Mutations in the *CHD7* Gene: The Experience of a Commercial Laboratory

Cynthia F. Bartels,¹ Cheryl Scacheri,² Lashonda White,³ Peter C. Scacheri,¹ and Sherri Bale³

CHARGE syndrome is an autosomal dominant multisystem disorder caused by mutation in the *CHD7* gene, encoding chromodomain helicase DNA-binding protein 7. Molecular diagnostic testing for *CHD7* mutation has been available in a clinical setting since 2005. We report here the results from the first 642 unrelated proband samples submitted for testing. Thirty-two percent (n = 203) of patient samples had a heterozygous pathogenic variant identified. The lower mutation rate than that published for well-characterized clinical samples is likely due to referral bias, as samples submitted for clinical testing may be for "rule-out" diagnoses, rather than solely to confirm clinical suspicion. We identified 159 unique pathogenic mutations, and of these, 134 mutations were each seen in a single individual and 25 mutations were found in two to five individuals (n = 69). Of the 203 mutations, only 9 were missense, with 107 nonsense, 69 frameshift, and 15 splice-site mutations likely leading to haploinsufficiency at the cellular level. An additional 72 variations identified in the 642 tested samples (11%) were considered to have unknown clinical significance. Copy number changes (deletion/duplication of the entire gene or one/several exons) were found to account for a very small number of cases (n = 3). This cohort represents the largest CHARGE syndrome sample size to date and is intended to serve as a resource for clinicians, genetic counselors, researchers, and other diagnostic laboratories.

Introduction

CHARGE SYNDROME IS an autosomal dominant condition characterized by a nonrandom cluster of congenital anomalies including coloboma of the eye, heart defects, choanal atresia, retarded growth, genital abnormalities, and inner and outer ear anomalies, as well as hyposmia and other cranial nerve abnormalities (Pagon *et al.*, 1981; Blake *et al.*, 1998). Numerous less-common features, including abnormal kidney, cleft lip/palate, and tracheoesophageal fistula, have also been reported. The clinical presentation of CHARGE syndrome can be highly variable (Zentner *et al.*, 2010). Estimates of the incidence of CHARGE syndrome range from 1:8500 to 1:12,000 (Issekutz *et al.*, 2005) (Kallen *et al.*, 1999).

De novo mutations in the gene encoding chromodomain helicase DNA-binding protein 7 (*CHD7*) are the major cause of CHARGE syndrome (Vissers *et al.*, 2004). DNA sequencing detects *CHD7* mutations in ~58%–64% of patients clinically diagnosed with CHARGE syndrome (Vissers *et al.*, 2004; Jongmans *et al.*, 2006; Lalani *et al.*, 2006). Of the *CHD7* mutations reported thus far, ~70% are nonsense or frameshift, 6%– 13% are missense, and 7%–15% are splice site mutations (Vissers *et al.*, 2004; Felix *et al.*, 2006; Jongmans *et al.*, 2006; Lalani *et al.*, 2006; Sanlaville *et al.*, 2006; Aramaki *et al.*, 2007; Vuorela *et al.*, 2007; Asakura *et al.*, 2008; Bergman *et al.*, 2008; Gennery *et al.*, 2008; Wincent *et al.*, 2008). Partial and whole gene deletions or duplications are rare, accounting for 3%–4% of pathogenic *CHD7* mutations (Aramaki *et al.*, 2006; Vuorela *et al.*, 2007; Bergman *et al.*, 2008; Wincent *et al.*, 2008). Although germline transmission of *CHD7* mutations has been reported (Pauli *et al.*, 2009), the majority of mutations arise *de novo*.

GeneDx is a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendmentscertified commercial laboratory that specializes in genetic testing for over 250 rare genetic disorders. Clinical testing of the *CHD7* gene at GeneDx has been available since 2005 and is performed on patient specimens using sequence analysis and, when indicated or desired, copy number analysis. The clinical utility of *CHD7* gene analysis is to confirm a clinical diagnosis of CHARGE syndrome or to resolve a differential diagnosis that may include diseases with similar or overlapping clinical presentations, such as Kallmann syndrome, 22q11 deletion syndrome, VACTERL association, and retinoic embryopathy. In addition, patients presenting with one or two of the clinical features of CHARGE syndrome, such as coloboma or choanal atresia, may also be referred for *CHD7* testing as these patients could have an unusual presentation of the disease.

¹Department of Genetics, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

²Formerly at GeneDx, currently at Medco Health Solutions, Franklin Lakes, New Jersey.

³GeneDx, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

Here we present the results of 642 unrelated patient samples submitted to GeneDx for *CHD7* mutation analysis. Based on recommendations by the American College of Medical Genetics (Richards *et al.*, 2008) for designating a variant as pathogenic, 203 of the 642 samples tested (32%) contained a variant in the *CHD7* gene that was considered pathogenic. This differs from other reports in the literature of 58%–64% positive rate of *CHD7* sequencing in CHARGE patients, reflecting the frequent lack of detailed clinical data provided with samples submitted to a clinical service laboratory. Twenty five of the 159 unique mutations (16%) were observed more than once, suggesting the presence of mutational hotspots within *CHD7*. We could not determine the clinical significance of additional 72 variants because of lack of available parental samples, clinical information, or functional data.

Methods

Criteria for diagnosis are defined by physicians and genetic counselors and are not provided to us. Genomic DNA was purified from buccal swabs or peripheral blood lymphocytes by standard methods. The protein-encoding exons of the CHD7 gene, exons 2-38, were amplified using oligonucleotide primers targeting intronic sequence flanking CHD7 exons under standard polymerase chain reaction conditions and sequenced bidirectionally by capillary sequencing on an ABI3730, using primers designed and optimized by the clinical laboratory. To help in identifying polymorphisms, synonymous and nonsynonymous variants were examined for conservation with the zebrafish CHD7-like protein (XP_ 697956). The zebrafish sequence was chosen for this purpose because it aligns well with the human sequence, yet it has more divergence from human CHD7 than other available sequences. Human and mouse CHD7 proteins are 97.1% identical, and human and chicken have 91.9% identity, whereas human and zebrafish CHD7s have 64.2% identity.

Testing for a *CHD7* exon deletion or duplication is now performed by the laboratory upon request, using either multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA) (SALSA MLPA kit P201-B1; MRC-Holland) or exon-level resolution oligonucleotide array comparative genomic hybridization (ExonArray). A proprietary CopyDx quantitative polymerase chain reaction method is used to confirm whole or partial gene deletions or duplications. We tested 11 samples by MLPA, 8 by exon array, and 4 by CopyDx after DNA sequencing showed no obvious disease-causing mutation and few or no heterozygous polymorphisms.

Results

Six hundred forty-two patients were referred by physicians and other authorized providers to GeneDx for clinical genetic testing of the *CHD7* gene. For each specimen, the entire protein coding sequence of the *CHD7* gene, along with intron sequence flanking each exon, was analyzed by DNA sequencing. Variants predicted to introduce premature stop codons or cause frameshifts were considered pathogenic. Variants involving the canonical splice donor–acceptor pair (GT-AG) were also considered pathogenic, in keeping with American College of Medical Genetics guidelines (Richards *et al.*, 2008). Missense changes or other putative splicing changes were considered pathogenic if proven *de novo* by testing both parents for its absence, or if the change was

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR 642 DNA SAMPLES ANALYZED

Samples	642			
No disease-causing mutation identified by DNA sequencing	401			
No heterozygous polymorphism	76 → one whole gene deletion			
	one exon 2 deletion			
	one exon 3 duplication			
With heterozygous	325			
polymorphisms				
Disease-causing mutation	200; 156 unique			
identified by DNA sequencing				
Nonsense mutations	107; 68 unique			
Frameshift mutations	69; 66 unique			
Splicing mutations	15; all unique			
Missense mutations	9; 7 unique			
Mutations of undetermined clinical significance	72			
Missense (nonsynonymous)	36 (excluding 3 putative splice variants); 33 unique			
Inframe residue	3. all unique			
insertion/deletion	o) un anque			
Potential splice:				
Intronic	17: 9 unique			
Exonic, nonsynonymous	3: all unique			
Exonic, synonymous	13; all unique			
	-			

identical to a previously reported *de novo* disease-associated mutation. Heterozygous polymorphisms were recorded to document the presence of two alleles.

We identified pathogenic CHD7 mutations in 203 (32%) patient samples. Two hundred of 203 mutations involved small, mostly single base changes, which were detected by DNA sequencing. These include 107 nonsense mutations, 69 frameshift mutations, 15 splicing mutations, and 9 missense mutations (Tables 1 and 2). One nonsense mutation was identified in the blood sample from a parent who was presumed to be mosaic. Two of the nine mutations classified as missense are located in the last bases of exons 8 and 17. These two mutations could affect splicing, as mutations at the end of exons are reported to inhibit the ability of the exon to be recognized by splicing factors (Talerico and Berget, 1990). We observed 25 different mutations more than once, including 7 not previously reported (Vissers et al., 2004; Felix et al., 2006; Jongmans et al., 2006; Lalani et al., 2006; Writzl et al., 2007; Gennery et al., 2008) (Table 2). Of these 25 mutations, 20 are nonsense, 3 are frameshift, and 2 are missense. The mutations we have identified are distributed throughout the coding region and do not appear to be preferentially located within regions corresponding to functional domains. The locations of the single-base mutations in the CHD7 gene and corresponding protein are shown in Figure 1.

Twenty-three specimens were further analyzed for copy number changes, using MLPA, CopyDx, or exon-level CGHarray. Of these cases, one duplication of exon 3, one whole gene deletion, and one deletion of exon 2 were identified.

A number of variants were identified in patient specimens that were novel or eluded classification (Table 3a). In most cases (n = 54) this is due to the lack of available parent samples.

Accession no.	Type	DNA mutation ^a	Protein mutation	Parental testing	Previously reported
052044	f	c.191_194delCAAA	p.T64fsX65		
063616	х	c.253C>T	p.Q85X		
073716	f	c.285delG	p.G95fsX210		
801921	х	c.334C>T	p.Q112X		4
808037	х	c.435G>A	p.W145X		4
060362	х	c.469C>T	p.R157X		1, 3, inherited in 7
900517	х	c.469C>T	p.R157X		1, 3, inherited in 7
051962	Х	c.502C>T	p.Q168X		
076598	х	c.511C>T	p.Q171X		
062461	Х	c.562C>T	p.Q188X		
807028	X	c.601C>1	p.Q201X	Dever	
054032	f c	c./29delC	p.P243fSX304	De novo	
060395	f c	c.780delC	p.P260fsX304		
000/74 076601	ſ	c.780delC	p.P26015A304		
062556	I Y	c.889C \ T	p.1209157.504		
051582	f	c.809C > 1	p.Q297A p.S301fsX317		
071214	r Y	c.934C>T	p.3501137017	De novo	9
074583	x	c.934C>T	p.R312X	De novo	9
804090	x	c.934C>T	p.R312X		9
806016	x	c.934C>T	p.R312X		9
808274	x	c.934C>T	p.R312X		9
801830	x	c.939T>G	p.Y313X		
053758	х	c.1024C>T	p.Q342X		
805081	f	c.1079_1095del17	p.G360fsX368		
060959	f	c.1095_1096insTC	p.P366fsX377		De novo in 4
903850	f	c.1140_1143dupTATG	p.H382fsX405		
801859	х	c.1153C>T	p.Q385X		
074683	f	c.1310dupA	p.H437fsX574	One parent excluded	
060219	х	c.1312C>T	p.Q438X		
802161	f	c.1319delC	p.P440fsX462		
077524	х	c.1366C>T	p.Q456X		
902216	X	c.1366C>T	p.Q456X		
052350	f	c.1374_1375delTC	p.S458fsX573		
051457	х	c.1480C>T	p.R494X		De novo in 4 and 11
061371	х	c.1480C>T	p.R494X		De novo in 4 and 11
074832	х	c.1480C>1	p.R494X		De novo in 4 and 11
803442	x	c.1480C>1	p.K494X		De novo in 4 and 11
902758	X C	c.1480C > 1	p.K494A		De novo in 4 and 11
012100	I Y	c.1400upA	p.r49/15A5/4		
802325	r f	c.1544dolC	$p.Q.004\Lambda$ $p.P515f_{c}Y563$		
811230	ı v	c.1576C>T	p.1 515137,505		
802993	f	c.1670C > 1	p.Q020A p.W537fsX537		
061801	f	c.1689dupA	p.E564fsX574		
811915	f	c.1730dupA	p.N577fsX584		
076142	f	c.1818 1819insAT	p.V607fsX608		
075651	f	c.1925delA	p.K642fsX710		
065234	f	c.2034delA	p.K678fsX710		
807136	S	c.2096+2T>C	IVS3+2T>C	One parent excluded	
053440	f	c.2180delT	p.L727fsX727	1	
070341	f	c.2244_2245delAC	p.R748fsX760		
061959	х	c.2311G>T	p.E771X		
051768	х	c.2440C>T	p.Q814X	De novo	
062375	S	c.2443-1delG	IVS6-1delG		
060118	S	c.2498+2dupT	IVS7+2dupT	De novo	
062315	f	c.2504_2508delATCTT	p.Y835fsX848		3
800824	t	c.2504_2508delATCTT	p.Y835fsX848		3
076679	t	c.2509_2512delCATT	p.H837fsX842		
002426	1	c.2509_2512delCATT	p.H837fsX842		De uere in 2
001328	х	c.25/2C>1	р.козох		De novo in 3

 TABLE 2.
 (CONTINUED)

Accession	Ŧ	DNA	Protein	Parental	Previously
<i>no.</i>	Туре	mutation ^a	mutation	testing	reported
074555	х	c.2572C>T	p.R858X		De novo in 3
801724	х	c.2572C>T	p.R858X		De novo in 3
806103	х	c.2572C>T	p.R858X		De novo in 3
070890	m/s	c.2613G>T	p.E871D ^b	De novo	
062987	S	c.2697+2T>G	IVS9+2T>G	One parent excluded	
071276	f	c.2737_2738insTC	p.Y913fsX925		
800699	х	c.2753G>A	p.W918X	De novo	
070907	х	c.2839C>T	p.R947X		2, <i>de novo</i> in 11
801407	X	c.2858G>A	p.W953X		
065597	t	c.2905_2906delAG	p.R969tsX993		
052425	S	c.2957+21>G	IVS11+21>G		
060339	X	c.2959C>1	p.K987X		<i>3, de novo</i> in <i>5</i>
0/0946	X	C.2959C>1	p.K987X		3, ae novo in 5
806826	X	C.2959C > 1	p.K98/A		3, ue novo in 5
810347	X	C.2959C > 1	p.K907X		3 de novo in 5
010347	x m	c.2959C > 1	p.R307A	De novo	<i>5, ue nobo</i> III <i>5</i>
064779	m	c 3082 A > C	p.Q1002R	De novo	De novo in 1 3 and 8
077115	m	c 3082A > G	p.11028V	De novo	De novo in 1, 3, and 8
064695	x	c.3106C>T	p.R1036X	Denoto	2 3
071885	x	c.3106C>T	p.R1036X		2,3
075224	x	c.3106C>T	p.R1036X		2.3
804863	x	c.3106C>T	p.R1036X		2.3
903061	x	c.3106C>T	p.R1036X		2, 3
811229	f	c.3122dupT	p.L1041fsX1052		,
061125	х	c.3205C>T	p.R1069X		12, <i>de novo</i> in 4 and 8
076312	f	c.3572_3573delAA	p.K1191fsX1206		
054292	f	c.3617_3619delTTGinsAATA	p.I1206fsX1207		
902200	х	c.3646A>T	p.K1216X		
903124	х	c.3646A>T	p.K1216X		
800035	х	c.3655C>T	p.R1219X		3, 9
805981	f	c.3693delA	p.K1231fsX1242		
054177	f	c.3728dupA	p.N1243fsX1262		
064752	х	c.3768C>G	p.Y1256X	De novo	
065763	s	c.3779-2A>G	IVS15-2A>G		3
071881	x	c.3802G>T	p.E1268X		
053821	f	c.3806_3811delTTAAAGinsA	p.F1269fsX1269		D
053162	m	c.3881T>C	p.L1294P ⁶		De novo in 4
807908	S	c.3989+1G>A	IVS16+1G>A		
061708	S	c.3990-2A>G	IVS16-2A>G		
063439	t	c.4012_4013delGG	p.G1338fsX1355		
077569	X	C.4015C>1	p.K1339X		2, 3, 11, ae novo in 4
052004	x r	c.4015C > 1	p.K1339A		2, 3, 11, <i>ue novo</i> in 4
032094	l v	c.415600pA	p.1136015A1363	De novo	0
078270	x f	c.4104G/A	p. W 1300A	De novo	
061322	m/s	c.4185C>C	p.Q1395ISX1403	De novo	De novo in 8
073529	m/ 5	c.4186-1C > A	VS17-1C > A	De hooo	De 1000 III 8
051749	f	c 4203 4204 delTA	n H1401 fs X1420		
053271	x	c 4318C>T	p.01440X		
063442	x	c.4393C>T	p.R1465X	De novo	4
074759	x	c.4393C>T	p.R1465X	Beneed	4
806837	x	c.4393C>T	p.R1465X		4
060639	x	c.4441A>T	p.K1481X		
074907	х	c.4480C>T	p.R1494X		2, 13
802505	s	c.4533+1G>A	IVS19+1G>A		,
801879	х	c.4593G>A	p.W1531X		
062503	х	c.4601G>A	p.W1534X		12, <i>de novo</i> in 4
052966	f	c.4634delT	p.L1545fsX1545		
903559	х	c.4753G>T	p.E1585X		
062946	х	c.4795C>T	p.Q1599X		Inherited in 8
					(continued)
					(commuea)

MUTATIONS IN THE CHD7 GENE

				~	
Accession no.	Tune	DNA mutation ^a	Protein mutation	Parental testing	Previously reported
	rype			leoning	reporteu
061334	х	c.4853G>A	p.W1618X	D	
077838	х	c.5029C>1	p.R1677X	De novo	
061465	х	c.5029C>1	p.K1677X		
065687	S	c.5050+1G>A	IVS22+IG>A		
806781	t	c.5054def1	p.L1685fsX1698		
806158	f	c.5086_5093delAAGAAGGT	p.K1696tsX1733		
053905	f	c.5094dupG	p.K1699tsX1736		
807855	х	c.5101C>T	p.Q1701X		
064486	x	c.5122C>T	p.Q1708X		
063670	f	c.5138_5141delTGGC	p.L1713fsX1730		
053226	f	c.5138_5141delTGGC c.5147_5148insGCCAGCTG	p.L1713fsX1737	De novo	
807173	f	c.5178_5179dupCT	p.Y1727fsX1732		
076269	m	c.5216T>G	p.L1739R ^b	De novo	
053286	х	c.5245A>T	p.R1749X		
063510	f	c.5250delA	p.Q1750fsX1752		
054190	х	c.5428C>T	p.R1810X		De novo in 4 and 11
902215	х	c.5428C>T	p.R1810X		De novo in 4 and 11
060225	S	c.5534+1G>A	IVS26+1G>A		De novo in 3 and 4
902057	f	c.5574delA	p.K1858fsX1868		
064246	f	c 5588delC	p P1863fsX1868		
807509	s	c 5666-2A>C	IVS28-2A>C		
070476	f	c 5776del A	n R1926fsX1929		
807429	r v	c 5782C>T	p.(1)/2013/(1)/2)		
052662	A V	c 5791C>T	p.Q1920X	De novo	
052314	x x	c 5833C>T	p.Q1951X	One parent excluded	4 de novo in 3
054428	A V	c 5822C>T	p.R1945X	one parent excluded	$\frac{1}{4}$, we note in 3
800825	r r	c.5055C > 1	p.R1943A $p.P1087f_{0}V2041$		4, <i>ue nobo</i> in 5
062684	f	c.6018dolA	p.1190715X2041		
804700	I V	a 6070C>T	p.R20001372042		1 3 de novo in 4
802868	X	c.0070C>T	p.R2024X		1, 3, ue novo in 4
064618	A V	c.0070C > T	p.R2024A		D_{α} more in 2
060386	л С	c.0079C > 1	P.K2027X WS20+8T C		De novo in A
808802	5	c.0103+01>C	P_{2052}		$2 = \frac{1}{2} $
806040	х х	(015) C > 1	p.K20001		<i>5, 5, ue novo</i> III 4
062558	X	C.0272G > A	p.W2091A		10
002336	X	C.0292C>1	p.K2098X		10
060100	x r	(.0292C > 1)	p.K2098X		10
052120	1	C.0320_03210EIAC	p.fi210/15/2110		
053898	m	C.63471>A	p.12116N	One parent excluded	
075071	m	C.034/1>A	p.12116N	De nooo	
075271	X	c.639/C > 1	p.Q2133X		
064459	ſ	c.6461delC	p.P2154fsX2214		
902770	f	c.6502delC	p.L2168fsX2214		
061870	t	c.6587_6589delCCGinsTA	p.12196fsX2214	P	
053153	f	c.6746delA	p.D2249fsX2276	De novo	
803104	х	c.6757G>1	p.E2253X		
042727	s	c.6775+1G>A	IVS31+1G>A		
062825	х	c.6850C>T	p.R2284X		De novo in 6 and 8
077988	х	c.6850C>T	p.R2284X		De novo in 6 and 8
805191	x	c.6850C>T	p.R2284X		De novo in 6 and 8
074324	f	c.7027delC	p.Q2343fsX2442	_	
05865	х	c.7132G>T	p.E2378X	De novo	
052445	x	c.7195C>T	p.Q2399X		
061695	f	c.7249delA	p.R2417fsX2442		
061278	х	c.7252C>T	p.R2418X	De novo	3
902420	х	c.7252C>T	p.R2418X		3
076853	х	c.7282C>T	p.R2428X		3
809472	х	c.7282C>T	p.R2428X		3
063341	f	c.7328delA	p.D2443fsX2502		
075614	х	c.7367C>G	p.S2456X		13
060501	f	c.7418_7427del10	p.P2473fsX2499		

TABLE 2. (CONTINUED)

Accession no.	Type	DNA mutation ^a	Protein mutation	Parental testing	Previously reported
062920	х	c.7447G>T	p.E2483X		
062147	х	c.7636G>T	p.E2546X	Father mosaic	13
051996	f	c.7782delG	p.W2594fsX2595	De novo	
076047	f	c.7875_7876delGA	p.Q2625fsX2628		
062087	х	c.7879C>T	p.R2627X		3
064661	х	c.7879C>T	p.R2627X	One parent excluded	3
054199	х	c.7891C>T	p.R2631X		
060051	х	c.7891C>T	p.R2631X		
070279	х	c.7891C>T	p.R2631X		
800072	х	c.7891C>T	p.R2631X		
811668	х	c.7891C>T	p.R2631X		
065478	f	c.7919_7926delCTTTGACA	p.T2640fsX2649		
806062	f	c.7921_7922delTT	p.L2641fsX2651		
065062	х	c.8054G>A	p.W2685X	De novo	
061050	f	c.8078delG	p.G2693fsX2708	De novo	
077711	f	c.8452_8459dupAACCCTCT	p.L2820fsX2891		
062355	f	c.8565delA	p.K2855fsX2888		
05885	f	c.8962dupG	p.D2988fsX2989	De novo	De novo in 8
077415	del	delEX2_38	Whole gene deletion		1, 11
063780	del	delEX2	Exon 2 dele		
807132	dup	dupEX3	Exon 3 dup		

 TABLE 2.
 (CONTINUED)

^aMutated bases in the human CHD7 cDNA were numbered based on accession number NM_017780. Gene and protein nomenclature follows recommendations (den Dunnen and Antonarakis, 2001). Bold font indicates recurrent mutations.

Conserved in zebrafish

CHD7 protein. ¹Vissers *et al.* (2004).

²Aramaki *et al.* (2006).

³Jongmans *et al.* (2006).

⁴Lalani *et al.* (2006).

⁵Sanlaville et al. (2006).

⁶Felix *et al.* (2006).

⁷Delahaye *et al.* (2007).

⁸Vuorela *et al.* (2007).

⁹Writzl et al. (2007).

¹⁰Gennery et al. (2008).

¹¹Wincent *et al.* (2008).

¹²Lee *et al.* (2009).

¹³Asakura *et al.* (2008); Fujita *et al.* (2009).

x = premature stop codon; f = frameshift mutation; s = splice site mutation; m = missense mutation; del = deletion; dup = duplication; ins = insertion.



FIG. 1. The *CHD7* gene (top) and protein (bottom). Colored circles above exons 2–38 depict the location of 200 CHARGEcausing mutations. Overlapping circles indicate identical mutations. Protein domains are labeled and lines indicate where each protein domain is encoded on the gene. All DNA mutations that introduced stop codons or frameshifts were considered disease causing, as were mutations of the canonical splice donor–acceptor pair (GT-AG). Missense changes or other putative splicing changes were not considered disease causing unless the change was a *de novo* mutation not found in either parent or if it was reported in the literature as a *de novo* mutation.

a. Rare missense variations, residue insertion/deletions, and variations that are silent coding changes or intron changes close to exon/intron junctions and have the potential to be splicing mutations

Accession no.	DNA mutation	Protein variation	Previously published	Situation	Parent	Conservation ^a
902591 076175	c.123G>A c.257C>G	p.M41I p.P86R			Identified	Yes No (Q)
62883 053498	c.561G>A c.712G>A	p.Q187Q p.V238M		With G744S	in 1 parent	Similar (H, cac) No (P)
53964 074161	c.1029C>T c.1122_1133dup12	p.S343S p.N377_T378ins		and A21601		Similar (N) Yes
5828 811103	c.1672C>G c.1677G>A	p.P558A p.S559S		7 bp from junction	Identified	Yes No (P)
053117	c.2096G>C	p.S699T		1 bp from junction,	in i parent	Yes
806511 800842 65571 62573	c.2097-5delT c.2182G>A c.2196A>G c.2498+6T>G	IVS3-5delT p.D728N p.P732P IVS7+6T>G		5 bp from junction		No Similar (E) Yes Yes
072511 065403	c.2499-3C>G c.2680A>G	IVS7-3C>G p.T894A		3 bp from junction In chromodomain	Identified	Yes Yes
061052 063067	c.2720A>C c.2750C>T	p.K907T p.T917M		In chromodomain In chromodomain	Identified in 1 parent	Yes Yes
903397 072071	c.2813G>A c.2831G>A	p.R938K p.R944H		5 bp from junction	Identified	Yes Yes
053964	c.2840G>A	p.R947Q		5 bp from junction	Identified in 1 parent	Yes
71691 802765 801050 801088 051914 903485 802422 072739	c.3202-5T>C c.3202-5T>C c.3378+5G>T c.3378+5G>T c.3607G>C c.3623T>A c.3942G>A c.3942G>A	IVS12-5T>C IVS12-5T>C IVS13+5G>T IVS13+5G>T p.E1203Q p.V1208D p.Q1314Q p.I1322P		5 bp from junction 5 bp from junction 5 bp from junction 5 bp from junction In SNF2-N domain In SNF2-N domain		Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
65403	c.3989C>G	p.R1330R		2 bp from junction,		Yes
065012	c.4033C>T	p.R1345C		putative splice In HeLICc domain	Identified in 1 parent	Yes
807330 811007	c.4247C>G c.4369A>C	p.11416R p.K1457Q		With V2931M	Identified in 1 parent	Yes Yes
072994 800514	c.4727T>G c.4849G>A	p.F1576C p.G1617S		2 bp from junction,		Similar (Y) Yes
060081	c.5050G>A	p.G1684S	13	putative splice 1 bp from junction, putative splice		Yes
063000	c.5373C>A	p.D1791E			identified in 1 parent	Yes
070154	c.5405-7G>A	IVS25-7G>A	2, 3	7 bp from junction,		No
072674	c.5405-7G>A	IVS25-7G>A	2, 3	7 bp from junction,		No
075645	c.5405-7G>A	IVS25-7G>A	2, 3	7 bp from junction,		No
808268	c.5405-7G>A	IVS25-7G>A	2, 3	7 bp from junction, putative splice		No

Accession no.	DNA mutation	Protein variation	Previously published	Situation	Parent	Conservation ^a
810826	c.5405-7G>A	IVS25-7G>A	2, 3	7 bp from junction, putative splice		No
074838	c.5597A>G	p.D1866G		11 bp from junction		Yes
053177	c.5597A>G	p.D1866G		11 bp from junction		Yes
64239	c.5841A>G	p.E1947E				Similar (D)
053492	c.5848G>A	p.A1950T			Identified in 1 parent	Yes
064827	c.5894+5G>A	IVS29+5G>A		5 bp from junction	-	Yes
805662	c.5905_5907del AGA	p.R1969del		11 bp from junction	Identified in 1 parent	Yes
054355	c.6103+5G>T	IVS30+5G>T		5 bp from junction		No
806941	c.6194G>A	p.R2065H				Yes
903222	c.6194G>A	p.R2065H			Identified in 1 parent	Yes
811609	c.6250A>G	p.S2084G				Yes
810303	c.6308G>A	p.G2103D				Yes
064850	c.6308G>A	p.G2103D				Yes
052986	c.6339T>C	p.D2113D				Yes
051356	c.6363G>A	p.E2121E				Yes
804307	c.6673G>A	p.A2225T				No (L)
62708	c.6936G>A	p.K2312K		1 bp from junction, putative splice		Yes
805742	c.6955C>T	p.R2319C	3, 6, 14		Identified in parent and sibling	Yes
077040	c.6989G>C	p.G2330A			0	Yes
61994	c.7158G>A	p.L2386L		7 bp from junction		Similar (V)
054238	c.7165-4A>G	IVS33-4A>G	3	4 bp from junction		No
051771	c.7165-4A>G	IVS33-4A>G		4 bp from junction		No
05828	c.7165-4A>G	IVS33-4A>G		4 bp from junction		No
054005	c.7485G>T	p.R2495S			Identified in 1 parent	No (–)
051390	c.7578C>T	p.S2528S			•	No (G)
071896	c.8047C>T	p.P2683S		In BRK domain	Identified in 1 parent	Yes
070710	c.8104C>T	p.R2702C			Identified in 1 parent	Yes
901480	c.8197G>A	p.A2733T			*	Yes
052878	c.8569T>G	p.S2857A				Yes
800917	c.8874C>T	p.A2958A				Similar (S)
811007	c.8791G>A	p.V2931M		With K1457Q	Identified	Yes
808890	c.8879_8881dup AGA	p.E2960_S2961insK			in 1 parent Identified in 1 parent	Yes

 TABLE 3. (CONTINUED)

b. 32 sequence variations identified as polymorphisms

Accession no.	DNA mutation	Protein variation	Previously published	Situation	Parental testing	Zebrafish conservation ^a	n	SNP ID no.
62599	c.216T>C	p.Y72Y				Similar (F)	5	rs16926453
070640	c.307T>A	p.S103T	11 (4/180 controls)			Yes	6	rs41272435
53498	c.309G>A	p.S103S				Yes	3	
05913	c.602A>G	p.Q201R			Identified in 1 parent	Yes	4	
53498	c.657C>T	p.G219G			1	No (–)	5	
053103	c.1018A>G	p.M340V	8		1	No (S)	6	rs41305525
803481	c.1105C>G	p.P369A			In parent and 2 relatives	No (–)	1	

Accession no.	DNA mutation	Protein variation	Previously published	Situation	Parental testing	Zebrafish conservation ^a	n	SNP ID no.
05885	c.1397C>T	p.S466L	6		1	No (P)	1	rs71640285
053015	c.1536A>G	p.P512P				Yes	3	
902192	c.1565G>T	p.G522V	6	Homozygous		No (A)	1	
62147	c.1907G>T	p.G636V		With E2546X		No (I)	1	
078278	c.2053_58 dupGAAAA	p.A685_K686dup	11 (3/80 controls)		Identified in 1 parent	Yes	6+	
53498	c.2124T>C	p.S708S	-		1	No (G)	6	
053498	c.2230G>A	p.G744S	8, 11	1 with V238M and A2160T		Yes	3	
77306	c.2361C>A	p.S787S				No (–)	3	
060685	c.3379-33A>G	IVS13-33A>G		33 bp from junction		No	1	rs45461501
60036	c.5051-4C>T	IVS22-4C>T)		No	6+	rs71640288
51581	c.5307C>T	p.A1769A		7 bp from junction		No (L)	6+	rs16926499
060386	c.6103+8T>C	IVS30+8T>C	4	,		Yes	6+	rs3763592
52986	c.6111C>T	p.P2037P		8 bp from junction		Yes	3	rs41312170
062383	c.6135G>A	p.P2045P)		Yes	6+	rs6999971
052668	c.6276G>A	p.E2092E	4			Yes	6+	rs2068096
60685	c.6282A>G	p.G2094G				Yes	6	rs41312172
053498	c.6478G>A	p.A2160T	8, 11	1 with V238M and G744S		No (–)	2	rs61753399
71954	c.6738G>A	p.E2246E	8, 11			Similar (D)	3	rs61729627
804229	c.6833T>C	p.A2274A	,			Yes	1	rs61743849
053179	c.7356A>G	p.T2452T	4			Similar (S)	6+	rs2272727
061251	c.7579A>C	p.M2527L			Identified in 1 parent	Yes	5	
53498	c.7590A>G	p.K2530K			I	Yes	3	rs61742801
53162	c.8355C>T	p.A2785A		With L1294P		No (G)	1	
070556	c.8416C>G	p.L2806V	8, 11		Identified in 1 parent	Yes	2	rs45521933
061484	c.8950C>T	p.L2984F			Identified in 1 parent	Similar (M)	3	

TABLE 3. (CONTINUED)

The inherited/de novo status of most is unknown unless otherwise indicated.

^aConservation with zebrafish CHD7 protein is noted for coding mutations. Conservation with zebrafish CHD7 DNA sequence is noted for possible splice variations.

¹Vissers *et al.* (2004).

²Aramaki *et al.* (2006).

³Jongmans *et al.* (2006). ⁴Lalani *et al.* (2006).

⁵Sanlaville et al. (2006).

⁶Felix et al. (2006).

⁷Delahaye et al. (2007).

⁸Vuorela et al. (2007).

⁹Writzl et al. (2007).

¹⁰Gennery et al. (2008).

¹¹Wincent et al. (2008).

¹²Lee et al. (2009).

¹³Asakura *et al.* (2008); Fujita *et al.* (2009).

¹⁴Holak et al. (2008).

Blue-shaded rows: five mutations are 1-2 bp from an intron and we believe these to be splicing mutations. The IVS25-7G>A mutation, in five additional samples, has been previously reported but has not yet been identified as a de novo mutation.

Blues boxes: algorithm-predicted splice site mutations.

Green boxes: missense mutations.

Gray boxes: deletion, duplication, insertion mutations.

Bold font indicates recurrent mutations.

Such results are reported as being variants of unknown significance in patient reports. In another 18 cases, where we were able to test one or both parents, the variant was observed in a parent. However, without further information, these missense changes are difficult to classify. Germline transmission has been reported and may be due to germline mosaicism, somatic mosaicism, or inheritance of the mutation from a mildly affected parent. When inheritance of a novel missense change is observed in a molecular diagnostic setting, it is difficult to know if the parent is mosaic for a pathogenic mutation or if the variant is a benign polymorphism (Zlotogora, 1998). In these cases, clinical evaluation of the parent is recommended to the referring physician.

Twenty-two variants that may affect splicing were identified based on prediction algorithms such as SIFT (Lowe, 2004) and PolyPhen (Ramensky *et al.*, 2002). Two of these were synonymous changes that could affect splicing, as has been observed in other diseases (Eriksson *et al.*, 2003). Table 3a includes nonsynonymous missense variants that are presumed to be very rare, as they have been observed only once or twice in the 1284 alleles we have tested and were not found in the SNP databases. Without further information, we cannot determine the pathogenicity of these variants.

Table 3b lists variants characterized as benign polymorphisms. Twenty-nine polymorphisms were found in multiple individuals in this report or in previous reports, two were found in individuals also carrying disease-causing mutations, and one was homozygous.

A total of 370 specimens had no detectible mutations by sequencing, and we were able to test only 23 specimens for exonic copy number changes. It is not unusual to observe several polymorphisms in the *CHD7* gene, and the observation of heterozygous positions ensures the presence of both alleles. In our negative samples, 76 altogether lacked heterozygous polymorphisms and another 88 specimens had only one to two polymorphisms. Although copy number changes are not common in the *CHD7* gene, these samples (26% of all samples submitted) may be good candidates for deletion and duplication testing using other methods for detection.

Discussion

This report serves as a summary of the findings of *CHD7* mutation analysis observed by one clinical diagnostic laboratory. Unlike other publications, we have not performed clinical evaluations on the patients in whom the analyses were performed, and these data must be regarded with that in mind.

We detected CHD7 mutations in 203 of 642 (\sim 32%) patient specimens referred to GeneDx for clinical testing. One hundred twenty of the 203 CHD7 mutations have not been previously reported. Consistent with previous reports, most of the mutations we detected are nonsense (n = 107; 52.7%) and frameshift (n = 69; 34%) mutations and are predicted to cause loss of function. Splicing (n = 15; 7.4%), missense (n = 9; 4.4%), and copy number changes (n = 3; 1.5%) are less common. There is a higher percentage of stop codons in our cohort than in the published literature (52.7% vs. 35.4%). Of 189 published mutations, there were 35.4% stop mutations, 33.3% frameshifts, 7%-15% splicing mutations, 6%-13% missense mutations, and 3% large deletion/duplications (Vissers *et al.*, 2004; Felix et al., 2006; Jongmans et al., 2006; Lalani et al., 2006; Sanlaville et al., 2006; Aramaki et al., 2007; Vuorela et al., 2007; Asakura et al., 2008; Bergman et al., 2008; Gennery et al., 2008; Wincent et al., 2008).

Variants found in 11% (n = 72) of our 642 patient samples could not be classified as either pathogenic or benign, which clearly underscores the need for a functional assay, or at least the availability of parental samples for follow-up. The observation of mutations in 32% of the specimens evaluated is far lower than the 58%–64% reported by other groups. This reflects the variability in clinicians' use of molecular diag-

nostic testing, including the fact that many clinicians are considering a number of diagnoses in the differential when faced with a child who has some findings indicative of CHARGE syndrome.

Notably, there are 25 different mutations that have been observed more than once in our cohort. Six of these recurrent mutations were observed in four or more patient specimens. Each of these is a nonsense change involving a CGA arginine codon (R312X, R494X, R858X, R987X, R1036X, R2631X). This is consistent with reports that the CG dinucleotide is hypermutable to TG (Youssoufian *et al.*, 1988; Antonarakis *et al.*, 2000), making the arginine CGA codon uniquely vulnerable to transition to a nonsense mutation. Human CHD7 contains 27 arginine CGA codons. Despite these mutation hot spots, this should not influence how *CHD7* mutation analysis is performed, given that overall these account for only a fraction (14.2%) of the total observed mutations.

In our study, we tested the DNA samples of both parents for the presence of a variant identified in their child in 25 families. This included testing for 12 nonsense, 6 frameshift, 6 missense, and 1 splice site mutation. Of these, only one mutation was identified in a parent and all other mutations had arisen de novo. Mosaicism for a p.E2546X nonsense mutation was observed in this individual's specimen. Sixteen cases of germline transmission of CHD7 mutation have been reported (Jongmans et al., 2006; Lalani et al., 2006; Delahaye et al., 2007; Jongmans et al., 2008; Vuorela et al., 2008; Wincent et al., 2008; Pauli et al., 2009). Some of these cases involve an affected or mildly affected parent, whereas in other cases the carrier parent is reported as unaffected. Two affected siblings have been reported in a family where the father had no detectable CHD7 gene mutation in lymphocyte DNA, but showed a mutation in ¹/₄ of his sperm (Pauli et al., 2009).

The *CHD7* gene is large at over 188 kb. Most laboratories seek mutations in the \sim 9 kb that constitute the protein coding sequence and intron–exon junctions. As with most diagnostic tests, mutation analysis does not include the promoter, non-coding exons, or introns. Future full-gene sequencing using "next-generation" methods may increase the clinical sensitivity of diagnostic testing of CHARGE syndrome, revealing mutation deep in introns and promoter regions in other patients who carry a clinical diagnosis but are mutation negative using current methods.

Acknowledgments

P.C.S. is supported by grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Development (R01HD056369) and the National Human Genome Research Institute (R01HG004722).

Disclosure Statement

C.S. is currently an employee of Medco Health Solutions, Inc. Her contributions to this document are not to be construed as reflecting the views of Medco Health Solutions, Inc.

References

- Antonarakis SE, Krawczak M, Cooper DN (2000) Diseasecausing mutations in the human genome. Eur J Pediatr 159 Suppl 3:S173–S178.
- Aramaki M, Kimura T, Udaka T, et al. (2007) Embryonic expression profile of chicken CHD7, the ortholog of the causa-

MUTATIONS IN THE CHD7 GENE

tive gene for CHARGE syndrome. Birth Defects Res A Clin Mol Teratol 79:50–57.

- Aramaki M, Udaka T, Kosaki R, *et al.* (2006) Phenotypic spectrum of CHARGE syndrome with CHD7 mutations. J Pediatr 148:410–414.
- Asakura Y, Toyota Y, Muroya K, *et al.* (2008) Endocrine and radiological studies in patients with molecularly confirmed CHARGE syndrome. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 93:920–924.
- Bergman JE, de Wijs I, Jongmans MC, *et al.* (2008) Exon copy number alterations of the CHD7 gene are not a major cause of CHARGE and CHARGE-like syndrome. Eur J Med Genet 51:417–425.
- Blake KD, Davenport SL, Hall BD, et al. (1998) CHARGE association: an update and review for the primary pediatrician. Clin Pediatr (Phila) 37:159–173.
- Delahaye A, Sznajer Y, Lyonnet S, *et al.* (2007) Familial CHARGE syndrome because of CHD7 mutation: clinical intra- and interfamilial variability. Clin Genet 72:112–121.
- den Dunnen JT, Antonarakis SE (2001) Nomenclature for the description of human sequence variations. Hum Genet 109:121–124.
- Eriksson M, Brown WT, Gordon LB, *et al.* (2003) Recurrent *de novo* point mutations in lamin A cause Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome. Nature 423:293–298.
- Felix TM, Hanshaw BC, Mueller R, *et al.* (2006) CHD7 gene and non-syndromic cleft lip and palate. Am J Med Genet A 140:2110–2114.
- Fujita K, Aida N, Asakura Y, *et al.* (2009) Abnormal basiocciput development in CHARGE syndrome. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 30:629–634.
- Gennery AR, Slatter MA, Rice J, *et al.* (2008) Mutations in CHD7 in patients with CHARGE syndrome cause T-B + natural killer cell + severe combined immune deficiency and may cause Omenn-like syndrome. Clin Exp Immunol 153:75–80.
- Holak HM, Kohlhase J, Holak SA, Holak NH (2008) New recognized ophthalmic morphologic anomalies in CHARGE syndrome caused by the R2319C mutation in the CHD7 gene. Ophthalmic Genet 29:79–84.
- Issekutz KA, Graham JM Jr., Prasad C, et al. (2005) An epidemiological analysis of CHARGE syndrome: preliminary results from a Canadian study. Am J Med Genet A 133A:309–317.
- Jongmans MC, Admiraal RJ, van der Donk KP, *et al.* (2006) CHARGE syndrome: the phenotypic spectrum of mutations in the CHD7 gene. J Med Genet 43:306–314.
- Jongmans MC, Hoefsloot LH, van der Donk KP, *et al.* (2008) Familial CHARGE syndrome and the CHD7 gene: a recurrent missense mutation, intrafamilial recurrence and variability. Am J Med Genet A 146A:43–50.
- Kallen K, Robert E, Mastroiacovo P, et al. (1999) CHARGE association in newborns: a registry-based study. Teratology 60:334–343.
- Lalani SR, Safiullah AM, Fernbach SD, et al. (2006) Spectrum of CHD7 mutations in 110 individuals with CHARGE syndrome and genotype-phenotype correlation. Am J Hum Genet 78:303–314.
- Lee YW, Kim SC, Shin YL, et al. (2009) Clinical and genetic analysis of the CHD7 gene in Korean patients with CHARGE syndrome. Clin Genet 75:290–293.

- Lowe DG (2004) Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints. Int J Comput Vis 60:91–110.
- Pagon RA, Graham JM Jr., Zonana J, Yong SL (1981) Coloboma, congenital heart disease, and choanal atresia with multiple anomalies: CHARGE association. J Pediatr 99:223–227.
- Pauli S, Pieper L, Haberle J, *et al.* (2009) Proven germline mosaicism in a father of two children with CHARGE syndrome. Clin Genet 75:473–479.
- Ramensky V, Bork P, Sunyaev S (2002) Human non-synonymous SNPs: server and survey. Nucleic Acids Res 30:3894–3900.
- Richards CS, Bale S, Bellissimo DB, *et al.* (2008) ACMG recommendations for standards for interpretation and reporting of sequence variations: revisions 2007. Genet Med 10:294– 300.
- Sanlaville D, Etchevers HC, Gonzales M, *et al.* (2006) Phenotypic spectrum of CHARGE syndrome in fetuses with CHD7 truncating mutations correlates with expression during human development. J Med Genet 43:211–217.
- Talerico M, Berget SM (1990) Effect of 5' splice site mutations on splicing of the preceding intron. Mol Cell Biol 10: 6299–6305.
- Vissers LE, van Ravenswaaij CM, Admiraal R, *et al.* (2004) Mutations in a new member of the chromodomain gene family cause CHARGE syndrome. Nat Genet 36:955–957.
- Vuorela P, Ala-Mello S, Saloranta C, *et al.* (2007) Molecular analysis of the CHD7 gene in CHARGE syndrome: identification of 22 novel mutations and evidence for a low contribution of large CHD7 deletions. Genet Med 9:690–694.
- Vuorela PE, Penttinen MT, Hietala MH, et al. (2008) A familial CHARGE syndrome with a CHD7 nonsense mutation and new clinical features. Clin Dysmorphol 17:249–253.
- Wincent J, Holmberg E, Stromland K, *et al.* (2008) CHD7 mutation spectrum in 28 Swedish patients diagnosed with CHARGE syndrome. Clin Genet 74:31–38.
- Writzl K, Cale CM, Pierce CM, et al. (2007) Immunological abnormalities in CHARGE syndrome. Eur J Med Genet 50:338–345.
- Youssoufian H, Antonarakis SE, Bell W, *et al.* (1988) Nonsense and missense mutations in hemophilia A: estimate of the relative mutation rate at CG dinucleotides. Am J Hum Genet 42:718–725.
- Zentner GE, Layman WS, Martin DM, Scacheri PC (2010) Molecular and phenotypic aspects of CHD7 mutation in CHARGE syndrome. Am J Med Genet A 152A:674–686.
- Zlotogora J (1998) Germ line mosaicism. Hum Genet 102:381-386.

Address correspondence to: Peter C. Scacheri, Ph.D. Department of Genetics Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, OH 44016

E-mail: peter.scacheri@case.edu

Sherri Bale, Ph.D. GeneDx Gaithersburg, MI 20877

E-mail: sherrib@genedx.com