Usefulness of copy number variant detection following monogenic disease exclusion in prenatal diagnosis
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Abstract

Aim: Families with an adverse history of monogenic disease focus on single-gene diagnosis instead of low-depth whole-genome sequence, during subsequent pregnancies. The aim of this study was to assess the potential usefulness of low-depth whole-genome sequencing (copy number variant sequencing [CNV-seq]) detection following monogenic disease exclusion in prenatal diagnosis.

Methods: A total of 285 families with a history of monogenic disease (of 41 different types; eliminated during the current pregnancy) were recruited and retrospectively analyzed. Low-depth whole-genome sequencing (CNV-Seq, Next-Seq CN500 platform) was performed for all fetuses.

Results: The CNV detection results of the 285 samples were as follows: one case of 18-trisomy chimera (0.35%), one case of pathogenic 3q29 microdeletion syndrome CNV (0.35%), four cases of variant of uncertain significance (VUS) CNVs (1.40%), and four cases of Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD) carriers (1.40%); and the remaining samples were normal (96.15%). Of note, 2/285 (0.70%) samples still exhibited pathogenic abnormalities. All positive samples were followed up where the two cases of pathogenic abnormalities elected the pregnancy termination, while the four VUS cases and four DMD-carrier cases were born healthy.

Conclusion: In cases where prenatal fetal monogenic disease has been ruled out, CNV detection is still beneficial and should be performed to prevent missed pathogenic CNVs. However, the costs need to be balanced against benefits, and the research will need to assess other types of testing.
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Introduction

With the development of high-throughput technology, an increasing number of monogenic disease mutation sites have been identified, and the demand for prenatal diagnosis is increasing. Prenatal diagnosis of monogenic diseases has become routine in China. Almost all monogenic diseases are rare diseases. Guidelines of diagnosis and treatment of rare diseases (2019) were issued by National Health Commission of People’s Republic of China. The guidelines include overview, etiology and epidemiology, clinical manifestations, auxiliary examinations, diagnosis, differential diagnosis, treatment and diagnosis flowchart of 121 monogenic diseases.

There are usually two types of prenatal diagnosis results: (i) the fetus is affected, in which case the family usually chooses to terminate the pregnancy, and (ii) the fetus is a carrier or healthy, in which case the family will usually continue with the pregnancy. In general, genetic counseling for carriers of monogenic disease focuses on fertility (natural or assisted
reproduction), genetic inheritance, prenatal diagnosis, and counseling for their offspring, whereas, genetic counseling for pregnant individuals with a carrier or healthy fetus would follow conventional process including prenatal screening or prenatal diagnosis.

In addition to testing for single-gene disease, prenatal diagnostic techniques include chromosome karyotype analysis, chromosome microarray analysis (CMA), low-depth whole-genome sequencing (CNV-Seq), whole exome sequencing (WES) and whole genome sequencing (WGS). However, whether fetuses with a ‘normal’ prenatal diagnosis require further chromosomal analysis and how best to perform these tests remains a concern for both doctors and families.

Genome copy number variants (CNVs) are copies of DNA sequences that are usually >1 kb in size, which can result in microdeletions, microduplications and complex rearrangements of the genome.1 CNVs have been found to play a vital role in an increasing number of human diseases such as autism, schizophrenia and epilepsy.2 Pathogenic CNVs have been shown to cause >300 types of chromosomal microdeletion and microduplication syndromes,2 with an overall incidence of approximately 1/600,3,4 accounting for 50% of birth defects caused by chromosomal abnormalities.5 Low-coverage massively parallel CNV sequencing (CNV-seq) technology is based on whole-genome next-generation sequencing technology6 and has been established as a suitable first-tier diagnostic test for detecting clinically significant fetal chromosome anomalies.7 However, it remains unclear whether pregnant women with a previous monogenic-disease birth or family history, which have been ruled out in the current pregnancy, requires CNV testing.

As CNV-Seq has optimum resolution of CNV and is affordable for patients. Hence, the aim of this study was to assess the potential usefulness of CNV detection following monogenic disease exclusion in prenatal diagnosis by CNV-Seq.

Methods

Subjects

A total of 774 pregnant women with a history of monogenic disease birth, treated at the Department of Genetics and Prenatal Diagnosis of the First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University from January 2017 to December 2019, were recruited. The flowchart of prenatal diagnosis process in 771 families with monogenic diseases was showed in Figure 1. And, 285 of 593 ‘normal’ group added the CNV testing. The average age of the women was 31.4 years (range: 19–46). The average gestational age of the women was 14 weeks (range: 11–29). The subjects were divided

Figure 1 The flowchart of prenatal diagnosis process in 285 families with monogenic diseases.
Genetics counseling

Genetic counseling for the candidate women before prenatal diagnosis using CNV-seq mainly contains the scopes and limitations of CNVs testing, especially for the possible detection of pathogenic CNV of incomplete penetrance, variant of uncertain significance (VUS) CNV, and further required parent-origin detection.

Samples

Chorionic villus sampling or amniocentesis was performed as previously described.8–10 Maternal peripheral blood samples were collected to eliminate maternal contamination. Genomic DNA was extracted from peripheral blood, chorionic villus, and amniocytes collected by centrifugation and washed with phosphate buffered saline using the DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen). Quantitative fluorescent PCR (QF-PCR) was used as the quality control to detect all DNA contamination. Short tandem repeat (STR) markers were used for chromosome 21 (D21S1435, D21S1411, D21S11), chromosome 18 (D18S1002, D18S391, D18S535, D18S386), chromosome 13 (DXS981, DXS6809, DXS22), and sex chromosomes X and Y according to the operating procedures.7

CNV-Seq

CNV-seq was performed as previously described.7 The identified CNVs (BLAST with hg19) were queried against public databases, including but not limited to DGV (http://dgv.tcag.ca/dgv/app/home), gnomAD (https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/), DECIPHER (https://decipher.sanger.ac.uk/), OMIM (https://www.omim.org/), UCSC (https://genome.ucsc.edu/) and ClinGen (https://dosage.clinicalgenome.org/), and pathogenicity was assessed according to the latest guidelines outlined by the American College of Medical Genetics (ACMG).11 CNVs were classified into five levels: benign, likely benign, VUS, likely pathogenic, and pathogenic.

| Table 1 Abnormal CNVs results in 285 fetuses with monogenic diseases excluded | Category | Pregnancy outcomes | Age at follow-up | Monogenic disease | CNV-seq results | Genotype | Pathogenic CNV results | Annotations | Clinical significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DMD | 47,XN,+18 | Termination of pregnancy | NA | NA | | | | | |
| SMA | 3q29 | Born healthy | NA | NA | | | | | |
| DMD | 22q11.21 | Born healthy | 4 | VUS CNVs | | | | | |
| PKU | 5q13.3-14q14.1 | Born healthy | 1 year and 7 months | | | | | |
| Deafness | 22q11.21 | Born healthy | 1 year and 5 months | | | | | |
| IRD | 18p11.31-p11.23 | Born healthy | 10 months | | | | | |
| DMD carriers | 46,XX,Xp21.1 | DMD carriers | 4 | DMD carriers | | | | | |
| | 46,XX,Xp21.1 | DMD carriers | 1 year and 9 months | | | | | |
| | 46,XX,Xp21.1 | DMD carriers | 2 years | | | | | |
| | 46,XX,Xp21.1 | DMD carriers | 1 year and 7 months | | | | | |

CNVs, copy number variant; DMD, Duchenne muscular dystrophy; PKU, phenylketonuria; SMA, spinal muscular atrophy; VUS, variant of uncertain significance.
Results

One case of 18-trisomy chimera and four DMD carriers were detected among 123 prenatal cases excluded for DMD disease

DMD is an X-linked recessive inherited neuromuscular disease caused by mutations in the disease-causing gene DMD. DMD mutation types include deletion (55–65%), duplication (5–10%), point mutation (25%) and other types (approximately 8%)\(^1\). Of the 123 cases excluded for DMD disease, CNV-Seq detected one case of 18-trisomy chimera and four DMD carriers.

In the 18-trisomy chimera case, the 33-year-old pregnant woman already had a son with DMD and was particularly anxious as to whether the fetus had DMD disease. Although the fetus was excluded for DMD using MLPA, suspected 18-trisomy was detected using QF-PCR and 18-trisomy chimera was confirmed in CNV-seq (Fig. 2a,b). The chimera ratio was 70%, as shown in Figure 2. The family chose to terminate the pregnancy following adequate genetic counseling.

In the 4/123 cases diagnosed as carriers of DMD heterozygosity by MLPA, a heterozygous deletion at Xp21.1 was also revealed using CNV-Seq. The deleted fragment contains the DMD gene (Table 1 and Fig. 3 [CNV results of one case]).

One case of 3q29 microdeletion syndrome was found among 31 cases excluded for SMA disease

A 34-year-old pregnant woman with a normal ultrasound at 12 weeks of gestation underwent chorionic villus sampling for SMA testing. Although the results were SMA-negative, a 1.66 Mb deletion in 3q29 (195 740 000 – 197 400 000) was detected by CNV-seq (Fig. 4). The deletion region contained 23 protein-coding genes, including 19 Online Mendelian Inheritance in Man (OMIM) genes, and spanned 3q29 recurrent microdeletion region (including the Discs large homolog 1 gene, DLG1; chr3: 195756054 – 197 344 662), with sufficient haploinsufficiency dosage pathogenicity (ISCA-37443). The haploinsufficiency phenotype was 3q29 deletion syndrome. The clinical manifestations of 3q29 microdeletion syndrome vary greatly, from mild to moderate developmental delay, autism disorder, intellectual disability, language developmental delay and microcephaly\(^13\).\(^14\) Therefore, the family chose to terminate the pregnancy after adequate genetic counseling.

Four VUS CNVs were detected among a total of 285 cases

VUS CNVs represent a broad category with no identified evidence proving pathogenicity; these CNVs require further investigation and testing of parental origin. In our study, four cases of VUS CNVs were detected among 285 cases. One case of 5q13.3q14.1 duplication, one that of 18p11.31p11.23 duplication, and two cases of 22q11.21 duplication; all inherited from the parents with normal phenotype. Hence, the families chose to continue the pregnancies. Four cases of VUS CNVs and four DMD-carrier cases were born healthy and were followed up for 7 months to 2 years.

Discussion

Monogenic disease is a type of genetic disease caused by a single gene mutation; it includes >10 000 types, most of which are rare diseases, with a total incidence of approximately 2–3%.\(^15\).\(^16\) Currently clinical testing of monogenic disease genes is carried out using Sanger sequencing, MLPA, gene-panels, next-generation gene sequencing, whole-exome sequencing, whole-genome sequencing and third-generation sequencing technology. Sanger sequencing, MLPA and gene-panels are the most commonly used methods for monogenic diseases with identified causal genes, as they are economical and fast. In addition, a series of diagnostic methods and strategies have been introduced for monogenic diseases.\(^17\) However, to date, there is no prenatal diagnosis strategy once monogenic diseases are excluded.

As CNV-seq has been demonstrated to be a suitable first-tier diagnostic test for detecting clinically significant fetal chromosome anomalies,\(^7\) we performed a retrospective analysis including 285 families in which prenatal monogenic diseases had been excluded and that had undergone additional voluntary CNV testing. We found that a 0.70% risk of abnormal pathogenicity (one case of 18-trisomy chimera and one case of 3q29 microdeletion syndrome) remained, and four cases of VUS CNVs (0.14%) and four DMD-carrier cases (0.14%) were observed.

At present, few cases of 3q29 microdeletion have been identified in fetuses in China and abroad. Zhang et al.\(^1\) reported a prenatal diagnosis of an intrauterine growth retardation fetus with 3q29 deletion syndrome, which constitutes a new variant,\(^18\) and...
Long et al. reported two cases of 3q29 deletion syndrome fetuses. A previous study found that most 3q29 deletions are de novo, and few cases are inherited from parents with phenotypes. The main clinical symptoms are ventricular septal defect and cleft lips and palate. However, no abnormalities were observed using ultrasound in our study. Coe et al. observed a 3q29 deletion in 11/29,085 cases of stunted children and 0/19,584 of the control group.

Figure 2 The results of 18-trisomy chimera detected by QF-PCR (a) and CNV-seq (b). The chimera ratio is about 70%.
In the four cases of female carriers of DMD heterozygosity, CNV detection showed a minimum of 200 kb and a maximum of 380 kb heterozygosity at Xp21.1, which was consistent with the original DMD MLPA test results. This indicates that CNV-Seq can verify heterozygous DMD carriers, which is consistent with the reported DMD detection results using single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) arrays or chromosome microarray.22,23

In addition, all positive samples were followed up: the two pathogenic cases underwent induced labor, while the four VUS cases and four DMD-carrier cases were born healthy.

As a gray area, VUS CNV brought a great challenge and difficulty for clinical genetic consulting. In addition, it may take the pregnant women and her family anxious. Currently, it is necessary to investigate the prenatal to further interpret the CNV in fetus. According to the research, 87.46% VUS were inherited from parents and there is no significant difference in abnormal pregnancy outcomes in the inherited, de novo, and refusal groups.24 And, in our study, all four VUS CNV were found to be inherited from parents with normal phenotype and were born healthy. In addition, pregnancy is a dynamic and long-term process, which needs comprehensive observation combined with ultrasound and other indicators. Therefore, the thorough and detailed informed consent is necessary. It is an urgent requirement to establish a database of VUS that includes features such as fetus ultrasound data, parental origin sources, pregnant outcome and postnatal development. This will provide a detailed guidance for interpreting VUS CNV more accurately.

Our results demonstrate that adding CNV detection can help prevent birth defects, as well as missed detection of pathogenic CNV in families in which the fetal single-gene disease has been ruled out. Thus, it was recommended to add the CNV detection in prenatal diagnosis guidelines of single disease. However, this diagnostic benefit needs to be balanced within a financial cost analysis as 309 families (51.9%) refused the test mainly due to the financial constraints. In 2019, per capita national income of the China was $10 410. The CNV testing costs about $365. It’s relatively expensive compared to the mean income. In addition, the limitation of this study lies in the number of family cases. In the future, the number of studies will be expanded and statistics will be analyzed again.

**Acknowledgments**

This study was supported by National Key R&D Program of China (grant number: 2018YFC1002206) and 2019 Medical Science and Technology Research Plan of Henan Province (LHGJ20190130).

**Disclosure**

None declared.

**References**

1. Iafrate AJ, Feuk L, Rivera MN et al. Detection of large-scale variation in the human genome. Nat Genet 2004; 36: 949–951.
2. Zhang F, Gu W, Hurles ME, Lupski JR. Copy number variation in human health, disease, and evolution. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet 2009; 10: 451–481.

3. Nevado J, Mergener R, Palomares-Bralo M et al. New microdeletion and microduplication syndromes: A comprehensive review. Genet Mol Biol 2014; 37(Suppl 1): 210–219.

4. Weise A, Mrasek K, Klein E et al. Microdeletion and microduplication syndromes. J Histchem Cytochem 2012; 60: 346–358.

5. Evans MI, Wapner RJ, Berkowitz RL. Noninvasive prenatal screening or advanced diagnostic testing: Caveat emptor. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2016; 215: 298–305.

6. Shi P, Li R, Wang C, Kong X. Influence of validating the parental origin on the clinical interpretation of fetal copy number variations in 141 core family cases. Mol Genet Genomic Med 2019; 7: e0094.

7. Wang J, Chen L, Zhou C et al. Prospective chromosome analysis of 3429 amniocenteses samples in China using copy number variation sequencing. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2018; 219: 287.e281.

8. Izetbegovic S, Mehdabyrinth S. Early amniocentesis as a method of choice in diagnosing gynecological diseases. Acta Inform Med 2013; 21: 270–273.

9. Huang L, Jiang T, Liu C. Fetal loss after amniocentesis: Analysis of a single center’s 7,957 cases in China. Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol 2015; 42: 184–187.

10. Akolekar R, Beta J, Picciarelli G, Ogilvie C, D’Antonio F. Procedure-related risk of miscarriage following amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2015; 45: 16–26.

11. Riggs ER, Andersen EF, Cherry AM et al. Technical standards for the interpretation and reporting of constitutional copy-number variants: A joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) and the Clinical Genome Resource (ClinGen). Genet Med 2020; 22: 245–257.

12. Maggio I, Chen X, Goncalves MA. The emerging role of viral vectors as vehicles for DMD gene editing. Genome Med 2016; 8: 59.

13. Quintero-Rivera F, Sharifi-Hannauer P, Martinez-Agosto JA. Autistic and psychiatric findings associated with the 3q29 microdeletion syndrome: Case report and review. Am J Med Genet A 2010; 152A: 2459–2467.

14. Mulle JG, Gambello MJ, Cook EH, Rutkowski TP, Glassford M. 3q29 recurrent deletion. In: Adam MP, Ardinger HH, Pagon RA et al. (eds). GeneReviews(R). Seattle, WA: 1993.

15. Wei Z. Single gene disease is not simple: The progress and prospect of gene diagnosis technology for single gene genetic disease. Chin J Prenat Diagn 2015; 4: 1–4.

16. Xiangdong K. Noninvasive prenatal genetic testing of single-gene genetic diseases. Chin J Obstet Gynecol 2018; 6: 421–424.

17. 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: 405–424.

18. Mengting Z. A case of 34q29 microdeletion leading to prenatal diagnosis of intrauterine growth retardation. Chin J Med Genet 2019; 6: 654.

19. Long W, Gu J, Ouyang J et al. Genetic analysis of two fetuses with congenital heart defects and 3q microdeletion. Zhonghua Yi Xue Yi Chuan Xue Za Zhi 2018; 5: 240–243.

20. Coe BP, Witherspoon K, Rosenfeld JA et al. Refining analyses of copy number variation identifies specific genes associated with developmental delay. Nat Genet 2014; 46: 1063–1071.

21. Cooper GM, Coe BP, Girirajan S et al. A copy number variation morbidity map of developmental delay. Nat Genet 2011; 43: 838–846.

22. Song T, Li Y, Xu Y et al. Incidental discovery of DMD gene deletions by chromosomal microarray analysis. Zhonghua Yi Xue Yi Chuan Xue Za Zhi 2019; 36: 773–776.

23. Lin S, Zhou Y, Zhou B, Gu H. Unexpected discovery of a fetus with DMD gene deletion using single nucleotide polymorphism array. Zhonghua Yi Xue Yi Chuan Xue Za Zhi 2017; 34: 563–566.

24. Chen L, Wang L, Yin D, Zeng Y, Tang F, Wang J. Influence of the detection of parent-of-origin on the pregnancy outcomes of fetuses with copy number variation of unknown significance. Sci Rep 2020; 10: 8864.

**Supporting information**

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher’s web-site:

**Table S1.** The category of monogenic diseases indicating prenatal diagnosis.

1008 © 2021 The Authors. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Research published by John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd on behalf of Japan Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology