

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

Background:

Approximately 1 in 10 Americans, an estimated 30 million individuals, are affected by rare disease and it is estimated that 80% of rare diseases have identified genetic origins.¹ The average time to get an accurate diagnosis is 6-8 years.¹ The diagnostic evaluation of an individual suspected of having a rare genetic condition may include combinations of radiographic, biochemical, electrophysiologic, and genetic testing. Genetic testing strategies include targeted approaches, such as single-gene analysis, and/or a targeted gene panel, chromosomal microarrays, as well as broad genomic sequencing, including exome sequencing (ES) and genome sequencing (GS). ES/GS are particularly useful for evaluating genetic conditions that demonstrate a high degree of genetic heterogeneity. When compared to serial genetic testing strategies, ES/GS are superior due to broader coverage, reduced cost and improved efficiencies.²⁻⁷

Identifying a molecularly confirmed diagnosis in a timely manner for an individual with a rare genetic condition can have a variety of health outcomes including but not limited to:^{6,8-19}

- guiding prognosis and improving clinical decision-making via
 - application of specific treatments, as well as withholding of contraindicated treatments for certain rare genetic conditions
 - planning or avoidance of surgical interventions
 - surveillance for comorbidities
 - initiation of palliative care
 - withdrawal of care
- reducing the psychological and financial impact of diagnostic uncertainty and the diagnostic odyssey (e.g., eliminating lower-yield testing and additional screening testing that may later be proven unnecessary once a diagnosis is achieved)
- informing genetic counseling for other living relatives (i.e., siblings), as well as recurrence risk counseling and prenatal diagnosis options for the family

Technical Information:

Genomic sequencing technologies currently utilized in clinical practice include exome sequencing and short-read genome sequencing. ES and GS are similar diagnostic tools in the evaluation of individuals with rare disease, but there are clear technical advantages of GS that support increased diagnostic yield and efficiencies. As such, GS will likely supplant ES to become the preferred diagnostic test, particularly as access to GS increases.²⁰

Exome sequencing (ES) is a capture-based method that targets the DNA sequence of coding regions (exons) and flanking intronic regions of 1% of the genome. ES is associated with technical and analytical variability, including uneven sequencing coverage and gaps in exon capture before sequencing. In contrast, genome sequencing (GS) involves shearing and sequencing all intergenic and intragenic regions, eliminating the need for a capture step, which increases efficiency and minimizes PCR-based artifacts. Both ES and GS can identify the following categories of pathogenic variants: missense, nonsense, splice-site, and small deletions or insertions. GS is advantageous as a diagnostic tool due to uniformity of coverage, including GC-rich regions, as well as the ability to detect variants that may be missed by ES, such as copy-number variants (CNV), mid-size insertions and deletions (ca. 10-500 bp), nucleotide repeat expansion mutations, deeper intronic mutations, structural variants (e.g.,

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

translocations, inversions), and variants that result in methylation defects and uniparental disomy.^{12,14,21-25}

Several studies have compared ES to GS and demonstrate improved diagnostic yield with GS. Lionel et al examined a cohort of participants (N=70) who received both GS and ES.⁵ In this cohort, GS had a diagnostic yield of 50% compared to 37% for ES. GS detected all diagnostic variants found by ES in addition to revealing several diagnostic variants not apparent in ES data. Examples of variants “missed” by ES included deep intronic SNVs, small CNVs, and SNVs in noncoding RNA. Wang et al showed that, in comparison to GS, a significant number of pathogenic variant types would have gone undetected by ES, CMA, and ES + CMA. Variant types that were undetected by ES included large CNVs, small deletions and structural variants.¹⁶

Addition of CNV calling to small variant calling pipelines improves diagnostic efficacy and efficiency in patients with rare genetic disease. As such, GS is a unified testing platform that can be used in place of combined or sequential ES and chromosomal microarray (CMA).^{5,25} In a prospective comparative study in which 100 patients with suspected genetic diseases received GS and CMA, GS identified genetic variants meeting clinical diagnostic criteria in 34% of cases, representing a fourfold increase in diagnostic rate over CMA (8%; P value = 1.42E – 05), and identified all CNVs detected by CMA.⁹

In addition, GS has shown incremental diagnostic yield in individuals with non-diagnostic ES. In a cohort of heavily pre-investigated patients, GS was able to provide a diagnosis in 13% of patients in whom ES results were inconclusive.²⁶ Another study of 50 patients with severe intellectual disability and non-diagnostic CMA ES demonstrated that GS had a diagnostic yield of 42%.²¹ Bertoli-Avella et al showed that up to 29.6% of ES negative cases could benefit from GS testing (14.5% with pathogenic or likely pathogenic results, and 15.1% with VUS).²⁷ The majority of genetic diagnoses made by GS in ES negative cases could be attributed to its superior technical performance; GS detected 79 noncoding variants, 41 of which were classified as pathogenic/likely pathogenic.

The use of family trio samples in genomic sequencing analysis helps reduce the time to diagnosis, the rate of uncertain findings, and improves the clinical sensitivity and efficiency with regard to the interpretation of clinically novel genes, and increases the diagnostic yield of ES/GS.^{11,14,28,29} As part of a meta-analysis, five studies that conducted within-cohort comparisons of diagnostic utility of singleton and trio ES/GS found the pooled odds of diagnosis for trios was twice that of singletons (P<0.0001).³⁰

Periodic reanalysis of previously obtained exome or genome sequence has the potential for additional diagnostic yield because of expanding variant databases, as well as periodic novel gene discovery and publication.^{24,31-33} A review of twenty-seven peer-reviewed articles revealed a median new diagnosis rate via reanalysis of 15% and median reanalysis timeframe of 22 months.³³ The authors suggest that an interval of greater than 18 months from the original report may be optimal for reanalysis. The majority of new diagnoses from re-analysis of ES result from newly discovered genes, with additional diagnostic yield from expanded phenotypic spectrum and upgraded classification of variants in previously known genes.³⁴ Reanalysis can be improved by thorough clinical reassessment and systematic reevaluation of the patient by the ordering provider.

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

Guidelines and Evidence:

The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG) has several relevant policy statements that offer guidance on: the clinical application of ES/GS,^{35,36} informed consent for ES/GS,³⁷ technical standards to ensure quality results and the interpretation and reporting of variants,³⁸ reporting of secondary findings in clinical ES/GS,^{39,40} and re-analysis.⁴¹

A statement from the ACMG includes the following indications for diagnostic testing using ES/GS in assessment of phenotypically affected individuals when:³⁵

“a. The phenotype or family history data strongly implicate a genetic etiology, but the phenotype does not correspond with a specific disorder for which a genetic test targeting a specific gene is available on a clinical basis.”

“b. A patient presents with a defined genetic disorder that demonstrates a high degree of genetic heterogeneity, making WES or WGS analysis of multiple genes simultaneously a more practical approach.”

“c. A patient presents with a likely genetic disorder, but specific genetic tests available for that phenotype have failed to arrive at a diagnosis.”

“d. A fetus with a likely genetic disorder in which specific genetic tests, including targeted sequencing tests, available for that phenotype have failed to arrive at a diagnosis.”

The ACMG issued an evidence-based clinical practice guideline for the use of exome sequencing and genome sequencing (ES/GS) in 2021.³⁶ The guideline supports the clinical utility of ES/GS as a first- or second-tier test for pediatric patients with multiple congenital anomalies with onset prior to age 1 year, or developmental delay, or intellectual disability with onset prior to 18 years. ES/GS has a higher diagnostic yield compared with standard genetic testing, and may be more cost-effective when ordered earlier in the diagnostic evaluation.

In 2021, the ACMG Secondary Findings Working Group published an updated policy statement with recommendations for reporting of secondary findings in clinical ES and GS.³⁹ This policy statement provides guidance on consenting, scope of secondary finding reporting based on test type, and proposes a framework for annual updates to the secondary findings list. The goal of the secondary finding gene list is to provide guidance to clinical laboratories on which medically actionable genes unrelated to the indication for testing should be evaluated as part of clinical ES/GS.⁴⁰

Recommendations for obtaining informed consent for clinical ES/GS, including secondary findings, have also been outlined by the ACMG.³⁷ A medical geneticist or genetic counselor should perform pre-test counseling and consent documentation.

The ACMG Laboratory Quality Assurance Committee issued points to consider in the reevaluation and reanalysis of genomic test results,⁴¹ including general considerations, considerations for variant-level reevaluation and case-level reanalysis, and reporting. This statement also suggests considerations for reanalysis versus retesting using new methodologies, including:

- Time elapsed since the previous testing occurred
- Improvements in technology/chemistry (e.g., new methods for DNA capture and sequencing)
- Bioinformatics advancements
- New information regarding the genetic etiology of a condition
- Additional patient phenotypes or family history that developed in the interim

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

GS/ES are powerful diagnostic tools for individuals with rare genetic conditions in which the specific genetic etiology is unclear or unidentified by standard clinical evaluation. While the diagnostic yield of GS/ES varies depending upon the individual's age, phenotype, previous workup, and inclusion of comparators, the efficacy is well established. Further, the diagnostic yield of GS/ES is higher when used earlier in the diagnostic work-up.⁴² A review of publications from 2009-2017 revealed median diagnostic yield of GS/ES in aggregate analyses was 33.2%, but varied by broad clinical categories and test type.¹³ The 100,000 Genomes Project demonstrated that GS had an overall diagnostic yield of 25% in 2183 probands—many of whom were heavily pre-tested.⁴³ Notably, diagnostic yields for intellectual disability, hearing disorders, and vision disorders ranged from 40 to 55%; diagnostic yield for individuals with dysmorphic or congenital anomalies was 21%. Based on the results, the National Health Service implemented GS as the first-tier test for 25+ different clinical conditions. Use of GS/ES also reveals dual molecular diagnoses that contribute to complex phenotypes (i.e., two significant findings associated with non-overlapping clinical presentations).⁹

Evidence for the clinical utility of ES/GS in individuals suspected of having rare genetic disease includes numerous retrospective and prospective case series, and randomized controlled trials. Relevant outcomes include improved clinical decision-making (e.g., initiation of specific treatments, withholding of contraindicated treatments, changes to surveillance, changes in reproductive decision making, and resource utilization).^{6,9,12,13,15-18,26,29,44,45} An impact on medical management has been clearly demonstrated in both rapid ES/GS and non-rapid ES/GS cohorts.

ES/GS has been shown to positively impact healthcare utilization through cost-savings compared to serial genetic testing strategies, as well as reduced lengths of stay and reduced professional and facility fees.^{3,7,11,18,42} Several health economic studies have been published that demonstrate that GS is the most efficient approach to the diagnosis of children with rare and undiagnosed genetic conditions compared to previous standard of care.^{7,46} If GS is unavailable, ES represents the next most efficient option compared with standard of care. Other strategies provided the same or fewer diagnoses at a higher incremental cost per diagnosis.

Genetic counselors play a critical role in guiding testing strategy and assessing the utility of genetic testing in individuals with rare disease, as well as supporting informed consent. Practice guidelines outline the role of GCs in consent and result disclosure/interpretation for ES/GS.³⁵ Genetic counselors are trained to assess appropriate testing strategies and prevent order errors.^{47,48} Genetic counselors can bridge access gap between medical geneticists and other specialists, ensuring appropriate utilization of genomic sequencing in individuals with rare disease.

Multiple Congenital Anomalies

Many congenital anomalies have an underlying genetic etiology, and may occur in isolation, or in conjunction with other features. ES/GS have demonstrated diagnostic utility in individuals with multiple congenital anomalies, particularly when ordered early in the diagnostic evaluation.^{43,45} The ACMG evidence-based clinical practice guideline supports the clinical utility of ES/GS as a first- or second-tier test for pediatric patients with multiple congenital anomalies with onset prior to age 1 year.³⁶

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

Neurodevelopmental Disorders (Developmental Delay/Intellectual Disability)

A meta-analysis investigating the diagnostic yield of ES in neurodevelopmental disorders (NDD), including global developmental delay, intellectual disability, and/or autism spectrum disorder, showed that ES outperformed chromosomal microarray, with an overall diagnostic yield of 36% (31% for isolated NDD, and 53% for NDD plus associated conditions).⁴⁹ In another study of 100 individuals with intellectual disability, use of GS as a first-line genetic test yielded a diagnostic rate of 27%, more than doubled compared to clinical microarray (12%), including identification of structural variants, single nucleotide variants, uniparental disomy, and short tandem repeats.⁵⁰

Epileptic encephalopathy

Epileptic encephalopathy (EE) is characterized by developmental delay or regression associated with refractory seizures and generally poor prognosis. Several studies have compared the use of ES to standard single-gene or panel testing in individuals with EE and shown improved diagnostic yield, shorter time to diagnosis, clinical management impacts, and cost-savings.⁵¹⁻⁵⁴ GS increases the diagnostic yield in EE beyond ES, supporting the expanded use of GS as an efficient diagnostic strategy in this patient population.^{55,56}

Hearing loss

The ACMG Professional Practice Guidelines Committee presented updated recommendations for the evaluation and etiologic diagnosis of hearing loss.⁵⁷ Hearing loss is genetically heterogeneous, supporting the value of panels and ES/GS in the diagnostic evaluation. Identifying the etiology of hearing loss may affect clinical management, particularly for syndromic hearing loss, improve prognostic accuracy, and guide recurrence risk counseling. The guideline includes an updated algorithm (Figure 1) that integrates pre-test genetic counseling and initial testing using single-gene tests and comprehensive hearing loss gene panels, as well as congenital CMV testing using newborn bloodspots. If the initial testing is unrevealing, ES/GS can be considered.

Mitochondrial disease

Mitochondrial diseases are clinical and genetically heterogeneous. Pathogenic variants in nuclear-encoded genes account for the majority of pediatric mitochondrial disease (70-80%) with 20-25% of cases due to pathogenic variants in the mitochondrial genome. Mitochondrial genome variants are more frequently responsible for mitochondrial disease in adults (75%).⁵⁸ Diagnosis typically involves a complex combination of metabolic testing, brain imaging, tissue histology and enzymology, and panel testing or mitochondrial genome analysis. GS is advantageous in the diagnostic work-up of mitochondrial disease because of coverage of both the nuclear and mitochondrial genomes in a single test, and ability to detect heteroplasmy levels as low as 1%. GS identified both mitochondrial and non-mitochondrial diagnoses in individuals with suspected mitochondrial disorders, preventing the need for invasive tests such as a muscle biopsy.^{58,59}

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

Criteria:

Exome Sequencing or Genome Sequencing:

Exome sequencing or genome sequencing (ES/GS) is considered medically necessary when ALL of the following criteria are met:

1. The etiology of the patient's features is not known and a genetic etiology is considered a likely explanation for the phenotype, based on ONE of the following, AND
 - a) Multiple congenital abnormalities affecting unrelated organ systems, OR
 - b) Epileptic encephalopathy (onset before three years of age), OR
 - c) At least TWO of the following criteria are met, OR
 - abnormality affecting at minimum a single organ system
 - autism
 - severe neuropsychiatric condition (e.g., schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, Tourette syndrome, self-injurious behavior, reverse sleep-wake cycles)
 - symptoms of a complex neurological condition (e.g., dystonia, hemiplegia, spasticity, epilepsy, hypotonia, myopathy, muscular dystrophy)
 - family history strongly suggestive of a genetic etiology, including consanguinity
 - period of unexplained developmental regression (unrelated to epilepsy or autism)
 - laboratory findings suggestive of an inborn error of metabolism
 - d) Confirmed bilateral sensorineural hearing loss of unknown etiology and panel testing is unrevealing, OR
 - e) Intellectual disability, following formal assessment by a developmental pediatrician or neurologist, defined as moderate/severe/profound by Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) criteria, diagnosed by 18 years of age, OR
 - f) Global developmental delay, following formal assessment by a developmental pediatrician or neurologist, defined as significant delay in younger children, under age five years, in at least two of the major developmental domains: gross or fine motor; speech and language; cognition; social and personal development; and activities of daily living.
2. Alternate etiologies have been considered and ruled out when possible (e.g., MRI abnormalities/brain malformations, environmental exposure, injury, infection, isolated prematurity), AND
3. Clinical presentation does not fit a well-described syndrome for which single-gene or targeted panel testing is available, AND
4. ES/GS is more efficient and economical than the separate single-gene tests or panels that would be recommended based on the differential diagnosis (e.g., genetic conditions that demonstrate a high degree of genetic heterogeneity), AND
5. Molecular results are predicted to impact health outcomes, including impact on medical management.

Exclusions:

- ES/GS is considered not medically necessary for the diagnosis of genetic disorders in individuals who do not meet the above criteria.
- ES/GS is considered experimental/investigational for screening for genetic disorders in asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic individuals.

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

Other Considerations:

- While ES and GS are similar diagnostic tools in the evaluation of individuals with rare disease, there are clear technical advantages of GS that support increased diagnostic yield and efficiencies. As such, if given a choice, GS is the preferred diagnostic test in individuals who meet the above criteria.
- GS is preferred when a mitochondrial disorder is suspected, due to analysis of both the nuclear and mitochondrial genome.
- Pre- and post-test counseling by an appropriate provider, such as an American Board of Medical Genetics and Genomics or American Board of Genetic Counseling-certified Genetic Counselor, is strongly recommended.
- Trio samples are preferred for ES/GS. Use of family trio samples in genomic sequencing analysis helps reduce the time to diagnosis, the rate of uncertain findings, and improves the clinical sensitivity and efficiency with regard to the interpretation of clinically novel genes, and increases the diagnostic yield of ES/GS.
- Re-analysis of previously obtained exome or genome sequence has the potential for additional diagnostic yield because of expanding variant databases, as well as periodic novel gene discovery and publication. Re-analysis could be considered prior to additional genomic sequencing, particularly if there has been onset or identification of additional symptoms that broadens the clinical phenotype assessed during the original ES/GS analysis, and/or there has been a change in the family history that expands the clinical picture, such as the birth or diagnosis of a similarly affected first-degree relative.
- ES/GS in the setting of prenatal genetic diagnosis or screening is not addressed in this policy.
- Ideal sample type should be considered based on the clinical presentation (e.g., mosaicism is suspected based on pigmentary anomalies, consider skin fibroblast as ideal sample type).
- Rapid genome sequencing (rGS), defined as return of preliminary positive results in <7 days and final report in <14 days, may be indicated for acutely-ill individuals. Criteria for rGS testing can be found in the [Rapid Genome Sequencing policy](#).

CPT Codes:

Procedure(s) addressed by this policy:	Procedure Code(s)
Exome (e.g., unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); sequence analysis	81415
Sequence analysis, each comparator exome (e.g., parent(s), sibling(s))	81416
Genome (e.g., unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome); sequence analysis	81425
Sequence analysis, each comparator genome (e.g., parent(s), sibling(s))	81426
Genome (e.g., unexplained constitutional or heritable disorder or syndrome), rapid sequence analysis (e.g., RCIGM Rapid Whole Genome Sequencing; Rady Children's Institute for Genomic Medicine)	0094U
Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole genome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, proband	0212U

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole genome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, each comparator genome (eg, parent, sibling)	0213U
Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole exome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, proband	0214U
Rare diseases (constitutional/heritable disorders), whole exome and mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis, including small sequence changes, deletions, duplications, short tandem repeat gene expansions, and variants in non-uniquely mappable regions, blood or saliva, identification and categorization of genetic variants, each comparator exome (eg, parent, sibling)	0215U

References:

1. RARE disease facts [Internet]. Global Genes. 2021 [cited 2021 May 17]. Available from: <https://globalgenes.org/rare-disease-facts/>
2. Shashi V, McConkie-Rosell A, Rosell B, et al. The utility of the traditional medical genetics diagnostic evaluation in the context of next-generation sequencing for undiagnosed genetic disorders. *Genet Med*. 2014 Feb; 16: 176–182. PMID: 23928913
3. Tan TY, Dillon OJ, Stark Z, et al. Diagnostic Impact and Cost-effectiveness of Whole-Exome Sequencing for Ambulant Children With Suspected Monogenic Conditions. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017 Sep 1;171(9):855-862. PMID: 28759686
4. Dillon OJ, Lunke S, Stark Z, et al. Exome sequencing has higher diagnostic yield compared to simulated disease-specific panels in children with suspected monogenic disorders. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2018 May;26(5):644-651. PMID: 29453417
5. Lionel AC, Costain G, Monfared N, et al. Improved diagnostic yield compared with targeted gene sequencing panels suggests a role for whole-genome sequencing as a first-tier genetic test. *Genet Med*. 2018 Apr;20(4):435-443. PMID: 28771251
6. NICUSeq Study Group, Krantz ID, Medne L, et al. Effect of Whole-Genome Sequencing on the Clinical Management of Acutely Ill Infants With Suspected Genetic Disease: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2021 Dec 1;175(12):1218-1226. PMID: 34570182
7. Incerti D, Xu XM, Chou JW, et al. Cost-effectiveness of genome sequencing for diagnosing patients with undiagnosed rare genetic diseases. *Genet Med*. 2022 Jan;24(1):109-118. PMID: 34906478
8. Soden SE, Saunders CJ, Willig LK, et al. Effectiveness of exome and genome sequencing guided by acuity of illness for diagnosis of neurodevelopmental disorders. *Sci Transl Med*. 2014 Dec 3;6(265):265ra168. PMID 25473036
9. Stavropoulos DJ, Merico D, Jobling R, et al. Whole Genome Sequencing Expands Diagnostic Utility and Improves Clinical Management in Pediatric Medicine. *NPJ Genom Med*. 2016 Jan 13;1. PMID: 28567303

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

10. Stark Z, Schofield D, Martyn M, et al. Does genomic sequencing early in the diagnostic trajectory make a difference? A follow-up study of clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness. *Genet Med*. 2019 Jan;21(1):173-180. PMID: 29765138
11. Farnaes L, Hildreth A, Sweeney NM, et al. Rapid whole-genome sequencing decreases infant morbidity and cost of hospitalization. *NPJ Genom Med*. 2018 Apr 4;3:10. PMID: 29644095
12. French CE, Delon I, Dolling H, et al. Whole genome sequencing reveals that genetic conditions are frequent in intensively ill children. *Intensive Care Med*. 2019 May;45(5):627-636. PMID: 30847515
13. Smith HS, Swint JM, Lalani SR, Yamal JM, de Oliveira Otto MC, Castellanos S, Taylor A, Lee BH, Russell HV. Clinical Application of Genome and Exome Sequencing as a Diagnostic Tool for Pediatric Patients: a Scoping Review of the Literature. *Genet Med*. 2019 Jan;21(1):3-16. PMID: 29760485
14. Kingsmore SF, Cakici JA, Clark MM, et al. A Randomized, Controlled Trial of the Analytic and Diagnostic Performance of Singleton and Trio, Rapid Genome and Exome Sequencing in Ill Infants. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2019 Oct 3;105(4):719-733. PMID: 31564432
15. Sanford EF, Clark MM, Farnaes L, et al. Rapid Whole Genome Sequencing Has Clinical Utility in Children in the PICU. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2019 Nov;20(11):1007-1020. PMID: 31246743
16. Wang H, Lu Y, Dong X, et al. Optimized trio genome sequencing (OTGS) as a first-tier genetic test in critically ill infants: practice in China. *Hum Genet*. 2020 Apr;139(4):473-482. PMID: 31965297
17. Dimmock DC S, Waldman B, Benson W, Ashburner C, Carmichael J. Project Baby Bear: Rapid precision care incorporating rWGS in 5 California children's hospitals demonstrates improved clinical outcomes and reduced costs of care. *Am J Hum Genetics*. 2021;108:1-8. PMID: 34089648
18. Sweeney NM, Nahas SA, Chowdhury S, et al. Rapid whole genome sequencing impacts care and resource utilization in infants with congenital heart disease. *NPJ Genom Med*. Apr 22 2021;6(1):29. PMID: 34039980
19. Bick D, Bick SL, Dimmock DP, et al. An online compendium of treatable genetic disorders. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet*. 2021 Mar;187(1):48-54. PMID: 33350578
20. Marwaha S, Knowles JW, Ashley EA. A guide for the diagnosis of rare and undiagnosed disease: beyond the exome. *Genome Med*. 2022 Feb 28;14(1):23. PMID: 35220969
21. Gilissen C, Hehir-Kwa JY, Thung DT, et al. Genome sequencing identifies major causes of severe intellectual disability. *Nature*. 2014 Jul 17;511(7509):344-7. PMID: 24896178
22. Meienberg J, Bruggmann R, et al. Clinical sequencing: is WGS the better WES? *Hum Genet*. 2016; 135: 359–362. PMID: 26742503
23. Bowling KM, Thompson ML, Amaral MD, et al. Genomic diagnosis for children with intellectual disability and/or developmental delay. *Genome Med*. 2017 May 30;9(1):43. PMID: 28554332
24. Costain G, Jobling R, Walker S, et al. Periodic reanalysis of whole-genome sequencing data enhances the diagnostic advantage over standard clinical genetic testing. *Eur J Hum Genet*. 2018 May;26(5):740-744. PMID: 29453418
25. Marshall CR, Chowdhury S, Taft RJ, et al. Best practices for the analytical validation of clinical whole-genome sequencing intended for the diagnosis of germline disease. *NPJ Genom Med*. 2020 Oct 23;5:47. PMID: 33110627
26. Splinter K, Adams DR, Bacino CA, et al. Effect of Genetic Diagnosis on Patients with Previously Undiagnosed Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2018 Nov 29;379(22):2131-2139. PMID: 30304647

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

27. Bertoli-Avella AM, Beetz C, Ameziane N, et al. Successful application of genome sequencing in a diagnostic setting: 1007 index cases from a clinically heterogeneous cohort. *Eur J Hum Genet.* 2021 Jan;29(1):141-153. PMID: 32860008
28. Taylor JC, Martin HC, Lise S, et al. Factors influencing success of clinical genome sequencing across a broad spectrum of disorders. *Nat Genet.* 2015 Jul;47(7):717-726. PMID: 25985138
29. Wu B, Kang W, Wang Y, et al. Application of Full-Spectrum Rapid Clinical Genome Sequencing Improves Diagnostic Rate and Clinical Outcomes in Critically Ill Infants in the China Neonatal Genomes Project. *Crit Care Med.* 2021 Oct 1;49(10):1674-1683. PMID: 33935161
30. Clark MM, Stark Z, Farnaes L, et al. Meta-analysis of the diagnostic and clinical utility of genome and exome sequencing and chromosomal microarray in children with suspected genetic diseases. *NPJ Genom Med.* 2018 Jul 9;3:16. PMID: 30002876
31. Wright CF, McRae JF, Clayton S...Firth HV. (2018). Making new genetic diagnoses with old data: Iterative reanalysis and reporting from genome-wide data in 1,133 families with developmental disorders. *Genetics in Medicine*, 20(10), 1216-1223. PMID: 29323667
32. Nambot S, Thevenon J, Kuentz P... Thauvin-Robinet C. (2018). Clinical whole-exome sequencing for the diagnosis of rare disorders with congenital anomalies and/or intellectual disability: Substantial interest of prospective annual reanalysis. *Genetics in Medicine*, 20(6), 645-654. PMID: 29095811
33. Tan NB, Stapleton R, Stark Z, et al. Evaluating systematic reanalysis of clinical genomic data in rare disease from single center experience and literature review. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.* 2020 Nov;8(11):e1508. PMID: 32969205
34. Ji J, Leung ML, Baker S, et al. Clinical Exome Reanalysis: Current Practice and Beyond. *Mol Diagn Ther.* 2021 Sep;25(5):529-536. PMID: 34283395
35. ACMG Board of Directors. Points to consider in the clinical application of whole-genome sequencing. *Genet Med* 2012; 14:759–761. PMID: 22863877
36. Manickam K, McClain MR, Demmer LA, et al. Exome and genome sequencing for pediatric patients with congenital anomalies or intellectual disability: an evidence-based clinical guideline of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genet Med.* 2021 Nov;23(11):2029-2037. PMID: 34211152.
37. ACMG Board of Directors. Points to consider for informed consent for genome/exome sequencing. *Genet Med* Sept 2013;15(9):748–749. PMID 23970068
38. Rehder C, Bean LJH, Bick D, et al. Next-generation sequencing for constitutional variants in the clinical laboratory, 2021 revision: a technical standard of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genet Med.* 2021 Aug;23(8):1399-1415. PMID: 33927380
39. Miller DT, Lee K, Gordon AS, et al. Recommendations for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing, 2021 update: a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genet Med.* 2021 Aug;23(8):1391-1398. PMID: 34012069
40. Miller DT, Lee K, Chung WK, et al. ACMG SF v3.0 list for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing: a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genet Med.* 2021 Aug;23(8):1381-1390. PMID: 34012068
41. Deignan JL, Chung WK, Kearney HM, et al. Points to consider in the reevaluation and reanalysis of genomic test results: a statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG). *Genet Med.* 2019 Jun;21(6):1267-1270. PMID: 31015575

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

42. Ontario Health (Quality). Genome-Wide Sequencing for Unexplained Developmental Disabilities or Multiple Congenital Anomalies: A Health Technology Assessment. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser.* 2020 Mar 6;20(11):1-178. PMID: 32194879
43. Smedley D, Smith KR, Martin A, Thomas EA, et al. 100,000 Genomes Pilot on Rare-Disease Diagnosis in Health Care - Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med.* 2021 Nov 11;385(20):1868-1880. PMID: 34758253
44. Bick D, Fraser PC, Gutzeit MF, et al. Successful Application of Whole Genome Sequencing in a Medical Genetics Clinic. *J Pediatr Genet.* 2017 Jun;6(2):61-76. PMID: 28496993
45. Scocchia A, Wigby KM, Masser-Frye D, et al. Clinical whole genome sequencing as a first-tier test at a resource-limited dysmorphology clinic in Mexico. *NPJ Genom Med.* 2019 Feb 14;4:5. PMID: 30792901
46. Lavelle TA, Feng X, Keisler M, et al. Cost-effectiveness of exome and genome sequencing for children with rare and undiagnosed conditions. *Genet Med.* 2022 Jun;24(6):1349-1361. PMID: 35396982
47. Accreditation Council for Genetic Counseling. Practice-Based Competencies for Genetic Counselors, Revised competency Domain 1, Number 4. 2020. Available from: http://www.gceducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ACGC-Core-Competencies-Brochure_15_Web_REV-6-2019.pdf
48. Kieke MC, Conta JH, Riley JD, Zetzsche LH. The current landscape of genetic test stewardship: A multi-center prospective study. *J Genet Couns.* 2021 Aug;30(4):1203-1210. PMID: 33728729
49. Srivastava S, Love-Nichols JA, Dies KA, et al. Meta-analysis and multidisciplinary consensus statement: exome sequencing is a first-tier clinical diagnostic test for individuals with neurodevelopmental disorders. *Genet Med.* 2019 Nov;21(11):2413-2421. PMID: 31182824
50. Lindstrand A, Eisfeldt J, Pettersson M, et al. From cytogenetics to cytogenomics: whole-genome sequencing as a first-line test comprehensively captures the diverse spectrum of disease-causing genetic variation underlying intellectual disability. *Genome Med.* 2019 Nov 7;11(1):68. PMID: 31694722
51. Thevenon J, Duffourd Y, Masurel-Paulet A, et al. Diagnostic odyssey in severe neurodevelopmental disorders: toward clinical whole-exome sequencing as a first-line diagnostic test. *Clin Genet.* 2016 Jun;89(6):700-7. PMID: 26757139.
52. Vissers LELM, van Nimwegen KJM, Schieving JH, et al. A clinical utility study of exome sequencing versus conventional genetic testing in pediatric neurology. *Genet Med.* 2017 Sep;19(9):1055-1063. PMID: 28333917
53. Palmer EE, Schofield D, Shrestha R, et al. Integrating exome sequencing into a diagnostic pathway for epileptic encephalopathy: Evidence of clinical utility and cost effectiveness. *Mol Genet Genomic Med.* 2018 Mar;6(2):186-199. PMID: 29314763
54. Minardi R, Licchetta L, Baroni MC, et al. Whole-exome sequencing in adult patients with developmental and epileptic encephalopathy: It is never too late. *Clin Genet.* 2020 Nov;98(5):477-485. PMID: 32725632
55. Ostrander BEP, Butterfield RJ, Pedersen BS, Farrell AJ, Layer RM, Ward A, Miller C, DiSera T, Filloux FM, Candee MS, Newcomb T, Bonkowsky JL, Marth GT, Quinlan AR. Whole-genome analysis for effective clinical diagnosis and gene discovery in early infantile epileptic encephalopathy. *NPJ Genom Med.* 2018 Aug 13;3:22. PMID: 30109124
56. Lee HF, Chi CS, Tsai CR. Diagnostic yield and treatment impact of whole-genome sequencing in paediatric neurological disorders. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2021 Aug;63(8):934-938. PMID: 33244750

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Disease

57. Li MM, Tayoun AA, DiStefano M, et al. Clinical evaluation and etiologic diagnosis of hearing loss: A clinical practice resource of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics (ACMG), *Genetics in Medicine*, 2022, ISSN 1098-3600, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gim.2022.03.018>.
58. Riley LG, Cowley MJ, Gayevskiy V, et al. The diagnostic utility of genome sequencing in a pediatric cohort with suspected mitochondrial disease. *Genet Med*. 2020 Jul;22(7):1254-1261. PMID: 32313153
59. Schon KR, Horvath R, Wei W, et al. Use of whole genome sequencing to determine genetic basis of suspected mitochondrial disorders: cohort study. *BMJ*. 2021 Nov 3;375:e066288. PMID: 34732400

Update details:

Updated to include exome and genome sequencing, revised inclusion criteria, added re-analysis criteria, removed age-limit, revised ordering provider details, updated references, and overall policy re-format.