

Clinical syndromes linked to biallelic germline variants in *MCM8* and *MCM9*

Noah C. Helderma^a, Ting Yang^{b,c,d}, Claire Palles^e, Diantha Terlouw^f, Hailiang Mei^g, Ruben H.P. Vorderman^g, Davy Cats^g, Marcos Díaz Gay^{b,c,d}, Marjolijn C.J. Jongmans^{h,i}, Ashwin Ramdien^a, **MCM8-MCM9 study group***, Mariano Golubicki^j, Marina Antelo^j, Laia Bonjoch^k, Mariona Terradas^l, Laura Valle^l, Ludmil B. Alexandrov^{b,c,d}, Hans Morreau^f, Tom van Wezel^f, Sergi Castellví-Bel^k, Yael Goldberg^m, Maartje Nielsen^a

*MCM8-MCM9 study group:

Irma van de Beekⁿ, Thomas F. Eleveld^h, Andrew Green^o, Frederik J. Hes^p, Marry M. van den Heuvel-Eibrink^{h,q}, Annelore Van Der Kelen^p, Sabine Kliesch^r, Roland P. Kuiper^h, Inge M.M. Lakeman^a, Lisa E.E.L.O. Lashley^s, Leendert H.J. Looijenga^{h,t}, Manon S. Oud^u, Johanna Steingröver^v, Yardena Tenenbaum-Rakover^w, Carli M. Tops^a, Frank Tüttelmann^v, Richarda M. de Voer^x, Dineke Westra^x, Margot J. Wyrwoll^y

^a Department of Clinical Genetics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

^b Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, United States

^c Department of Bioengineering, UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, United States

^d Moores Cancer Center, UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92037, United States

^e Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

^f Department of Pathology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

^g Sequencing Analysis Support Core, Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

^h Princess Maxima Center for Pediatric Oncology, Utrecht, The Netherlands

ⁱ Department of Genetics, University Medical Center Utrecht, University of Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^j Oncology Section and Molecular Biology Laboratory, Hospital of Gastroenterology "Dr. C.B. Udaondo", Buenos Aires, Argentina

^k Gastroenterology, Fundació de Recerca Clínic Barcelona-Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques August Pi I Sunyer (FRCB-IDIBAPS), CIBEREHD, Universitat de Barcelona, Clínic Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

^l Hereditary Cancer Program, Catalan Institute of Oncology; Oncobell Program, IDIBELL; CIBERONC, Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

^m Raphael Recanati Genetic Institute, Rabin Medical Center-Beilinson Hospital, Petah Tikva, Israel

ⁿ Department of Clinical Genetics, The Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^o Department of Clinical Genetics, Children's Health Ireland (CHI) at Crumlin, Dublin, Ireland

^p Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Universitair Ziekenhuis Brussel (UZ Brussel), Clinical Sciences, research group Genetics, Reproduction and Development, Centre for Medical Genetics, Brussels, Belgium

^q Division of Childhealth, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^r Centre of Reproductive Medicine and Andrology, Department of Clinical and Surgical Andrology, University Hospital Münster, Münster, Germany

^s Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

^t Department of Pathology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

^u Department of Human Genetics, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, Netherlands

^v Centre of Medical Genetics, Institute of Reproductive Genetics, University and University Hospital of Münster, Münster, Germany

^w Pediatric Endocrinology, Clalit Health Services, Afula, Israel and The Rappoport Faculty of Medicine, Technion, Haifa, Israel

^x Department of Human Genetics, Radboud University Medical Center, Radboud Institute for Molecular Life Sciences, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

^y Centre for Regenerative Medicine, Institute for Stem Cell Research, School of Biological Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Abbreviations

ACMG, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; AF, allele frequency; AMP, Association for Molecular Pathology; CADD, Combined Annotation-Dependent Depletion; CI, confidence interval; CRC, colorectal cancer; ERN-GENTURIS, European Reference Network initiative for rare genetic tumor risk syndromes; FFPE, formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded; ICD10, International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision; ICD-O, International Classification of Diseases for Oncology; MCM8, minichromosome maintenance 8 homologous recombination repair factor; MCM9, minichromosome maintenance 9 homologous recombination repair factor; MMR, mismatch repair; OR, odds ratio; pLoF, predicted loss of function; POI, primary ovarian insufficiency; SBS, single base substitution(s); SIFT, Sorting Intolerant from Tolerant; SNV, single nucleotide variant; VEP, Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor; VUS, variant of uncertain significance; WES, whole exome sequencing; WGS, whole genome sequencing

Correspondence

Dr. Maartje Nielsen

Department of Clinical Genetics – Leiden University Medical Center

Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA Leiden, The Netherlands

Acknowledgements

The authors sincerely thank all patients and their families for their participation in this study. This research has been conducted using data from UK Biobank (project code 86977), a major biomedical database (www.ukbiobank.ac.uk). Moreover, this research was made possible through access to

data in the National Genomic Research Library (project code 1142), which is managed by Genomics England Limited (a wholly owned company of the Department of Health and Social Care). The National Genomic Research Library holds data provided by patients and collected by the NHS as part of their care and data collected as part of their participation in research. The National Genomic Research Library is funded by the National Institute for Health Research and NHS England. The Wellcome Trust, Cancer Research UK and the Medical Research Council have also funded research infrastructure. Finally, this publication and the underlying study have been made possible partly based on data that Hartwig Medical Foundation and the Center of Personalised Cancer Treatment (CPCT) have made available to the study through the Hartwig Medical Database (reference number HMF-DR-288).

Abstract

Background: *MCM8* and *MCM9* are newly proposed cancer predisposition genes, linked to polyposis and early-onset cancer, in addition to their association with hypogonadism. Given the uncertain range of phenotypic manifestations and unclear cancer risk estimates, this study aimed to delineate the molecular and clinical characteristics of individuals with biallelic germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants.

Methods: Population allele frequencies and biallelic variant carrier frequencies were calculated using data from gnomAD, and a variant enrichment analysis was conducted across multiple cancer and non-cancer phenotypes using data from the 100K Genomes Project and the 200K exome release of the UK Biobank. A case series was conducted, including previously reported variant carriers with and without updated clinical data and newly identified carriers through the European Reference Network (ERN) initiative for rare genetic tumor risk syndromes (GENTURIS). Additionally, mutational signature analysis was performed on tumor data from our case series and publicly available datasets from the Hartwig Medical Foundation and TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas to identify mutational signatures potentially associated with *MCM8/MCM9* deficiency.

Results: Predicted loss of function and missense variants in *MCM8* (1.4 per 100,000 individuals) and *MCM9* (2.5 per 100,000 individuals) were found to be rare in gnomAD. However, biallelic *MCM9* variants showed significant enrichment in cases from the 100K Genomes Project compared to controls for colonic polyps (odds ratio (OR) 6.51, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.24–34.11; $P = 0.03$), rectal polyps (OR 8.40, 95% CI 1.28–55.35; $P = 0.03$), and gastric cancer (OR 27.03, 95% CI 2.93–248.5; $P = 0.004$). No significant enrichment was found for biallelic *MCM8* variant carriers or in the 200K UK Biobank. In our case series, which included 26 biallelic *MCM8* and 28 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers, we documented polyposis, gastric cancer, and early-onset colorectal cancer in 6, 1, and 6 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers, respectively, while these phenotypes were not observed in biallelic *MCM8* variant carriers. Additionally, our case series indicates that, beyond hypogonadism—which was present in 23 and 26 of the carriers, respectively—biallelic *MCM8* and *MCM9* variants are

associated with early-onset germ cell tumors (occurring before age 15) in 2 *MCM8* and 1 *MCM9* variant carriers. Tumors from *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers with available germline sequencing data predominantly displayed clock-like mutational processes (single base substitution signatures 1 and 5), with no evidence of signatures associated with DNA repair deficiencies.

Discussion: Our data indicates that biallelic *MCM9* variants are associated with polyposis, gastric cancer, and early-onset CRC, while both biallelic *MCM8* and *MCM9* variants are linked to hypogonadism and the early development of germ cell tumors. These findings underscore the importance of including *MCM8/MCM9* in diagnostic gene panels for certain clinical contexts and suggest that biallelic carriers may benefit from cancer surveillance.

Introduction

The identification of cancer predisposition syndromes plays a crucial role in preventing and surveilling malignancies at an early stage in affected individuals. Nevertheless, a significant proportion of familial cancer cases lack a clear explanation.¹ This poses challenges in developing personalized surveillance programs and highlights the urgency of exploring and identifying novel cancer predisposition genes.

The minichromosome maintenance 8 homologous recombination repair factor (*MCM8*; NM_032485.6, ENST00000610722.4, OMIM [608187](#)) and minichromosome maintenance 9 homologous recombination repair factor (*MCM9*; NM_017696.3, ENST00000619706.5, OMIM [610098](#)) genes are two recently suggested cancer predisposition genes.²⁻⁴ The proteins encoded by these genes form a helicase hexameric complex that is likely involved in DNA replication and the initiation of DNA replication⁵⁻⁹, meiosis^{7, 10-13}, homologous recombination¹⁴⁻²⁰ and mismatch repair (MMR).^{4, 19, 21}

Following their significant association with primary ovarian insufficiency (POI; [HP:0008209](#))^{2-4, 22-40}, biallelic germline variants of *MCM8/MCM9* were first linked to cancer in several families with polyposis ([HP:0200063](#)) and early-onset colorectal cancer (CRC; [HP:0003003](#)).²⁻⁴ Subsequently, there have been reports of individuals with CRC carrying a monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant²⁻⁴, as well as reports describing mono- and biallelic germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants in patients with other nonmalignant pathologies, including short stature ([HP:0004322](#))^{29, 34, 35, 38, 39}, delayed puberty ([HP:0000823](#))^{22, 23, 26, 28, 33, 38-40}, hypothyroidism ([HP:0000821](#))^{22, 28}, and absent or infantile uteri/ovaries.^{22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37-40}

Due to the limited number of families with biallelic germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants described so far, the complete spectrum of phenotypic manifestations and accurate cancer risk estimates remain uncertain. As a result, the incorporation of the *MCM8/MCM9* genes into diagnostic gene panels is not widespread, and the respective syndrome(s) associated with both genes could easily be missed.

This study, therefore, sought to delineate the molecular and clinical features of biallelic germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants and to establish recommendations for the clinical management of variant carriers.

Methods

Ethical statement

This study was approved by the local IRB and biobank committee of the Leiden University Medical Center in The Netherlands (protocol B18.007). Storage and management of clinical and molecular data and patient samples from our case series was supervised by the Leiden University Medical Center in The Netherlands. Patient samples were handled according to the medical ethical guidelines described in the Code of Conduct for responsible use of human tissue in the context of health research (Federation of Dutch Medical Scientific Societies). Samples were coded/anonymized, and all patients provided written informed consent for the use of tissue and data. The patient and sample IDs used in this study cannot be used to reveal participant identities by anyone outside the research team.

Population-based cohorts

Estimation of population allele and biallelic carrier frequencies in gnomAD v.2.1.1

The gnomAD (v.2.1.1, containing 141,456 samples; <https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/>) database was accessed in May 2023 to estimate the allele frequencies of *MCM8/MCM9* variants across multiple populations. Predicted loss of function variants (pLoF; including splice acceptor, splice donor, frameshift, and stop gained variants) and missense variants, as classified based on the Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor (VEP) consequence⁴¹, were analyzed separately for both genes (**Figure 1**). Allele frequencies are presented as # of cases per 100,000 persons, unless otherwise specified.

The gnomAD (v.2.1.1, exomes only, containing 125,748 samples; <https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/>) database was assessed in May 2023 to estimate the biallelic carrier frequencies of *MCM8/MCM9* variants. These carriers could be either homozygous or compound heterozygous for the *MCM8/MCM9* variant(s). For compound heterozygous variant carriers, we included individuals who carried two heterozygous variants in *trans* (on different copies of the genes), while individuals with two heterozygous variants in *cis* (on the same copy of the gene)

were excluded from the analysis. Phasing of the variants was predicted by the gnomAD variant co-occurrence tool (gnomad.broadinstitute.org/variant-cooccurrence).

Identification of carriers and variant enrichment analysis in 200K UK Biobank and 100K Genomes Project datasets

Germline variants in *MCM8* and *MCM9* were identified from the 100,000 Genomes Project (project code 1142, version 17) and the 200K exomes release of the UK Biobank (project code 86977, released on November 17, 2021). Variants were annotated using Variant Effect Predictor (VEP) v.107.⁴¹ We retained missense variants with a Combined Annotation-Dependent Depletion (CADD)⁴² score ≥ 20 and a deleterious Condel score⁴³, as well as pLoF variants (including splice acceptor, splice donor, frameshift, and stop gained variants), provided their allele frequency was $< 1\%$ in gnomAD v2.1.1 (**Figure 1**). The impact of variants on the canonical transcripts was reported for *MCM8* (ENST00000610722.4) and *MCM9* (ENST00000619706.5).

The International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision (ICD10) codes from participants' diagnosis information (Participant Explorer in 100K Genomes Project, field ID 41270 in 200K UK Biobank), along with the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology (ICD-O) codes obtained from cancer histology and behavior fields (field ID 40011 and 40012 in 200K UK Biobank), as shown in **Supplementary Table 1**, were searched to identify participants with phenotypes associated with *MCM8/MCM9* variants, as selected based on literature⁴⁴ as well as our case series.

We conducted case-control tests to assess whether potentially pathogenic biallelic (homozygous or compound heterozygous) *MCM8/MCM9* variants were enriched in participants with the phenotypes of interest compared to a control cohort. A total of 15,091 controls were identified from the 100K Genomes Project dataset and 90,897 from the 200K UK Biobank dataset. Controls were selected based on the absence of personal or family history of common cancers and any phenotypes listed in **Supplementary Table 1**. To account for differences in age and ethnicity between cases and controls, association testing was performed using PLINK v1.9, adjusting for both variables. Sex was included as

a covariate in all analyses, except for breast cancer, endometrial cancer, and female infertility, where only female controls were considered.

Case series

We identified *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers through multiple channels. On August 1, 2023, we conducted a comprehensive literature search for ‘MCM8’ and ‘MCM9’ in the NCBI PubMed database. This strategy yielded 116 studies discussing *MCM8* and 75 studies discussing *MCM9*. We included all studies in English and carefully examined them for any descriptions of *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers. We excluded (systematic) reviews from to avoid duplicate patient data. Patient data was sourced from the papers themselves^{22-32, 34-40, 45-50} or updated data was obtained from the first or corresponding authors upon request.^{2-4, 51}

Secondly, as part of the European Reference Network (ERN) for all patients with one of the rare genetic tumour risk syndromes (GENTURIS) initiative⁵², we identified *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers not previously documented through outpatient clinics at various institutes across Europe. Patient data was sourced from genetic practitioners or retrieved from patient records.

Pathogenicity-based filtering and classification of the identified MCM8/MCM9 variant carriers

The *MCM8/MCM9* variants identified in the case series and cancer-specific cohorts (see next section) were filtered based on their predicted pathogenicity (**Figure 1**). Initially, we annotated the *MCM8/MCM9* variants using the guidelines from the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) and the Association for Molecular Pathology (AMP) for variant interpretation^{53, 54}, along with the CADD scoring⁴² and gnomAD v.2.1.1 allele frequency, accessed through Franklin.⁵⁵ We excluded from the analysis (i) carriers of benign or likely benign *MCM8/MCM9* variants and (ii) variants of uncertain significance (VUS) with a CADD score lower than 20 or a gnomAD AF higher than 1%.

Individuals with homozygous or compound heterozygous variants that met the pathogenicity-based filtering criteria were considered as biallelic carriers. Conversely, compound heterozygous carriers

with one variant meeting the criteria and one that did not were categorized as monoallelic carriers. Additionally, compound heterozygous carriers with a pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant and a VUS that met the pathogenicity-based filtering criteria were included in the pathogenic or likely pathogenic group, i.e., as biallelic carriers.

Cancer-specific cohorts

We ascertained several cancer-specific cohorts to search for variant carriers with cancer phenotypes associated with germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants. These included 44 non-related serrated polyposis patients (SPS cohort)⁵⁶ and 24 cancer-affected members of 16 nonpolyposis CRC families (fCRCX cohort) from which germline whole exome sequencing (WES) data was available for the analysis of single nucleotide variants and insertion-deletion mutations, as well as 632 metastasized CRCs and 25 metastasized endometrial carcinomas with available germline and tumor whole genome sequencing (WGS) data, accessible upon request by the Hartwig Medical Foundation database (reference number HMF-DR-288; <https://www.hartwigmedicalfoundation.nl/>). The identified *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers were filtered and classified based on pathogenicity using the same criteria applied to the *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers from the case series, as detailed in the previous section (**Figure 1**).

Mutational signature analysis

DNA sequencing and bioinformatic analysis of tumors from the case series

Patients and samples. To explore single base substitution (SBS) mutational signatures potentially associated with *MCM8/MCM9* deficiency, DNA was obtained from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tumor tissue from the following individuals of our case series: one individual (1 tumor) with biallelic *MCM8* variants, two individuals (5 tumors) with monoallelic *MCM8* variants, three individuals (10 tumors) with biallelic *MCM9* variants, and one individual (1 tumor) with monoallelic *MCM8* and *MCM9* variants.

Sample preparation and molecular evaluation. DNA extraction from FFPE tissue blocks was conducted using the NucleoSpin® DNA FFPE XS kit (MACHEREY-NAGEL, Düren, DE), and DNA concentrations were quantified using the Qubit™ Meter dsDNA High Sensitivity kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, US). To ensure an adequate DNA level for subsequent analysis, DNA from a

melanoma and an adenoma of one biallelic *MCM9* variant carrier (sample ID P5_34AB) were combined. WGS or WES was performed using the NovaSeq 6000 Sequencing System (Illumina Inc, San Diego, CA).

Somatic mutation calling. FASTQ files were aligned to the human genome build GRCh38.d1.vd1 using Burrows-Wheeler Aligner (BWA-MEM, v0.7.17).⁵⁷ Picard MarkDuplicates (GATK v4.1.4.1) (Picard Toolkit, <http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard>; Broad Institute, Cambridge, US) was applied to mark all duplicated reads.⁵⁸ SBS were identified using Mutect2 (GATK v4.1.4.1)⁵⁹, VarScan (v2.4.3)⁶⁰, MuSE (v1.0)⁶¹, and Strelka (v2.9.10)⁶² and filtered by variant caller confidences scores. Only variants that were called from at least two of these four callers were selected for the following mutational signature analysis and additional filtering based on their mutation confidence scores was applied: TLOD score ≥ 10 (Mutect2) and SomaticEVS ≥ 13 (Strelka2). Samples with no matched germline sequencing data (11 out of 16 samples) were applied only to Mutect2 for variant calling under tumor-only mode.

Mutational signature analysis. Mutational signature assignment was performed using SigProfilerAssignment (v0.0.32)⁶³ based on the COSMICv3.3 SBS reference signatures.⁶⁴⁻⁶⁸ Treatment-associated signatures (SBS11, SBS25, SBS31, SBS32, SBS35, SBS86, SBS87, SBS90, and SBS99) were excluded from all samples before signature assignment (using the *exclude_signature_subgroups* option), except for sample ID P8_33A, who had history of neoadjuvant chemotherapy treatment.

Bioinformatic analysis of publicly available whole genome sequencing data

To further evaluate potential SBS mutational signatures associated with *MCM8/MCM9* deficiency, we analyzed tumor WGS data from two publicly available sources. Firstly, we examined tumor data from cases with germline monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants from the HMF cancer-specific cohort, as described earlier. Additionally, we evaluated tumor data from the TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas, accessed through cBioPortal for Cancer Genomics (<https://www.cbioportal.org/>) between February and April of 2023.

For the TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas samples, tumors from any cancer type were selected based on the presence of somatic *MCM8/MCM9* variant(s) that met the following criteria: (i) a tumor variant allele frequency of $\geq 20\%$; (ii) classified as pathogenic or likely pathogenic or as a VUS according to the ACMG/AMP recommendations for variant interpretation.^{53, 54} Additionally, variants were excluded in case they were assessed as tolerated by the Sorting Intolerant from Tolerant score⁶⁹ and deemed benign by the PolyPhen score (Figure 1).⁷⁰

In both the HMF and TCGA WGS datasets, SBS mutational signatures were identified by fitting the counts of single nucleotide variants (SNVs) per 96 tri-nucleotide context to the COSMIC v3.3 reference mutational signatures⁷¹, using the MutationalPatterns tool.⁷²

Statistical analysis

Clinical data was collected using Castor EDC (Castor Electronic Data Capture; <https://castoredc.com>).

Figures were created, and statistical analysis was performed using Rstudio v2022.02.3+492 (Team R, Integrated Development for R, Boston, MA, 2022) or PLINK v1.9.

Results

Population-based cohorts

Individuals with (biallelic) germline MCM8/MCM9 variants are rare in gnomAD v.2.1.1

The occurrence of pLoF variants of *MCM8* in gnomAD (v.2.1.1) was 1.4 individuals per 100,000 persons across all populations, with the highest prevalence (5.5 per 100,000 persons) in the African/African American population (Table 1). Regarding *MCM9*, the prevalence of a pLoF variant was 2.5 individuals per 100,000 persons across all populations, with the highest prevalence (5.7 per 100,000 persons) found in the European Finnish population. The prevalence of missense *MCM8* and *MCM9* variants was 462.4 and 1173.3 individuals per 100,000 persons, respectively. Twenty-three individuals (0.02%) were identified as biallelic carriers of missense variants or more severe mutations of the *MCM8* gene (Table 1). With respect to the *MCM9* gene, 22 (0.02%) individuals were predicted to be biallelic carriers, including 21 carriers of missense variants or worse and one carrier of a homozygous pLoF variant.

Table 1. Population allele and biallelic carrier frequencies in gnomAD v.2.1.1

Population	# of variant carriers per 100,000 persons ^{a,b}			
	<i>MCM8</i>		<i>MCM9</i>	
	pLoF (n=83)	missense (n=490)	pLoF (n=55)	missense (n=556)
All	1.4	462.4	2.5	1173.3
African/African American	5.5	1058.3	2.6	1223.8
Latino/Admixed American	1.0	520.4	2.3	1142.6
Ashkenazi Jewish	0.5	362.7	0.7	1218.7
East Asian	0.6	757.4	0.9	1065.6
European (Finnish)	0.6	266.3	5.7	1127.8
European (non-Finnish)	0.8	303.9	2.2	1202.8
South Asian	0.9	594.9	1.7	1151.3
Other	0.7	379.2	2.2	1182.0
Zygoty	# of variant carriers per 125,748 persons ^{c,d}			
	<i>MCM8</i>		<i>MCM9</i>	
Compound heterozygous ^e				
pLoF + pLoF	0 ^f		0 ^g	
missense or pLoF + missense or pLoF	1 ^h		9 ⁱ	
Homozygous				
pLoF	0		1	
missense or pLoF	22		13	

^a Population AF of *MCM8/MCM9* variants calculated based on the gnomAD (v.2.1.1) database, accessed through <https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/> in May 2023.

^b Color intensity of each cell is proportional to the population AF, in relation to the population allele frequencies of cells from the same column.

^c Data was extracted from the gnomAD v2.1.1 database and was based on exomes only (n=125,748). The gnomAD database was accessed through <https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/> in May 2023.

^d Although highly uncommon, there is a possibility that an individual may be categorized in both the compound heterozygous group and the homozygous group. This situation arises when the individual carries a rare homozygous variant and, simultaneously, a rare heterozygous/heterozygous variant pair in the same gene.

^e Only variants in *trans* (located on different copies of the gene) were considered.

^f One individual had two unphased (unknown whether *cis* or *trans*) heterozygous variants.

^g One individual had two unphased (unknown whether *cis* or *trans*) heterozygous variants.

^h Ten individuals had two unphased (unknown whether *cis* or *trans*) heterozygous variants.

¹Sixteen individuals had two unphased (unknown whether *cis* or *trans*) heterozygous variants.

AF, allele frequency; gnomAD, The Genome Aggregation Database; pLoF, predicted loss of function

Biallelic MCM9 variant carriers in the 100K Genomes Project have an increased risk of polyposis and gastric cancer, while no enrichment was observed for biallelic MCM8 variants or in the 200K UK Biobank dataset

In the 100K Genomes Project, we identified 51 biallelic carriers (21 homozygous and 30 compound heterozygous) and 2,782 monoallelic carriers of pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants in the *MCM8* gene. Moreover, we found 64 biallelic carriers (21 homozygous and 43 compound heterozygous) and 3,166 monoallelic carriers of pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants in the *MCM9* gene. Among the 51 biallelic *MCM8* variant carriers in the 100K Genomes Project, 2 individuals (3.9%) had colorectal cancer (CRC), 3 (5.9%) had colonic polyps, 3 (5.9%) had colonic adenomas, 3 (5.9%) had rectal polyps, 2 (3.9%) had hypothyroidism, and 5 (9.8%) had breast cancer. Additionally, 1 individual (2.0%) had epilepsy, 1 had endometrial cancer, 1 had short stature, and 1 experienced delayed puberty. Among the 64 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers in the 100K Genomes Project, 3 individuals (4.7%) had colorectal cancer (CRC), 2 (3.1%) had colonic polyps, 2 (3.1%) had colonic adenomas, 2 (3.1%) had rectal polyps, 3 (4.7%) had hypothyroidism, 5 (7.8%) had breast cancer, and 2 (3.1%) had epilepsy. Additionally, 1 individual (1.6%) had melanoma, 1 had gastric cancer, and 1 had endometrial cancer. While no significant enrichment of biallelic *MCM8* pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants was observed for any of these phenotypes compared to controls, we did observe significant associations between biallelic *MCM9* pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants and colonic polyps (odds ratio (OR) 6.51, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.24-34.11; $P = 0.03$), rectal polyps (OR 8.40, 95% CI 1.28-55.35; $P = 0.03$), and gastric cancer (OR 27.03, 95% CI 2.93-248.5; $P = 0.004$) (**Table 2**).

In the 200K exomes release of the UK Biobank, we identified 110 biallelic carriers (47 homozygous and 63 compound heterozygous) and 8,453 monoallelic carriers of pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants in the *MCM8* gene. Additionally, we found 74 biallelic carriers (15 homozygous and 59 compound heterozygous) and 4,991 monoallelic carriers of pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants in the *MCM9* gene. Among the 110 biallelic *MCM8* variant carriers in the 200K UK

Biobank, 2 individuals (1.8%) were registered with CRC, 3 (2.7%) with colonic polyps, 4 (3.6%) with adenomas, 1 (0.9%) with female infertility, and 6 (5.5%) with hypothyroidism. Among the 74 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers in the 200K UK Biobank, 1 individual (1.4%) was registered with colorectal cancer (CRC), 3 (4%) with colonic polyps, 6 (8%) with adenomas, 1 (1.4%) with rectal polyps, and 2 (2.7%) with hypothyroidism. However, no significant enrichment of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* pLoF or predicted deleterious missense variants was observed for any of these phenotypes compared to controls in the 200K UK Biobank (Table 3).

None of the other phenotypes investigated (see Supplementary Table 1) were registered among the biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers, based on ICD10/ICD-O registrations.

Table 2. Enrichment analysis of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants in 100K Genomes Project, adjusting for age, sex and ethnicity

Phenotype	Potentially deleterious alleles in cases	Potentially deleterious alleles in controls	Non/unlikely deleterious alleles in cases	Non/unlikely deleterious alleles in controls ^a	OR (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value
<i>MCM8</i>						
Colonic	14	10	13198	30168	1.62 (0.38-6.86)	0.51
CRC	4	10	6942	30168	0.52 (0.04-6.08)	0.60
Colonic polyps	6	10	6096	30168	1.20 (0.20-7.11)	0.84
Colonic adenomas	6	10	5748	30168	2.37 (0.40-14.08)	0.34
Rectal polyps	6	10	2802	30168	2.41 (0.38-15.47)	0.35
Hypothyroidism	4	10	6642	30168	0.89 (0.14-5.83)	0.91
Breast cancer ^a	10	6	8866	16244	1.04 (0.21-5.12)	0.96
Epilepsy	2	10	6196	30168	0.77 (0.03-19.72)	0.88
Endometrial cancer ^a	2	6	2212	16244	0.83 (0.07-10.31)	0.89
Short stature	2	10	1986	30168	0.68 (3.32e ⁻¹³ -1.42e ¹²)	0.98
Delayed puberty	2	10	256	30168	1.19 (1.35e ⁻³⁷ -1.05e ³⁷)	0.99
<i>MCM9</i>						
Colonic	12	10	13200	30168	3.68 (0.74-18.41)	0.11
CRC	6	10	6940	30168	1.49 (0.12-18.11)	0.75
Colonic polyps	4	10	6098	30168	6.51 (1.24-34.11)	0.03
Colonic adenomas	4	10	5750	30168	1.55 (0.13-18.33)	0.73
Rectal polyps	4	10	2804	30168	8.40 (1.28-55.35)	0.03
Hypothyroidism	6	10	6640	30168	3.88 (0.72-20.81)	0.11
Breast cancer ^a	10	2	8866	16242	3.53 (0.33-	0.29

					37.2)	
Epilepsy	4	10	6194	30168	0.40 (0.02-9.27)	0.57
Melanoma	2	10	1426	30168	5.08 (0.43-59.06)	0.19
Gastric cancer	2	10	560	30168	27.03 [2.93-248.5]	0.004
Endometrial cancer ^a	2	2	2212	16242	1.7 (0.01-270.4)	0.83

^a For the analysis of breast and endometrial cancer, only female controls were included for comparison.

CI, confidence interval; CRC, colorectal cancer; OR, odds ratio

Table 3. Enrichment analysis of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants in 200K UK Biobank, adjusting for age, sex and ethnicity

Phenotype	Potentially deleterious alleles in cases	Potentially deleterious alleles in controls	Non/unlikely deleterious alleles in cases	Non/unlikely deleterious alleles in controls ^a	OR (95% CI)	P value
<i>MCM8</i>						
Colonic	16	136	39158	181658	0.54 (0.26-1.14)	0.11
CRC	4	136	6474	181658	0.83 (0.20-3.41)	0.80
Colonic polyps	6	136	18518	181658	0.43 (0.14-1.39)	0.16
Colonic adenomas	8	136	20586	181658	0.52 (0.19-1.44)	0.21
Rectal polyps	0	136	10328	181658	NA	NA
Female infertility ^a	2	74	988	98908	2.68 (0.34-21.11)	0.35
Hypothyroidism	12	136	21982	181658	0.67 (0.29-1.58)	0.36
<i>MCM9</i>						
Colonic	16	84	39158	181710		
CRC	2	84	6476	181710	0.82 (0.11-5.99)	0.84
Colonic polyps	6	84	18518	181710	0.80 (0.25-2.63)	0.72
Colonic adenomas	12	84	20582	181710	1.51 (0.63-3.61)	0.35
Rectal polyps	2	84	10326	181710	0.49 (0.07-3.59)	0.48
Female infertility ^a	0	42	990	98898	NA	NA
Hypothyroidism	4	84	21990	181710	0.46 (0.11-1.94)	0.29

^a For the analysis of female infertility, only female controls were included for comparison.

CI, confidence interval; CRC, colorectal cancer; NA, not applicable; OR, odds ratio

Case series

Phenotype of biallelic germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants carriers

In our case series, we identified 26 biallelic *MCM8* variant carriers (including 15 with pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants and 11 with a VUS) and 28 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers (including 22 with pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants and 6 with a VUS) that met the pathogenicity-based filtering criteria. This group included 3 biallelic *MCM8* and 4 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers who had

not been previously described (**Figure 1**). An overview of all identified *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers, including their sources, is presented in **Supplementary Table 2**. A detailed description of all newly identified *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers and previously documented carriers for whom we obtained updated clinical information (individuals meeting the pathogenicity-based filtering criteria only), including pedigrees, is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers often present with hypogonadism linked to impaired gonadal development

The majority of individuals with biallelic *MCM8* (23 out of 26, 88%) or *MCM9* (26 out of 28, 93%) variants from our case series experienced hypogonadism ([HP:0000815](#)) (**Figure 2**). Apart from five males (three with biallelic *MCM8* variants and two with biallelic *MCM9* variants) with azoospermia (no sperm in the semen; [HP:0000027](#)), these issues involved women affected by POI. Fourteen out of twenty (70%) individuals affected by POI and carrying biallelic *MCM8* variants had undetectable or small ovaries coupled with an infantile or absent uterus upon ultrasound in thirteen (65%) of the cases. Among the biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers affected by POI, 14 out of 23 (61%) exhibited invisible or small ovaries, and 12 out of 23 (52%) had infantile or absent uteri. Furthermore, osteoporosis or delayed bone age ([HP:0000939](#)) was reported in seven individuals with biallelic *MCM9* variants and one individual with biallelic *MCM8* variants, which were all affected by hypogonadism. In both the *MCM8* and *MCM9* groups, hypogonadism manifested at a relatively young age, typically between 10 and 30 years (**Figure 3**). Many of these patients were part of earlier studies, with no updated clinical data available upon request, so most were lost to follow-up post-publication.

Biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers may face polyposis, gastric cancer and early-onset colorectal cancer, while both biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* carriers may face female germ cell tumors.

Polyposis (typically > 20 polyps, including hyperplastic, adenomatous, and serrated types) was reported in 6 out of 28 (21%) biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers from our case series (**Figure 2**). Similarly, CRC was observed in 6 of 28 (21%) biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers in our case series. This includes three carriers of likely pathogenic variant(s) who developed CRC between the ages of 30

and 40, and three carriers with a variant of uncertain significance (VUS) diagnosed between 40 and 60 years (**Figure 3**). No CRC or polyp diagnoses were reported among the biallelic *MCM8* variant carriers. Three female carriers—two with biallelic *MCM8* variants and one with a biallelic *MCM9* variant—were diagnosed with germ cell tumors ([HP:0100728](#)) between the ages of 11 and 15 years. These included two endodermal sinus tumors originating from dysgerminomas, which themselves arose from gonadoblastomas, and one germ cell tumor of unspecified origin. Single biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers were diagnosed with gastric cancer ([HP:0012126](#)), an HPV-unrelated clear cell carcinoma of the cervix ([HP:0031522](#)), and melanoma ([HP:0012056](#)), whereas a biallelic *MCM8* variant carrier was diagnosed with breast cancer ([HP:0003002](#)).

Monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants may experience hypogonadism

During the pathogenicity-based filtering process of our case series, we filtered 49 mono-allelic *MCM8* variant carriers and 45 monoallelic *MCM9* variant carriers. Out of these 49 monoallelic *MCM8* variant carriers, hypogonadism was noted in 14 (29%) individuals, with two having a likely pathogenic variant and 12 carrying a VUS (**Supplementary Figure 1-2**). Two monoallelic *MCM8* variant carriers were diagnosed with CRC, another two with polyposis, and two individuals with a monoallelic *MCM8* variant were diagnosed with breast cancer.

Among the 45 monoallelic *MCM9* variant carriers from our case series, ten (22%) were known to have hypogonadism, including one individual who was also diagnosed with CRC and polyposis (**Supplementary Figure 1-2**). CRC and polyps were additionally reported in five and six other monoallelic *MCM9* variant carriers, respectively. No other types of cancer were reported in the monoallelic *MCM9* group.

Genotype-phenotype correlations reveal potential hotspot sites

Mapping of variants onto the *MCM8* and *MCM9* protein domains revealed that the variants in our case series clustered in two key regions: the N-terminal DNA binding domain, which is crucial for protein-DNA binding (6 of 11 *MCM8* variants in biallelic carriers, 55%; 4 of 20 *MCM9* variants in biallelic carriers, 20%), and the AAA+ core domain, essential for DNA helicase activity (5 of 11 *MCM8*

variants in biallelic carriers, 45%; 12 of 20 *MCM9* variants in biallelic carriers, 60%) (**Figure 4, Supplementary Figure 3**).⁴⁴ Additionally, several variants were found to be shared among multiple families with hypogonadism from our case series. For instance, the c.482A>C [p.(His161Pro)] VUS in the *MCM8* gene, previously linked to hypogonadism^{26, 39, 46, 49, 51}, was shared by six biallelic carriers across two families. Similarly, the pathogenic c.394C>T [p.(Arg132*)] variant in the *MCM9* gene, also associated with hypogonadism^{39, 49, 51}, was shared by seven biallelic carriers from four unrelated families.

Cancer-specific cohorts

No biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers meeting the pathogenicity-based filtering criteria were identified in the SPS (serrated polyposis cases), fCRCX (nonpolyposis CRC families) and HMF (metastasized CRC and endometrial cancer cases) cancer-specific cohorts. In the HMF cancer-specific cohort, four monoallelic *MCM8* and three monoallelic *MCM9* variant carriers meeting the pathogenicity-based filtering criteria were identified with CRC.

Mutational signature analysis

Clock-like mutational processes dominate in tumors from the case series and HMF cancer-specific cohort

SBS mutational signatures SBS1 and SBS5, which represent clock-like mutational processes⁷³, were present across all tumors from our case series with matched germline sequencing data available (5 out of 16 sequenced tumors, 31.3%, involving three CRCs and two breast cancers), and were similarly present in a CRC and two polyps from a wildtype control (**Figure 5A-B**). With respect to MMR deficiency-associated signatures, only signature SBS26 was detected and only in one tumor (P2_2T, breast cancer), where it contributed to a minority of the mutations (269 out of 2026, 13%) (**Figure 5B**).⁶⁴⁻⁶⁸ Sequenced tumors without matched germline sequencing data available were dominated by sequencing artefact signatures (SBS45, SBS47, SBS50, SBS51, SBS54, SBS56, SBS58, SBS95)⁶⁴⁻⁶⁸, precluding us from the possibility of comparing these cases to those with matched controls or previously published cases.⁴ Clock-like signatures SBS1 and SBS5, along with signatures SBS93 and SBS40 of unknown etiology, were the most prevalent signatures in metastasized CRCs

from seven individuals carrying monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants in the HMF cancer-specific cohort (Supplementary Figure 4).

Somatic MCM8/MCM9 mutations may occur as a result of other DNA repair deficiencies and mutational processes, potentially involving copy number variations.

In the TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas dataset, insights into the somatic mutational behavior of *MCM8* and *MCM9* were gained through the observation of copy number alterations in both genes. Furthermore, unsupervised hierarchical clustering of SBS mutational signature profiles revealed clusters characterized by signatures such as SBS7a/b (UV damage), SBS2 and SBS13 (APOBEC activity), SBS6, SBS14, SBS15, SBS20, and SBS21 (MMR deficiency), and SBS10a/b (POLE deficiency)⁶⁴⁶⁸, which suggest that somatic *MCM8/MCM9* variants may be secondary to other DNA repair deficiencies and mutational processes (Supplementary Figure 5).

Discussion

Following the initial discovery of biallelic germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants in families with CRC, polyposis, and hypogonadism²⁻⁴, we present a comprehensive clinical and molecular characterization of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers from multiple sources. Our analysis of the 100K Genomes Project reveals that biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers are at increased risk for polyposis and gastric cancer, a pattern not observed in biallelic *MCM8* carriers. This finding is further supported by our case series, which included 26 biallelic *MCM8* and 28 biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers, including seven previously unreported cases. Furthermore, the case series indicates that, in addition to hypogonadism associated with impaired gonadal development, biallelic *MCM8* and *MCM9* variants are linked to the development of germ cell tumors, with biallelic *MCM9* variants potentially associated with early-onset CRC. These findings highlight the importance of including *MCM8* and *MCM9* in diagnostic gene panels for relevant clinical contexts and suggest that biallelic carriers may benefit from cancer surveillance.

Gaining an unbiased understanding of the phenotype of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers is currently challenging. This difficulty arises mainly from the limited inclusion of *MCM8/MCM9* genes in current diagnostic gene panels for cancer and polyposis, constraining our case series, and the relative rarity of germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants in the general population, as reflected by our investigations in gnomAD v.2.1.1, the 100K Genomes Project, and the 200K exome release of the UK Biobank. This rarity may have contributed to the absence of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants in the cancer-specific cohorts and could have influenced the enrichment analysis of these variants in the 100K Genomes Project and 200K UK Biobank. Aside from the increased risk of polyposis and gastric cancer associated with biallelic *MCM9* variants in the 100K Genomes Project, the lack of enrichment for biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants in other phenotypes and in the 200K UK Biobank may be attributed to one of two factors: (i) these variants may not actually contribute to studied phenotypes, or (ii) there may be limitations in the analysis itself, such as reliance on the accuracy and consistency of ICD10/ICD-O registrations and the variant filtering approach, which, partly due to

the relative novelty of both genes, relied primarily on *in silico* prediction tools. With regards to our case series, we acknowledge an ascertainment bias, contributing to the high frequency of hypogonadism in our cohort since most patients examined were from studies primarily focused on fertility problems rather than cancer. In contrast, the occurrence of cancer and polyposis among biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers may be underestimated because many patients in our case series are still young, potentially too young to have developed cancer, and because colonoscopies are not typically recommended for biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers. Moreover, the prevalence of the associated phenotypes might be underestimated due to our variant filtering approach, being dependent on limited *in silico* prediction algorithms and data from previous studies, for instance with regards to segregation analysis and variant phasing. This may have led to misclassification of individuals as (biallelic) variant carriers, thereby potentially diluting the observed prevalence of phenotypes in our analyses.

Despite its limitations, our population-based analysis and case series describe the most extensive collection of individuals with biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants to date, underscoring the importance of considering these variants in specific clinical contexts. We recommend considering biallelic *MCM9* variants in individuals and families with unexplained polyposis, gastric cancer, germ cell tumors, or (early-onset) CRC, particularly in cases of recessive inheritance and known hypogonadism, until more data are available. Similarly, biallelic *MCM8* variants should be considered in cases of unexplained germ cell tumors, especially when accompanied by recessive inheritance or hypogonadism. Additionally, given previous reports linking biallelic *MCM8* variants to CRC⁴ and the potential underestimation of cancer and polyposis in our case series, it may be prudent to consider biallelic *MCM8* variants in cases of unexplained CRC or polyposis until further data are available. As these genes become more integrated into diagnostic gene panels and more families are identified, larger sample sizes and longer follow-up periods will allow for more accurate cancer risk assessments.

Given the range of malignancies observed in our case series, surveillance for these patients could be considered within a shared decision-making framework, taking into account the current evidence until more data become available. Similar to the *NTHL1*- and *MUTYH*-deficiency syndromes⁷⁴⁻⁷⁶, which are associated with CRC and polyposis, the *MCM9*-deficiency syndrome observed in our population-based analysis and case series may warrant comparable surveillance protocols. Established colon surveillance guidelines for *NTHL1*- and *MUTYH*-deficiency syndromes⁷⁴⁻⁷⁶, which recommend (bi)annual colonoscopy beginning around 18-20 years of age, could potentially be extended to individuals carrying biallelic *MCM9* variants. However, given the observed onset age of 30–60 years in our series, initiating colonoscopy at 25 years may be more appropriate. Additionally, due to the potential increased risk of gastric cancer, concurrent gastroscopy could be considered. Considering the prevalence of germ cell tumors in female biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers, annual ultrasound screening starting at age 10 could be considered, given the early onset of 11-15 years observed in our case series. Further evaluation of cancer risks and the cost-effectiveness of surveillance measures is necessary to develop comprehensive surveillance guidelines.

In contrast to biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers, our current data suggest that the phenotype of monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers may primarily be limited to hypogonadism, with no clear evidence of an increased cancer risk, which does not seem to justify cancer surveillance for these individuals. Although the prevalence of hypogonadism among monoallelic carriers in our case series (29% for *MCM8*, 22% for *MCM9*) appears higher than the global prevalence (e.g., 3.5% for *POI*⁷⁷), the potential ascertainment bias in our study, as previously discussed, highlights the need for further research to more fully characterize the phenotype of monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers.

To gain potential causal evidence for a role of *MCM8/MCM9* deficiency in the development of polyps and cancer, future studies exploring the mutational signatures of tumors from *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers are essential. In the mutational signature analysis from our case series, we observed that clock-like mutational processes dominate in tumors from *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers with

matched germline sequencing data available. However, we could not confirm the proposed role of MCM8 and MCM9 in MMR or other DNA repair mechanisms based on specific SBS signature contributions. The clock-like mutational signatures SBS1 and SBS5, commonly found in most CRCs without specific DNA repair defects and in many other cancer types⁶⁴⁻⁶⁸, were not more prevalent in tumors from *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers than in those from our wildtype control. Future studies should therefore confirm whether tumors from *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers are molecularly similar to sporadic tumors or if other mutational signatures, possibly missed in this study, are associated with MCM8/MCM9 deficiency.

In conclusion, our study offers a detailed clinical and molecular characterization of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers from various sources. Our data suggests that biallelic *MCM9* variants are associated with polyposis, gastric cancer, and early-onset CRC, while both biallelic *MCM8* and *MCM9* variants are linked to hypogonadism and the early development of germ cell tumors. These findings support the inclusion of *MCM8/MCM9* in diagnostic gene panels for specific clinical contexts and indicate that carriers might benefit from cancer surveillance. Further studies are essential to accurately assess cancer risk and determine the causative role of *MCM8/MCM9* deficiency in cancer predisposition.

References

1. You YN, Borrás E, Chang K, et al. Detection of Pathogenic Germline Variants Among Patients With Advanced Colorectal Cancer Undergoing Tumor Genomic Profiling for Precision Medicine. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2019;62(4):429-37.
2. Goldberg Y, Aleme O, Peled-Perets L, et al. MCM9 is associated with germline predisposition to early-onset cancer-clinical evidence. *NPJ Genom Med*. 2021;6(1):78.
3. Goldberg Y, Halpern N, Hubert A, et al. Mutated MCM9 is associated with predisposition to hereditary mixed polyposis and colorectal cancer in addition to primary ovarian failure. *Cancer Genet*. 2015;208(12):621-4.
4. Golubicki M, Bonjoch L, Acuna-Ochoa JG, et al. Germline biallelic Mcm8 variants are associated with early-onset Lynch-like syndrome. *JCI Insight*. 2020;5(18).
5. Lutzmann M, Mechali M. MCM9 binds Cdt1 and is required for the assembly of prereplication complexes. *Mol Cell*. 2008;31(2):190-200.
6. Lutzmann M, Mechali M. How to load a replicative helicase onto chromatin: a more and more complex matter during evolution. *Cell Cycle*. 2009;8(9):1309-13.
7. Hartford SA, Luo Y, Southard TL, et al. Minichromosome maintenance helicase paralog MCM9 is dispensable for DNA replication but functions in germ-line stem cells and tumor suppression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011;108(43):17702-7.
8. Volkening M, Hoffmann I. Involvement of human MCM8 in prereplication complex assembly by recruiting hcdc6 to chromatin. *Mol Cell Biol*. 2005;25(4):1560-8.
9. Acharya A, Bret H, Huang JW, et al. Mechanism of DNA unwinding by MCM8-9 in complex with HROB. *Nat Commun*. 2024;15(1):3584.
10. Blanton HL, Radford SJ, McMahan S, et al. REC, *Drosophila* MCM8, drives formation of meiotic crossovers. *PLoS Genet*. 2005;1(3):e40.
11. Crismani W, Portemer V, Froger N, et al. MCM8 is required for a pathway of meiotic double-strand break repair independent of DMC1 in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *PLoS Genet*. 2013;9(1):e1003165.
12. Kohl KP, Jones CD, Sekelsky J. Evolution of an MCM complex in flies that promotes meiotic crossovers by blocking BLM helicase. *Science*. 2012;338(6112):1363-5.
13. Hartmann M, Kohl KP, Sekelsky J, et al. Meiotic MCM Proteins Promote and Inhibit Crossovers During Meiotic Recombination. *Genetics*. 2019;212(2):461-8.
14. Lee KY, Im JS, Shibata E, et al. MCM8-9 complex promotes resection of double-strand break ends by MRE11-RAD50-NBS1 complex. *Nat Commun*. 2015;6:7744.
15. Lutzmann M, Grey C, Traver S, et al. MCM8- and MCM9-deficient mice reveal gametogenesis defects and genome instability due to impaired homologous recombination. *Mol Cell*. 2012;47(4):523-34.
16. Natsume T, Nishimura K, Minocherhomji S, et al. Acute inactivation of the replicative helicase in human cells triggers MCM8-9-dependent DNA synthesis. *Genes Dev*. 2017;31(8):816-29.
17. Nishimura K, Ishiai M, Horikawa K, et al. Mcm8 and Mcm9 form a complex that functions in homologous recombination repair induced by DNA interstrand crosslinks. *Mol Cell*. 2012;47(4):511-22.
18. Park J, Long DT, Lee KY, et al. The MCM8-MCM9 complex promotes RAD51 recruitment at DNA damage sites to facilitate homologous recombination. *Mol Cell Biol*. 2013;33(8):1632-44.
19. McKinzey DR, Gomathinayagam S, Griffin WC, et al. Motifs of the C-terminal domain of MCM9 direct localization to sites of mitomycin-C damage for RAD51 recruitment. *J Biol Chem*. 2021;296:100355.
20. Traver S, Coulombe P, Peiffer I, et al. MCM9 Is Required for Mammalian DNA Mismatch Repair. *Mol Cell*. 2015;59(5):831-9.

21. Liu K, Wang Y, Zhu Q, et al. Aberrantly expressed HORMAD1 disrupts nuclear localization of MCM8-MCM9 complex and compromises DNA mismatch repair in cancer cells. *Cell Death Dis.* 2020;11(7):519.
22. AlAsiri S, Basit S, Wood-Trageser MA, et al. Exome sequencing reveals MCM8 mutation underlies ovarian failure and chromosomal instability. *J Clin Invest.* 2015;125(1):258-62.
23. Tenenbaum-Rakover Y, Weinberg-Shukron A, Renbaum P, et al. Minichromosome maintenance complex component 8 (MCM8) gene mutations result in primary gonadal failure. *J Med Genet.* 2015;52(6):391-9.
24. Dou X, Guo T, Li G, et al. Minichromosome maintenance complex component 8 mutations cause primary ovarian insufficiency. *Fertil Steril.* 2016;106(6):1485-9 e2.
25. Desai S, Wood-Trageser M, Matic J, et al. MCM8 and MCM9 Nucleotide Variants in Women With Primary Ovarian Insufficiency. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2017;102(2):576-82.
26. Bouali N, Francou B, Bouligand J, et al. New MCM8 mutation associated with premature ovarian insufficiency and chromosomal instability in a highly consanguineous Tunisian family. *Fertil Steril.* 2017;108(4):694-702.
27. Zhang YX, He WB, Xiao WJ, et al. Novel loss-of-function mutation in MCM8 causes premature ovarian insufficiency. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.* 2020;8(4):e1165.
28. Heddar A, Beckers D, Fouquet B, et al. A Novel Phenotype Combining Primary Ovarian Insufficiency Growth Retardation and Pilomatricomas With MCM8 Mutation. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2020;105(6).
29. Wang F, Guo S, Li P. Two novel mutations in the MCM8 gene shared by two Chinese siblings with primary ovarian insufficiency and short stature. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.* 2020;8(9):e1396.
30. Jin H, Ahn J, Park Y, et al. Identification of potential causal variants for premature ovarian failure by whole exome sequencing. *BMC Med Genomics.* 2020;13(1):159.
31. Tucker EJ, Bell KM, Robevska G, et al. Meiotic genes in premature ovarian insufficiency: variants in HROB and REC8 as likely genetic causes. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2022;30(2):219-28.
32. Alvarez-Mora MI, Todeschini AL, Caburet S, et al. An exome-wide exploration of cases of primary ovarian insufficiency uncovers novel sequence variants and candidate genes. *Clin Genet.* 2020;98(3):293-8.
33. Fauchereau F, Shalev S, Chervinsky E, et al. A non-sense MCM9 mutation in a familial case of primary ovarian insufficiency. *Clin Genet.* 2016;89(5):603-7.
34. Franca MM, Funari MFA, Lerario AM, et al. Screening of targeted panel genes in Brazilian patients with primary ovarian insufficiency. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(10):e0240795.
35. Guo T, Zheng Y, Li G, et al. Novel pathogenic mutations in minichromosome maintenance complex component 9 (MCM9) responsible for premature ovarian insufficiency. *Fertil Steril.* 2020;113(4):845-52.
36. Liu H, Wei X, Sha Y, et al. Whole-exome sequencing in patients with premature ovarian insufficiency: early detection and early intervention. *J Ovarian Res.* 2020;13(1):114.
37. Shen J, Qu D, Gao Y, et al. Genetic etiologic analysis in 74 Chinese Han women with idiopathic premature ovarian insufficiency by combined molecular genetic testing. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* 2021;38(4):965-78.
38. Turkyilmaz A, Cayir A, Yarali O, et al. Clinical characteristics and molecular genetic analysis of a cohort with idiopathic congenital hypogonadism. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab.* 2021;34(6):771-80.
39. Wood-Trageser MA, Gurbuz F, Yatsenko SA, et al. MCM9 mutations are associated with ovarian failure, short stature, and chromosomal instability. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2014;95(6):754-62.
40. Yang X, Touraine P, Desai S, et al. Gene variants identified by whole-exome sequencing in 33 French women with premature ovarian insufficiency. *J Assist Reprod Genet.* 2019;36(1):39-45.

41. McLaren W, Gil L, Hunt SE, et al. The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. *Genome Biol.* 2016;17(1):122.
42. Rentzsch P, Witten D, Cooper GM, et al. CADD: predicting the deleteriousness of variants throughout the human genome. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2019;47(D1):D886-D94.
43. Gonzalez-Perez A, Lopez-Bigas N. Improving the assessment of the outcome of nonsynonymous SNVs with a consensus deleteriousness score, Condel. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2011;88(4):440-9.
44. Helderman NC, Terlouw D, Bonjoch L, et al. Molecular functions of MCM8 and MCM9 and their associated pathologies. *iScience.* 2023;26(6):106737.
45. Terradas M, Munoz-Torres PM, Belhadj S, et al. Contribution to colonic polyposis of recently proposed predisposing genes and assessment of the prevalence of NTHL1- and MSH3-associated polyposes. *Hum Mutat.* 2019;40(11):1910-23.
46. Kherraf ZE, Cazin C, Bouker A, et al. Whole-exome sequencing improves the diagnosis and care of men with non-obstructive azoospermia. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2022;109(3):508-17.
47. Bally JF, Zhang M, Dwosh E, et al. Genomic study of a large family with complex neurological phenotype including hearing loss, imbalance and action tremor. *Neurobiol Aging.* 2022;113:137-42.
48. Chen S, Wang G, Zheng X, et al. Whole-exome sequencing of a large Chinese azoospermia and severe oligospermia cohort identifies novel infertility causative variants and genes. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2020;29(14):2451-9.
49. Jolly A, Bayram Y, Turan S, et al. Exome Sequencing of a Primary Ovarian Insufficiency Cohort Reveals Common Molecular Etiologies for a Spectrum of Disease. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2019;104(8):3049-67.
50. Soares de Lima Y, Arnau-Collell C, Diaz-Gay M, et al. Germline and Somatic Whole-Exome Sequencing Identifies New Candidate Genes Involved in Familial Predisposition to Serrated Polyposis Syndrome. *Cancers (Basel).* 2021;13(4).
51. Potorac I, Laterre M, Malaise O, et al. The Role of MCM9 in the Etiology of Sertoli Cell-Only Syndrome and Premature Ovarian Insufficiency. *J Clin Med.* 2023;12(3).
52. ERN-GENTURIS. Role of *MCM8/9* variants in (colorectal) cancer predisposition 2022 [Available from: <https://www.genturis.eu/|=eng/research/research-projects/mcm8-9-jun-2022.html>].
53. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, et al. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. *Genet Med.* 2015;17(5):405-24.
54. Richards CS, Bale S, Bellissimo DB, et al. ACMG recommendations for standards for interpretation and reporting of sequence variations: Revisions 2007. *Genet Med.* 2008;10(4):294-300.
55. Genoox. Franklin [Available from: <https://franklin.genoox.com/clinical-db/home>].
56. Quintana I, Terradas M, Mur P, et al. Wnt genes in colonic polyposis predisposition. *Genes Dis.* 2023;10(3):753-7.
57. Li H, Durbin R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics.* 2009;25(14):1754-60.
58. Van der Auwera GA, O'Connor BD. *Genomics in the Cloud: Using Docker, GATK, and WDL in Terra* (1st Edition). O'Reilly Media; 2020.
59. Benjamin D, Sato T, Cibulskis K, et al. Calling Somatic SNVs and Indels with Mutect2. *bioRxiv.* 2019:861054.
60. Koboldt DC, Zhang Q, Larson DE, et al. VarScan 2: somatic mutation and copy number alteration discovery in cancer by exome sequencing. *Genome Res.* 2012;22(3):568-76.
61. Fan Y, Xi L, Hughes DS, et al. MuSE: accounting for tumor heterogeneity using a sample-specific error model improves sensitivity and specificity in mutation calling from sequencing data. *Genome Biol.* 2016;17(1):178.

62. Kim S, Scheffler K, Halpern AL, et al. Strelka2: fast and accurate calling of germline and somatic variants. *Nat Methods*. 2018;15(8):591-4.
63. Diaz-Gay M, Vangara R, Barnes M, et al. Assigning mutational signatures to individual samples and individual somatic mutations with SigProfilerAssignment. *Bioinformatics*. 2023;39(12).
64. Sondka Z, Dhir NB, Carvalho-Silva D, et al. COSMIC: a curated database of somatic variants and clinical data for cancer. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2024;52(D1):D1210-D7.
65. Otlu B, Diaz-Gay M, Vermes I, et al. Topography of mutational signatures in human cancer. *Cell Rep*. 2023;42(8):112930.
66. Alexandrov LB, Kim J, Haradhvala NJ, et al. The repertoire of mutational signatures in human cancer. *Nature*. 2020;578(7793):94-101.
67. Alexandrov LB, Nik-Zainal S, Wedge DC, et al. Signatures of mutational processes in human cancer. *Nature*. 2013;500(7463):415-21.
68. Islam SMA, Diaz-Gay M, Wu Y, et al. Uncovering novel mutational signatures by de novo extraction with SigProfilerExtractor. *Cell Genom*. 2022;2(11):None.
69. Ng PC, Henikoff S. Predicting deleterious amino acid substitutions. *Genome Res*. 2001;11(5):863-74.
70. Adzhubei IA, Schmidt S, Peshkin L, et al. A method and server for predicting damaging missense mutations. *Nat Methods*. 2010;7(4):248-9.
71. Tate JG, Bamford S, Jubb HC, et al. COSMIC: the Catalogue Of Somatic Mutations In Cancer. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2019;47(D1):D941-D7.
72. Manders F, Brandsma AM, de Kanter J, et al. MutationalPatterns: the one stop shop for the analysis of mutational processes. *BMC Genomics*. 2022;23(1):134.
73. Alexandrov LB, Jones PH, Wedge DC, et al. Clock-like mutational processes in human somatic cells. *Nat Genet*. 2015;47(12):1402-7.
74. Belhadj S, Mur P, Navarro M, et al. Delineating the Phenotypic Spectrum of the NTHL1-Associated Polyposis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2017;15(3):461-2.
75. Nielsen M, Morreau H, Vasen HF, et al. MUTYH-associated polyposis (MAP). *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2011;79(1):1-16.
76. Grolleman JE, de Voer RM, Elsayed FA, et al. Mutational Signature Analysis Reveals NTHL1 Deficiency to Cause a Multi-tumor Phenotype. *Cancer Cell*. 2019;35(2):256-66 e5.
77. Li M, Zhu Y, Wei J, et al. The global prevalence of premature ovarian insufficiency: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Climacteric*. 2023;26(2):95-102.
78. Consortium ITP-CAoWG. Pan-cancer analysis of whole genomes. *Nature*. 2020;578(7793):82-93.
79. Diaz-Gay M, Alexandrov LB. Unraveling the genomic landscape of colorectal cancer through mutational signatures. *Adv Cancer Res*. 2021;151:385-424.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Flow chart of study approach. Pathogenicity-based filtering of (A) population-based cohorts, (B) our case series and cancer-specific cohorts, and (C) the TCGA Pan-Cancer atlas dataset.

^afCRCX cohort comprised 24 CRC-affected members of 16 Amsterdam-positive non-polyposis CRC families; ^bSPS cohort comprised 44 unrelated serrated polyposis families; ^cHMF cohort comprised 632 metastasized CRCs and 25 metastasized ECs. Tumors from the TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas were selected based on the presence of somatic *MCM8/MCM9* variants and are not related to germline variant carriers. *ACMG/AMP*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AF*, allele frequency; *CADD*, Combined Annotation-Dependent Depletion; *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *EC*, endometrial cancer; *pLoF*, predicted loss of function; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance.

Figure 2. Phenotype of biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers. The phenotype is presented for all (A) biallelic *MCM8* and (B) biallelic *MCM9* variant carriers from our case series. Each column represents an individual, while each row corresponds to one of the four primary observed phenotypes: CRC, other type(s) of cancer, hypogonadism, and polyposis. Person IDs are provided below each column. *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance.

Figure 3. Disease onset in biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers. The onset of the four primary observed phenotypes (CRC, other type(s) of cancer, hypogonadism, and polyposis) is displayed for each biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carrier with available age details in our case series. Those without age details were excluded from the analysis. Individuals are ordered by ACMG/AMP classification (pathogenic or likely pathogenic, *VUS*)^{53, 54} and current age or age at the time of death/lost to follow-up. *ACMG*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AMP*, Association for Molecular Pathology; *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance.

Figure 4. Biallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants mapped onto the respective protein domains. (A) *MCM8* and (B) *MCM9* variants from all biallelic variant carriers in our case series are mapped onto the domains of the *MCM8* and *MCM9* proteins, respectively. Each homozygote variant carrier

corresponds to one diamond symbol, whereas for compound heterozygous variant carriers, both variants are separately plotted. The fill and color of the diamond symbols correspond to the phenotype of the individual (CRC, other type(s) of cancer, hypogonadism, polyposis) and the ACMG/AMP classification of the variant (pathogenic or likely pathogenic, VUS)^{53, 54}, respectively. *ACMG*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AMP*, Association for Molecular Pathology; *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *RF*, arginine finger; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance; *WA*, Walker A; *WB*, Walker B; *WH*, winged-helix; *ZF*, zinc-finger.

Figure 5. Mutational signatures analysis of tumors from *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers from our case series. (A) Sample overview of the tumors that were available from our case series for mutational signature analysis, including the corresponding genotype, next generation sequencing (NGS) approach, the availability of normal control tissue, and the tumor type. Control tissue originated from an individual tested negative for germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants. (B) The number of mutations in each signature is presented for every tumor. Mutational signature assignment was performed using SigProfilerAssignment (v0.0.32)⁶³ based on the COSMICv3.3 single base substitution (SBS) reference signatures. SBS1 and SBS5 were classified as clock-like mutational signatures, while SBS3 was considered to be caused by defective homologous recombination (HR) repair. SBS26 was linked to defective MMR, and SBS30 and SBS36 were associated with defective base excision repair (BER). SBS88 was attributed to colibactin exposure, and SBS92 to tobacco smoking. SBS37, SBS40, and SBS94 were considered to be of unknown etiology, while SBS40, SBS45, SBS50, SBS51, SBS54, SBS56, SBS58, and SBS95 were considered possible sequencing artifacts. *BER*, base excision repair; *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *HR*, homologous repair; *MMR*, mismatch repair; *NGS*, next generation sequencing; *SBS*, single base substitution; *WES*, whole exome sequencing; *WGS*, whole genome sequencing.

Supplementary Figure 1. Phenotype of monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers. The phenotype is presented for all (A) monoallelic *MCM8* and (B) monoallelic *MCM9* variant carriers from our case

series. Each column represents an individual, while each row corresponds to one of the four primary observed phenotypes: CRC, other type(s) of cancer, hypogonadism, and polyposis. Person IDs are provided below each column. *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance.

Supplementary Figure 2. Disease onset in monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers. The onset of the four primary observed phenotypes (CRC, other type(s) of cancer, hypogonadism, and polyposis) is displayed for each monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carrier with available age details in our case series. Those without age details were excluded from the analysis. Individuals are ordered by ACMG/AMP classification (pathogenic or likely pathogenic, VUS)^{53, 54} and current age or age at the time of death/lost to follow-up. *ACMG*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AMP*, Association for Molecular Pathology; *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance.

Supplementary Figure 3. Monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variants mapped onto the respective protein domains. (A) *AMCM8* and (B) *MCM9* variants from all monoallelic variant carriers in our case series are mapped onto the domains of the *MCM8* and *MCM9* proteins, respectively. The fill and color of the diamond symbols correspond to the phenotype of the individual (CRC, other type(s) of cancer, hypogonadism, polyposis) and the ACMG/AMP classification of the variant (pathogenic or likely pathogenic, VUS)^{53, 54}, respectively. *ACMG*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AMP*, Association for Molecular Pathology; *CRC*, colorectal cancer; *RF*, arginine finger; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance; *WA*, Walker A; *WB*, Walker B; *WH*, winged-helix; *ZF*, zinc-finger.

Supplementary Figure 4. Mutational signature analysis of metastasized CRCs from monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers in the HMF cancer-specific cohort. Mutational signature analysis was conducted on metastasized CRCs from monoallelic *MCM8/MCM9* variant carriers in the HMF cancer-specific cohort. The heatmap displays unsupervised hierarchical clustering of the SBS mutational signature profiles. This analysis included tumors from four monoallelic *MCM8* and three monoallelic *MCM9* variant carriers without a second hit in the *MCM8/MCM9* genes. All germline *MCM8/MCM9* variants were classified as VUS per the ACMG/AMP classification for variant interpretation.^{53, 54} The


rows represent SBS mutational signatures, while the columns represent individual samples. The identification of SBS mutational signatures was achieved by fitting the counts of SNVs per 96 trinucleotide context to the COSMIC signatures⁷¹, employing the MutationalPatterns tool.⁷² *ACMG*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AMP*, Association for Molecular Pathology; *HMF*, Hartwig Medical Foundation; *SBS*, single base substitution; *SNV*, single nucleotide variant; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance.

Supplementary Figure 5. Mutational signature analysis on TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas samples


harboring somatic *MCM8/MCM9* mutation(s). (A) Heatmaps showing unsupervised hierarchic clustering of the SBS mutational signature profiles of TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas tumors with somatic *MCM8/MCM9* mutation(s). Rows represent SBS mutational signatures, while columns represent individual samples. In clusters represented by SBS7a/b (UV damage), SBS2 and SBS13 (APOBEC activity), SBS6, SBS14, SBS15, SBS20, and SBS21 (MMR deficiency), or SBS10a/b (POLE deficiency), the somatic *MCM8/MCM9* variants were likely secondary to other mutational processes.^{66, 67, 71, 78, 79}

Tumors with likely pathogenic *MCM8* (n=1) or *MCM9* (n=4) variants in the unexplained clusters were marked by red squares. (B) In tumors with likely pathogenic *MCM8* (n=1) or *MCM9* (n=4) variants from the unexplained clusters, shared SBS mutational signatures included SBS22 (aristolochic acid exposure), SBS42 (haloalkane exposure), and SBS54 (sequencing artefact). Notably, SBS mutational signatures associated with MMR deficiency (SBS6, SBS14, SBS15, SBS20, SBS21) were also present in three of these five tumors. However, these could be explained by a likely pathogenic *MLH1* variant and two variants of unknown significance in the *MSH6* gene in one (TCGA-DI-A1BU-01) of these tumors. The TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas was assessed via cBioPortal for Cancer Genomics (<https://www.cbioportal.org/>) in February-April, 2023. *ACMG*, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics; *AMP*, Association for Molecular Pathology; *LP*, likely pathogenic; *mt*, mutation; *SBS*, single base substitution; *TCGA*, The Cancer Genome Atlas; *VUS*, variant of uncertain significance; *wt*, wildtype.


A. *MCM8/MCM9*




C. *MCM8/MCM9*






B. *MCM8*



MCM9







**Events**

- × Death/lost to follow-up
- Polyposis
- CRC
- ▲ Other type(s) of cancer
- ◆ Hypogonadism

A. MCM8



B. MCM9



Reported phenotype		ACMG/AMP	
◊ (black)	CRC	◊ (black)	VUS
◊ (white)	Hypogonadism	◊ (white)	Pathogenic or likely pathogenic
◊ (grey)	Other type(s) of cancer		
◊ (white)	Polyposis		

A.

	Sample ID	Genotype	NGS	Matched germline sequencing	Tumor type
MCM9	P4_7T	biallelic <i>MCM9</i>	WES	y	CRC
	P4_8T		WES	y	colon polyp with infiltrating CRC
	P5_9T	biallelic <i>MCM9</i>	WES	n	colon polyp
	P5_10T		WES	n	colon polyp
	P5_34AB		WGS	n	melanoma + polyp
	P5_34C		WGS	n	colon polyp
	P8_33A		WGS	n	stomach carcinoma
	P8_33B	biallelic <i>MCM9</i>	WGS	n	CRC
	P8_33C		WGS	n	colon polyp
P7_12T	monoallelic <i>MCM8</i> , monoallelic <i>MCM9</i>	WES	y	CRC	
MCM8	P1_1T	monoallelic <i>MCM8</i>	WES	n	germ cell tumor
	P2_2T	monoallelic <i>MCM8</i>	WES	y	breast cancer
	P2_3T		WES	y	breast cancer
	P6_11T	monoallelic <i>MCM8</i>	WES	n	colon polyp
	P6_24A		WGS	n	colon polyp
	P6_24B		WGS	n	colon polyp
Control	P3_4T	wildtype <i>MCM8</i> / <i>MCM9</i>	WES	n	CRC
	P3_5T		WES	n	colon polyp
	P3_6T		WES	n	colon polyp

B.

MCM8/MCM9 variant carriers

wildtype control

