Single Gene Disorders: Cystic Fibrosis and Family History

Richard B. Parad, MD, MPH Brigham and Women's Hosptial Department of Newborn Medicine Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA and New England Newborn Screening Program University of Massachusetts Medical School

Family History for CF Risk Assessment

- As an autosomal recessive disorder, prior to the 1989 CFTR gene discovery, carrier status could only be identified by being the parent of an affected child, and other family members provided with a calculated risk, and dx only through sx or FHx.
- DNA diagnostics now allow direct carrier identification, but the test is imperfect, expensive and benefits from focus.
- Population screening for CF carrier status (national) and CF newborn screening (state based) are developments that change but do not preclude the importance of FHx.

Cystic Fibrosis Clinical

- Lung Disease
 - chronic infection, inflammation and airway obstruction
- Gastrointestinal Disease
 - pancreatic insufficiency with fat malabsorption leading to malnutrion
- Salt Loss with high sweat chloride
- Sterility in males
- Other
 - cirrhosis, diabetes

Estimated Incidence by Ethnic/Racial Background

Caucasian
Hispanic
African-American
Asian

1/3,000 1/6,000 1/10,000 1/30,000

Symptoms in 864 Newly Diagnosed Patients With CF

RESPIRATORY	52.1%
Failure to thrive/malnutrition	32.2%
Steatorrhea & malabsorption	27.2%
Meconium ileus	19.9%
Family history	15.3%
Neonatal screening	4.5%

Family History and CF Dx

Literature estimates - must distinguish between:

- CF diagnosis because of + FHx
 - Only information is that a relative is affected
 - underwent carrier testing (population scr, infertility, +FHx)
 - underwent prenatal diagnosis
 - screening ultrasound echogenic or dilated bowel
 - amniocentesis for AMA or specific risks
 - had newborn sweat and or genetic testing done

found to have + FHx at time of CF diagnosis

 Together, +FHx estimates were 10 - 15%, but now higher with population screening and +NBS (TP and FP)

Age at Diagnosis - All Patients, 2004



Median Predicted Survival Age, 1985-2004



The median predicted survival is 35.1 years for 2004. The whiskers represent the 95 percent confidence bounds for the survival estimates, so the 2004 median predicted survival is between 33 and 38.1 years.

Survival from Age One, by Year of Birth



Actual survival of patients in the Registry has steadily improved since 1980. Of patients born between 1980 and 1984 (the earliest cohort shown here), 90.2 percent survived to age 15. For patients born between 1990 and 1994, 95.2 survived to age 15.

Diagnosis

Phenotype: Lung, GI, GU sx

- Supporting evidence:
 - Sputum cx, CXR, stool fat, GU exam
- FHx

CFTR Function:

- Pilocarpine iontophoresis: sweat [CI-] 75mg sweat
 - Normal <40 (<30 for newborns)
 - Borderline 40 59 (30 59 for newborns)
 - CF ≥ 60
- Nasal PD

Genotype: At least one mutation detected

Modifiers of Phenotype





Discovery of CFTR and the ∆F508 Mutation

Cystic Fibrosis Transmembrane Conductance Regulator (CFTR) Gene

- Gene 250,000 bp
 mRNA 6,000 bp
 Protein 1480 aa
 - ABC transporter superfamily
- Mutations identified >1,400 (2005)



Frequency of 25 CF Gene Mutations

20 of 25 mutations tested were found (84% of CF alleles)



Kristidis P, et al. Am J Hum Genet. 1992;50:1178-84.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF F508

	% CF CHROM F508
UK	0.80
Toronto	0.71
Spain	0.51
Italy N/C/S	0.75/0.50/0.30
Israel	0.30
Baltimore(Black)	0.37
Boston	0.62

Molecular Consequences of CFTR Mutations

Normal	I	II	III	IV	v
	No synthesis	Block in processing	Block in regulation	Altered	Reduced synthesis
_	Nonsense G542X	Missense	Missense G551D	Missense R117H	Missense A455E
	Frameshift 394deITT	AA deletion ∆F508			Alternative Splicing
	Splice junction			3	849+10kbC->T

Newborn Screening Impact

Diagnosis as newborn by NBS

August 1994

3 month old diagnosed during 2001 in a non-screening state



Newborn screening for cystic fibrosis

Photo courtesy of Frank J. Accurso, MD

Wisconsin CF Neonatal Screening RCT: Growth of Screened and Traditionally Diagnosed Patients

(Farrell et al, J Pediatrics 2005;147:S30-S36)





Recommendations and Reports

October 15, 2004 / Vol. 53 / No. RR-13

Newborn Screening for Cystic Fibrosis

Evaluation of Benefits and Risks and Recommendations for State Newborn Screening Programs



Image courtesy of Natus Medical Incorporated

INSIDE: Continuing Education Examination

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION "On the basis of a preponderance of evidence, the health benefits to children with CF outweigh the risk of harm and justify screening for CF."



Cystic Fibrosis Newborn Screening: Evidence for Benefit and Current Experience

PROCEEDINGS FROM A WORKSHOP CO-SPONSORED BY THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION AND THE CYSTIC FIBROSIS FOUNDATION, ATLANTA, GEORGIA, NOVEMBER 20-21, 2003

> CO-GLEST EDITORS: RICHARD PARAD, MD, MPH PHILIP FARRELL, MD, PHD PRESTON CAMPBELL, MD

Publication of proceedings supported by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and unrestricted educational grants from Pfizer, Inc. Solvay Pharmaceuticals

www.jpeds.com

155N 0822-3476

Current Status of CF NBS (2006)



Projected Status of CF Newborn Screening

US annual births ~ 4,000,000

	% births screened	New diagnoses		
2000	5%	50		
2006	25%	250		
2007	70%	700		
2010 (CFF	target) 100%	1,000		

Population Screening: NIH Consensus Statement 1997

Offer CF genetic screening to:

- Adults with positive FHx CF
- Partners of CF affected
- Couples planning pregnancy
- Couples seeking prenatal care

Implementation

Population Screening

PRO

- Maximize parental options
- Prevention of affecteds
- Cost effective

CON

- Test is imperfect
- Test is difficult to understand
- Results cause anxiety
- Parents may not act on results (25-75% terminate)

ACMG/ACOG/NIH

Implementation issues discussed:

- target population (universal vs. high risk ethnicities)
- couple vs. sequential
- mutation panel selection
- extended testing
- mild variant mutations
- test interpretation, reporting, genetic counseling
- laboratory QA

Joint recommendations for preconceptual and prenatal carrier screening for CF

Parent education pamphlets
Provider education programs
Who prepares/consents parents?
Who reports genotype?
Who is referred to genetic counseling?

ACMG 25

∆F508	G551D	R117H	W1282X	2789+5G>A
∆ I 507	G85E	R334W	1078delT	3120G>A
A455E	I148T	R347P	1717-1G>A	3659delC
711+1G>T	N1303K	R553X	1898+1G>A	3849+10kbC>T
G542X	R1162X	621+1 G>T	2184delA	621+1G>T

Risk after carrier testing

% mutations detected	Carrier risk if -	Risk CF offspring one parent +	Risk CF both parents -
0	1/25	NA	1/2500
70	1/83	1/331	1/27,000
80	1/124	1/494	1/61,000
85	1/165	1/661	1/109,200
90	1/246	1/984	1,242,100
95	1/491	1/1964	1/964,200

Ethnic adjustment for carrier risk

Estimated carrier risk

Ethnic group	Detection rate	Before test	After negative test
Ashkenazi Jewish	97%	1/29	~1/930
European Caucasian	80%	1/29	~1/140
African American	69%	1/65	~1/207
Hispanic American	57%	1/46	~1/105
Asian American	-	1/90	_

What do patients need to understand before consenting to testing?

- What is the disease and what is its outcome e.g., median survival, is there a cure?
- What are the Mendelian genetics ?
- What are the weaknesses of the genetic test (false negative)
- What will happen if the test is positive (what are the options for termination, insurance implications, clinical status of carrier)



Cystic Fibrosis Testing:

What Happens If Both My Partner and I Are Carriers?

Massachusetts Newborn Screening for CF





*ΔF508, R117H, G551D, G542X, W1282X, N1303K, R334W, 621+1G>T, R553X, ΔI507, 1717-1G>A, R347P, R560T, 3849+10kbC>T, A455E, 3120+1G>A, 3659delC, A559T, R1162X, S1255X, 405+3A>C, 711+1G>T, 2789+5G>A, G480C, 2307insA, G85E, 1078delT

Contact Algorithm: Call to Pedi with collection of FHx C elevated IRT, 2 CFTR mutations (6%) 1:1 likelihood of CF refer to CF center for intake/sweat test B elevated IRT, 1 CFTR mutation (70%) • 1:40 likelihood of CF: likely carrier refer for sweat testing, genetic counseling emphasis on genetic counseling post-sweat result A elevated IRT, zero CFTR mutations (24%) 1:100 likelihood of CF: probable FP. 1CU, 1ethnic refer for sweat test, no genetic counseling



New England Newborn Screening Program



TABLE 2. First Signs Prompting Clinical Suspicion for CF in 110 Screened-Positive, CF-Affected Infants as Reported by Primary Care Provider Upon Receipt of CF-Screen-Positive Result

	n	%
Specific Signs	34	31
Prenatal diagnosis	12	11
Meconium ileus	10	9
Other bowel obstruction	8	7
Both parents carriers; no prenatal diagnosis	4	4
Nonspecific signs (asymptomatic)	22	20
Slow weight gain; stooling issues	17	15
Rule out NEC	1	1
Fever and respiratory symptoms with	1	1
hospital admission		
Other unrelated*	3	3
Well or no signs prompting clinical suspicion	54	49

NEC indicates necrotizing enterocolitis.

* Transposition of the great arteries, umbilical granuloma, ear malformation.

Increase in % +FHx for CF Carrier (by Population screening of +NBS in family)



Over 4 years, 325 newborns were referred to a single CF center for +NBS and underwent GC (confirmation of NBS phone hx). 52 (16.7%) had +FHx due to genetic testing in family(population screening or positive newborn screen). Only 2% had affected family members. Note that only 10% of carriers are detected as CFNBS FP.

Understanding of Genetics

Mail survey of 64 CFNBS FP who underwent GC

Knowledge retention

- 32% answered all 6 questions correctly
- 50% answered 5 of 6 questions correctly
- Comprehension among "Non-Carrier" parents
 - Asked to chose between:
 - A. I am definitely not a carrier of CF, or
 - B. There is a small chance that I am a CF carrier
 - 53% answered A, 47% answered B
- 98% of families shared information with other family members

Anxiety scale showed 2-fold increase in carrier vs. non-carrier

Perspectives

Screener: Many pediatricians, when notified of a +CFNBS result, have not been told by the mother either that she underwent negative CF carrier screening (which ↓ risk), that a mutation was detected or what mutation.

Neonatologist: There is a significant degradation of important medical and family history information at the time of transmission between the mother's record and the newborn's new medical record.



ſ						OBSTET	RICAL H	ISTOR	Ŷ			
	Mo	/Yr	Sex	Ges. Age	EDC Birth ₩t.	: 04 Labor Hr.	/10/06 Birth Place	Del. Type	Anes.	Ch St	Pre. Onset	Comm.
	00	200	4					SAB				Ectopic not
	07 07 00 05	200 200 200 200	4 3 M 2	38	6-0(2722)		bwh	SAB PCS SAB SAB	SPI	L	N	abd cerclage 20wk loss of
												< OK >
l	AB: 1 ALT-1	next O(OK	fiel ():qui	ld SH it,NO(IIFT-TAB: pi CHANGES FILI	reviou ED A	s field rrow key	ESC ys to	: exit highli	ght,	enter	to select



Genetic Screening		Page	1
11/26/70 F 35 ADM:0	2/12/06 -	02/14/06	EDC
Questions applicable to patient, FUB, either's family	+/-	Commonte	
Patient age 35 or older		COMMETTS	
Down syndrome	i-i		
Neural Tube Defect	[-]		
Hemophilia	[-]		
Muscular dystrophy			
UYSTIC FIDFOSIS	[-] [-]		
Sickle cell (Dx or Trait)	[-]		
Mental retardation	i-i		
Jewish,French-Canadian,Italian,Mediterranean,Asian	[-]		
Meds/Drugs since LMP	[-]		
Pt. or FUB has child w/ birth defect not listed above .			
utner	[-]		
		0k	















· · · · ·		
	FLOW SHEET	
	G/P 6/1	UltraSound: Date: 08/15/05 GA: 6.0 EDC: 04/10/06
Gain: 5.2 TWG: 24 Date GA WT B/P	LMP: 07/07/05 P PRO/GLU FHR PRES	Ht Edema FA Prov. Cmt
01/18/06 28 2/7 137 98 01/18/06 Brief Note 01/18/06 Brief Note 01/13/06 Brief Note 01/12/06 Brief Note 01/11/06 27 2/7 136 112 12/28/05 25 2/7 135 83 12/14/05 23 2/7 131 106 11/30/05 21 2/7 128 85 11/21/05 Brief Note	/60 T N 2/60 T N +/+ /65 N N ++ V 6/73 T N ++ /66 N N +/+	- +/+ WILKINS- * 62/ NO ++ DUNN-ALB * ++ LUDMAN * - +/+ WILKINS- *
11/16/05 19 2/7 123 103	3/75 NN sonox2	posx2 WILKINS- * 🔽
ENTER to select a visit,	arrow keys to move up o	or down one visit

Note

- first US here 2v cord and EIF did not get NL scans done to her knowledge,
- discussed increased risk for trisomy 21 with EIF, also with second finding of 2v cord; cardiac and renal are normal; given 24 yo egg donor even increasing her risk 3-5 fold would still result in an absoulte risk which is small (majority would be normal) - risk of 1/200 for amnio discussed,
- selective reduction discussed will talk to husband and let me know

etificioe noip	000 ab y 0	
	,	
		ABO: [B]] RH: [POS]
TEST	DATE	RESULT
Antibody Screen:	[02/14/06]]	[NEG]
RPR:	[01/11/06]	INEGATIVE
Hct/Hgb:	[02/15/06]]	[29.1*#]
HBsAG:	109/06/05 1	[NEGATIVE]
GLT/GLU:	[01/11/06]	[186*]
GTT:	[01/18/06]	[;NO FASTING SAMPLE RECEIVED-148-175*-161*]
Rubella:	109/06/05 1	(POSITIVE)
GC:	109/06/05 1	INEGATIVE
Urine Culture:	[01/25/06]	[Total Colony Count: 10,000]
Chlamydia:	109/06/05 1	INEGATIVE
Pap Smear:	109/06/05 1	[neg]
PPD:	[]	[]
MSAFP:	[]	[]
AMNIO/CVS:	[]	[]
HIV:	[]	[]
Sickle/Hgb Elec:	[]	[]
Group B Štrep:	[01/25/06]	(BETA HEMOLYTIC STREPTOCOCCUS GROUP B 1
<non bwh="" p="" results<=""></non>	s> < <mark>Flow</mark>	Sheet> <additional results=""> <ok></ok></additional>

INPATIENT ADMISSION SHEET

NEWBORN FACESHEET

BRIGHAM AND WOMEN'S HOSPITAL BOSTON, MA 02115

> ADMIT DATE: 02/16/06 ADMIT TIME: 22:46

MATERNAL DATA

MOTHER'S MR#: 20504163 MOTHER'S ROOM #: LAB-15

Age: 24 G: P: EDC: 03/01/06 GA: 38 wks. Blood Type: A+ Antibody screen: NEG Prenatal Information: RUBELLA Positive RPR HBsAg Negative GC Chlamydia GBS Negative TOX scrn

PPD

LABOR Room: L04 Complications of labor: Birth Weight: 5 LBS. 2 OZ. (2325 GRAMS) Length of ROM: 7 hrs. 31 min. None Birth Weight: 5 LBS. 2 OZ. (45 CMS.) DELIVERY Date: 02/16/06 Time: 22:46 Route: Vaginal Spontaneous Apgar Score: 9 9 Length: 18 INCHES (45 CMS.)

SEX: F BIRTHDATE: 02/16/06 AGE: 0

ADMIT DIAGNOSIS: NEWBORN

ADMIT DIAGNOSIS CODE: V30.00 ADMIT STATUS: NEWBORN

'RO

0

BRIGHAM AND WOMEN'S HOSPITAL A Teaching Affiliate of Harvard Medical School 75 Francis Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115	
NEWBORN SUMMARY	
Infant's Last Name	
MATERNAL DATA Age 24 G 3 P A EDC 3-1-06 Blood Type A+ Prenata PRENATAL HISTORY For Prenatal Screens - See infant face sheet G3 P 2 EDC 31106 C381 GBS (-) HCP (-) RI Present pregnancy -> 2VC, TUF, declined Amniu	Il Care Utilization: Visits <5 Initial Visit > 28 wks. - - -
LABOR OB Provider ROMhrs 2/16/06 C315m. Sepsis Risk Factors (check all that apply): Delivery Room Course: Delivery Room Course: Delivery Room Course: Delivery Room Course: Delivery Room Course: Delivery Room Course: Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Mec. foord : yes Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Called t L+D d/t perstal Sex: 0 M DF Date 2 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Apgars 9 10 Apgars 9 9 10 Apgars 9 10 A	HC 340 Len 450 BW 23301 5.2 165
Feeding Plans: breast bottle D/C date: / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /	-
Plans/Instructions: Questions can be directed to Newborn Medicine, (617) 732-7739 Signature	



BRIGHAM AND WOMEN'S HOSPITAL A Teaching Afiiliate of Harvard Medical School 75 Francis Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

NEWBORN EVALUATION

This infant is classified as: Est GA	DATE
	and the second second second second
Pre-term (<36 weeks) L1 rerm (36-42 weeks) L1 Post-term (>42weeks)	1
LI SGA LI AGA LI LGA	
Wt Ibozgm HCcm Ltin	
Physical Examination	
Date of Time of AM Baby's age	
exam / / exam PM at exam hrs.	
Respiration	
Temperature Pulse rate rate	
SYSTEM AND ADDRESS	
Tone/Appearance	
Skin: color, lesions,	
Head/Neck	
Eves 00	
Lunos	
Heart O	
Abdomen	
Pulses	
Genitalia	
Extramitiae/lointe	
Neurologic/Reflexes	
	-
SIGNATURE	
	¶
D/C PE: Normal	
Specify Abnormalities:	

Conclusion

Tool should be developed for transmission of **OB**/perinatal history as foundation for pediatric tool. Prenatal and perinatal data may be important to predicting pediatric disease.