthcare and gained popularity among consumers who can it directly, without ad<br>from trained clinicians to guide interpretation for healthcare and gained popularity among consumers who can it directly, without advice<br>
from trained clinicians to guide interpretation of results (9-11).<br>
71<br>
Interest has recently risen among governing bodies in develo From trained clinicians to guide interpretation of results (9-11).<br>
71 Interest has recently risen among governing bodies in developing protocols for population-<br>
17 Unterest has recently risen among governing bodies in de 71<br>
72 Interest has recently risen among governing bodies in developir<br>
73 wide genetic screening; such initiatives are being rolled out in t<br>
74 US (12-18). Genetic screening involves testing a population for g<br>
75 risk f - 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 we focus here on screening for pathogenic variants with monogenic associations with rare US (12-18). Genetic screening involves testing a population for genetic variants indicative of<br>
risk for specific diseases to identify people with either higher predisposition of developing<br>
that disease or the potential t The state of specific diseases to identify people with either higher predisposition of developing<br>That disease or the potential to pass it on to their offspring. This approach utilises modern<br>Sequencing techniques to evalu This approach utilises modern<br>This approach utilises modern<br>Sequencing techniques to evaluate multiple genes associated with selected traits. In<br>Contrast 'targeted' tests are those performed because of some suggestion that 977 sequencing techniques to evaluate multiple genes associated with selected traits. In<br>
278 contrast 'targeted' tests are those performed because of some suggestion that a person<br>
279 may harbour disease variants (e.g., contrast 'targeted' tests are those performed because of some suggestion that a permay harbour disease variants (e.g., symptoms or family history of disease). Although<br>screening is relevant to liabilities ranging between m may harbour disease variants (e.g., symptoms or family history of disease). Although<br>
SCO screening is relevant to liabilities ranging between monogenic and polygenic (cf. (16, 19)<br>
We focus here on screening for pathogeni 900 screening is relevant to liabilities ranging between monogenic and polygenic (cf. (16, we focus here on screening for pathogenic variants with monogenic associations with<br>
82 diseases, particularly as applied to neurod

we focus here on screening for pathogenic variants with monogenic associations with rare<br>
82 diseases, particularly as applied to neurodegenerative disorders.<br>
83 Although no widespread implementation of genetic screening 82 diseases, particularly as applied to neurodegenerative disorders.<br>83 Although no widespread implementation of genetic screening protocols currently exist<br>85 internationally, comparable metabolic screening, testing neona 83<br>
84 Although no widespread implementation of genetic screening pro<br>
85 internationally, comparable metabolic screening, testing neonate<br>
86 of metabolic diseases, is routine in many countries (17, 20, 21). P<br>
87 typical 83

85 internationally, comparable metabolic screening, testing neonates for metabolite mark<br>86 internationally, comparable metabolic screening, testing neonates for metabolite mark<br>86 of metabolic diseases, is routine in many 86 of metabolic diseases, is routine in many countries (17, 20, 21). Positive metabolic tests are<br>87 typically validated with secondary testing, including targeted genetic tests (9, 22, 23).<br>88 The utility of genetic scree typically validated with secondary testing, including targeted genetic tests (9, 22, 23).<br>
88 The utility of genetic screening can be assessed by the extent to which action can be taken<br>
90 The utility of genetic screening The utility of genetic screening can be assessed by the extent to which action can be the following a positive test: its actionability (24, 25). One key tenet of actionability is the probability of having or later developi 88 89 Sollowing a positive test: its actionability (24, 25). One key tenet of actionability is the<br>81 probability of having or later developing a disease following a positive test. Yet post-test<br>82 disease probability can be

91 probability of having or later developing a disease following a positive test. Yet post-te<br>92 disease probability can be strikingly low where disease risk prior to testing is low, as w<br>93 be for population screening for disease probability can be strikingly low where disease risk prior to testing is low, as wou<br>be for population screening for rare diseases (26).<br>94<br>Bayesian inference, which is routine within clinical decision making (27), be for population screening for rare diseases (26).<br>
92 Bayesian inference, which is routine within clinical decision making (27), can be used to<br>
96 understand post-test ('posterior') disease risk. Under this logic, disea 94<br>
95 Bayesian inference, which is routine within clinical<br>
96 understand post-test ('posterior') disease risk. Unc<br>
97 a test can be inferred given existing knowledge of<br>
88 Key considerations to understanding post-test 95<br>96 7<br>98 99<br>00 01<br>02<br>03 96 understand post-test ('posterior') disease risk. Under this logic, disease probability follow<br>97 a test can be inferred given existing knowledge of the probability of other relevant even<br>98 Key considerations to underst 97 a test can be inferred given existing knowledge of the probability of other relevant events.<br>
98 Key considerations to understanding post-test disease risk, beyond pre-test (also known as<br>
99 'prior') disease risk, incl 98 Key considerations to understanding post-test disease risk, beyond pre-test (also known as<br>99 'prior') disease risk, include the genetic marker penetrance , its frequency among people<br>90 displaying disease symptoms, and 99 (prior) disease risk, include the genetic marker penetrance, its frequency among people<br>
99 (prior) disease risk, include the genetic marker penetrance, its frequency among people<br>
90 (displaying disease symptoms, and t displaying disease symptoms, and the sensitivity and specificity of the test (analytic validic)<br>
1991 This reasoning is therefore highly relevant to screening for rare neurodegenerative diseas<br>
1992 for which genetic cause This reasoning is therefore highly relevant to screening for rare neurodegenerative diseases,<br>102 for which genetic causes are typically rare variants of variable penetrance (28).<br>103<br>104 This article overviews important c 102 for which genetic causes are typically rare variants of variable penetrance (28).<br>
102 for which genetic causes are typically rare variants of variable penetrance (28).<br>
103 This article overviews important considerati 103<br>
104 This article overviews important considerations for genetic screening of rare dis<br>
105 presents several case studies focused on neurodegenerative diseases. Consider<br>
106 conditional probability in medical decision

104<br>105<br>106

- 
- 105 presents several case studies focused on neurodegenerative diseases. Considering<br>106 conditional probability in medical decision making is not novel but these concepts must be<br>3 106 conditional probability in medical decision making is not novel but these concepts is<br>conditional probability in medical decision making is not novel but these concepts is  $106$  conditional probability in medical decision making is not not not novel but the probability must be

- 107
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 108 large-scale indiscriminate testing of genetic variation across a population will not be<br>
109 actionable and may be misinterpreted. We modelled genetic screening for Huntington's<br>
110 disease (29), HD, and amyotrophic l not actionable and may be misinterpreted. We modelled genetic screening for Huntingto<br>
109 actionable and may be misinterpreted. We modelled genetic screening for Huntingto<br>
110 disease (29), HD, and amyotrophic lateral sc
- 
- 

110 disease (29), HD, and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (30), ALS, using Bayesian logic to exam<br>
110 disease (29), HD, and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (30), ALS, using Bayesian logic to exam<br>
111 the probability of disea 111 the probability of disease following a positive test result for a dichotomous ALS and HD<br>112 genetic markers. We additionally modelled screening for phenylketonuria (PKU) (31), to<br>113 compare genetic and metabolic scre 112 genetic markers. We additionally modelled screening for phenylketonuria (PKU) (31), to<br>
113 compare genetic and metabolic screening.<br>
114 **Methods:**<br> **115 Methods:**<br> **115 Methods:**<br> **117 We use Bayesian logic to calcul** 113 compare genetic and metabolic screening.<br>
114<br> **115 Methods:**<br> **116 Bayesian framework**<br>
117 We use Bayesian logic to calculate the probability of having or subsequently manifesting<br>
117 We use Bayesian logic to calcu 114<br>
115 **Methods:**<br> **115 Methods:**<br>
116 **Bayesian framework**<br>
117 We use Bayesian logic to calculate the prob<br>
118 disease *D* following a test result indicating<br>
119 variant). *M* is associated with increased liak<br>
120 p -- 115<br>115<br>116<br>117<br>118<br>112<br>121<br>122<br>123 116 **Bayesian fra**<br>
116 **Bayesian fra**<br>
117 We use Baye<br>
118 disease D fo<br>
119 variant). M i<br>
120 presence of<br>
121 following a p<br>
122 Supplement<br>
124 parameters 117 We use Bayesian logic<br>118 disease D following a<br>119 variant). M is associat<br>120 presence of M, while<br>121 following a positive re<br>122 Supplementary Mater<br>124 parameters represent<br>125 example, disease seve

- 
- 

118 disease *D* following a test result indicating presence or absence of marker *M* (the genetic variant). *M* is associated with increased liability of *D*, and positive test result *T* indicates presence of *M*, while 119 disease D following a test result indicating presence or absence of marker M (the genetic<br>
119 variant). M is associated with increased liability of D, and positive test result T indicates<br>
120 presence of M, while ne Variant). M is associated with increased hability of D, and positive test result 7 indicates<br>
120 presence of M, while negative test result T' indicates its absence, denoted M'. Disease ri<br>
121 following a positive result The presence of M, while negative test result T multates its absence, denoted MT. Disease risk<br>
121 following a positive result is denoted  $P(D|T)$ , using  $P(D|T')$  for a negative result.<br>
122 Supplementary Materials 1 summa 121 following a positive result is denoted  $P(D|T)$ , using  $P(D|T)$  for a negative result.<br>
122 Supplementary Materials 1 summarises the underlying logic. We assume that all<br>
124 parameters represent binary events. This was 123<br>124<br>125<br>126<br>127<br>128<br>129<br>130<br>131 124 parameters represent binary events. This was a necessary simplification of reality as, for<br>
125 example, disease severity is not considered.<br>
126 We estimate  $P(D|T)$  and  $P(D|T')$  using the following input parameters:<br>

- 
- 
- 125 example, disease severity is not considered.<br>
126<br>
127 We estimate  $P(D|T)$  and  $P(D|T')$  using the following input parameters:<br>
128  $P(D)$ , probability of a person having or later manifesting disease D prior to testing
	-
- 126<br>
127 We estimate  $P(D|T)$  and  $P(D|T')$  using the fo<br>
128  $P(D)$ , probability of a person having o<br>
129  $P(M|D)$ , frequency of marker  $M$  amo<br>
130  $P(D|M)$ , penetrance, probability of has<br>
131  $P(T|M)$ , sensitivity (tr 127<br>128<br>129<br>130<br>131<br>132<br>133<br>134<br>135 127 We estimate  $P(D|T)$  and  $P(D|T)$  using the following input parameters:<br>
128 •  $P(D)$ , probability of a person having or later manifesting disease<br>
129 •  $P(D|M)$ , penetrance, probability of having or later manifesting *L* **•** P(D), probability of a person having or later manifesting disease D prior to testing<br> **•** P(M/D), frequency of marker M among those affected by D<br> **•** P(D/M), penetrance, probability of having or later manifesting D f 129 •  $P(M|D)$ , frequency of marker M among those affected by D<br>
130 •  $P(D|M)$ , penetrance, probability of having or later manifesti<br>
131 •  $P(T|M)$ , sensitivity (true positive rate) of the testing proced<br>
133 •  $P(T'|M')$ , spec 130 •  $P(D|M)$ , penetrance, probability of having or later manifesting D for people<br>
131 •  $P(T|M)$ , sensitivity (true positive rate) of the testing procedure for detecting<br>
133 •  $P(T|M')$ , specificity (true negative rate) of t 131 **a**  $P(T/M)$ , sensit<br>
133 **a**  $P(T'/M')$ , speciding  $M$ <br>
134 absence of *M*<br>
135 Bayes theorem is app<br>
137 132 •  $P(T|M)$ , sensitivity (true positive rate) of the testing procedure for detecting M<br>
133 •  $P(T'|M')$ , specificity (true negative rate) of the testing procedure for identifying<br>
134 absence of M<br>
135 Bayes theorem is app
	-

133 •  $P(T'|M')$ , specificity (true negative rate) of the testing procedure for identifying the<br>
134 absence of *M*<br>
135 Bayes theorem is applied to derive the total probability of harbouring disease marker *M*,<br>
137  $P(M) = \frac$ 134 absence of *M*<br>135<br>136 Bayes theorem is app<br>137<br>138 and of disease *D* man<br>140 136<br>136<br>137<br>138<br>139<br>140 137<br>
137 Bayes theorem is applied to derive the total probability of harbouring disease marker M,<br>  $P(M) = \frac{P(D) \times P(M|D)}{P(D|M)}$ ,<br>
138 and of disease D manifesting given the absence of M,<br>  $P(D|M') = \frac{P(D) \times (1 - P(M|D))}{(1 - P(M))}$ .

$$
P(M) = \frac{P(D) \times P(M|D)}{P(D|M)}
$$

$$
P(D|M)
$$
\ng given the absence of *M*,

\n
$$
P(D|M') = \frac{P(D) \times (1 - P(M|D))}{(1 - P(M))}
$$
\nprobability of positive test result *T*, *P*(*T*), according to the

\nthe test and the probability of *M* being present versus about *M* is the result.

139<br>139<br>140<br>142<br>143<br>144 140<br>
140<br>
149<br>
141<br>
142 We next calculate the total probability of positive test result T,  $P(T)$ , according to the<br>
143 sensitivity and specificity of the test and the probabilities of M being present versus absent:<br>
144 - 142<br>143<br>144<br>145<br>146 142 We next calculate the total probability of positive test result T, P(T), according to the<br>
143 sensitivity and specificity of the test and the probabilities of M being present versus a<br>
144  $P(T) = P(T|M) \times P(M) + (1 - P(T'|M')) \times (1$ 143<br>
143<br>
143 Bayes theorem is then used to derive the probabilities of M being present after positive,<br>
145 Bayes theorem is then used to derive the probabilities of M being present after positive,

$$
P(T) = P(T|M) \times P(M) + (1 - P(T'|M')) \times (1 - P(M)).
$$

 $P(T) = P(T|M) \times P(M) + (1 - P(T'|M')) \times (1 - P(M)).$ <br>145<br>146 Bayes theorem is then used to derive the probabilities of *M* being present after positive,<br>4 m))<br>ent after positive,<br>4 145 146 Bayes theorem is then used to derive the probabilities of M being present after positive,

$$
P(M|T) = \frac{P(M) \times P(T|M)}{P(T)}
$$

147 Equation 4 , -| - 1-| -1  -

149<br>150<br>151<br>152<br>154<br>154 150<br>150<br>151 results.<br>152<br>153 The probabilit<br>154 when conside<br>155 150<br>
151 results.<br>
151 results.<br>
152<br>
153 The probabilities of manifesting disease *D* (which has conditional independence from *T*<br>
154 when considering *M*) after receiving positive test result *T*,<br>
155<br>  $P(D|T) = P(D|M) \times P$ T))<br>
conditional independence from T<br>
lt T,<br>  $Equation 6$ <br>  $[M') \times (1 - P(M|T))$ , 152<br>152 The pro<br>154 when co<br>155<br>156 and neg<br>158 153<br>154<br>155<br>156<br>157<br>158 153 The probabilities of mannessing disease D (which has conditional independence from T<br>
154 when considering M) after receiving positive test result T,<br>  $P(D|T) = P(D|M) \times P(M|T) + P(D|M') \times (1 - P(M|T))$ ,<br>
157 and negative test result

$$
P(D|T) = P(D|M) \times P(M|T) + P(D|M') \times (1 - P(M|T))
$$

154 when considering M) after receiving positive test result T, 155 Equation 6 |
 , -| -| -| -| 1-|

157<br>157<br>158<br>159<br>161<br>162<br>163 158<br>
158<br>
158<br>
159<br>
26 can then be determined.<br>
160<br>
26 can then be determined.<br>
161<br>
162 **Case studies**<br>
168 The Project MinE (32), ALS variant server (33), ClinVar (34), and gnomAD databases were<br>
164 searched alongside ) *) ,*<br>atabases were<br>g tool<br>put parameters<br>:nsitivity (P(T/M))<br>ant calling with 160<br>161<br>162<br>163<br>164<br>165<br>165<br>167<br>168 161<br>
162 **Case studies**<br>
163 The Project MinE (32), AL<br>
164 searched alongside the protocomposition<br>
165 benchmarking reports to<br>
166 were defined using data f<br>
167 and specificity ( $P(T/M)$ ) w<br>
168 state-of-the-art genomic -- 162<br>163<br>164<br>165<br>166<br>167<br>168<br>169<br>170 163 The Project N<br>164 searched alor<br>165 benchmarkin<br>166 were defined<br>167 and specificit<br>168 state-of-the-a<br>169 variant types<br>170 vary across the correct of the state-of-the-a<br>171 our purposes 164 searched alongside the previous databases and next-generation sequencing tool<br>165 benchmarking reports to obtain data for the included case studies. Most input parameters<br>166 were defined using data from published lit 165 benchmarking reports to obtain data for the included case studies. Most input part of the were defined using data from published literature and online databases. Sensitivial 167 and specificity  $(P(T/M))$  were defined by 166 were defined using data from published literature and online databases. Sensitivity  $(P(T|M)$  and specificity  $(P(T|M))$  were defined by performance benchmarks for variant calling with state-of-the-art genomic sequencing tec The vertext disease is a sensitivity (P(T) and specificity (P(T) M)) were defined by performance benchmarks for variant calling with<br>
state-of-the-art genomic sequencing techniques specialised for genotyping particular<br>
v and specificity (P(T/M)) were defined by performance benchmarks for variant calling with<br>state-of-the-art genomic sequencing techniques specialised for genotyping particular<br>variant types (see Supplementary Materials 2; Ta

For the state of the state-of-the-art games in the state of the state is accuracy vary across the genome and other sources of error 170 vary across the genome and other sources of error exist, these heuristics are sufficient for<br>171 our purposes.<br>172<br>173 Table 1 presents the parameter estimates and post-test disease risks calculated across<br>174 various 171 our purposes.<br>
172<br>
172<br>
173 Table 1 presents the parameter estimates and post-test disease risks calculated across<br>
174 various scenarios. A comprehensive description of parameter ascertainment, including<br>
175 penetra 172<br>
172<br>
173 Table 1 presen<br>
174 various scenar<br>
175 penetrance es<br>
176 assumptions a<br>
177<br>
178 *Case 1 – Hunti*<br>
180 HD is a late-on -- 173<br>174<br>175 176<br>177 178<br>181<br>181 174 various scenarios. A comprehensive description of parameter ascertainment, including<br>175 penetrance estimation, is given in Supplementary Materials 3; Table S2 summarises the<br>176 assumptions and corresponding reality.<br> 175 penetrance estimation, is given in Supplementary Materials 3; Table S2 summarises the<br>175 assumptions and corresponding reality.<br>177<br>178 *Case 1 – Huntington's disease*<br>180 HD is a late-onset Mendelian disease with aut 176 assumptions and corresponding reality.<br>
176 assumptions and corresponding reality.<br>
177<br>
179 *Case 1 – Huntington's disease*<br>
180 HD is a late-onset Mendelian disease with autosomal dominant inheritance caused by a<br>
18

- 78<br>178<br>180<br>181<br>182<br>183<br>184 179<br>180<br>181<br>182<br>183<br>184
- 177<br>
178<br>
179  $Case 1 Huntington's disease$ <br>
180 HD is a late-onset Mendelian disease with<br>
181 trinucleotide, CAG, short tandem repeat<br>
182 613004). We let *M* be a CAG expansion<br>
183 penetrance in a normal lifespan (29).<br>
184 179 Case 1 – Huntington's assease<br>180 – HD is a late-onset Mendelian c<br>181 – trinucleotide, CAG, short tande<br>182 – 613004). We let *M* be a CAG e<br>183 – penetrance in a normal lifespa<br>184
- 
- 181 Homoleotide, CAG, short tandem repeat expansion (STRE) in the *HTT* gene (OMIM:<br>182 613004). We let *M* be a CAG expansion of >40 repeat units, which would have complete<br>183 penetrance in a normal lifespan (29).<br>184 181 trinucleotide, CAG, short tandem repeat expansion (STRE) in the  $HTP$  gene (OMIM:<br>182 613004). We let *M* be a CAG expansion of >40 repeat units, which would have comp<br>183 penetrance in a normal lifespan (29).<br>184
- 182 613004). We let M be a CAG expansion of 240 repeat units, which would have complete<br>183 penetrance in a normal lifespan (29). 184 penetrance in a normal lifespan (29).

185 186 disease probability by baseline risk of HD in a general population and (2) as a targeted test<br>
187 considering pre-test disease probability for an individual whose parent harbours the fully<br>
188 penetrant *HTT* STRE a

considering pre-test disease probability for an individual whose parent harbours the fully<br>penetrant *HTT STRE* and who has a 0.5 probability of inheriting *M* (we have not modelled<br>genetic anticipation (35)).<br>190<br>*Case 2* 188 penetrant *HTT* STRE and who has a 0.5 probability of inheriting *M* (we have not modelled<br>189 genetic anticipation (35)).<br>190 *Case 2 – amyotrophic lateral sclerosis*<br>191 *Case 2 – amyotrophic lateral sclerosis*<br>192 A For penetrant HTT STRE and who has a 0.5 probability of inheriting M (we have not modelled<br>189 genetic anticipation (35)).<br>190 *Case 2 – amyotrophic lateral sclerosis*<br>192 ALS is a late-onset disease with locus and allelic 190<br>
191 *Case 2 – amyotrophic later*<br>
192 ALS is a late-onset disease<br>
193 and phenotype modification<br>
194 40 genes are associated w<br>
195 614260) are the most freq<br>
196 than 10% of cases. Autoso<br>
197 genetic disease cause 191<br>192<br>193<br>194<br>195<br>196<br>197<br>198<br>199 191 Case 2 – amyotropme fateral sclerosis<br>
192 – ALS is a late-onset disease with locus a<br>
193 – and phenotype modification range be<br>
194 – 40 genes are associated with ALS (30,<br>
195 – 614260) are the most frequently impli and phenotype modification range between monogenic and polygenic. Variants in at least<br>
193 and phenotype modification range between monogenic and polygenic. Variants in at least<br>
194 40 genes are associated with ALS (30,

194 40 genes are associated with ALS (30, 36-38). *SOD1* (OMIM: 147450) and *C9orf72* (OMIM:<br>
195 614260) are the most frequently implicated genes, where variants of each account for few<br>
196 than 10% of cases. Autosomal d 194 40 genes are associated with ALS (30, 36-38). SOD1 (OMIM: 147450) and C9orf72 (OMIM: than 10% of cases. Autosomal dominant inheritance is typical for most people with a known<br>197 genetic disease cause.<br>198 We modelled several definitions of markers for ALS risk, drawing from three of the<br>200 commonest ALS 197 genetic disease cause.<br>
198 We modelled several definitions of markers for ALS risk, drawing from three of the<br>
200 commonest ALS genes: *SOD1, C9orf72,* and *FUS* (OMIM: 137070). *SOD1*- and *FUS*-linked ALS<br>
201 is t 198<br>
199 We modelled several d<br>
200 commonest ALS genes<br>
201 is typically attributed to<br>
202 supporting evidence ha<br>
203 *C9orf72* is a hexanucle<br>
204 one or both of ALS and<br>
205 typically incomplete pe<br>
206 and ~45% for t 199<br>199<br>200<br>202<br>203<br>204<br>205<br>206<br>207 200 commonest ALS genes: *SOD1, C9orf72,* and *FUS* (OMIM: 137070). *SOD1*- and *FUS*-li<br>
201 is typically attributed to SNVs and many pathogenic variants with varying strength c<br>
202 supporting evidence have been reporte 200 commonest ALS genes:  $3001$ ,  $2001$ ,  $201$ , and FUS (OMIM: 137070).  $3021$ - and FUS-linked ALS<br>
201 is typically attributed to SNVs and many pathogenic variants with varying strength of<br>
202 supporting evidence have b 202 supporting evidence have been reported in these genes (39). The pathogenic form of<br>
202 supporting evidence have been reported in these genes (39). The pathogenic form of<br>
203 *C9 or f* 72 is a hexanucleotide, GGGGCC, 203  $200$  203 C901/2 is a hexanucleotide, GGGGCC, 3TRE associated principally with the onset of either<br>
204 one or both of ALS and frontotemporal dementia (40). Known variants in these genes have<br>
205 typically incomplete penetrance

- 205 typically incomplete penetrance; examples include ~90-100% penetrance for *SOD1* p.A5V<br>
206 and ~45% for the *C9orf72 STRE* (41, 42).<br>
207<br>
208 The definitions of *M* modelled in this case study were:<br>
209 **a** SOD1 (al 205 typically incomplete penetrance; examples include 50-100% penetrance for SOD1 p.A5V<br>
206 and ~45% for the C9orf72 STRE (41, 42).<br>
207<br>
208 The definitions of M modelled in this case study were:<br>
209 • *SOD1* (all) – M 207<br>
207<br>
208 The definitions of *M* modelled in this cas<br>
209 • *SOD1* (all) – *M* includes any rare v<br>
210 ancestry contained within the me<br>
211 frequencies were derived (see Su<br>
212 • *SOD1* (A5V) – *M* represents the 208<br>209<br>210<br>211<br>212<br>213<br>214<br>215<br>216 208 Fine definitions of M modelled in this case study were:<br>
209 • *SOD1* (all) – *M* includes any rare variant reporte<br>
210 ancestry contained within the meta-analysis sale<br>
211 frequencies were derived (see Supplementary
- 209  $SOD1$  (all) *M* includes any rare variant reported in people with ALS of European<br>
210 ancestry contained within the meta-analysis sample set from which the variant<br>
211 frequencies were derived (see Supplementary
- 211 and the meta-analysis sample set from which the variant same of the meta-analysis sample set from which the variant same and the meta-analysis sample set from which the variant frequencies were derived (see Supplementa 212 •  $SOD1 (ASV) - M$  represents the pathogenic  $SOD1$  p.A5V variant, or<br>
213 common  $SOD1$  variants among North American ALS populations, c<br>
high penetrance (41, 43).<br>
215 •  $FUS$  (all) – M includes any rare variant reported in
- 212 SOD1 (A5V) M represents the pathogenic *SOD1* p.A5V variant, one of the most<br>
213 common *SOD1* variants among North American ALS populations, characterised b<br>
214 high penetrance (41, 43).<br>
215 FUS (all) M incl 213 common SOD1 variants among North American ALS populations, characterised by<br>
215 **FUS** (all) – M includes any rare variant reported in people with ALS of European<br>
216 ancestry contained within the meta-analysis sampl 215 •  $FUS$  (all) –  $M$  includes any<br>
216 ancestry contained within<br>
217 frequencies were derived<br>
218 •  $FUS$  (ClinVar) –  $M$  includes<br>
219 pathogenic for ALS within<br>
220 sporadic ALS (see Table SE)<br>
221 •  $C9orf 72 - M$  repre 215 • *FUS* (all) – *M* includes any rare variant reported in people with ALS of European<br>
216 ancestry contained within the meta-analysis sample set from which the variant<br>
217 frequencies were derived (see Supplementary 217 and FUS (ClinVar) – M includes any of 21 FUS variants reported as pathogenic or like<br>
218 • FUS (ClinVar) – M includes any of 21 FUS variants reported as pathogenic or like<br>
220 pathogenic for ALS within ClinVar and p
- 
- 
- 218 *FUS* (ClinVar) *M* includes any of 21 *FUS* variants reported as path<br>
219 pathogenic for ALS within ClinVar and present within databases of<br>
220 sporadic ALS (see Table S3) (32-34).<br>
221 *C9orf72 M* repres **• FUS (ClinVar)** – M includes any of 21 FUS variants reported as pathogenic or likely<br>
219 **•** pathogenic for ALS within ClinVar and present within databases of familial and<br>
220 **•** *C9orf72* – M represents a pathogenic 220 sporadic ALS (see Table S3) (32-34).<br>
221 sporadic ALS (see Table S3) (32-34).<br>
221 external and FUS (all) scenarios, M encompasses variants classed as pathogenic<br>
223 In the *SOD1* (all) and *FUS* (all) scenarios, M e 221 **COUTER 1999 SEAD CONTERNATE SAMPLE 223**<br>222 sporadic Microsofter Control of the Countries Also<br>224 likely pathogenic, and variants of uncertain<br>225 these scenarios since many variants of uncertain<br>225 these scenarios 221 • C9orf72 – M represents a pathogenic C9orf72 STRE of 30 $\le$  repeat GGGGCC units<br>222 in the *SOD1* (all) and *FUS* (all) scenarios, M encompasses variants classed as pathogenic,<br>224 likely pathogenic, and variants of 222 Within the first intron of the C901772 gene.<br>
223 In the *SOD1* (all) and *FUS* (all) scenarios, *M* encomp<br>
224 likely pathogenic, and variants of uncertain signific<br>
225 these scenarios since many variants of uncerta 223 In the SOD1 (all) and FOS (all) scenarios, M encompasses variants classed as pathogenic,<br>
224 Interesponsible these scenarios since many variants of uncertain significance (44). It is appropriate to model<br>
225 Interesp
- 
- These scenarios since many variants of uncertain significance in ALS-implicated genes has<br>thigh probability of being deleterious and should not necessarily be ignored (38).<br>227<br>For the C9orf72 marker, we modelled two scena high probability of being deleterious and should not necessarily be ignored (38).<br>
227<br>
228 For the C9orf72 marker, we modelled two scenarios: (1) genetic screening with sensitivity<br>
239 and specificity defined by performa 227<br>228 For the C9orf72 marker, we modelled two scenarios: (1) genetic screening with s<br>229 and specificity defined by performance of existing tools for genotyping STREs in s<br>230 data; (2) using repeat-primed polymerase ch ---<br>228<br>229<br>230<br>231 228 For the C90172 marker, we modelied two scenarios: (1) genetic screening with sensitivity<br>229 and specificity defined by performance of existing tools for genotyping STREs in sequencin<br>230 data; (2) using repeat-primed 220 data; (2) using repeat-primed polymerase chain reaction with amplicon-length analysis (45) as a secondary test to validate a positive result from screening via sequencing in scenario 1.
- 231 as a secondary test to validate a positive result from screening via sequencing in scenario 1.  $\mathcal{L}$  as a secondary test to valid at positive result from screening via sequencing via secondary  $\epsilon$

232

233<br>234<br>235<br>236<br>237<br>238<br>239<br>240<br>241

233 Case 3 – phenylisetonuna<br>234 – PKU is an autosomal reces<br>235 – gene (OMIM: 612349) (31<br>236 – homozygous or compoun<br>237 – recorded in European pop<br>238 – p.Arg261Gln (31).<br>240 – We modelled two testing<br>241 – probability 234 PKO is an autosomal recessive disease with infantic onset, caused by variants in the PAH<br>235 gene (OMIM: 612349) (31); most variants pathogenic for PKU are SNVs. M represents beli<br>237 recorded in European populations o gene (OMIMI: 612349) (31), most variants pathogenic for TKO are SNVs. M represents being<br>
236 homozygous or compound heterozygous for any of the three most common *PAH* variants<br>
237 recorded in European populations of peo 237 homozygous or compound heterozygous for any or the three most common PAH variants<br>
237 recorded in European populations of people with PKU: p.Arg408Trp, c.1066-11G>A,<br>
238 p.Arg261Gln (31).<br>
239 We modelled two testing 238 p.Arg261Gln (31).<br>
239 We modelled two testing scenarios for PKU: (1) genetic screening, with pre-test dise<br>
241 probability defined per the baseline population risk of PKU, and (2) secondary testin<br>
242 confirm positi 239<br>240 We modelled two<br>241 probability defined<br>242 confirm positive respectively 240<br>241<br>242<br>243 241 probability defined per the baseline population risk of PKU, and (2) secondary testing to<br>242 confirm positive results obtained using tandem mass spectrometry (46) as in established<br>243 metabolic screening protocols (s

242 confirm positive results obtained using tandem mass spectrometry (46) as in established<br>243 metabolic screening protocols (see Supplementary Materials 3.3).<br>243 metabolic screening protocols (see Supplementary Material

243 metabolic screening protocols (see Supplementary Materials 3.3).  $243$  metabolic screening protocols (see Supplementary Materials 3.3).

Table 1. Input parameters and disease risk estimates following testing for all case study scenarios.

Parameter ascertainment is comprehensively described within Supplementary Materials 3. HD = Huntington's disease; ALS = amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; PKU = phenylketonuria. SNV = single nucleotide variant; STRE = short tandem repeat expansion. <sup>§</sup>Estimates are based on populations of predominantly European ancestry – 95% confidence intervals shown for newly derived estimates in the ALS case study; "includes FUS variants classified as pathogenic or likely pathogenic for ALS in the ClinVar database and recorded within ALS population databases (see Table S3, Table S4);  $"$ defined by variant calling performance benchmarks of tools for genotyping in sequencing data by variant type (see Table S1) and, where marked  $^{\dagger}$ , by aggregate laboratory accuracy for genotyping C9orf72 STRE with repeat-primed polymerase chain reaction and amplicon-length analysis (45). <sup>Ω</sup>Risk following positive results in primary screening and confirmatory



tests relative to a negative screening result (probability of PKU given a negative metabolic screening result is approximated as  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ ).

244 Results and Discussion<br>245<br>246 **Post-test disease probabilit**<br>247 *Screening versus diagnostic*<br>248 Across case studies, we sho<br>249 contextually-blind genetic s<br>250 Table 1). Disease risk was al<br>251 absence of the test 246<br>247<br>248<br>249<br>250<br>251<br>252

246 Post-test disease probability<br>247 Screening versus diagnostic te<br>248 Across case studies, we show<br>249 contextually-blind genetic scri<br>250 Table 1). Disease risk was alwi<br>251 absence of the tested variant,<br>252 The HD ca 247 Screening versus diagnostic testing<br>248 Across case studies, we showed low<br>249 contextually-blind genetic screening<br>250 Table 1). Disease risk was always ne<br>251 absence of the tested variant, as we<br>252 The HD case stud 249 contextually-blind genetic screening scenarios; risk ranged between 12.7% and 0.4% (see<br>250 Table 1). Disease risk was always negligible following a negative test result, indicating<br>251 absence of the tested variant, a 250 Table 1). Disease risk was always negligible following a negative test result, indicating<br>251 absence of the tested variant, as would be seen for any rare trait.<br>252<br>253 The HD case study illustrates the distinction be 251 The HD case study illustrates the distinction between contextually-blind screening and<br>252 The HD case study illustrates the distinction between contextually-blind screening and<br>254 diagnostic testing for rare diseases 252<br>
253 The HD case study illustrates the distinction between contextually<br>
254 diagnostic testing for rare diseases: following a positive test result<br>
255 (90.8%) using targeted testing but low (0.4%) in screening. This 253<br>254<br>255<br>256<br>257<br>258<br>259

254 diagnostic testing for rare diseases: following a positive test result, lifetime HD risk was<br>255 (90.8%) using targeted testing but low (0.4%) in screening. This difference reflects that,<br>256 unlike screening, targeted

255 (90.8%) using targeted testing but low (0.4%) in screening. This difference reflects that,<br>256 unlike screening, targeted testing is performed based on some indication of a person's<br>257 elevated disease risk (e.g., exi

- 
- 

256 Unlike screening, targeted testing is performed based on some indication of a person's<br>257 elevated disease risk (e.g., existing disease symptoms or family history). Accordingly, preflect disease probability is greater elevated disease risk (e.g., existing disease symptoms or family history). Accordingly, pr<br>258 test disease probability is greater. Inherently low pre-test disease probability will be a<br>259 pervasive issue in screening for 259 pervasive issue in screening for rare diseases.<br>
260<br>
261 *Relative risk and secondary testing*<br>
262 The utility of a test for identifying at-risk individuals can be examined based on relative<br>
263 disease risk followi 260<br>
261 Relative risk and secondary testing<br>
262 The utility of a test for identifying at-risk indivi<br>
263 disease risk following positive rather than neg<br>
264 only minimally greater for people testing posit<br>
265 the ALS

264 only minimally greater for people testing positive rather than negative. This is observed in<br>265 the ALS C9orf72 case study, where risk was only 1.7 times greater (Table 1) following a

261<br>262<br>263<br>264<br>265<br>266<br>267 261 Relative risk and secondary testing<br>262 The utility of a test for identifying a<br>263 disease risk following positive rathe<br>264 only minimally greater for people to<br>265 the ALS C9orf72 case study, where<br>266 positive scre disease risk following positive rather than negative test results: utility is limited when ri<br>
264 only minimally greater for people testing positive rather than negative. This is observed<br>
265 the ALS C9orf72 case study,

264 only minimally greater for people testing positive rather than negative. This is observed in<br>265 the ALS *C9orf72* case study, where risk was only 1.7 times greater (Table 1) following a<br>266 positive screening from seq 265 the ALS C9orf72 case study, where risk was only 1.7 times greater (Table 1) following a<br>266 positive screening from sequencing alone, despite this variant being the most common<br>267 genetic cause of ALS (37).<br>268 We add 265 the ALS C90172 case study, where risk was only 1.7 times greater (Table 1) following a<br>266 positive screening from sequencing alone, despite this variant being the most common<br>267 genetic cause of ALS (37).<br>268 We addi genetic cause of ALS (37).<br>
268 we additionally observed 6.35 times greater ALS risk for a person testing positive on bo<br>
270 screening for *C9orf72* and a secondary test than for a person testing negative on the init<br>
271 268<br>
268 We additionally observed<br>
270 screening for C9orf72 and<br>
271 screening. This increased r<br>
272 independent measures of<br>
273 the initial screening result<br>
274 269<br>270<br>271<br>272<br>273<br>275<br>275 270 screening for *C9orf72* and a secondary test than for a person testing negative on the initial<br>271 screening. This increased relative risk reflects that a person testing positive on two<br>272 independent measures of dise

- 
- 

270 screening for C50172 and a secondary test than for a person testing negative on the initial<br>271 screening. This increased relative risk reflects that a person testing positive on two<br>272 independent measures of disease 271 screening. This increased relative risk reflects that a person testing positive on two<br>
272 independent measures of disease risk has greater absolute probability of disease than after<br>
273 the initial screening result 273 the initial screening result alone.<br>274 the initial screening result alone.<br>275 We emphasise that secondary testing is important to increase certainty in positive tests. The<br>276 PKU case study demonstrates its potentia 274<br>
275 We emphasise that secondary test<br>
275 We emphasise that secondary test<br>
277 the established metabolic approase<br>
278 genetic screening. The metabolic<br>
279 indicates existing disease manifes<br>
280 marked by variants 275<br>276<br>277<br>278<br>280<br>281 276 PKU case study demonstrates its potentially sizable impact. A positive screening result using<br>277 the established metabolic approach alone indicated 16.7% PKU risk, versus 12.7% within<br>278 genetic screening. The metabo 277 the established metabolic approach alone indicated 16.7% PKU risk, versus 12.7% within<br>278 genetic screening. The metabolic marker, which is universal across people with PKU and<br>279 indicates existing disease manifesta 278 genetic screening. The metabolic marker, which is universal across people with PKU and<br>279 indicates existing disease manifestation, eclipses need for genetic screening for PKU,<br>280 marked by variants with incomplete p

indicates existing disease manifestation, eclipses need for genetic screening for PKU,<br>
280 marked by variants with incomplete penetrance that are not present for all people with<br>
281 PKU. However, the genetic test remains marked by variants with incomplete penetrance that are not present for all people with PKU. However, the genetic test remains useful for validating the positive metabolic<br>282 screening result (17): probability of PKU follo PKU. However, the genetic test remains useful for validating the positive metabolic<br>
282 screening result (17): probability of PKU following a confirmatory genetic test conducted<br>
283 the basis of a positive metabolic scre 282 screening result (17): probability of PKU following a confirmatory genetic test conduction<br>283 the basis of a positive metabolic screening result was 88.9%.<br>284 The overall benefit of secondary testing will however dif

- 
- 

283 screening result was 88.9%.<br>
284 the basis of a positive metabolic screening result was 88.9%.<br>
284 The overall benefit of secondary testing will however differ by scenario. For ALS, the risk<br>
286 remained moderate (~2 284<br>
285 The overall benefit of secondary testing will however differ b<br>
286 The mained moderate (~2%) despite two positive test results for<br>
287 Constraints upon post-test disease probability<br>
289 Figure 1, Figure 2, and 285<br>286<br>287<br>288<br>289<br>290

- 
- 

- 286 The overall beddefined the overall benefits of secondary testing testing testing testing testing testing test<br>287 Constraints upon post-test disease probability<br>289 The original of any test disease probability<br>290 The 287<br>288 *Constraints upon post-test disease probability*<br>289 Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3 illustrate how the post-test disease prob<br>290 the probability of any test, disease, or marker characteristic decreases. S 288<br>289<br>290 288 Constraints upon post-test disease probability<br>289 Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3 illustrate how t<br>290 the probability of any test, disease, or marker
- 290 the probability of any test, disease, or marker characteristic decreases. Sensitivity and<br>the probability of any test, disease, or marker characteristic decreases. Sensitivity and<br>the probability of any test, disease, 290 the probability of any test, disease, or marker characteristic decreases. Sensitivity and

291 specificity critically constrain certainty about post-test disease risk, and this role is amplified<br>292 as the other parameter probabilities decrease. Figure 1 particularly demonstrates the 293 increased role of specificity in rarer diseases, where disease risk following a positive test 293 increased role of specificity in rarer diseases, where disease risk following a positive test

294 result will be moderated only by penetrance in a protocol of perfect specificity.

295



296<br>297<br>298 Figure 1. Probability of a disease given a positive genetic test result for a marker of increased disease risk (P(D|T)) according<br>299 to the sensitivity (P(T|M)) and the specificity (P(T'|M')) of the testing pr to the sensitivity ( $P(T|M)$ ) and the specificity ( $P(T'|M')$ ) of the testing protocol

300 Panel A presents this for a disease with pre-test probability (P(D)) of 0.5, while panel B presents a disease with P(D) of 0.01. 301 Penetrance is complete (P(D|M) = 1) and variant M is harboured by all people with disease D (P(M|D) = 1) in both panels.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.03.23292187;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.03.23292187) this version posted July 3, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint<br>(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted med



302<br>303 Figure 2. Probability of disease D following a positive genetic test result for marker M (P(D|T)) according to pre-test disease<br>304 probability (P(D)) probability (P(D))

**305** M occurs in all people with D (P(M|D) = 1) and has complete penetrance (P(D|M) = 1)). Plot lines are defined according to **306** sensitivity (P(T|M)) and specificity (P(T<sup>'</sup>|M')) of existing protocols for genotyping

307 Materials 2): single nucleotide variant (SNV),  $P(T|M) = 0.9996$ ,  $P(T'|M') = 0.9995$ ; small insertion or deletion (Indel),  $P(T|M)$ 

 $308 = 0.9962$ ,  $P(T|M') = 0.9971$ ; short tandem repeat expansion (STRE),  $P(T|M) = 0.99$ ,  $P(T|M') = 0.90$ ; copy number variant **308** = 0.9962, P(T'| M') = 0.9971; short tandem repeat expansion (STRE), P(T| M)=0.99, P(T'| M') = 0.90; copy number variant<br>**309** (CNV) – del. (deletion), P(T| M) = 0.289, P(T'| M') = 0.959; CNV – dup. (duplication), P(T



310  $P(M|D) = 1$ ,  $P(T|M) = 0.9996$ ,  $P(T'|M') = 0.9995$   $P(M|D) = 1$ ,  $P(T|M) = 0.99$ ,  $P(T'|M') = 0.90$ <br>311 Figure 3. Change in disease risk following a positive test result for a marker of increased disease risk (P(D|T)) according to<br>31 penetrance (P(D|M))

<sup>313</sup> Panels A and B display modelled and hypothetical markers of ALS which differ in frequency across people affected by ALS<br>314 (P(M|D)), where pre-test disease probability (P(D)) is 0.0033 and diamonds mark the penetranc

<sup>315</sup> hypothetical variants (see Table 1). Panels C and D display diseases in which  $P(M|D) = 1$  and with  $P(D)$  set in line with the

<sup>316</sup> modelled case studies or a hypothetical rare disease. Analytic validity parameters are defined according to the performance

<sup>310</sup> modelled case studies or a hypothetical rare disease. Analytic validity parameters are defined according to the performance<br>317 of sequencing tools for genotyning single nucleotide variants in A and C-and of short tand 317 of sequencing tools for genotyping single nucleotide variants in A and C, and of short tandem repeat expansions in B and D 318 (see Table S1; Figure 2).

- 320
- 
- 
- 
- 

- 
- 321 testing. The respective trade-offs between prioritising each of these must be regarded:<br>322 sensitivity is required to detect markers, while high specificity increases confidence in<br>323 positive results. Established sc 322 sensitivity is required to detect markers, while high specificity increases confidence in<br>323 positive results. Established screening protocols prioritise high sensitivity to maximise<br>324 detection of at-risk individua From the marker manner, manufact provided in positive results. Established screening protocols prioritise high sensitivity to maximise<br>324 detection of at-risk individuals, with confirmatory secondary testing being vital t 324 detection of at-risk individuals, with confirmatory secondary testing being vital to mini<br>325 false-positive results (9, 22, 23).<br>326 Since the characteristics of diseases and associated variants are all pre-determined 325 false-positive results (9, 22, 23).<br>326 Since the characteristics of diseases and associated variants are all pre-determined within a<br>328 Since the characteristics of diseases and associated variants are all pre-determ 326<br>327 Since the characteristics of disea<br>328 population, disease markers (var<br>329 variants will be those more prev.<br>330 which can be genotyped with hig<br>331 Figure 3, panels A and B).<br>332 ---<br>327<br>328<br>329<br>331<br>332<br>333 328 population, disease markers (variants) screened should be chosen carefully. The most usefu<br>
329 variants will be those more prevalent among people affected, of high penetrance, and<br>
330 which can be genotyped with high variants will be those more prevalent among people affected, of high penetrance, and<br>330 which can be genotyped with high sensitivity and specificity (see Table 1, ALS case study;<br>331 Figure 3, panels A and B).<br>332 **Practi**
- which can be genotyped with high sensitivity and specificity (see Table 1, ALS case stud<br>
331 Figure 3, panels A and B).<br>
332 **Practical implementation of genetic screening**<br>
334 *Marker selection*<br>
335 Before a marker is
- 

## 332<br> **Practical implementation**<br>
334 Marker selection<br>
335 Before a marker is used in<br>
336 recognising that this may<br>
337 common or only present i<br>
338 them (36, 43). Screening p

- 
- 
- 
- Figure 3, panels A and B).<br>332 **Practical implementation of genetic screening**<br>334 *Marker selection*<br>335 Before a marker is used in screening, its relevance across people must be evaluated,<br>336 recognising that this may v
- 
- 333<br>334<br>335<br>336<br>337<br>338<br>339 Fractical implementation of genetic screening<br>334 *Marker selection*<br>335 Before a marker is used in screening, its relevan<br>336 recognising that this may vary by ancestry. For i<br>337 common or only present in certain populat 335 Before a marker is<br>335 Before a marker is<br>336 recognising that t<br>337 common or only is<br>338 them (36, 43). Sci<br>339 systemic inequali<br>340 have limited gene<br>341 recognising that this may vary by ancestry. For instance, particular variants may be le<br>
star is used in screening protocols must therefore account for these differences to p<br>
systemic inequalities, especially for minoriti 337 common or only present in certain populations, and penetrance can also vary between<br>338 them (36, 43). Screening protocols must therefore account for these differences to prev<br>339 systemic inequalities, especially for them (36, 43). Screening protocols must therefore account for these differences to prev<br>339 systemic inequalities, especially for minorities which are often under-studied and there<br>340 have limited genetic information avai systemic inequalities, especially for minorities which are often under-studied and therefore<br>
340 have limited genetic information available.<br>
341 Regard must be given to the clinical interpretability of selected markers.
- 
- 
- 340 have limited genetic information available.<br>
341 Regard must be given to the clinical interpretability of selected markers. We illustrated<br>
342 Regard must be given to the clinical interpretability of selected markers. 341<br>
342 Regard must be given to the clinical interpre<br>
343 Several approaches to defining markers in t<br>
344 Scenario, disease risk is marked by an aggre<br>
345 Without curation, the relationship to diseas<br>
346 Substantially 342<br>343<br>343<br>345<br>347<br>348
- 
- several approaches to defining markers in the ALS case study. Within the SOD1 (all)<br>344 scenario, disease risk is marked by an aggregation of putatively pathogenic SOD1 varian<br>345 Without curation, the relationship to dise 343 several approaches to defining markers in the ALS case study. Within the SOD1 (all)<br>344 scenario, disease risk is marked by an aggregation of putatively pathogenic SOD1 va<br>345 Without curation, the relationship to dise
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

344 Scenario, disease risk is marked by an aggregation of putatively pathogenic 3001 variants.<br>345 Without curation, the relationship to disease varies across them. E.g., *SOD1* p.1114T has<br>346 substantially lower penetran 345 Without curation, the relationship to disease varies across them. E.g., SOD1 p.1114T has<br>346 substantially lower penetrance than p.ASV, and many potentially relevant variants have<br>347 uncertain significance (34, 38, 39 347 uncertain significance (34, 38, 39, 42). Curation could involve defining a positive result as<br>348 presence of variants with sufficient evidence of pathogenicity (44), as in the *FUS* (ClinVar<br>350 senario, or as harbour presence of variants with sufficient evidence of pathogenicity (44), as in the FUS (ClinVar)<br>349 scenario, or as harbouring specific variants, as in the SOD1 (A5V) scenario.<br>350 De novo variants and variants of uncertain s SHOT DRESERT OF VARIATISE WITH SUITE ENTIRE CONDIGENTLY (44), as in the FUS (CINIVAR)<br>350<br>350<br>351 De novo variants and variants of uncertain significance present a substantial challenge for<br>352 screening since they will fr 349 scenario, or as harbouring specific variants, as in the SOD1 (A5V) scenario.<br>350<br>351 De novo variants and variants of uncertain significance present a substantia<br>352 screening since they will frequently be identified, 351<br>352<br>353<br>354<br>355<br>357 SERVIE DEFINITED STATES IN VARIATIS OF UNCERTAIN SIGNIFICANCE present a substantial challenge for<br>352 Screening since they will frequently be identified, yet must be set aside until variant<br>353 interpretation is possible d

- 
- 

353 interpretation is possible despite potentially being deleterious (12). PKU demonstrat<br>354 scale of this issue for rare diseases with multiple implicated variants, as 55% of delet<br>355 *PAH* genotypes are observed unique scale of this issue for rare diseases with multiple implicated variants, as 55% of deleterious<br>355 *PAH* genotypes are observed uniquely (31).<br>356 *Utility over time and actionability*<br>358 As genetic screening is possible 355 PAH genotypes are observed uniquely (31).<br>356<br>357 Utility over time and actionability<br>358 As genetic screening is possible from birth, while non-genetic methods may not be, age of<br>359 viability for screening methods sh 355 PAH genotypes are observed uniquely (31).<br>356<br>357 Utility over time and actionability<br>358 As genetic screening is possible from birth, v<br>369 similarly for screening methods should be even<br>361 prodromal disease markers. 357<br>358<br>359<br>360<br>361<br>362<br>363 357 Utility over time and actionability<br>358 As genetic screening is possible fro<br>360 screening may enable preventative<br>361 prodromal disease markers. For in<br>362 prodromal feature for Parkinson's<br>363 enable early interventi 359 Viability for screening methods should be evaluated. For late-onset diseases, early genetic<br>360 screening may enable preventative treatments to at-risk individuals or close monitoring fo<br>361 prodromal disease markers. 360 screening may enable preventative treatments to at-risk individuals or close monitoring fo<br>361 prodromal disease markers. For instance, rapid eye movement sleep behaviour disorder is<br>362 prodromal feature for Parkinson prodromal disease markers. For instance, rapid eye movement sleep behaviour disorder is a<br>362 sprodromal feature for Parkinson's disease (47) and monitoring of at-risk individuals may<br>363 enable early intervention. The inf Frodromal feature for Parkinson's disease (47) and monitoring of at-risk individuals may<br>
anable early intervention. The influence of time upon treatment viability and effectiveness<br>
must also be considered. For example, g enable early intervention. The influence of time upon treatment viability and effectivene<br>364 must also be considered. For example, genetic therapy has potential utility for preventing<br>365 delaying onset of degenerative di must also be considered. For example, genetic therapy has potential utility for preventing o<br>365 delaying onset of degenerative disorders (48).<br>366 365 must also be considered. For example, generative, generative, processes of delaying onset of degenerative disorders (48).<br>366<br>366  $366$ 

- 367
- 
- 
- 
- contingent upon the actionability of the result. A framework of actionability (24, 25), s<br>369 to align with laypersons' views on treatment acceptability (49), states that actionability<br>370 determined by: disease likelihood 369 to align with laypersons' views on treatment acceptability (49), states that actionability is<br>370 determined by: disease likelihood and severity, intervention effectiveness in disease<br>371 minimisation or prevention, an
- 
- 
- 

- 370 determined by: disease likelihood and severity, intervention effectiveness in disease<br>371 minimisation or prevention, and the consequence of the intervention to a person and risk<br>372 not performed. Each of these elemen 371 minimisation or prevention, and the consequence of the intervention to a person and<br>372 ont performed. Each of these elements are critical when selecting traits and markers<br>373 genetic screening and for the clinical in
- 372 mot performed. Each of these elements are critical when selecting traits and markers for<br>373 genetic screening and for the clinical interpretation of results.<br>374 **Limitations**<br>376 The Bayesian logic in the case studie genetic screening and for the clinical interpretation of results.<br>
374<br> **1375 Limitations**<br>
376 The Bayesian logic in the case studies simplifies genotype-phenotype relationships and<br>
377 cannot address all consideration 374<br>375 **Limitations**<br>375 **Limitations**<br>375 The Bayesian logic in the case studies simplifies genotype-pher<br>377 cannot address all considerations relevant to clinical genetic te<br>378 not considered. Other factors include: p
- 
- 375<br>376<br>377<br>378<br>380<br>381 375 Emmations<br>376 The Bayesia<br>377 cannot addr<br>378 not consider<br>380 recessive co<br>381 fundamenta<br>382 instance, alt comportion and and the Bayesian deviations of the Bayesian considered. Other factors include: polygenicity and oligogenicity, pleiotropy, the rol genetic and environmental modifying factors, and that of additive genetic ef 378 not considered. Other factors include: polygenicity and oligogenicity, pleiotropy, the role of<br>379 genetic and environmental modifying factors, and that of additive genetic effects in<br>380 recessive conditions and heter genetic and environmental modifying factors, and that of additive genetic effects in<br>380 recessive conditions and heterozygous carriers of pathogenic variants. Such influences can<br>381 fundamentally impact both the probabil Frank Sackgary and the environmentally impact both the probability that a disease will manifest and its severial modifying instance, although spinal muscular atrophy is caused by partial or complete biallelic of the *SMN1*
- 
- 381 fundamentally impact both the probability that a disease will manifest and its severity. For<br>382 instance, although spinal muscular atrophy is caused by partial or complete biallelic deletio<br>383 of the *SMN1* gene, add impact in the same of the sum of the same of the same of the same additional copies of *SMN2* reduce disease expressivity by mitigating loss<br>384 of *SMN1* function (50). Any results from genetic screening must be interpret
- 

of the SMN1 gene, additional copies of SMN2 reduce disease expressivity by mitigating loss<br>384 of SMN1 function (50). Any results from genetic screening must be interpreted within the<br>385 wider context of that disease and 383 of *SMN1* function (50). Any results from genetic screening must be interpreted within the<br>385 of *SMN1* function (50). Any results from genetic screening must be interpreted within the<br>385 **Conclusion**<br>388 **Conclusion** 385 of SMM1 function (50). Any results from genetic screening must be interpreted within the<br>385 wider context of that disease and its modifiers.<br>386 **Conclusion**<br>388 We have shown that risk following a positive screening 386<br>387 **Conclusion**<br>388 We have shown that risk following a positive scr<br>389 rare neurological diseases. Accordingly, to maxi<br>390 prioritising protocols of very high sensitivity and<br>391 screening, giving regard to clinica 387<br>387<br>388<br>389<br>391<br>392<br>393 387 Conclusion<br>388 We have show<br>389 rare neurolog<br>390 prioritising pr<br>391 screening, giv<br>393 A key advanta Frame show that the utility of screening, we suggest<br>
The neurological diseases. Accordingly, to maximise the utility of screening, we suggest<br>
prioritising protocols of very high sensitivity and specificity, careful selec prioritising protocols of very high sensitivity and specificity, careful selection of markers<br>391 screening, giving regard to clinical interpretability, and secondary testing to confirm posi<br>392 findings.<br>393 A key advanta 391 screening, giving regard to clinical interpretability, and secondary testing to confirm positive<br>392 findings.<br>393 A key advantage of a genetic screening approach for late-onset diseases is that these<br>395 markers can b

392 findings.<br>393 screening, giving regard to clinical interpretation, yields the conset diseases is that these<br>394 A key advantage of a genetic screening approach for late-onset diseases is that these<br>395 markers can be e

- 
- 

393<br>
394 A key adv<br>
395 markers<br>
396 targeting<br>
393 Although<br>
399 stress the 394<br>395<br>396<br>397<br>398<br>399<br>400 markers can be examined across the lifespan. Hence, positive test results could be use<br>396 targeting people for prevention, and for monitoring of prodromal features.<br>397 Although considering disease risk within a Bayesian 396 targeting people for prevention, and for monitoring of prodromal features.<br>397 Although considering disease risk within a Bayesian context is not novel, it is important to<br>399 Although considerations raised here at a t 397<br>398 Although considering disease risk within a Bayesian context is not novel, it is<br>399 stress the considerations raised here at a time when governments evaluate<br>400 of genomic sequencing for population screening and a 398<br>399<br>400<br>401<br>403<br>404 399 Stress the considerations raised here at a time when governments evaluate implementatic<br>399 Stress the considerations raised here at a time when governments evaluate implementatic<br>300 of genomic sequencing for populati 399 of genomic sequencing for population screening and as access to genetic testing outside<br>399 of genomic sequencing for population screening and as access to genetic testing outside<br>399 healthcare settings increases. Whi 401 healthcare settings increases. While genetic screening has many potential benefits, the<br>402 limitations of such an approach should be properly understood. Policy makers must<br>403 consider the impact of a positive test r 402 limitations of such an approach should be properly understood. Policy makers must<br>403 consider the impact of a positive test result on large numbers of people that will never<br>404 develop a given disease, a particularly 403 consider the impact of a positive test result on large numbers of people that will nev<br>404 develop a given disease, a particularly salient issue for late-onset diseases. Although<br>405 present focus, the substantial ethi dianglerig develop a given disease, a particularly salient issue for late-onset diseases. Although no<br>105 present focus, the substantial ethical and social considerations raised in conjunction to<br>106 screening must also be quare throw the substantial ethical and social considerations raised in conjunction to<br>
406 screening must also be regarded (13).<br>
407<br> **Data Availability**<br>
410 Data sharing not applicable<br>
411 406 screening must also be regarded (13).<br>407<br>408 **Data Availability**<br>410 Data sharing not applicable<br>411<br>412

- 
- 

### 408<br>409<br>410<br>411<br>412 409<br>410<br>411<br>412

- 407<br>408<br>409 **Data Availability**<br>410 Data sharing not applicable<br>411<br>412 409 Data Avanability<br>410 Data sharing not app<br>411<br>412 411  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2$
- 
- 412<br>1

# 413 **Acknowledgements**<br>414 We wish to thank Profes<br>415 contribution to project c<br>416 Biesecker of the Nationa<br>418 **Author contribution:**<br>420 **TPS:** Conceptualisation,

- contribution to project conceptualisation and methodology. We also thank Dr Lesl<br>416 Biesecker of the National Human Genome Research Institute of the National Institute<br>417 Health for contributing to our discussions around Action to project conceptualisation and methodology. The and main of contribution<br>417 Health for contributing to our discussions around this work.<br>418 **Author contributions**<br>**420 TPS:** Conceptualisation, Methodology, Forma Health for contributing to our discussions around this work.<br>
418<br> **Author contributions**<br> **420 TPS**: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writi<br>
421 - Original Draft, Writing – Re 418<br>
419 **Author contributions**<br>
420 **TPS**: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Inves<br>
421 **– Original Draft, Writing – Review and Editing, Visualisation.**<br>
422 Methodology, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – 419<br>420<br>421<br>422<br>423<br>425 419 **Author contributions**<br>420 **TPS**: Conceptualisation, M<br>421 - Original Draft, Writing -<br>422 Methodology, Writing - C<br>423 Conceptualisation, Writin<sub>,</sub><br>424 and Editing. NP: Conceptu<br>425 Methodology, Writing - R<br>426
- 
- 422 Methodology, Writing Original Draft, Writing Review and Editing, Supervision. **N**<br>423 Conceptualisation, Writing Review and Editing. FF: Conceptualisation, Writing Review and Editing. Supervision. **A**<br>424 –
- 420 Tr. Conceptualisation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing<br>421 Original Draft, Writing Review and Editing, Visualisation. AI: Conceptualisation,<br>422 Methodology, Writing Neview and 422 Methodology, Writing Ungman Draft, Writing Review and Editing, Supervision. MM:<br>423 Conceptualisation, Writing – Review and Editing. FF: Conceptualisation, Writing – Revie<br>424 and Editing. NP: Conceptualisation, Writin
- 
- 
- 

## 427<br>428<br>428<br>430<br>431<br>432<br>433

425 Methodology, Whing Meview and Editing, Supervision.<br>426 **Funding**<br>428 AAC is an NIHR Senior Investigator. This is an EU Joint Pro<br>429 Disease Research (JPND) project. The project is supported<br>430 organizations under th

- 423 Conceptualisation, Writing Review and Editing. Tr. Conceptualisation, Writing Review<br>424 and Editing. NP: Conceptualisation, Writing Review and Editing. AAC: Conceptualisation,<br>425 Methodology, Writing Review and E
- 
- 424 and Editing. NP: Conceptualisation, Writing Review and Editing. AAC: Conceptualisation,<br>426<br>427 **Funding**<br>428 AAC is an NIHR Senior Investigator. This is an EU Joint Programme-Neurodegenerative<br>429 Disease Research (
- 
- 
- 427 Funding<br>
428 AAC is an I<br>
429 Disease Re<br>
430 organizatid<br>
431 MR/L5015<br>
432 and throu<sub>l</sub><br>
434 and Maud Disease Research (JPND) project. The project is supported through the following fundinal organizations under the aegis of JPND (United Kingdom, Medical Research Council MR/L501529/1 and MR/R024804/1; Economic and Social Re organizations under the aegis of JPND (United Kingdom, Medical Research Council<br>431 MR/L501529/1 and MR/R024804/1; Economic and Social Research Council ES/L008238/1<br>432 and through the Motor Neurone Disease Association. Th MR/L501529/1 and MR/R024804/1; Economic and Social Research Council ES/L008<br>
and through the Motor Neurone Disease Association. This study represents indepe<br>
research part funded by the NIHR Maudsley Biomedical Research Ce and through the Motor Neurone Disease Association. This study represents independent<br>433 meta-conomic meta-conomic Disease Association. This study represents independent<br>434 meta-council Research Centre at South London<br>434 research part funded by the NIHR Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre at South London<br>434 and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The work leading up to tl<br>435 publication was funded by the European Com and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The work leading up to th<br>435 publication was funded by the European Community's Horizon 2020 Programme (H2O2O-<br>436 PHC-2014-two-stage; grant 633413). This work
- ublication was funded by the European Community's Horizon 2020 Programme (H2020-<br>
236 PHC-2014-two-stage; grant 633413). This work was part funded by my Name'5 Doddie<br>
Foundation, and Alan Davidson Foundation. The views ex
- 
- 
- 
- PHC-2014-two-stage; grant 633413). This work was part funded by my Name'5 Doddie<br>437 Foundation, and Alan Davidson Foundation. The views expressed are those of the author<br>438 and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, Foundation, and Alan Davidson Foundation. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, King's College London, or the Department of Health and Social Care. Al is funded by Sou and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, King's College London, or the Department<br>
439 of Health and Social Care. Al is funded by South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation<br>
440 Trust, MND Scotland, Motor Neurone Dise
- 
- 
- 
- 

of Health and Social Care. Al is funded by South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation<br>440 Trust, MND Scotland, Motor Neurone Disease Association, National Institute for Health and<br>441 Care Research, Spastic Paraplegia Founda Trust, MND Scotland, Motor Neurone Disease Association, National Institute for Health<br>
440 Trust, MND Scotland, Motor Neurone Disease Association, National Institute for Health<br>
441 Care Research, Spastic Paraplegia Founda 441 Care Research, Spastic Paraplegia Foundation, Rosetrees Trust, Darby Rimmer MND<br>442 Foundation, the Medical Research Council (UKRI) and Alzheimer's Research UK.<br>443 **Role of the funding source**<br>445 The funding sources 442 Foundation, the Medical Research Council (UKRI) and Alzheimer's Research UK.<br>443<br>444 **Role of the funding source**<br>445 The funding sources had no role in the writing of this manuscript or the decision to s<br>447 **Declarat** 443<br>444 **Role of the funding source**<br>445 The funding sources had no role in the writing of this manuscript or the decision<br>446 **Declaration** Council and Alzheimer's Research UKRI<br>448 **Declaration of interests**<br>449 Al, MR, 444<br>445<br>446<br>448<br>449<br>450 **444 Role of the funding source**<br>445 The funding sources had no role<br>446 for publication.<br>447 **Declaration of interests**<br>449 Al, MR, FF, and NP declare no co<br>450 AstraZeneca. AAC declares royal<br>451 Publications, and The Ge For publication.<br>
445 The funding sources had no role in the writing of this manuscript or the decision<br>
447 **Declaration of interests**<br>
449 Al, MR, FF, and NP declare no competing interests. TPS declares employment with<br>

### 447<br>
448 **Declaration o**<br>
449 Al, MR, FF, and<br>
450 AstraZeneca. AA<br>
451 Publications, an<br>
452 reports consulta<br>
453 Cytokinetics, Ge 448<br>449<br>451<br>452<br>453<br>454

- 449 Al, MR, FF, and NP declare no<br>450 AstraZeneca. AAC declares re<br>451 Publications, and The Geneti<br>452 reports consultancies or advi<br>453 Cytokinetics, GenieUs, GSK, I<br>454 Quralis, Sano, Sanofi, and Wa<br>455 has planned pate
- 450 AstraZeneca. AAC declares royalties from The Brain, A Beginner's Guide: Oneworld<br>451 Publications, and The Genetics of Complex Human Diseases, A Laboratory Manual.<br>452 reports consultancies or advisory boards for Amyly
- Publications, and The Genetics of Complex Human Diseases, A Laboratory Manual.<br>
452 Publications, and The Genetics of Complex Human Diseases, A Laboratory Manual.<br>
452 reports consultancies or advisory boards for Amylyx, A
- 
- 453 Cytokinetics, GenieUs, GSK, Lilly, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma, Novartis, OrionPhari<br>454 Quralis, Sano, Sanofi, and Wave Pharmaceuticals. AAC is the deputy editor for Brains has planned patents for 'Use of CSF-Neurofilame
- reports consultancies or advisory boards for Amylyx, Apellis, Biogen, Brainstorm,<br>453 Cytokinetics, GenieUs, GSK, Lilly, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma, Novartis, OrionPharma,<br>454 Quralis, Sano, Sanofi, and Wave Pharmaceuticals. 2454 Cytralis, Sano, Sanofi, and Wave Pharmaceuticals. AAC is the deputy editor for Brain.<br>455 has planned patents for 'Use of CSF-Neurofilament determinations and CSF-Neurofila<br>456 thresholds of prognostic and stratificat
- has planned patents for 'Use of CSF-Neurofilament determinations and CSF-Neurofilamen<br>
456 thresholds of prognostic and stratification value with regards to response to therapy in<br>
457 neuromuscular and neurodegenerative d
- 
- 456 thresholds of prognostic and stratification value with regards to response to therapy in<br>157 meuromuscular and neurodegenerative diseases'. AAC is Scientific co-lead for United to End<br>158 MND Partnership Coalition and 1467 thresholds and neurodegenerative diseases'. AAC is Scientific co-lead for United to<br>458 MND Partnership Coalition and Guarantor of Brain. AAC has stock options for Quralis.<br>458
- 458 MND Partnership Coalition and Guarantor of Brain. AAC has stock options for Quralis.<br>158 458 MND Partnership Coalition and Guarantor of Brain. AAC has stock options for Quralis.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.03.23292187;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.03.23292187) this version posted July 3, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint<br>(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted med



 $461$ 461

462 463<br>464<br>465<br>466<br>468<br>469 463 References:<br>464 1. lacoa<br>465 DNAscan: pe<br>466 Bioinform. 20<br>467 2. Weng<br>469 human geno<br>470 3. Illum 2465 DNAscan: personal computer compatible NGS analysis, annotation and visualisation. BN<br>
466 Bioinform. 2019;20(1):213.<br>
2. Wenger AM, Peluso P, Rowell WJ, Chang P-C, Hall RJ, Concepcion GT, et al. Accur<br>
468 circular co Bioinform. 2019;20(1):213.<br>
466 Bioinform. 2019;20(1):213.<br>
467 2. Wenger AM, Peluso P, Rowell WJ, Chang P-C, Hall RJ, Concepcion GT, et al. Accuration<br>
468 circular consensus long-read sequencing improves variant detectio 467 2. Wenger AM, Peluso<br>468 circular consensus long-read<br>469 human genome. Nat Biotec<br>470 3. Illumina. Accuracy Ir<br>471 Platform2019 07/09/2019...<br>472 <u>docs.illumina.com/documer</u><br>473 <u>006/Content/Source/Inform</u> circular consensus long-read sequencing improves variant detection and assembly of a<br>
469 human genome. Nat Biotechnol. 2019;37(10):1155-62.<br>
470 3. Illumina. Accuracy Improvements in Germline Small Variant Calling with th 469 human genome. Nat Biotechnol. 2019;37(10):1155-62.<br>470 3. Illumina. Accuracy Improvements in Germline Small Variant Calling with the DRA<br>471 Platform2019 07/09/2019. Available from: https://science-<br>472 docs.illumina.c 470 3. Illumina. Accuracy Improvements in Germline Sr<br>
471 Platform2019 07/09/2019. Available from: https://scier<br>
472 docs.illumina.com/documents/Informatics/dragen-v3-ac<br>
<u>006/Content/Source/Informatics/Dragen/dragen-v3-</u> Platform2019 07/09/2019. Available from: https://science-<br>
472 docs.illumina.com/documents/Informatics/dragen-v3-accuracy-appnote-html-970-2019-<br>
473 006/Content/Source/Informatics/Dragen/dragen-v3-accuracy-appnote-970-201 006/Content/Source/Informatics/Dragen/dragen-v3-accuracy-appnote-970-2019-<br>
474 006/dragen-v3-accuracy-appnote-970-2019-006.html.<br>
475 4. Kosugi S, Momozawa Y, Liu X, Terao C, Kubo M, Kamatani Y. Comprehensive<br>
476 evaluat 006/dragen-v3-accuracy-appnote-970-2019-006.html.<br>
475 4. Kosugi S, Momozawa Y, Liu X, Terao C, Kubo M, Kamatani Y. Comprehensiv<br>
476 evaluation of structural variation detection algorithms for whole genome sequenc<br>
477 Ge 475 4. Kosugi S, Momozawa Y, Liu X, Terao C, Kubo M,<br>476 evaluation of structural variation detection algorithms<br>477 Genome Biol. 2019;20(1):117.<br>478 5. Rhoades R, Jackson F, Teng S. Discovery of rare<br>479 using next-genera evaluation of structural variation detection algorithms for whole genome sequencin<br>
475 evaluation of structural variation detection algorithms for whole genome sequencin<br>
477 Genome Biol. 2019;20(1):117.<br>
478 5. Rhoades R Genome Biol. 2019;20(1):117.<br>478 5. Rhoades R, Jackson F, Teng S. Discovery of rare variants implicated in schizophr<br>479 using next-generation sequencing. J transl genet genom. 2019;3:1.<br>480 6. Davey JW, Hohenlohe PA, Ette 478 5. Rhoades R, Jackson F, T<br>479 using next-generation sequenc<br>480 6. Davey JW, Hohenlohe F<br>481 wide genetic marker discovery<br>482 Genet. 2011;12(7):499-510.<br>483 7. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okba<br>484 polygenic prediction from a ge 478 5. Rhoades R, Jackson F, Teng S. Discovery of rare variants implicated in schizophrenia<br>479 using next-generation sequencing. J transl genet genom. 2019;3:1. using next-generation sequencing. J transl genet genom. 2019;3:1.<br>480 6. Davey JW, Hohenlohe PA, Etter PD, Boone JQ, Catchen JM, Blaxter ML. Genome-<br>481 wide genetic marker discovery and genotyping using next-generation se 6. Davey JW, Hohenlohe PA, Etter PD, Boone JQ, Catchen JM, I<br>
481 wide genetic marker discovery and genotyping using next-generation<br>
482 Genet. 2011;12(7):499-510.<br>
7. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher Genet. 2011;12(7):499-510.<br>483 7. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okbay A, Kong E, Maghzian O, Zacher M, et al. Gene discovery and<br>484 polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1<br>485 million i 483 7. Lee JJ, Wedow R, Okl<br>484 polygenic prediction from a<br>485 million individuals. Nat Gene<br>486 8. Bycroft C, Freeman C<br>487 resource with deep phenoty<br>488 9. Hörster F, Kölker S, L<br>489 Screening Programmes in Eu 484 polygenic prediction from a genome-wide association study of educational attainment in 1.1<br>485 million individuals. Nat Genet. 2018;50(8):1112-21.<br>486 8. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et million individuals. Nat Genet. 2018;50(8):1112-21.<br>
486 8. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank<br>
487 resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562(7726):2 8. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Ell<br>187 mesource with deep phenotyping and genomic data.<br>188 9. Hörster F, Kölker S, Loeber JG, Cornel MC, Horster S, Loeber JG, Cornel MC, Horster S, Loeber JG, Cornel MC, Horst France with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562(7726):203-9.<br>
488 9. Hörster F, Kölker S, Loeber JG, Cornel MC, Hoffmann GF, Burgard P. Newborn<br>
489 Screening Programmes in Europe, Arguments and Efforts Reg 487 resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562(7726):203-9.<br>488 9. Hörster F, Kölker S, Loeber JG, Cornel MC, Hoffmann GF, Burgard P. Newborn 9. Hörster F, Kölker S, Loeber JG, Cornel MC, Hoffmann GF, Burgard P. Newborr<br>489 Screening Programmes in Europe, Arguments and Efforts Regarding Harmonisation:<br>490 on Organic Acidurias. JIMD Rep. 2017;32:105-15.<br>491 10. P Screening Programmes in Europe, Arguments and Efforts Regarding Harmonisation: F<br>
489 Screening Programmes in Europe, Arguments and Efforts Regarding Harmonisation: F<br>
491 10. Perrone F, Cacace R, Van Mossevelde S, Van den on Organic Acidurias. JIMD Rep. 2017;32:105-15.<br>491 10. Perrone F, Cacace R, Van Mossevelde S, Van den Bossche T, De Deyn PP, Cras P, et and 2021 (Senetic screening in early-onset dementia patients with unclear phenotype: 491 10. Perrone F, Cacace R, Van Mossevelde S, Va<br>492 Genetic screening in early-onset dementia patien<br>493 clinical diagnosis. Neurobiol Aging. 2018;69:292.e<br>494 11. Majumder MA, Guerrini CJ, McGuire AL. D<br>495 and Risk. An Genetic screening in early-onset dementia patients with unclear phenotype: relevance for<br>193 clinical diagnosis. Neurobiol Aging. 2018;69:292.e7-.e14.<br>11. Majumder MA, Guerrini CJ, McGuire AL. Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Te 493 clinical diagnosis. Neurobiol Aging. 2018;69:292.e7-.e14.<br>494 11. Majumder MA, Guerrini CJ, McGuire AL. Direct-to-Consumer Genetic Testing: Value<br>495 and Risk. Annu Rev Med. 2021;72(1):151-66.<br>496 12. Murray MF, Evans 11. Majumder MA, Guerrini CJ, McGuire AL. Direct-to<br>495 and Risk. Annu Rev Med. 2021;72(1):151-66.<br>496 12. Murray MF, Evans JP, Khoury MJ. DNA-Based Pop<br>497 Suitability and Important Knowledge Gaps. JAMA. 2019.<br>498 13. Dic and Risk. Annu Rev Med. 2021;72(1):151-66.<br>
496 12. Murray MF, Evans JP, Khoury MJ. DNA-Based Population Screening: Potential<br>
497 Suitability and Important Knowledge Gaps. JAMA. 2019.<br>
498 13. Dickinson JA, Pimlott N, Gra 496 12. Murray MF, Evans JP, Khoury MJ. DNA<br>497 Suitability and Important Knowledge Gaps. JA<br>498 13. Dickinson JA, Pimlott N, Grad R, Singh<br>499 things go wrong. Can Fam Physician. 2018;64<br>500 14. Jansen ME, Lister KJ, van 497 Suitability and Important Knowledge Gaps. JAMA. 2019.<br>498 13. Dickinson JA, Pimlott N, Grad R, Singh H, Szafran O, Wilson BJ, et al. Screening<br>499 things go wrong. Can Fam Physician. 2018;64(7):502-8.<br>500 14. Jansen ME 13. Dickinson JA, Pimlott N, Grad R, Singh H, Szafran<br>
1499 things go wrong. Can Fam Physician. 2018;64(7):502-8.<br>
14. Jansen ME, Lister KJ, van Kranen HJ, Cornel MC. P<br>
15. Genome UK: The future of healthcare.<br>
15. Genome things go wrong. Can Fam Physician. 2018;64(7):502-8.<br>
500 14. Jansen ME, Lister KJ, van Kranen HJ, Cornel MC. Policy Making in Newborn Screening<br>
701 Needs a Structured and Transparent Approach. Front Public Health. 2017; 14. Jansen ME, Lister KJ, van Kranen HJ, Cornel MC.<br>
14. Jansen ME, Lister KJ, van Kranen HJ, Cornel MC.<br>
15. Genome UK: The future of healthcare.<br>
16. Moorthie S, Hall A, Janus J, Brigden T, Villiers CB<br>
16. Moorthie S, H Needs a Structured and Transparent Approach. Front Public Health. 2017;5(53).<br>
15. Genome UK: The future of healthcare.<br>
502 15. Genome UK: The future of healthcare.<br>
503 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-u 15. Genome UK: The future of healthcare.<br>
502 15. Genome UK: The future of healthcare.<br>
503 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/genome-uk-the-future-of-health.<br>
504 16. Moorthie S, Hall A, Janus J, Brigden T, Villie 903 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications<br>504 16. Moorthie S, Hall A, Janus J, Brigden T, V<br>505 and clinical utility. University of Cambridge; 20<br>506 17. Adhikari AN, Gallagher RC, Wang Y, Cur<br>607 role of exome sequen 504 **16.** Moorthie S, Hall A, Janus J, Brigden T, Villiers CBd, Blackburn L, et al. Polygenic score<br>505 and clinical utility. University of Cambridge; 2021.<br>506 17. Adhikari AN, Gallagher RC, Wang Y, Currier RJ, Amatuni G, and clinical utility. University of Cambridge; 2021.<br>506 17. Adhikari AN, Gallagher RC, Wang Y, Currier RJ, Amatuni G, Bassaganyas L, et al. The<br>507 role of exome sequencing in newborn screening for inborn errors of metabo 506 17. Adhikari AN, Gallagher RC, Wang Y, Currier<br>507 role of exome sequencing in newborn screening fo<br>508 2020;26(9):1392-7. For the of exome sequencing in newborn screening for inborn errors of metabolism. Nat Med.<br>  $2020;26(9):1392-7$ .  $508$  2020;26(9):1392-7.

508 2020;26(9):1392-7.

509 18. Programs: The Promise and Challenges 2021 [Available from:<br>
511 https://www.cdc.gov/genomics/events/newborn\_screening\_2021.htm.<br>
512 19. Pain O, Gillett AC, Austin JC, Folkersen L, Lewis CM. A tool for translating polygeni 11 https://www.cdc.gov/genomics/events/newborn\_screening<br>
19. Pain O, Gillett AC, Austin JC, Folkersen L, Lewis CM. A t<br>
19. Dain O, Gillett AC, Austin JC, Folkersen L, Lewis CM. A t<br>
19. Loeber JG, Burgard P, Cornel MC, R For the absolute scale using summary statistics. Eur J Hum Gene<br>513 scores onto the absolute scale using summary statistics. Eur J Hum Gene<br>514 20. Loeber JG, Burgard P, Cornel MC, Rigter T, Weinreich SS, Rupp K,<br>515 scree 513 scores onto the absolute scale using summary statistics. Eur J Hum Genet. 2022;30:339-48<br>514 20. Loeber JG, Burgard P, Cornel MC, Rigter T, Weinreich SS, Rupp K, et al. Newborn<br>515 screening programmes in Europe; argum 20. Loeber JG, Burgard P, Cornel MC, Rigter T, Weinreich SS, Rupp K, et al. Newborn<br>515 screening programmes in Europe; arguments and efforts regarding harmonization. Part 1 –<br>516 From blood spot to screening result. J Inh screening programmes in Europe; arguments and efforts regarding harmonization. Part<br>516 From blood spot to screening result. J Inherit Metab Dis. 2012;35(4):603-11.<br>517 21. Tarini BA, Christakis DA, Welch HG. State Newborn 516 From blood spot to screening result. J Inherit Metab Dis. 2012;35(4):603-11.<br>517 21. Tarini BA, Christakis DA, Welch HG. State Newborn Screening in the Tandem Mass<br>518 Spectrometry Era: More Tests, More False-Positive 21. Tarini BA, Christakis DA, Welch HG. State Newborn Screening in the T<br>518 Spectrometry Era: More Tests, More False-Positive Results. Pediatrics. 2006;<br>22. Southern KW, Munck A, Pollitt R, Travert G, Zanolla L, Dankert-R 518 Spectrometry Era: More Tests, More False-Positive Results. Pediatrics. 2006;118(2):448.<br>519 22. Southern KW, Munck A, Pollitt R, Travert G, Zanolla L, Dankert-Roelse J, et al. A<br>520 survey of newborn screening for cyst 22. Southern KW, Munck A, Pollitt R, Travert G, Zanolla L, Dankert-Roelse J, et al. A<br>520 survey of newborn screening for cystic fibrosis in Europe. J Cyst Fibros. 2007;6(1):57-65.<br>521 23. Rinaldo P, Zafari S, Tortorelli S survey of newborn screening for cystic fibrosis in Europe. J Cyst Fibros. 2007;6(1):57-65<br>521 23. Rinaldo P, Zafari S, Tortorelli S, Matern D. Making the case for objective perforn<br>522 metrics in newborn screening by tande 23. (a) Sall 23. (a) Rinaldo P, Zafari S, Tortorelli S, Matern D. Making the case for objective performand the metrics in newborn screening by tandem mass spectrometry. Ment Retard Dev Disabil Republic Republic Republic Re metrics in newborn screening by tandem mass spectrometry. Ment Retard Dev Disabil Res<br>
523 Rev. 2006;12(4):255-61.<br>
524 24. Rehm HL, Berg JS, Brooks LD, Bustamante CD, Evans JP, Landrum MJ, et al. ClinGen<br>
525 — The Clinic For the United States in new spectrum of the United States in New 2006;12(4):255-61.<br>
524 24. Rehm HL, Berg JS, Brooks LD, Bustamante CD, Evans JP, Landrum MJ, et al. ClinGen<br>
525 - The Clinical Genome Resource. N Engl J M 524 24. Rehm HL, Berg JS<br>525 — The Clinical Genome F<br>526 25. Hunter JE, Irving<br>527 evidence-based protocol<br>528 genomic variation. Gene<br>529 26. Biesecker LG. Ger<br>530 kettles of fish. Genome M 525 — The Clinical Genome Resource. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(23):2235-42.<br>526 25. Hunter JE, Irving SA, Biesecker LG, Buchanan A, Jensen B, Lee K, et al. A standardize<br>527 evidence-based protocol to assess clinical actionabi 25. Hunter JE, Irving SA, Biesecker LG, Buchanan A, Jensen B, Lee K, evidence-based protocol to assess clinical actionability of genetic disord<br>
527 evidence-based protocol to assess clinical actionability of genetic disor evidence-based protocol to assess clinical actionability of genetic disorders associated with<br>528 genomic variation. Genet Med. 2016;18(12):1258-68.<br>529 26. Biesecker LG. Genomic screening and genomic diagnostic testing-tw 528 genomic variation. Genet Med. 2016;18(12):1258-68.<br>529 26. Biesecker LG. Genomic screening and genomic diagnostic testing-two very different<br>530 kettles of fish. Genome Med. 2019;11(1):75.<br>531 27. Hunink MGM, Weinstein 529 26. Biesecker LG. Genomic screening and genomic<br>530 kettles of fish. Genome Med. 2019;11(1):75.<br>531 27. Hunink MGM, Weinstein MC, Wittenberg E, Dr<br>532 al. Decision Making in Health and Medicine: Integratin<br>533 Cambridg kettles of fish. Genome Med. 2019;11(1):75.<br>531 27. Hunink MGM, Weinstein MC, Wittenberg E, Drummond MF, Pliskin JS, Wong JB, et<br>532 al. Decision Making in Health and Medicine: Integrating Evidence and Values. 2nd ed.<br>533 27. Hunink MGM, Weinstein MC, Wittenk<br>
531 27. Hunink MGM, Weinstein MC, Wittenk<br>
532 al. Decision Making in Health and Medicine: I<br>
533 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 201<br>
28. Bertram L, Tanzi RE. The genetic epid al. Decision Making in Health and Medicine: Integrating Evidence and Values. 2nd ed.<br>533 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2014.<br>534 28. Bertram L, Tanzi RE. The genetic epidemiology of neurodegenerative disease. J Cl Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2014.<br>534 28. Bertram L, Tanzi RE. The genetic epidemiology of neurodegenerative disease. J<br>535 Invest. 2005;115(6):1449-57.<br>536 29. Langbehn DR, Brinkman RR, Falush D, Paulsen JS, Ha 28. Bertram L, Tanzi RE. The genetic epidem<br>535 Invest. 2005;115(6):1449-57.<br>536 29. Langbehn DR, Brinkman RR, Falush D, P<br>537 prediction of the age of onset and penetrance is<br>538 length. Clin Genet. 2004;65(4):267-77.<br>539 1535 Invest. 2005;115(6):1449-57.<br>
536 29. Langbehn DR, Brinkman RR, Falush D, Paulsen JS, Hayden MR. A new model for<br>
537 prediction of the age of onset and penetrance for Huntington's disease based on CAG<br>
158 length. Cl 536 29. Langbehn DR, Brinkma<br>537 prediction of the age of onset<br>538 length. Clin Genet. 2004;65(4<br>539 30. Brown RH, Al-Chalabi.<br>540 2017;377(2):162-72.<br>541 31. Hillert A, Anikster Y, B<br>542 Genetic Landscape and Epide prediction of the age of onset and penetrance for Huntington's disease based on CAG<br>538 length. Clin Genet. 2004;65(4):267-77.<br>539 30. Brown RH, Al-Chalabi A. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. N Engl J Med.<br>2017;377(2):162-72 537 prediction of the age of onset and penetrance for Huntington's disease based on CAG<br>538 length. Clin Genet. 2004;65(4):267-77.<br>539 30. Brown RH, Al-Chalabi A. Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. N Engl J Med.<br>540 2017;377(2 539 30. Brown RH, Al-Chalabi A. Amyotr<br>540 2017;377(2):162-72.<br>541 31. Hillert A, Anikster Y, Belanger-Q<br>542 Genetic Landscape and Epidemiology o<br>543 2020;107(2):234-50.<br>544 32. van der Spek RAA, van Rheenen<br>545 The projec 2017;377(2):162-72.<br>
540 2017;377(2):162-72.<br>
541 31. Hillert A, Anikster Y, Belanger-Quintana A, Burlina A, Burton BK, Cardu<br>
542 Genetic Landscape and Epidemiology of Phenylketonuria. Am J Hum Genet.<br>
2020;107(2):234-50. 541 31. Hillert A, Anik<br>542 Genetic Landscape an<br>543 2020;107(2):234-50.<br>544 32. van der Spek<br>545 The project MinE dat<br>546 researchers and the J<br>547 40. Genetic Landscape and Epidemiology of Phenylketonuria. Am J Hum Genet.<br>
543 2020;107(2):234-50.<br>
544 32. van der Spek RAA, van Rheenen W, Pulit SL, Kenna KP, van den Berg LH, Veldink JH.<br>
545 The project MinE databrowser: 2020;107(2):234-50.<br>
543 2. van der Spek RAA, van Rheenen W, Pulit SL, Kenna KP, van den Berg<br>
545 The project MinE databrowser: bringing large-scale whole-genome sequenci<br>
7545 The project MinE databrowser: bringing large 544 32. van der Spek<br>545 The project MinE dat<br>545 The project MinE dat<br>547 40.<br>548 33. ALS Variant Se<br>550 34. Landrum MJ, The project MinE databrowser: bringing large-scale whole-genome sequencing in ALS to<br>546 researchers and the public. Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener. 2019;20:432<br>547 40.<br>548 33. ALS Variant Server [Internet] researchers and the public. Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener. 2019; 20:4<br>547 40.<br>548 33. ALS Variant Server [Internet]. [cited 02/2021]. Available from:<br>550 <u>http://als.umassmed.edu/</u>.<br>550 34. Landrum MJ, Lee 547 40.<br>548 33. ALS Variant Server [Internet]. [cited 02/2021]. Available from:<br>550 <u>http://als.umassmed.edu/</u>.<br>550 34. Landrum MJ, Lee JM, Benson M, Brown GR, Chao C, Chitipiralla S, et al. ClinVar:<br>551 improving access t 548 33.<br>549 <u>http</u><br>550 34.<br>551 imp<br>552 201<br>553 35. 549 http://als.umassmed.edu/.<br>550 34. Landrum MJ, Lee JM, Benson M, Brown GR, Chao C, Chitipiralla<br>551 improving access to variant interpretations and supporting evidence. 1<br>2018;46(D1):D1062-D7.<br>553 35. Paulson H. Repeat 550 34. Landrum MJ, Lee JM<br>551 improving access to variant<br>552 2018;46(D1):D1062-D7.<br>553 35. Paulson H. Repeat e. 551 improving access to variant interpretations and supporting evidence. Nucleic Acids Res.<br>552 2018;46(D1):D1062-D7.<br>553 35. Paulson H. Repeat expansion diseases. Handb Clin Neurol. 2018;147:105-23.<br>553 35. Paulson H. Rep 552  $2018;46(D1):D1062-D7.$ <br>553 35. Paulson H. Repeat expansion diseases. Handb Clin Neurol. 2018;147:105-23. 553 35. Paulson H. Repea 553 35. Paulson H. Repeat expansion diseases. Handb Clin Neurol. 2018;147:105-23.

554 36. ALSgeneScanner: a pipeline for the analysis and interpretation of DNA sequencing data of<br>556 ALS patients. Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener. 2019;20:207-15.<br>557 37. Zou Z-Y, Zhou Z-R, Che C-H, Liu C-Y, He R-L ALS patients. Amyotroph Lateral Scler Frontotemporal Degener. 2019;20:207-15.<br>
557 37. Zou Z-Y, Zhou Z-R, Che C-H, Liu C-Y, He R-L, Huang H-P. Genetic epidemiology of<br>
558 amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a systematic review 557 37. Zou Z-Y, Zhou Z-R, Che C-H, Liu C-Y, He R-L, Huang H-P. Genetic epidemiolo<br>558 amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Neurol Net<br>559 Psychiatry. 2017;88:540-9.<br>560 38. Mehta PR, lac 558 amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Neurol Neurosur<br>559 Psychiatry. 2017;88:540-9.<br>560 38. Mehta PR, lacoangeli A, Opie-Martin S, van Vugt J, Al Khleifat A, Bredin A, et al. 1<br>561 im 559 Bychiatry. 2017;88:540-9.<br>560 38. Mehta PR, lacoangeli A, Opie-Martin S, van Vugt J, Al Khleifat A, Bredin A, et al. Th<br>561 impact of age on genetic testing decisions in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Brain.<br>562 2022;1 560 38. Mehta PR, lacoange<br>561 impact of age on genetic te<br>562 2022;145(12):4440-7.<br>563 39. Abel O, Powell JF, A<br>564 bioinformatics tool for amy<br>565 51.<br>566 40. Renton AE, Majouni 561 impact of age on genetic testing decisions in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Brain.<br>562 2022;145(12):4440-7.<br>563 39. Abel O, Powell JF, Andersen PM, Al-Chalabi A. ALSoD: A user-friendly online<br>564 bioinformatics tool f 2022;145(12):4440-7.<br>
562 2022;145(12):4440-7.<br>
563 39. Abel O, Powell JF, Andersen PM, Al-Chalabi A. ALSoD: A user-friendly online<br>
564 bioinformatics tool for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis genetics. Hum Mutat. 2012;3<br>
56 563 39. Abel O, Powell<br>564 bioinformatics tool for<br>565 51.<br>566 40. Renton AE, Ma<br>567 hexanucleotide repeat<br>568 FTD. Neuron. 2011;72<br>569 41. Cudkowicz ME, bioinformatics tool for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis genetics. Hum Mutat. 2012;33(<br>565 51.<br>566 40. Renton AE, Majounie E, Waite A, Simon-Sanchez J, Rollinson S, Gibbs JR, et a<br>567 hexanucleotide repeat expansion in C9ORF7 565 51.<br>566 40. Renton AE, Majounie E, Waite A, Simon-Sanchez J, Rollinson S, Gibbs JR, et al. A<br>567 hexanucleotide repeat expansion in C9ORF72 is the cause of chromosome 9p21-linked ALS-<br>568 41. Cudkowicz ME, McKenna-Yase 566 40.<br>567 hex<br>568 FTD<br>569 41.<br>570 Epid<br>571 of N<br>572 42. hexanucleotide repeat expansion in C9ORF72 is the cause of chromosome 9p21-linked<br>568 FTD. Neuron. 2011;72(2):257-68.<br>569 41. Cudkowicz ME, McKenna-Yasek D, Sapp PE, Chin W, Geller B, Hayden DL, et al.<br>570 Epidemiology of 569 41. Cudkowicz ME, McKenna-<br>570 Epidemiology of mutations in sup<br>571 of Neurology. 1997;41(2):210-21.<br>572 42. Spargo TP, Opie-Martin S,<br>573 variant penetrance from family hi<br>574 scale data. Genome Med. 2022;14<br>575 43. S Epidemiology of mutations in superoxide dismutase in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. A<br>571 of Neurology. 1997;41(2):210-21.<br>572 42. Spargo TP, Opie-Martin S, Bowles H, Lewis CM, lacoangeli A, Al-Chalabi A. Calcu<br>73 variant 571 of Neurology. 1997;41(2):210-21.<br>572 42. Spargo TP, Opie-Martin S, Bowles H, Lewis CM, lacoangeli A, Al-Chalabi A. Calculating<br>573 variant penetrance from family history of disease and average family size in population 572 42. Spargo TP, Opie-Martin S, I<br>
573 variant penetrance from family his<br>
574 scale data. Genome Med. 2022;14<br>
575 43. Saeed M, Yang Y, Deng HX,<br>
576 effect of SOD1 A4V mutation caus<br>
577 44. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, variant penetrance from family history of disease and average family size in population-<br>574 scale data. Genome Med. 2022;14:141.<br>575 43. Saeed M, Yang Y, Deng HX, Hung WY, Siddique N, Dellefave L, et al. Age and founder<br>5 574 hexale data. Genome Med. 2022;14:141.<br>1975 heavie and Saeed M, Yang Y, Deng HX, Hung WY, Siddique N, Dellefave L, et al. Age and founder 575 43. Saeed M, Yang Y, Deng HX, Hung<br>576 effect of SOD1 A4V mutation causing AL<br>577 44. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D,<br>578 guidelines for the interpretation of sequent<br>580 Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-<br>581 4 576 effect of SOD1 A4V mutation causing ALS. Neurology. 2009;72(19):1634-9.<br>577 44. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D, Das S, Gastier-Foster J, et al. Standards and<br>578 guidelines for the interpretation of sequence varian 44. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D, Das S, Gastier-Foster J, et al. Stand<br>578 guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus ree<br>580 the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommend<br>
579 the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Mo<br>
580 Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-23.<br>
581 4 579 the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular<br>580 Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-23.<br>581 45. Akimoto C, Volk AE, van Blitterswijk M, Van den Broeck M, Leblond CS, Lumbros 930 Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-23.<br>
581 45. Akimoto C, Volk AE, van Blitterswijk M, Van den Broeck M, Leblond CS, Lumbroso S,<br>
582 et al. A blinded international study on the reliability of genetic testing for GG 580 Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-23.<br>581 45. Akimoto C, Volk AE, van Blitterswijk M, Van den Broeck M, Leblond CS, Lumbroso S, 581 45. Akimoto C, Volk AE, van Blitterswijk<br>582 et al. A blinded international study on the responsions in C9orf72 reveals marked differ<br>583 Genet. 2014;51(6):419.<br>585 46. Schulze A, Lindner M, Kohlmüller D,<br>586 Expanded et al. A blinded international study on the reliability of genetic testing for GGGGCC-repeat<br>
s83 expansions in C9orf72 reveals marked differences in results among 14 laboratories. J Med<br>
S84 Genet. 2014;51(6):419.<br>
585 46 expansions in C9orf72 reveals marked differences in results among 14 laboratories. J Med<br>584 Genet. 2014;51(6):419.<br>585 46. Schulze A, Lindner M, Kohlmüller D, Olgemöller K, Mayatepek E, Hoffmann GF.<br>586 Expanded newborn s 584 Genet. 2014;51(6):419.<br>585 46. Schulze A, Lindner M, Kohlmüller D, Olgemöller K, Mayatepek E, Hoffmann GF.<br>586 Expanded newborn screening for inborn errors of metabolism by electrospray ionization-<br>587 tandem mass spec 585 46. Schulze A, Lindn<br>585 46. Schulze A, Lindn<br>586 Expanded newborn scre<br>587 tandem mass spectrom<br>588 2003;111(6):1399-406.<br>589 47. Ferini-Strambi L,<br>590 (RBD) as a marker of ne<br>591 48. Amado DA, Davi Expanded newborn screening for inborn errors of metabolism by electrospray ionizations.<br>
586 Expanded newborn screening for inborn errors of metabolism by electrospray ionizations.<br>
587 2003;111(6):1399-406.<br>
588 2003;111( 2003;111(6):1399-406.<br>
589 tandem mass spectrom mass spectrometry: Fig. 3139-406.<br>
589 tandem mass spectrometry: Calibration mass of the mass of the MSI (RBD) as a marker of neurodegenerative disorders. Arch Ital Biol. 201 589 47. Ferini-Strambi L,<br>590 (RBD) as a marker of ne<br>591 48. Amado DA, Davi<br>592 2021;29(12):3345-58.<br>593 49. Paquin RS, Mitte<br>594 perspectives on burden<br>595 genetic disorders. Gene (RBD) as a marker of neurodegenerative disorders. Arch Ital Biol. 2014;152(2-3):129-46.<br>591 48. Amado DA, Davidson BL. Gene therapy for ALS: A review. Mol Ther.<br>592 2021;29(12):3345-58.<br>593 49. Paquin RS, Mittendorf KF, Le 590 (RBD) as a marker of neurodegenerative disorders. Arch Ital Biol. 2014;152(2-3):129-46. 2021;29(12):3345-58.<br>
593 49. Paquin RS, Mittendorf KF, Lewis MA, Hunter JE, Lee K, Berg JS, et al.<br>
594 perspectives on burden, risk, tolerability, and acceptability of clinical interve<br>
595 genetic disorders. Genet Med. 593 49. Paquin RS, Mit<br>593 49. Paquin RS, Mit<br>595 genetic disorders. Gen<br>595 50. Wadman RI, Ja<br>597 Intragenic and structu<br>598 atrophy. Brain Commu 593 49. Paquin RS, Mittendorf KF, Lewis MA, Hunter JE, Lee K, Berg JS, et al. Expert and lay<br>594 perspectives on burden, risk, tolerability, and acceptability of clinical interventions for For perspectives on burden, risk, tolerability, and acceptability of clinical interventions for genetic disorders. Genet Med. 2019;21(11):2561-8.<br>596 50. Wadman RI, Jansen MD, Stam M, Wijngaarde CA, Curial CAD, Medic J, et 595 genetic disorders. Genet Med. 2019;21(11):2561-8.<br>596 50. Wadman RI, Jansen MD, Stam M, Wijngaarde CA, Curial CAD, Medic J, et al.<br>597 Intragenic and structural variation of the SMN locus and clinical variability of sp 596 50. Wadman RI, Jansen MD, Stam M, Wijngaard<br>597 Intragenic and structural variation of the SMN locus<br>598 atrophy. Brain Commun. 2020;2(2):fcaa075.<br>599 597 Intragenic and structural variation of the SMN locus and clinical variability of spinal<br>598 atrophy. Brain Commun. 2020;2(2):fcaa075.<br>599 598 Intragent and structural variability of the SMN locus and clinical variability of spinal muscular and community<br>599<br>599 599<br>599<br>*Brain Commun. 2020*;