

1 **Consensus guidelines for eligibility assessment of pathogenic** 2 **variants to antisense oligonucleotide treatments**

3
4 David Cheerie^{*1,2}, Margaret Meserve³, Danique Beijer^{4,5}, Charu Kaiwar⁶, Logan Newton^{1,2}, Ana
5 Lisa Taylor Tavares^{7,8}, Aubrie Soucy Verran³, Emma Sherrill³, Stefanie Leonard⁹, Stephan J.
6 Sanders^{10,11,12}, Emily Blake¹³, Nour Elkhateeb^{7,8}, Aastha Gandhi^{1,2}, Nicole S. Y. Liang^{14,15}, Jack T.
7 Morgan¹⁶, Anna Verwillow¹⁷, Jan Verheijen¹⁸, Andrew Giles¹⁹, Sean Williams^{1,2}, Maya Chopra²⁰,
8 Laura Croft²¹, Hormos Salimi Dafsari^{22,23,24}, Alice E. Davidson^{25,26}, Jennifer Friedman^{27,28}, Anne
9 Gregor^{29,30}, Bushra Haque¹, Rosan Lechner^{31,32}, Kylie-Ann Montgomery^{33,26}, Mina Ryten^{34,26}, Emil
10 Schober^{22,21}, Gabriele Siegel³⁵, Patricia Sullivan³⁶, Bianca Zardetto¹⁶, Timothy Yu^{3,37}, Matthis
11 Synofzik^{4,5}, Annemieke Aartsma-Rus¹⁶, Gregory Costain^{1,2,14,38}, Marlen C. Lauffer^{*16}, and on
12 behalf of the N=1 Collaborative⁹

13
14 *Corresponding authors

15 david.cheerie@sickkids.ca

16 m.c.lauffer@lumc.nl

17
18
19 ¹ Program in Genetics & Genome Biology, SickKids Research Institute, Toronto, Ontario, M5G
20 0A4, Canada

21 ² Department of Molecular Genetics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1A8, Canada

22 ³ Division of Genetics and Genomics, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts,
23 02115, USA

24 ⁴ Division of Translational Genomics of Neurodegenerative Diseases, Hertie-Institute for Clinical
25 Brain Research and Center of Neurology, University of Tübingen, 72076, Tuebingen, Germany

26 ⁵ German Center of Neurodegenerative Diseases (DZNE), 72076 Tübingen Germany

27 ⁶ Clinical Molecular Geneticist, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Precision
28 Diagnostics Laboratory, Children's Hospital Colorado, Aurora, CO 80045, USA

29 ⁷ Genomics England, London, E14 5AB, UK

30 ⁸ Department of Clinical Genetics, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,
31 Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB2 0QQ, UK

32 ⁹ N=1 Collaborative, 7 Carole Place, Somerville, MA 02143, USA

33 ¹⁰ Institute of Developmental and Regenerative Medicine, Department of Paediatrics, University
34 of Oxford, Oxford, OX3 7TY, UK

35 ¹¹ Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, UCSF Weill Institute for Neurosciences,
36 University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158, USA

37 ¹² New York Genome Center, New York, NY 10013, USA.

38 ¹³ Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota 55902, USA

39 ¹⁴ Division of Clinical & Metabolic Genetics, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, M5G
40 1X8, Canada

41 ¹⁵ Department of Genetic Counselling, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 1X8,
42 Canada

43 ¹⁶ Dutch Center for RNA Therapeutics, Department of Human Genetics, Leiden University Medical
44 Center, Leiden, 2333 ZA, The Netherlands

45 ¹⁷ Harvard Medical School, Center for Genomic Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, 55
46 Fruit St, Boston, MA, 02114, USA
47 ¹⁸ Department of Quantitative Health Sciences, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota 55902, USA
48 ¹⁹ Ambry Genetics, 1 Enterprise, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656, US
49 ²⁰ Rosamund Stone Zander Translational Neuroscience Center, Department of Neurology, Boston
50 Children's Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA
51 ²¹ Centre for Genomics and Personalised Health, School of Biomedical Sciences, Faculty of
52 Health, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD 4001, Australia
53 ²² Department of Pediatrics and Center for Rare Diseases, Faculty of Medicine and University
54 Hospital Cologne, University of Cologne, 50937 Cologne, Germany
55 ²³ Max-Planck-Institute for Biology of Ageing and Cologne Excellence Cluster for Ageing-
56 associated Diseases, 50931 Cologne, Germany
57 ²⁴ Randall Division of Cell and Molecular Biophysics, Muscle Signaling Section, King's College
58 London, London WC2R 2LS, UK
59 ²⁵ UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, London, EC1V 9EL, UK
60 ²⁶ UK Platform for Nucleic Acid Therapies (UpNAT)
61 ²⁷ Departments of Neurosciences and Pediatrics, University of California San Diego, San Diego,
62 California, CA 92093, USA.
63 ²⁸ Division of Neurology, Rady Children's Hospital; Rady Children's Institute for Genomic
64 Medicine, San Diego, California, CA 92123, USA.
65 ²⁹ Department of Human Genetics, Inselspital University Hospital Bern, University of Bern, 3010
66 Bern, Switzerland.
67 ³⁰ Department for Biomedical Research (DBMR), University of Bern, 3010 Bern, Switzerland.
68 ³¹ Department of Clinical Genetics; Erasmus MC 3015 CN Rotterdam, The Netherlands
69 ³² Center of Expertise for Neurodevelopmental Disorders (ENCORE); Erasmus MC, 3015 CN
70 Rotterdam, The Netherlands
71 ³³ UCL GOS Institute of Child Health/UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, WC1N
72 1EH, UK
73 ³⁴ Dementia Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 0AH, UK
74 ³⁵ Institute of Medical Genetics, University of Zurich, 8952 Schlieren, Switzerland
75 ³⁶ Children's Cancer Institute, Lowy Cancer Research Centre, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, 2033,
76 NSW, Australia
77 ³⁷ Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA
78 ³⁸ Departments of Paediatrics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 1X8, Canada
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90

91 **Abstract**

92 Of the around 7,000 known rare diseases worldwide, disease-modifying treatments are available
93 for fewer than 5%, leaving millions of individuals without specialized therapeutic strategies. In
94 recent years, antisense oligonucleotides (ASOs) have shown promise as individualized genetic
95 interventions for rare genetic diseases. However, there is currently no consensus on which
96 disease-causing DNA variants are suitable candidates for this type of genetic therapy.
97 The Patient Identification Working Group of the N=1 Collaborative (N1C), alongside an
98 international group of volunteer assessors, has developed and piloted consensus guidelines for
99 assessing the eligibility of pathogenic variants towards ASO treatments. We herein present the
100 N1C VARIANT (Variant Assessments towards Eligibility for Antisense Oligonucleotide
101 Treatment) guidelines, including the guiding scientific principles and our approach to consensus
102 building. Pathogenic, disease-causing variants can be assessed for the three currently best-
103 established ASO treatment approaches: splice correction, exon skipping, and downregulation of
104 RNA transcripts. A genetic variant is classified as either “eligible”, “likely eligible”, “unlikely
105 eligible”, or “not eligible” in relation to the different approaches, or “unable to assess”. We also
106 review key considerations for assessment for upregulation of transcripts from the wildtype allele,
107 an emerging ASO therapeutic strategy. We provide additional tools and training material to enable
108 clinicians and researchers to use these guidelines for their eligibility assessments.
109 With this initial edition of our N1C VARIANT guidelines, we provide the rare genetic disease
110 community with guidance on how to identify suitable candidates for variant-specific ASO-based
111 therapies and the possibility of integrating such assessments into routine clinical practice.

112

113 **Keywords**

114 Antisense oligonucleotides, rare genetic diseases, consensus guidelines, individualized genetic
115 therapies, personalized medicine

116

117 **Introduction**

118 There are about 7,000 different rare diseases known to date, with disease-modifying treatments
119 approved for about 5% of them.^{1, 2} A rare disease is defined as a condition that affects less than
120 200,000 people in the US, or less than 1 in 2,000 individuals within Europe and Canada.¹ It is
121 estimated that 6% of the world's population lives with a rare disease.³ The majority of rare
122 diseases are thought to be genetic in origin, and with the massive improvements made in genetic
123 diagnostics in the last decades, we can now diagnose up to 50% of individuals who suffer from a
124 rare disease.⁴ As more individuals receive a molecular genetic diagnosis, the need to develop
125 targeted treatments is increasingly urgent. Yet, with many of these rare diseases only affecting a
126 handful of individuals across the globe, the usual drug development route is not a viable pathway
127 in most cases and more bespoke therapeutic strategies are necessary.⁵

128 Antisense oligonucleotides (ASOs) are one promising form of genetic therapy. Over 20 different
129 oligonucleotide therapies for general applications have been approved by either the Food and
130 Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), the UK's Medicines & Healthcare
131 products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and/or the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and
132 Welfare⁶ and these drugs have been administered and well-studied in thousands of patients
133 worldwide. Systemic delivery is possible (for instance, via subcutaneous or intravenous injection)
134 but localized or targeted delivery is also feasible for a growing number of target organs (brain and
135 spinal cord via intrathecal injection, eye via intraocular injection, liver, and muscle via GalNAc and

136 transferrin receptor targeting respectively), allowing relatively low doses to be administered with
137 potentially high treatment effects.⁷ Due to the finite half-life of ASOs, treatment needs to be
138 administered repeatedly (often every 1-4 months), but this also allows treatment regimen and
139 dosing to be tailored for each individual where helpful, optimizing to individual benefit and side
140 effects.

141 Since 2018, multiple groups and organizations have developed ASO treatments for individuals
142 and small groups of patients, either targeted to their specific variant, a single nucleotide
143 polymorphism, or the disease gene in general.⁸⁻¹⁰ These developments have given hope to the
144 rare disease community that individualized, disease-modifying therapies may be a realistic option
145 for additional patients in the near future. More than 10 individuals have received individualized
146 ASO therapies, and more are under development (personal communication).

147 ASOs are versatile in their usage, as they can be employed to: (i) downregulate transcripts in the
148 case of toxic gain-of-function (GoF) and dominant negative variants, (ii) restore the reading frame
149 in case of truncating variants leading to a loss-of-function (LoF) effect, (iii) correct aberrant
150 splicing, and (iv) increase protein expression of the wildtype allele in disorders associated with
151 haploinsufficiency (see Suppl. File 1).¹¹ Yet, not all genetic variants can be targeted with ASOs
152 and even the ones that can be targeted can be distinguished into more eligible (stronger) and less
153 eligible (weaker) candidates. It is thus important to systematically assess every case for its
154 eligibility for ASO treatment to identify the individuals most likely to benefit from such therapies.

155 The N=1 Collaborative (N1C) (<https://www.n1collaborative.org/>) is a global initiative to
156 standardize ultra-rare “n-of-1/few” therapy development and deliver it safely and equitably to
157 individuals with rare diseases. The N1C Patient Identification Working Group (PIWG) is focused
158 on three key areas: (i) identifying suitable genetic variants for ASO development, (ii) determining
159 diseases that are prime candidates for genetic therapy, and (iii) selecting patients who are suitable
160 for individualized genetic therapy development. Additionally, the group aims to provide structured
161 informational support to clinicians, researchers, and patient organizations on identifying
162 individuals most likely to benefit from genetic therapies, understanding the necessary disease
163 information to inform therapeutic decisions, and providing guidance on patient communication
164 throughout the development process. The PIWG has developed criteria and established a
165 consensus on how to assess diagnostic DNA variants for amenability to ASO therapies. The
166 guidelines are based on two recently published frameworks from members within the group^{9,12},
167 and this work has now been extended beyond the initial frameworks to include criteria for many
168 types of genetic pathological mechanisms causing a monogenic disorder.

169 Here, we describe the development of the consensus guidelines - named N1C VARIANT (**V**ariant
170 **A**ssessments towards **E**ligibility for **A**ntisense Oligonucleotide **T**reatment) guidelines -, present
171 the first version of the guidelines for use by the wider community, and provide training material
172 such as example assessments and training videos. We further introduce the “N1C Variant
173 Eligibility Calculator” that aids with the assessments.

174
175
176
177

178 **Methods**

179 ***Overview of Guideline Development***

180 The development of the consensus guidelines (N1C VARIANT Guidelines) was a multisite effort
181 with input from pre-clinical and clinical researchers, and genetics healthcare providers. The
182 guidelines were developed through alternating rounds of revisions and piloting, leading to the final
183 version 1.0 (Suppl. File 1).

184

185 Version 0.1

186 Development began with a PIWG internal assessment of sample variants. A single assessor from
187 four participating sites [the Dutch Center for RNA Therapeutics (DCRT), The Netherlands;
188 Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids), Toronto, Canada; the Hertie-Institute for Clinical Brain
189 Research, Tübingen, Germany; Boston Children's Hospital, USA] independently assessed 30
190 selected variants (previously assessed at the DCRT). The assessment approaches and outcomes
191 from each site were compared, debated by the PIWG, and distilled into an outline of the
192 guidelines.

193

194 This outline of the guidelines for ASO eligibility proposed the purpose, content, format, and
195 definitions of classifications. The outline was shared with the PIWG membership for input and
196 revised based on their feedback. This outline was used to draft the first version of the consensus
197 guidelines (version 0.1). This first version was only applicable to LoF variants in genes causing
198 autosomal recessive and X-linked recessive disorders, and only assessed variants for exon
199 skipping and splice correcting ASOs. This draft was shared with the PIWG, where feedback was
200 collected and applied. Following revisions by the PIWG, the revised draft was shared with a group
201 of external volunteers (n=5), who reviewed the guidelines, provided feedback, and assessed a
202 test set of three variants (Suppl. File 2).

203

204 Version 0.2

205 Feedback and assessment results from the external volunteers were collected as written
206 responses and used for further revision (version 0.2). We paid attention not only to the feedback
207 on the guidelines but also to how the test variants were assessed and whether the reasoning for
208 the assessments was in alignment with our guidelines. When assessors did not come to the
209 correct conclusion we rephrased and adjusted the guidelines to aid with the assessments.

210

211 Version 0.2 was once again shared with the PIWG for edits and feedback before being distributed
212 to a larger group of external volunteer assessors (n=14) for a second round of piloting on a set of
213 twelve test variants (Suppl. File 2). Once again, feedback and assessment reports were collected
214 and used to revise the guidelines.

215

216 Version 0.3

217 In version 0.3, the guidelines were expanded to include assessment of eligibility towards
218 ASO/siRNA-mediated transcript knockdown for GoF and dominant negative variants, and towards
219 upregulation from the WT allele (e.g., targeted augmentation of nuclear gene output [TANGO]¹³)
220 as well as all known types of inheritance patterns. This revised guideline was shared with external
221 volunteers (n=19) for a third round of piloting with 15 test variants (Suppl. File 2). Assessment
222 results and feedback were collected as written responses, in addition to the explanations of their

223 assessments, and together used by the PIWG to refine the guidelines. This final version (version
224 1.0) was shared with all co-authors for final feedback before submission.

225

226 ***Test Variant Curation***

227 All test variants were selected by one member of the PIWG who did not participate in the
228 assessment rounds. Selected variants were sourced from published literature or the ClinVar
229 database (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/clinvar/>). Two PIWG members independently assessed
230 each variant and determined the feasibility of the variant assessment depending on the publicly
231 available information (including prior success with ASO development, where applicable). Once a
232 variant's analysis and classification were agreed upon, these members drafted a "correct answer"
233 representing the expected outcome using the guidelines (Suppl. File 3). Answers with
234 explanations were communicated to all volunteer assessors after each assessment round.

235

236 ***Guidelines Piloting***

237 Volunteer assessors ranged from graduate students (at both the Masters and PhD level) to faculty
238 with different levels of experience in clinical genetics and ASO therapy development. Assessors
239 included trained basic science or translational researchers, genetic counselors, and clinicians.
240 Assessors were recruited via the professional networks connected to the N1C (e.g., departmental
241 colleagues, announcements in the N1C newsletter, and international conferences featuring N1C
242 PIWG members). An overview of where the assessors are currently working and what their role
243 is is given in Table 1.

244

245 **Table 1:** Global makeup of volunteer assessors including current institution and role/position.

Country of Institution	Number of Assessors	Institutions	Role/Position
Australia	2	Children's Cancer Institute	PhD candidate
		Queensland University of Technology	Senior Scientist
Canada	4	The Hospital for Sick Children	Masters research students (3) Genetic Counselor
Germany	3	Hertie Institute for Clinical Brain Research	Postdoctoral Research Fellow
		University of Cologne	Clinician Scientist MD candidate
The Netherlands	2	Dutch Center for RNA Therapeutics, LUMC	PhD candidate
		Erasmus Medical Center	MD/PhD candidate
Switzerland	2	University Hospital of Bern	Senior Scientist

		University of Zurich	Senior Scientist
United Kingdom	4	University College London	Associate Professor Professor of Neuroscience and Clinical Geneticist Research Associate
		Genomics England	Clinical Fellow
United States	8	Boston Children's Hospital	Genetic Counselor Clinician Scientist
		Mayo Clinic	Research Fellow Senior Bioinformatician
		Ambry Genetics	Genetic Counselor
		Massachusetts General Hospital	Genetic Counselor
		Rady Children's Hospital	Clinician Scientist
		Children's Hospital Colorado	Clinical Molecular Geneticist

246

247 Once the assessors agreed to participate, they received a welcome email with an introduction to
248 the assessments and initial information on the timeline and tasks.

249

250 **Video Example Development**

251 To support the assessor, exemplary assessments of selected test set variants were provided via
252 short videos. The video examples provide step-by-step instructions on assessing variants using
253 the N1C VARIANT guidelines. Videos were designed and recorded on Microsoft PowerPoint.
254 Videos were reviewed by both the PIWG and the volunteer assessors. A subset of videos was
255 first shared with the PIWG, who provided feedback on the content and structure. Videos were
256 then revised before being shared with volunteer assessors during each round of piloting.
257 Feedback on the videos was collected as written responses.

258

259 The variants discussed in the video examples were selected by members of the PIWG. The
260 variants were assessed using the N1C VARIANT guidelines. All selected variants were sourced
261 from published literature or the ClinVar database, with some already having a developed ASO.
262 Two members of the PIWG compared analyses and determined the feasibility of the variant
263 assessment approach. Once a variant's analysis and classification were agreed upon, a step-by-
264 step analysis was recorded – representing a suggested analysis approach to be taken by
265 assessors using the N1C VARIANT guidelines, along with the expected classification of the
266 variant. Videos are available on the N=1 Collaborative YouTube page

267 (<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL1FlwS0tbJHj0-aDMmZ5fUy5d40eiwa8B>) and N1C
268 website (<https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-guidelines>).

269

270 ***Development of the N1C Variant Eligibility Calculator***

271 Based on feedback from the assessors and members of the N1C PIWG, an interactive decision
272 tree was developed to facilitate applying the guidelines (the N1C Variant Eligibility Calculator).
273 First, a catalog with questions and answers based on the guidelines was written, including
274 indications of connections between different sections. For the development of an interactive online
275 tool, HTML and Javascript code was written based on the catalog of questions with the help of
276 ChatGPT which provided a skeleton of the code upon request. The tool was deployed on the N1C
277 website (<http://eligibilitycalculator.n1collaborative.org/>). The full code is available on the N1C's
278 GitHub page:

279 <https://github.com/N1Collaborative/Variant-Eligibility-Calculator>. The eligibility calculator was
280 thoroughly tested by several co-authors of this manuscript, including one assessor doing their
281 assessments of the final 15 variants using the tool to see if they came up with the correct answers.
282 Feedback was gathered through a written response and incorporated accordingly.

283

284 ***Upregulation from the WT allele Table***

285 Our guidelines refer to various resources for the assessment of pathogenic variants towards
286 upregulation from the WT allele (Suppl. File 1), including four landmark papers¹³⁻¹⁶. To aid in the
287 assessment of variants toward upregulation eligibility, a combined file containing the findings from
288 each suggested paper was generated (Suppl. File 4). The data from Mittal *et al.*, Lim *et al.*, and
289 Felker *et al.*, was extracted from the papers' supplementary files. The data from Liu *et al.* was
290 extracted from the uORF website (<http://rnainformatics.org.cn/RiboUORF/>) through POST
291 requests. All data from all available genes from each paper was combined into one Excel file. For
292 each gene on the combined file, pLI scores and ClinGen haploinsufficiency (HI) scores were
293 indicated. The pLI score was downloaded from gnomAD v4.0
294 (<https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/downloads>). ClinGen HI scores were downloaded from
295 ClinGen (<https://search.clinicalgenome.org/kb/downloads>).

296

297 **Results**

298 ***Purpose of guidelines***

299 We have developed a consensus guideline (N1C VARIANT guideline) for eligibility assessment
300 and prioritization of pathogenic variants to ASO treatments. With these guidelines, assessors can
301 identify genetic variants most likely to benefit from an ASO-based therapy and distinguish these
302 variants from currently less suitable candidates. The full guidelines are available in
303 Supplementary File 1. Updated versions of the guidelines will also be available via the N1C
304 website (<https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-guidelines>).

305

306 The guidelines take into consideration the genetic diagnosis of the individual, molecular principles,
307 and pathomechanism of the disease and genetic variant. The purpose of the guideline is to
308 provide clinicians, geneticists, and researchers with a framework for analyzing and classifying
309 disease-causing variants for their amenability to ASO-based therapy. With these guidelines,
310 assessors should be able to:

- 311 1. Identify variants eligible for assessment and use publicly available databases and
312 resources to assist in the variant assessment process

- 313 2. Assess whether a variant is eligible for ASO-mediated splice correction (i.e., correction of
- 314 mis-splicing)
- 315 3. Assess whether a variant is eligible for ASO-mediated exon skipping
- 316 4. Assess whether a candidate gene and/or variant is eligible for siRNA or ASO-mediated
- 317 transcript knockdown
- 318 5. Classify variants as either “eligible”, “likely eligible”, “unlikely eligible”, “not eligible” for the
- 319 aforementioned ASO approaches, or as “unable to assess” using these guidelines. The
- 320 definition of each classification is dependent on the type of ASO therapy
- 321 6. Consider strategies for the upregulation of wildtype alleles in cases of haploinsufficiency
- 322

323 Overall, these guidelines focus on evaluating (likely) pathogenic, disease-causing variants for
324 eligibility towards ASO treatment. For a full assessment of a patient case, disease and individual-
325 specific clinical factors have to also be taken into consideration, but this work is beyond the scope
326 of these guidelines. These guidelines reflect a general way of evaluating variants, but there are
327 many gene, mechanism, and disease-specific considerations and/or exceptions. Throughout the
328 guidelines, relevant exceptions of variant assessments are indicated.

329 **Guideline Structure**

330 Only a subset of the guidelines will be relevant to evaluating any one specific variant. The
331 guidelines walk readers through a series of steps where they are prompted to verify variant
332 annotations, inheritance patterns, and pathomechanisms. If critical information is unavailable or
333 insufficient, the guidelines prompt readers that this variant is ineligible for further assessment
334 (“unable to assess”). Conversely, if the necessary information is available and known, readers
335 can use the guidelines to identify appropriate or multiple applicable ASO strategies: splice
336 correction, canonical exon skipping, RNA knockdown, or upregulation from the WT allele. Upon
337 identification of a relevant ASO strategy, readers can direct themselves to the relevant section
338 with the help of flowcharts where they assess the variant’s eligibility towards a specific strategy in
339 greater detail. Throughout the guideline, relevant publicly available resources to aid with the
340 assessments are shared.

341
342
343 As part of the guidelines, assessors are encouraged to check whether an ASO has already been
344 developed for a specific variant, exon, or disorder (whether in clinical or preclinical stages). Clear
345 criteria are provided to define what constitutes sufficient evidence for a functional ASO, depending
346 on the strategy. To assist in this search, the guidelines offer resources and recommended search
347 terms for identifying functionally tested ASOs.

348
349 At the end of the assessment, assessors can classify a variant’s eligibility towards splice
350 correction, canonical exon skipping, and/or RNA knockdown based on the information gathered
351 using the guidelines. The classification criteria were developed as part of the consenting process
352 and are outlined below. Assessment strategies are provided for upregulation from the WT allele,
353 but classifications towards eligibility are not defined because this area of ASO therapeutics is less
354 established to date. Instead, the guidelines provide context on when upregulation from the WT
355 allele might be used, and considerations for their development. We further provide an easy way
356 to check for multiple approaches at once by combining available resources on upregulation from
357 the WT allele into one simple Excel table (Suppl. File 4).

358

359 **Classification terms**

360 The complexity of the assessments necessitated defining new terms for a classification schema.
361 Prior published classification schema assessed variant amenability to ASO therapy using terms
362 such as “probably”, “possibly”, “unlikely” amenable, “exclude from assessment,” and “consider for
363 exon skipping”.^{9,12} However, these schemas focused on only certain types of variants and ASO
364 strategies. To improve on these prior schemas and expand them to multiple ASO strategies,
365 version 1.0 of these guidelines now employs five tiers for all classifications: “eligible”, “likely
366 eligible”, “unlikely eligible”, “not eligible”, and “unable to assess”.

367
368 “Eligible” variants are those for which functional evidence supports the effectiveness of an ASO
369 approach. For splice-correcting ASOs, this means that an ASO has already been developed and
370 shown to be effective, either clinically or pre-clinically, for the specific splice-altering variant. In
371 the context of exon skipping, which aims to “skip” the exon containing the pathogenic variant to
372 produce a truncated yet functional protein product, one would search for functional evidence of
373 exon skipping being non-pathogenic. This would include experimentally induced exon skipping
374 events (i.e., CRISPR deletions, ASOs) showing functional evidence at the protein level that
375 residual protein function remains. This also includes naturally occurring exon skipping events (i.e.,
376 benign exon skipping events found in healthy populations). A pathogenic variant found within an
377 exon where either experimentally induced or naturally occurring exon skipping occurs would then
378 be classified as eligible for canonical exon skipping ASOs. Similar ideas apply when assessing
379 variants for eligibility towards knockdown. If a gain-of-function or dominant negative variant, both
380 of which can be considered for knockdown, is found on a gene where a non-allele or non-variant
381 specific knockdown approach has been functionally proven, the variant can be classified as
382 eligible towards knockdown ASOs.

383
384 “Not eligible” variants are those for which a specific ASO therapeutic approach is not considered
385 possible. This may be due to functional evidence demonstrating the failure of ASO therapies, for
386 example, canonical exon skipping led to a non-functional protein, or molecular criteria that render
387 the variant unsuitable for ASO targeting. Examples of “not eligible” variants include single-exon
388 genes in the context of exon skipping ASOs or genes with tightly regulated dosage in RNA
389 knockdown strategies.

390
391 “Likely eligible” variants are those that, based on molecular criteria, could potentially be targeted
392 by an ASO, although no functional evidence is currently available to confirm this. Conversely,
393 “unlikely eligible” variants are those where molecular criteria suggest an ASO is unlikely to be
394 effective, but no functional evidence directly contradicts the potential use of an ASO.

395
396 Variants are classified “unable to assess” when they either do not apply to these guidelines, e.g.
397 are of a type that cannot be assessed, or if there is not enough information available that allows
398 for an assessment of the variant, e.g., the inheritance pattern of the variant is unknown or no
399 information on the pathomechanism is available.

400 401 **Videos**

402 At the time of publication, 12 videos have been created and shared (Table 2). These videos
403 provide step-by-step guidance for assessors, highlighting key resources and assessment
404 techniques. Each video demonstrates the assessment of a specific variant towards a relevant

405 strategy, with each example leading to a unique outcome. The videos can be found on the N1C
 406 YouTube channel
 407 (<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL1FlwS0tbJHj0-aDMmZ5fUy5d40eiwa8B>) and via the
 408 N1C website (<https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-guidelines>).
 409

410 **Table 2:** List of video examples referred to and published with version 1.0 of the N1C VARIANT
 411 guidelines. Variants normalized using Mutalyzer (<https://mutalyzer.nl/>).

Video	Variant	Gene Symbol	ASO Strategy	Outcome/Classification
1	NM_000350.3:c.2626C>T, p.(Gln876*)	<i>ABCA4</i>	Canonical exon skipping	Eligible
2	NM_016589.4:c.597-1340A>G	<i>TIMMDC1</i>	Splice correcting	Eligible
3	NM_000533.5:c.680dup, p.(Cys228Leufs*5)	<i>PLP1</i>	Canonical exon skipping	Not eligible
4	NM_003793.4:c.213+1G>C	<i>CTSF</i>	Splice correcting	Not eligible
5	NM_000277.3:c.611A>G, p.(Tyr204Cys)	<i>PAH</i>	Splice correcting	Unlikely eligible
6	NM_025152.3:c.815-27T>C	<i>NUBPL</i>	Splice correcting	Unlikely eligible
7	NM_024312.5:c.3503_3504del, p.(Leu1168Glnfs*5)	<i>GNPTAB</i>	Canonical exon skipping	Unlikely eligible
8	NM_001040142.2:c.5645G>A, p.(Arg1882Gln)	<i>SCN2A</i>	Knockdown	Eligible
9	NM_001165963.4:c.3733C>T, p.(Arg1245*) NM_130839.5:c.67C>T, p.(Arg23*)	<i>SCN1A</i> <i>UBE3A</i>	Upregulation from the WT allele	Eligible
10	NM_003793.4:c.264del, p.(Cys89Alafs*59)	<i>CTSF</i>	Canonical exon skipping	Likely eligible
11	NM_000170.3:c.538C>T, p.(Gln180*)	<i>GLDC</i>	Canonical exon skipping	Not eligible
12	Multiple variants		N/A	Unable to assess

412
 413
 414

415 **Variant Eligibility Calculator**

416 To support the assessment and help assessors focus on going through the sections of the
417 guidelines relevant to their current assessment, the N1C Variant Eligibility Calculator was
418 developed. At the time of publication, the eligibility calculator walks assessors step-by-step
419 through version 1.0 of the N1C VARIANT guidelines. One key feature of the calculator is the
420 inability to skip question prompts. Each step discussed in the guidelines is crucial for in-depth
421 variant assessment and is required for accurate variant classification. Due to the inability to
422 progress without answering the question, users of the calculator are encouraged to further
423 research the gene or variant before proceeding with the assessment. Additionally, the calculator
424 takes into consideration the kind of variants (i.e., missense, stop gain, synonymous) before
425 directing users to relevant sections of the guidelines. Overall, this tool allows users to
426 systematically navigate the guidelines, acting as a “checklist” before proceeding with
427 assessments. The calculator further provides users with the ability to track their assessments and
428 receive a printout of the specific questions answered and what the answers were to understand
429 the overall classification and identify potential mistakes during the assessment process. The
430 calculator is available via the N1C website (<http://eligibilitycalculator.n1collaborative.org/>) and the
431 N1C’s GitHub page (<https://n1collaborative.github.io/Variant-Eligibility-Calculator/>).

432

433

434 **Discussion**

435 Here we introduced version 1.0 of the N1C VARIANT (**V**ariant **A**ssessments towards **E**ligibility
436 for **A**ntisense Oligonucleotide **T**reatment) guidelines for the assessment of pathogenic variants
437 for eligibility towards ASO treatments, alongside the process of their development and consenting.
438 Additionally, we introduce and discuss the development of training materials and tools to aid with
439 variant assessments.

440

441 These guidelines represent the first proposed international consensus approach for evaluating
442 the potential eligibility of pathogenic variants causing monogenic disorders toward ASO therapies.
443 With the significant progress and publicity in the last few years regarding the development of
444 individualized genetic therapies⁸⁻¹⁰ there is hope within the rare disease community that ASOs
445 may benefit an increasing number of community members. With our guidelines and the
446 accompanying training materials and tools, we aim to support the rare disease community by
447 providing guidance on which variants are most likely to be eligible for ASO therapies.

448

449 As a takeaway from the iterative process of developing these guidelines, we want to emphasize
450 that this is a complex assessment procedure that takes time to learn. Similar to the annotation
451 and classification of pathogenicity for genetic variants with the ACMG guidelines¹⁷, the
452 assessment of pathogenic variants for their eligibility for ASO treatments takes many different
453 aspects into account.

454

455 We propose a new five-tier classification schema for ASO treatment amenability, whereby a
456 variant is classified with respect to specific ASO strategies and can thus receive different labels
457 for different types of ASO treatments. The classifications are “eligible”, “likely eligible”, “unlikely
458 eligible”, “not eligible”, or “unable to assess”. While the “eligible” and “not eligible” definitions are
459 clear, categorizing and classifying variants as “likely eligible” and “unlikely eligible” proves to be
460 more challenging, as the evidence for or against eligibility exists on a spectrum. Future work will

461 aim to refine these categories further, mirroring the efforts to introduce more gradations into the
462 ACMG/AMP variant classification scheme.

463 We further expect to communicate adjustments in the upcoming years, as technologies advance
464 and knowledge grows regarding which genetic variants are most likely amenable to an ASO
465 treatment. We expect that in some cases variant classifications for a certain ASO approach will
466 change with these adjustments, for example, due to new information on the feasibility of ASO
467 designs for certain types of variants, necessitating reassessments over time. In that regard, we
468 would like to point out that it is important to read the literature on available ASO treatments
469 critically and scrutinize the methodology used and the functional data provided, before
470 considering a variant eligible for ASO treatments.

471
472 At this point, there is a limited number of ASOs developed and clinically tested, thus not for all
473 different variant types, pathomechanisms, and inheritance patterns discussed herein are ASOs
474 currently available. That means that no gold-standard evidence for many considerations were
475 available for the establishment of these guidelines, and these guidelines can thus be considered
476 expert opinions. However, the guidelines were based on the collective expertise gained from
477 assessing about 1,500 variants since 2018 at the sites of the PIWG members (BCH, SickKids,
478 DCRT), and the knowledge the PIWG members have on ASO design and development, which
479 involves leading experts in the field of ASO development and tailored ASO therapies.

480
481 While efforts were made to test the guidelines with various assessors from different professional
482 backgrounds, the application of these guidelines in diverse healthcare settings might reveal
483 additional needs for adjustments and refinements in the future.

484
485 Although the amenability of a specific variant to a certain ASO therapeutic strategy is a
486 fundamental first step, disease- and patient-specific factors are equally important considerations
487 in the development and provision of individualized genetic therapies.¹¹ Considerations will also
488 include the reversibility and severity of symptoms. This means that an eligible variant does not
489 necessarily equal an eligible patient. The assessments of disease- and patient-specific factors
490 are outside the scope of this work and will require additional recommendations and guidelines.^{18,19}

491
492 Ideally, we would like to see the integration of the eligibility assessments into clinical practice, to
493 not only provide individuals suffering from rare diseases with a diagnosis but also with information
494 on possible treatment approaches, where applicable. We believe that with the additional training
495 material and test variants provided, clinical geneticists and specialist human geneticists working
496 in laboratories and diagnostic centers can train themselves to become assessors. In the long
497 term, we envision automation of our guidelines and assessment procedures in the form of tools
498 that take the pathogenic variant as input and deliver an analysis of the best therapeutic strategy
499 for each individual.

500
501 We plan to regularly update the guidelines as well as the tools and training material. Updated
502 versions with the version number and date of the update will be provided on the N1C website
503 (<https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-guidelines>).

504
505
506

507 **Appendices**

508 Supplement material

509 Supplementary File 1 - Version 1.0 of the guidelines

510 Supplementary File 2 - Overview of all test variants for the three rounds

511 Supplementary File 3 - Answer keys for all test variants in the three rounds

512 Supplementary File 4 Upregulation from the WT allele Summary Table

513

514 **Declaration of interests**

515 Nothing to declare.

516

517 **Acknowledgments**

518 We would like to thank further N1C members for their input and help during the development of
519 these guidelines. We especially want to thank Nicole Nolen for all her help and support in making
520 the training material and tools available on the N1C website. We also thank all families and
521 clinicians who have provided us with their genetic diagnoses over the years, which ultimately led
522 to the establishment of these guidelines.

523 This work was supported by the European Union, project European Rare Disease Research
524 Alliance (ERDERA, # 101156595) (to M.S. and A.A.-R.). D.C. is supported by a SickKids
525 Restrcomp Master's Scholarship and the SickKids Innovators Fund. L.N. is supported by a
526 Canada Graduate Scholarship - Master's from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research
527 (CIHR). D.C., B.H., and G.C. also acknowledge support from CIHR (PJT186240). D.B. is
528 supported by a Humboldt Research Fellowship and the Hertie-Network of Excellence in Clinical
529 Neuroscience. M.C.L. is funded by a Walter Benjamin Fellowship from the DFG. A.E.D., K.-A.M.,
530 and M.R. are supported by the UK Platform for Nucleic Acid Therapies (UpNAT). B.Z., A.A.-R.,
531 R.L. are supported by a ZonMW PSIDER grant.

532

533 **Author contributions**

534 D.C. and M.C.L. of the N1C PIWG conceptualized the N1C VARIANT guidelines. D.C. and M.C.L.
535 drafted the guidelines and the manuscript, conducted the assessment rounds, and evaluated and
536 implemented the feedback. D.C. made the example videos. M.C.L. selected the test variants for
537 assessment and developed and built the variant eligibility calculator.

538 M.M., D.B., C.K., L.N., A.L.T.T., A.S., E.S., L.N., S.S., M.S., T.Y., A.A.-R., G.C. are members of
539 the N1C PIWG; they reviewed the outlines and drafts of the different rounds of guidelines and
540 edited the manuscript. They further provided feedback on the videos. M.M., D.B., C.K., and L.N.,
541 also participated in the variant assessment training and provided feedback and explanations on
542 the assessments. S.L. facilitated the PIWG meetings, set up documents, and helped with putting
543 the work onto the public databases and the N1C website.

544 E.B., N.E., A.G., N.L., J.M., A.V., J.V., A.G., S.W., M.C., L.C., H.S.D., A.E.D., J.F., A.G., R.L., K.-
545 A.M., M.R., E.S., G.S., P.S. participated as assessors and provided feedback on the guidelines
546 and training material. B.H. made the upregulation from the WT table. L.N. and B.Z. tested the
547 variant eligibility calculator and provided feedback.

548 Authors were listed as follows: Junior members of the N1C PIWG were named first, followed by
549 assessors who participated in multiple rounds of assessments and provided extensive feedback,
550 all other assessors were named in alphabetical order. Lastly, senior members of the N1C PIWG
551 were named. D.C. and M.C.L. of the N1C PIWG were placed as first and senior authors
552 respectively as they were leading the overall effort.

553 **Web Resources**

554 Videos available on YouTube: [https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL1FlwS0tbJHj0-](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL1FlwS0tbJHj0-aDMmZ5fUy5d40eiwa8B)
555 [aDMmZ5fUy5d40eiwa8B](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL1FlwS0tbJHj0-aDMmZ5fUy5d40eiwa8B)

556

557 Calculator available on GitHub and N1C website:
558 <https://n1collaborative.github.io/Variant-Eligibility-Calculator/>
559 and <http://eligibilitycalculator.n1collaborative.org/>

560

561 Guidelines available on N1C website: [https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-](https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-guidelines)
562 [guidelines](https://www.n1collaborative.org/post/n1c-variant-guidelines)

563

564 **Data and Code Availability**

565 Data is available in supplementary files 2, 3, and 4 for variant assessments and upregulation from
566 the WT allele approaches. All code was deployed on GitHub under an open-source AGPL license
567 (<https://github.com/N1Collaborative/Variant-Eligibility-Calculator>).

568

569

570 **References**

571

- 572 1. Haendel, M., Vasilevsky, N., Unni, D., Bologna, C., Harris, N., Rehm, H., Hamosh, A.,
573 Baynam, G., Groza, T., McMurry, J. et al. (2020). How many rare diseases are there? *Nat. Rev.*
574 *Drug Discov.* 19, 77–78.
- 575 2. Kaufmann, P., Pariser, A.R., Austin, C. (2018). From scientific discovery to treatments for
576 rare diseases – the view from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences – Office
577 of Rare Diseases Research. *Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases* 13, 196.
- 578 3. Ferreira, C.R. (2019). The burden of rare diseases. *Am. J. Med. Genet.* 179, 885–892.
- 579 4. Nurchis, M.C., Altamura, G., Riccardi, M.T., Radio, F.C., Chillemi, G., Bertini, E.S., Garlasco,
580 J., Tartaglia, M., Dallapiccola, B., Damiani, G. (2023). Whole genome sequencing diagnostic
581 yield for paediatric patients with suspected genetic disorders: systematic review, meta-analysis,
582 and GRADE assessment. *Archives of Public Health* 81, 93.
- 583 5. Aartsma-Rus, A., van Roon-Mom, W., Lauffer, M., Siezen, C., Duijndam, B., Coenen-de Roo,
584 T., Schüle, R., Synofzik, M., Graessner, H. (2023). Development of tailored splice-switching
585 oligonucleotides for progressive brain disorders in Europe: development, regulation, and
586 implementation considerations. *RNA* 29, 446–454.
- 587 6. Egli, M., Manoharan, M. (2023). Chemistry, structure and function of approved
588 oligonucleotide therapeutics. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 51, 2529–2573.
- 589 7. Roberts, T.C., Langer, R., Wood, M.J.A. (2020). Advances in oligonucleotide drug delivery.
590 *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery* 19, 673–694.
- 591 8. Kim, J., Hu, C., Moufawad El Achkar, C., Black, L.E., Douville, J., Larson, A., Pendergast,
592 M.K., Goldkind, S.F., Lee, E.A., Kuniholm, A. et al. (2019). Patient-Customized Oligonucleotide
593 Therapy for a Rare Genetic Disease. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 381, 1644–1652.
- 594 9. Kim, J., Woo, S., de Gusmao, C.M., Zhao, B., Chin, D.H., DiDonato, R.L., Nguyen, M.A.,
595 Nakayama, T., Hu, C.A., Soucy, A. et al. (2023). A framework for individualized splice-switching
596 oligonucleotide therapy. *Nature* 619, 828–836.
- 597 10. Ziegler, A., Carroll, J., Bain, J.M., Sands, T.T., Fee, R.J., Uher, D., Kanner, C.H., Montes, J.,
598 Glass, S., Douville, J. et al. (2024). Antisense oligonucleotide therapy in an individual with
599 KIF1A-associated neurological disorder. *Nat. Med.*
- 600 11. Lauffer, M.C., van Roon-Mom, W., Aartsma-Rus, A., N = 1 Collaborative. (2024).
601 Possibilities and limitations of antisense oligonucleotide therapies for the treatment of
602 monogenic disorders. *Commun. Med. (Lond)* 4, 6–1.

- 603 12. Zardetto, B., Lauffer, M.C., van Roon-Mom, W., Aartsma-Rus, A., on behalf of the N = 1
604 Collaborative. (2024). Practical Recommendations for the Selection of Patients for
605 Individualized Splice-Switching ASO-Based Treatments. *Human Mutation* 2024, 9920230.
- 606 13. Lim, K.H., Han, Z., Jeon, H.Y., Kach, J., Jing, E., Weyn-Vanhentenryck, S., Downs, M.,
607 Corriero, A., Oh, R., Scharner, J. et al. (2020). Antisense oligonucleotide modulation of non-
608 productive alternative splicing upregulates gene expression. *Nature Communications* 11, 3501.
- 609 14. Mittal, S., Tang, I., Gleeson, J.G. (2022). Evaluating human mutation databases for
610 “treatability” using patient-customized therapy. *Med* 3, 740–759.
- 611 15. Felker, S.A., Lawlor, J.M.J., Hiatt, S.M., Thompson, M.L., Latner, D.R., Finnila, C.R.,
612 Bowling, K.M., Bonnstetter, Z.T., Bonini, K.E., Kelly, N.R. et al. (2023). Poison exon annotations
613 improve the yield of clinically relevant variants in genomic diagnostic testing. *Genetics in*
614 *Medicine* 25, 100884.
- 615 16. Liu, Q., Peng, X., Shen, M., Qian, Q., Xing, J., Li, C., Gregory, R.I. (2022). Ribo-uORF: a
616 comprehensive data resource of upstream open reading frames (uORFs) based on ribosome
617 profiling. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 51, D248–D261.
- 618 17. Richards, S., Aziz, N., Bale, S., Bick, D., Das, S., Gastier-Foster, J., Grody, W.W., Hegde,
619 M., Lyon, E., Spector, E. et al. (2015). Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of
620 sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical
621 Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. *Genet. Med.* 17, 405–
622 424.
- 623 18. Synofzik, M., van Roon-Mom, W.M.C., Marckmann, G., van Duyvenvoorde, H.A.,
624 Graessner, H., Schüle, R., Aartsma-Rus, A. (2022). Preparing n-of-1 Antisense Oligonucleotide
625 Treatments for Rare Neurological Diseases in Europe: Genetic, Regulatory, and Ethical
626 Perspectives. *Nucleic Acid Ther.* 32, 83–94.
- 627 19. Jonker, A.H., Tataru, E., Graessner, H., Dimmock, D., Jaffe, A., Baynam, G., Davies, J.,
628 Mitkus, S., Iliach, O., Horgan, R. et al. (2024). The state-of-the-art of N-of-1 therapies and the
629 IRDiRC N-of-1 development roadmap. Accepted for publication in *Nature Reviews Drug*
630 *Discovery*.
- 631
- 632