

Cystic Fibrosis Research News

Title:

Reclassifying inconclusive diagnosis after newborn screening for Cystic Fibrosis. Moving forward.

Lay Title:

Improving conclusions after newborn screening for babies with no clear diagnosis

Authors:

Aurelie Hatton^{1,2*}, Anne Bergougnoux^{3,4*}, Katarzyna Zybert^{5*}, Benoit Chevalier^{1,2*}, Myriam Mesbahi^{1,2}, Jean Pierre Altéri⁴, Katarzyna Walicka-Serzysko⁵, Magdalena Postek⁵, Magali Taulan-Cadars^{3,6}, Aleksander Edelman^{1,2}, Alexandre Hinzpeter^{1,2}, Mireille Claustres⁶, Emmanuelle Girodon^{1,7**}, Caroline Raynal^{3,4**}, Isabelle Sermet-Gaudelus^{1,2,8,9**}, Dorota Sands^{5**}

* Co-first

** Co-last

Affiliations:

¹ INSERM U1151, Institut Necker Enfants Malades, Université de Paris, 75015 Paris, France.

² Université de Paris, Paris, France.

³ PhyMedExp, University of Montpellier, INSERM U1046, CNRS UMR 9214, Montpellier, France.

⁴ CHU de Montpellier, Laboratoire de Génétique Moléculaire, Montpellier, France.

⁵ Cystic Fibrosis Department, Institute of Mother and Child, Warsaw, Poland.

⁶ Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France.

⁷ Laboratoire de Génétique et Biologie Moléculaires, Hôpital Cochin, APHP Centre-Université de Paris, Paris, France.

⁸ Centre de Référence Maladies Rares, Mucoviscidose et maladies apparentées, Hôpital Necker Enfants Malades, Paris, France

⁹ European Reference Network-Lung

What was your research question?

In newborn screening for Cystic Fibrosis (CF) sometimes we cannot clearly rule out a diagnosis of CF or disorders related to CFTR dysfunction (CFTR-related diseases).

Cystic Fibrosis Research News

Why is this important?

We urgently need to define a strategy to detect infants who might change to be diagnosed with CF or a CFTR-RD in order to plan a suitable follow up and possible access to CFTR modulators.

What did you do?

We followed 23 children with no clear diagnosis after newborn screening for CF for an average of 7.7 years (varying from 4 to 13 years). We investigated the whole CFTR gene (whole CFTR gene sequencing) as well as, CFTR function in the bowel (intestinal current measurement on rectal biopsies; ICM) and in the nose (nasal potential difference; NPD).

What did you find?

Extensive testing identified genetic variants with varying clinical consequences and 3 variants of unknown significance (VUS); these were all combined with a CF causing mutation. All patients had a normal CFTR activity in the bowel. There were three different NPD profiles: results similar to those found in people with CF (such as people with the F508del/D1152H mutations) and thus qualifying these people as having CF, normal responses, suggesting an extremely low likelihood of developing a CFTR-RD, such as in people with the F508del/TG11T5 mutations; partial CFTR function above 20% of the normal, highlighting a risk, albeit low, of developing CFTR-RD, such as in people with the F508del/F1052V mutations. Two of the 3 VUS were reclassified by experiments as causing disease (D537N, T582I) and one had no clinical consequence (M952T).

What does this mean and reasons for caution?

It is important to combine genetic and functional investigations to assess the possibility of babies with inconclusive diagnosis at neonatal screening later being diagnosed with CF or CFTR-RD.

What's next?

CFTR function should be studied in such babies, ideally in cells taken from the nose which can be sent to central laboratories to be grown and investigated.

Original manuscript citation in PubMed

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34949556/>