# MMR: CanVIG-UK Gene-Specific Guidance



Date: 23/10/2023 Version: 1.6

A. Garrett<sup>1</sup>, S. Allen<sup>1</sup>, L. Loong<sup>1</sup>, M Durkie<sup>2</sup>, J. Drummond<sup>3</sup>, G.J. Burghel<sup>4</sup>, R. Robinson<sup>5</sup>, A. Callaway<sup>6</sup>, J. Field<sup>7</sup>, T. McDevitt<sup>8</sup>, T. McVeigh<sup>9</sup>, H. Hanson<sup>1,10,11</sup>, C. Turnbull<sup>1,9</sup>

- 1) Division of Genetics and Epidemiology, The Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK.
- 2) Sheffield Diagnostic Genetics Service, NEY Genomic Laboratory Hub, Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK
- 3) East Anglian Medical Genetics Service, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK
- 4) Manchester Centre for Genomic Medicine and NW Laboratory Genetics Hub, Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK
- 5) Yorkshire Regional Genetics Service, Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Leeds, UK
- 6) Wessex Regional Genetics Laboratory, Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust, Salisbury, UK
- 7) Genomics and Molecular Medicine Service, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK
- 8) Department of Clinical Genetics, CHI at Crumlin, Dublin, Ireland
- 9) The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, Fulham Road, London
- 10) Peninsula Regional Genetics Service, Royal Devon University Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Exeter, UK
- 11) Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

For use in conjunction with CanVIG-UK Consensus Specification for Cancer susceptibility Genes of ACGS Best Practice Guidelines for Variant Classification. Evidence lines for which there are no gene-specific recommendations should be reviewed in context of CanVIG-UK Consensus Specification for CancerSusceptibility Genes.

Evidence element and evidence strengths allowed		Thresholds/data-sources/applications specifically relevant to <u>MLH1,</u> <u>MSH2, MSH6, PMS2</u>			
<b>PS4: Case-control:</b> The prevalence of the variant in affected individuals is significantly increased compared with the prevalence in controls	_VSTR _MOD _SUP	<ul> <li>NHSD case control data can be used for case-control analysis:</li> <li>Controls should represent appropriate ethnicity and sex. (i.e. both male and female UKBiobank controls can be used)</li> <li>As this is an enriched series, OR≥10 is required</li> <li>Current data/denominator counts for base substitutions are available at <u>CanVar-UK</u></li> <li>For non-base-substitutions i.e. deletions/duplications/insertions, NHSD counts can be accessed from <u>CanVIG-UK</u></li> <li>A variant observation cannot be included within the case count used for PS4 case-control analyses if the same family has been used for family history scoring within PP4</li> </ul>			
PP4: Phenotypic specificity/case counting (Patient's phenotype or family history is highly specific for a disease with a single genetic aetiology)	_VSTR _STR _MOD _SUP	Evidence Points       Cellular/molecular phenotype         0.5       For MLH1 variant with MLH1 promoter methylation statu unknown         • MSI high AND/OR       • Loss on immunohistochemistry (IHC) of MLH1+PMS AND/OR         • Loss of MLH1 on IHC (PMS2 IHC status unknown)         1       Informative LOH at chromosomal locus of tumour-suppr gene         For MSH2, MSH6 variant         • MSI high AND/OR         • Loss on IHC of same single protein as variant AND/	S2 essor		

#### Evidence towards Pathogenicity

	e.g For ML methyla • MS • Los For PM • MS • Los • Los	. for MSH2 varian H1 variant where ation status I high <b>AND/OR</b> ss of MLH1+PMS ss of MLH1 on IH0 IS2 variant I high <b>AND/OR</b> ss of PMS2 alone ss of MLH1+PMS ed for MSI or IHC, n ed for both LOH AN ven to carry the gerr t primary tumours ca	t, loss of MSH2- MLH1 proven no 2 on IHC <b>AND/C</b> C (PMS2 IHC sta on IHC <b>AND/OF</b> 2 on IHC ot both D MSI/IHC nline variant can c	ormal MLH1 promoter <b>R</b> atus unknown) <b>R</b> contribute tumour data
	mily History Scorir	Isolated single primary or first cancer in proband/family (≥50, 40-49, <40)	Additional family members* or cancers in proband; for each cancer (≥50, 40-49, <40):	Evidence Points
	Colon (CRC), Endometrium (EC), TCC (renal pelvis/ureter only), small bowel Rectum, ovary,	(2, 4, 6)	(4, 6, 8)	Divide the sum of family history scores across available families by 7 to get the evidence points • 7= 1EP= sup
	gastric, hepatobiliary, pancreas, TCC (bladder)			• 14= 2EP= mod
•	Manchester data ser *For a multiplex fami In a family cluster of the cluster The proband is the y A family can only be tumour data availabl A family cannot be u already been include (but can be used for The variant must be cancer population fro within the non-cance Where family history pathogenic boundary registry	ties (courtesy of Eva ily cluster of $\leq 3$ case $\geq 4$ cases, one unaf coungest case in the included for family e supporting misma sed for family histor d within the case of tumour scoring) present in $\leq 2$ indivi- om gnomAD v2 and er populations of gno score influences fin y), cancer family histor	ans, Woodward) es, relatives shoul fected intervening family with CRC// history scoring wh tch repair deficien ry scoring for PP4 ounts for case-cor duals from the Nor ≤1 individuals fro omAD v2 nal classification (€ tory should be cor	en there is concordant acy (i.e. MSI/IHC) if the same family has atrol analyses within PS4 n-Finnish European non- m each other ethnic group e.g. at VUS/likely afirmed through cancer
•	combination A single family ca The same individ scoring A maximum of 2 publication	an contribute no lual can contribu evidence points PM3 (biallelic)/Pl	more than 2 e ute to both tum can be award P1(segregation	our and family history ed for a single ) cannot be used

PM2: Absent from	_MOD	
controls (or at	_SUP	
extremely low frequency		
if recessive) in ESP,		
1000GP, or ExAC		
PVS1: Predicted null	_VSTR	Based on InSiGHT recommendations for initiation codon variants, the
variant (in a gene	STR	following PVS1 strengths apply to initiation codon variants and truncating
where LOF is a known	MOD	variants identified in the first 100 bp of the MMR genes:
mechanism of disease)	_	MLH1 – very strong
	_SUP	MSH2 – do not use
		MSH6 – strong
		PMS2 – strong
PS1: Same amino acid	STR	FINGZ - Strong
change as an	_31K	
established variant		
	MOD	
PM4: Protein-length-	_MOD	
changing variant	_SUP	
PM5: Novel missense	_MOD	
change at an amino	SUP	
acid residue where a		
different missense		
change determined to		
be pathogenic seen		
before		
PP3: In silico: Multiple	SUP	
lines of computational		
evidence support a		
deleterious effect on the		
gene or gene product		
<b>PM1, PP2:</b>	STR	
Enrichment/constraint:		
<b>PP2</b> : Missense variant	_MOD	
in a gene that has a low	_SUP	
•		
rate of benign missense		
variation and in which		
missense variants are a		
common mechanism of		
disease		
<b>PM1:</b> Located in a		
mutational hot spot		
and/or critical and well-		
established functional		
domain (e.g. active site		
of an enzyme) without		
benign variation		
PS3: Functional: Well-	_VSTR	
established in vitro or in	_STR	
vivo functional studies	_MOD	
supportive of a	_SUP	
damaging effect on the	_001	
gene or gene product		
PP1: Co-segregation	_VSTR	Cases already used for tumour/family history scoring in PP4 cannot
with disease in multiple	STR	additionally be used for PP1
affected family members	_MOD	
in a gene definitively	_SUP	
known to cause the	_30P	
disease		
L		

<b>PS2/PM6: De novo</b> (maternity and paternity confirmed/unconfirmed) in a patient with the disease and no family history	_STR _MOD _SUP	
<b>PM3: in trans</b> with a pathogenic variant ( <b>recessive disorders</b> )	_STR _MOD _SUP	A constitutional mismatch repair deficiency (CMMRD) phenotype can be used for PM3 application Cases already used for tumour/family history scoring in PP4 cannot additionally be used for PM3
<b>PP5: Reputable source</b> recently reports variant as pathogenic, but the evidence is not available to the laboratory to perform an independent evaluation	_VSTR _STR _MOD _SUP	

### Evidence towards Benignity

Evidence towards Benighity		
BA1/BS1: Allele frequency	_SA	BA1: MTAF = 0.001 (0.1%)
is "too high" in ExAC or	_STR	BS1: MTAF = 0.0001 (0.01%)
gnomAD for disorder		The MTAF (maximum tolerated allele frequency) has been
		calculated via cardiodb using the calculate AF function: prevalence 1
		in 15 ( <i>MLH1</i> ), 1 in 15 ( <i>MSH2</i> ), 1 in 36 ( <i>MSH6</i> ), 1 in 36 ( <i>PMS2</i> );
		genetic heterogeneity 0.01; allelic heterogeneity 1.0 (BA1) 0.1 (BS1:
		MLH1, MSH2, PMS2) 0.15 (MSH6); penetrance 0.45 (MLH1), 0.43
		(MSH2), 0.41 (MSH6), 0.12 (PMS2). See training resources from
		Miranda Durkie for further details.
		Cancer-free controls should be used when determining the
		maximum allele count / filtering allele frequency; therefore it is
		permissible to use the cancer-free PopMAX FAF on gnomAD
		against the MTAF cutoffs for BA1/BS1.
		See consensus guidelines for further details on PopMAX FAF,
		and the use of cardiodb for calculating the maximum allele count /
		filtering allele frequency.
BS2: Observation in	_STR	
controls inconsistent with	_SUP	
disease penetrance.		
Observed in a healthy adult individual for a recessive		
(homozygous), dominant (heterozygous), or X-linked		
(hemizygous) disorder, with		
full penetrance expected at		
an early age		

BP4: In silico: Multiple lines	_SUP	
of computational evidence		
suggest no impact on gene		
or gene product		
(conservation, evolutionary,		
splicing impact, etc.)		
BP1: Missense variant in a	SUP	
gene for which primarily	_00.	
truncating variants are		
known to cause disease		
BP7: Synonymous (silent)	_SUP	
variant for which splicing	_	
prediction algorithms predict		
no impact to the splice		
consensus sequence		
•		
BP3: In-frame	SUP	
deletions/insertions in a		
repetitive region		
BS3: Well-established in	_STR	
vitro or in vivo functional	MOD	
studies show no damaging	SUP	
effect on protein function or	_30P	
splicing		
BS4: Non segregation with	STR	
disease	SUP	
	_001	
BP2: Observed in trans	STR	
with a pathogenic variant	SUP	
for a fully penetrant	_001	
dominant gene/disorder or		
observed in cis		
BP6: Reputable source	STR	
recently reports variant as	SUP	
benign, but the evidence is		
not available to the		
laboratory to perform an		
independent evaluation		
BP5: Alternate molecular	_SUP	
basis for disease		
		1

## Version History/Amendments

Revised version	Date	Section	Update	Amended by	Approved by
1.4	03/11/2021	PP4/PS4	Tumour and family history scoring information combined together in PP4, tumour scoring system updated. Ordering of evidence criteria amended.	Turnbull	CStAG
1.4	02/12/2021	PS4	Addition of guidance on using NHSD data for case-control analyses	Garrett	CStAG
1.4	17/12/2021	PVS1	Addition of recommendations for truncating variants within first 100bp	Callaway	CStAG
1.4	17/12/2021	PS4/PM2	Addition of recommendation for non- cancer female controls to be used for PMS6 and PMS2	Turnbull	CStAG

1.4	05/01/2022	PM3/PP1/ PP4	Clarification that a case cannot be used for PP4 if has already been used for PM3/PP1 and vice versa	Garrett	Turnbull
1.5	25/05/2022	PM2	Removal of requirement for gnomAD controls to be NFE	Garrett	CStAG
1.6	30/06/2023	PS4	Update on case-counting approach where variant seen in multiple cases but also observed in control datasets.	Allen/Garrett	CStAG
1.6	04/07/2023	PVS1	Clarification that guidance applies to initiation codon variants	Allen	CStAG
1.6	04/07/2023	PS4/PM2	Update of wording to match consensus specification, and removal of sex-matching as requirement for MSH6 and PMS2	Allen/Garrett	CStAG
1.6	23/10/2023	BA1/BS1	Clarification of MTAF usage and filtering allele frequency. Addition and clarification of data used in calculation of MTAF for each gene.	Callaway	CStAG

## **References**

 Thompson BA, Spurdle AB, Plazzer J-P, et al. Application of a five-tiered scheme for standardized classification of 2,360 unique mismatch repair gene variants lodged on the InSiGHT locus-specific database. *Nature Genetics* 2014;46(2):107-115. doi:10.1038/ng.2854 [published Online First: 2013/12/22]