

Original Investigation | Neurology Utility of Exome Sequencing for Diagnosis in Unexplained Pediatric-Onset Epilepsy

Hyun Yong Koh, MD, PhD; Lacey Smith, MS, CGC; Kimberly N. Wiltrout, MD; Archana Podury, BA; Nitish Chourasia, MD; Alissa M. D'Gama, MD, PhD; Meredith Park, BS; Devon Knight, BA; Emma L. Sexton, BS; Julia J. Koh, BS; Brandon Oby, BS; Rebecca Pinsky, CPNP; Diane D. Shao, MD, PhD; Courtney E. French, PhD; Wanqing Shao, PhD; Shira Rockowitz, PhD; Piotr Sliz, PhD; Bo Zhang, PhD; Sonal Mahida, MGC, CGC; Christelle Moufawad El Achkar, MD; Christopher J. Yuskaitis, MD, PhD; Heather E. Olson, MD, MSc; Beth Rosen Sheidley, MS, CGC; Annapurna H. Poduri, MD, MPH; for the BCH Neurology Referral and Phenotyping Group

Abstract

IMPORTANCE Genomic advances inform our understanding of epilepsy and can be translated to patients as precision diagnoses that influence clinical treatment, prognosis, and counseling.

OBJECTIVE To delineate the genetic landscape of pediatric epilepsy and clinical utility of genetic diagnoses for patients with epilepsy.

DESIGN, SETTING, AND PARTICIPANTS This cohort study used phenotypic data from medical records and treating clinicians at a pediatric hospital to identify patients with unexplained pediatriconset epilepsy. Exome sequencing was performed for 522 patients and available biological parents, and sequencing data were analyzed for single nucleotide variants (SNVs) and copy number variants (CNVs). Variant pathogenicity was assessed, patients were provided with their diagnostic results, and clinical utility was evaluated. Patients were enrolled from August 2018 to October 2021, and data were analyzed through December 2022.

EXPOSURES Phenotypic features associated with diagnostic genetic results.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES Main outcomes included diagnostic yield and clinical utility. Diagnostic findings included variants curated as pathogenic, likely pathogenic (PLP), or diagnostic variants of uncertain significance (VUS) with clinical features consistent with the involved gene's associated phenotype. The proportion of the cohort with diagnostic findings, the genes involved, and their clinical utility, defined as impact on clinical treatment, prognosis, or surveillance, are reported.

RESULTS A total of 522 children (269 [51.5%] male; mean [SD] age at seizure onset, 1.2 [1.4] years) were enrolled, including 142 children (27%) with developmental epileptic encephalopathy and 263 children (50.4%) with intellectual disability. Of these, 100 participants (19.2%) had identifiable genetic explanations for their seizures: 89 participants had SNVs (87 germline, 2 somatic mosaic) involving 69 genes, and 11 participants had CNVs. The likelihood of identifying a genetic diagnosis was highest in patients with intellectual disability (adjusted odds ratio [aOR], 2.44; 95% CI, 1.40-4.26), early onset seizures (aOR, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.88-0.98), and motor impairment (aOR, 2.19; 95% CI 1.34-3.58). Among 43 patients with apparently de novo variants, 2 were subsequently determined to have asymptomatic parents harboring mosaic variants. Of 71 patients who received diagnostic results and were followed clinically, 29 (41%) had documented clinical utility resulting from their genetic diagnoses.

Key Points

Question What are the diagnostic yield and clinical utility of genetic sequencing for patients with unexplained pediatric epilepsy?

Findings This cohort study of 522 children with previously unexplained epilepsy used exome sequencing to identify and clinically confirm diagnostic results for 100 children, including 89 with single nucleotide variants and 11 with copy number variants. Individuals with earlier seizure onset, intellectual disability, and motor impairment were more likely to have diagnostic results, and at least 29 patients had changes in treatment, surveillance, or prognosis based on their genetic diagnoses.

Meaning These findings suggest that for children with unexplained epilepsy, genetic evaluation yielded precise diagnoses with direct clinical implications.

+ [Supplemental content](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380)

Author affiliations and article information are listed at the end of this article.

(continued)

Open Access. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY License.

JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 (Reprinted) July 20, 2023 1/15

Abstract (continued)

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE These findings suggest that pediatric-onset epilepsy is genetically heterogeneous and that some patients with previously unexplained pediatric-onset epilepsy had genetic diagnoses with direct clinical implications.

JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi[:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380)

Introduction

Epilepsy, defined by recurrent unprovoked seizures or a single seizure with risk factors for developing others,¹ is a common disorder often presenting in infancy or childhood^{2,3} and associated with comorbid conditions, including intellectual disability and autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Approximately 1 in 3 individuals with epilepsy have medically refractory seizures.⁴ Accordingly, patients, families, and clinicians seek underlying explanations and potentially etiologically specific treatments. Recent studies have demonstrated that a substantial proportion of nonacquired epilepsy is caused by inherited and de novo variants in several brain-expressed genes,^{5,6} providing insight into developmental and epileptic encephalopathies (DEE), genetic generalized epilepsy (GGE), and nonacquired focal epilepsy (NAFE), sometimes involving the same genes.^{5,7-10}

Even in the research setting, only 30% to 50% of individuals with presumed genetic epilepsy have known genetic explanations.¹¹ The discrepancy between presumed vs identified molecular diagnoses highlights a gap in understanding of the genetic causes of epilepsies. Furthermore, millions of individuals with presumed genetic epilepsy do not have identified genetic conditions, in part due to limited access to sequencing and challenges in interpretation of findings in many settings.¹²

Increasing potential for precision diagnosis has fueled a growing focus on precision medicine for the epilepsies.13-15 A genetic diagnosis provides an end to the diagnostic odyssey for patients and families and may inform prognosis, recurrence risk, and screening for additional clinical features.¹² These latter aspects, and the knowledge that a search for a cause of the epilepsy has been attempted, reflect the potential for clinical and personal utility, which has not been systematically studied, to our knowledge.^{16,17}

Leveraging a prospectively ascertained, single-institution cohort of 522 individuals with a range of pediatric-onset epilepsy phenotypes and performing exome sequencing (ES), we report diagnostic results and their clinical utility.

Methods

Study Cohort

This cohort study was approved by the Boston Children's Hospital (BCH) institutional review board. All participants provided consent and assent when able. We enrolled biological parents and affected siblings whenever possible. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and reported according to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology [\(STROBE\)](http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/strobe/) reporting guideline.

Between August 2018 and October 2021, we recruited individuals from the BCH Department of Neurology and Division of Epilepsy and Clinical Neurophysiology inpatient and outpatient units. Patients with nonacquired epilepsy with unknown genetic etiology were eligible. We did not exclude patients with nonspecific brain magnetic resonance imaging abnormalities, focal cortical dysplasia, or nodular heterotopia. We included patients with abnormal electroencephalogram findings without clinical seizures (eg, DEE with spike-wave activation in sleep), as their genetic causes are expected to overlap with clinical epilepsy. We excluded patients with events suspicious for seizure without definitive epilepsy. DNA was collected as previously described,^{18,19} with details provided in the eMethods in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380).

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023 2/15

Phenotypic Assessment

We reviewed clinical data from the BCH electronic medical record (EMR) and referring clinicians. We categorized age of seizure onset as neonatal (<1 month), infantile (1 month to <12 months), early childhood (1 year to <6 years), school-aged (6 years to <14 years), or adolescent (≥14 years). Seizure and epilepsy types were classified according to the International League Against Epilepsy classification by treating physicians and confirmed or reclassified by study epileptologists (K.N.W., N.C., C.M.E.A., H.E.O., and A.H.P.).²⁰⁻²⁴ Each patient was categorized as DEE vs non-DEE, and the non-DEE group divided into GGE (with specific idiopathic generalized epilepsy [IGE] syndromes noted), NAFE, or combined generalized and focal epilepsy. We assessed for the presence of intellectual disability, classified intellectual disability as borderline, mild, moderate, severe, or profound, based on reported IQ in neuropsychological evaluations (when available) or documentation by neurologists of developmental skills and supports needed, classified using standardized published criteria.²⁵ We reviewed the description of the motor portion of the neurological examination and descriptions of motor function (eg, motor milestones, activities of daily living). We assessed for evidence of abnormalities in tone (hypotonia, hypertonia), movement disorder, cerebral palsy, and other diagnoses. We noted relevant neurological family history (including febrile seizures). As variants were identified, we reassessed clinical data relevant to the specific gene.

Variant Identification and Classification

We identified rare, predicted damaging, and clinically relevant variants using standard variant calling and analyses (eMethods in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380).¹⁹ Variants were reviewed by a multidisciplinary team of pediatric neurologists, epileptologists (C.M.E.A., C.J.Y., H.E.O., and A.H.P.), genetic counselors (L.S., S.M. and B.R.S.), and additional researchers (H.Y.K. and A.M.D.) with expertise in epilepsy genetics. We classified variants as pathogenic (P), likely pathogenic (LP), or variants of uncertain significance (VUS) according to the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics/Association for Molecular Pathology guidelines.²⁶ Variants were deemed diagnostic if they were P or LP in a gene associated with the patient's phenotype or VUS in a gene associated with the phenotype but with unavailable parental segregation data.

Return of Results

All families opted to receive results. Clinical confirmation was conducted using original samples maintained at GeneDx's Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments–certified laboratory. Clinical reports were issued and families notified of results by treating neurologists and/or qualified clinicians from the study team through the BCH Epilepsy Genetics Clinic.

Assessment of Clinical Utility

For participants receiving diagnostic results at BCH, we evaluated notes for data regarding clinical utility¹⁶: impact on treatment or clinical management and/or change in prognosis. We noted mention of personal utility (eg, relief, referral to gene-specific advocacy organizations). For participants with results communicated outside BCH, we assessed whether management recommendations would have been warranted based on the genes involved.

Statistical Analysis

To identify phenotypic factors associated with diagnostic findings, we performed a bivariate analysis for each variable, including sex, age at seizure onset, DEE or intellectual disability, ASD, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), motor impairment (eg, cerebral palsy, hypertonia, hypotonia), and history of afebrile seizure in a parent. We included these variables in a multivariable logistic regression model using R statistical software version 3.2.3 (R Project for Statistical Computing) and SPSS statistical software version 27.0 (IBM) with 2-sided P < .05 as the statistical significance threshold. Data were analyzed on a rolling basis through December 2022.

Results

Cohort Characterization

We enrolled 522 individuals, including 269 (51.5%) male patients, with a mean (SD) age at epilepsy onset of 1.2 (1.4) years and a mean (SD) age at assessment of 9.6 (6.7) years (**Table 1**). We classified 142 individuals (27.2%) as DEE. Individuals without DEE included 127 individuals (24.3%) with GGE, 53 individuals (10.2%) with specific IGE syndromes, 152 individuals (29.1%) with NAFE, and 48 individuals (9.2%) with combined generalized and focal epilepsy. The most frequently observed syndrome was infantile epileptic spasms syndrome (IESS), reported in 46 individuals (8.8%). Other diagnoses included childhood absence epilepsy (34 individuals [6.5%]), Lennox-Gastaut syndrome (24 individuals [4.6%]), self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spike (16 individuals [3.1%]), juvenile myoclonic epilepsy (14 individuals [2.7%]), and epilepsy with myoclonic–atonic seizures (11 individuals [2.1%]). Individuals with seizure onset in early childhood represented the largest subset (229 individuals [43.9%]). Seizures were reported to be refractory to antiseizure medications at last follow-up in 281 participants (53.5%). Comorbidities were common, including intellectual disability in 263 individuals (50.4%). In addition, 75 individuals (14.4%) had ASD and 71 individuals (13.6%) had ADHD. A total of 99 individuals (18.9%) had had previous nondiagnostic clinical genetic testing (ie, panel or chromosomal microarray analysis).

Summary of Genetic Diagnoses

Sequencing was conducted on 328 trios (17 individuals with siblings), 170 duos with only 1 biological parent available (8 individuals with siblings), and 24 singletons (4 individuals with siblings) (**Figure 1**). We identified diagnostic genetic etiologies in 100 of 522 individuals (19.2%): 89 single nucleotide variants (SNVs) (17.0%) and 11 CNVs (2.1%). Among 142 individuals with DEE, we identified genetic etiologies in 45 individuals (31.7%). Of 180 individuals with GGE including IGE, we identified genetic etiologies in 26 individuals (14.4%); genetic etiologies were also identified in 22 of 152 individuals (14.5%) with NAFE and 7 of 48 individuals (14.6%) with combined focal and generalized epilepsy (eFigure 1 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380). There was genetic heterogeneity in all groups, and some genes were identified in multiple groups (eFigure 1 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380). Diagnostic yield among individuals with prior clinic testing was 18 of 99 individuals (18.2%), similar to those who had no prior testing (82 of 423 individuals [19.4%]; P = .79).

Diagnostic SNVs

We initially identified 317 individuals with rare, potentially damaging SNVs. Manual filtering resulted in 89 individuals (17.0%) with a total of 96 variants (including compound heterozygous or homozygous variants) that we classified as diagnostic and returned to families (81 P or LP variants, 15 VUS) (**Figure 2** and **Table 2**). These 89 participants harbored variants (including 43 previously reported) in 69 genes established as associated with epilepsy and neurodevelopmental disorders (eFigure 2 and eTable 1 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380). Nine patients had diagnostic variants in SCN1A (OMIM: [182389\)](https://omim.org/entry/182389), 3 patients each in DEPDC5 (OMIM: [614191\)](https://omim.org/entry/614191) and PRRT2 (OMIM: [614386\)](https://omim.org/entry/614386), 2 patients each in ANKRD11 (OMIM: [611192\)](https://omim.org/entry/611192), CHD2 (OMIM: [602119\)](https://omim.org/entry/602119), GABRG2 (OMIM: [137164\)](https://omim.org/entry/137164), KCNMA1 (OMIM: [600150\)](https://omim.org/entry/600150), PCDH19 (OMIM: [300460\)](https://omim.org/entry/300460), SCN1B (OMIM: [600235\)](https://omim.org/entry/600235), STXBP1 (OMIM: [602926\)](https://omim.org/entry/602926), and SYNGAP1 (OMIM: [603384\)](https://omim.org/entry/603384), and 1 patient each in 58 other genes. Variant types included missense (54 variants [50.5%]), nonsense (16 variants [15.0%]), frameshift (13 variants [12.2%]), and splice site affecting (9 variants [8.4%]) (eFigure 3 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380). Two variants were present in mosaic form, 1 in SCN1A and 1 in NEXMIF. Heterozygous apparently de novo variants in genes associated with autosomal dominant conditions and mechanisms comprised 39 variants (40.2%) of our diagnostic variants (eFigure 3 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380); 2 of these variants were subsequently identified to be mosaic in a parent. We identified inherited variants in 24 individuals, including 14 autosomal dominant conditions and 15 autosomal recessive conditions.

Abbreviations: ADHD, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; ASD, autism spectrum disorder; ASM, antiseizure medication; DEE, developmental and epileptic encephalopathy; GGE, genetic generalized epilepsy; IGE, idiopathic generalized epilepsy; NAFE, nonacquired focal epilepsy.

 $\hat{\Box}$ JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 (Reprinted) July 20, 2023 5/15

Nondiagnostic SNVs

An additional 161 individuals (30.8%) had VUS in known epilepsy genes (eTable 2 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380) not considered diagnostic due to phenotypic or disease mechanism inconsistency (eTable 3 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380). A total of 93 individuals had variants (72 de novo variants) in 101 candidate genes (eFigure 2 and eTable 4 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380) not yet implicated in epilepsy but with experimental evidence suggesting a role in brain development (eg, neuronal migration, signaling, or hyperexcitability).²⁸

Genetics Related to Syndromes

We identified genetic diagnoses in 9 of 46 individuals (20%) with IESS. Of 9 individuals with SCN1A P, LP, or VUS variants, 3 had clinical Dravet syndrome; notably, 2 parents harbored these variants in mosaic form. The others had DEE (1 individual), GGE (2 individuals), NAFE (1 individual with a germline variant and 1 individual with a mosaic variant in the proband), and combined epilepsy (1 individuals), all with seizures in the setting of fever or illness. Notably, we observed a range of epilepsy phenotypes for those genes responsible for more than 1 condition, with SCN1A associated with all 4 of the aforementioned categories, DEPDC5 with GGE and NAFE and PRRT2 with GGE and NAFE.

We iteratively interrogated phenotypic data in our interpretation of VUS, accounting for clinical features relevant to the implicated genes. For example, following detection of compound heterozygous VUS in PGAP2, we confirmed hyperphosphatasia through clinical biochemical testing. A homozygous VUS in SLC12A5 was identified in a patient with epilepsy of infancy with migrating focal seizures.29,30 Finally, a VUS in CLN8 provided an early diagnosis of neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosis, allowing for anticipatory guidance. We designated these VUS as likely diagnostic, given phenotypic features closely associated with the relevant genes.

epilepsy were enrolled and underwent ES, with 1 or both parents as available. We identified diagnostic single nucleotide variants (SNVs) in 89 individuals. These pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants and diagnostic variants of uncertain significance (VUS) were clinically confirmed and returned to patients and families. Dedicated copy number variant (CNV) analysis of the ES data identified an additional 11 diagnostic CNVs, which were also returned to patients and families. Candidate gene findings and VUS in epilepsy-associated genes that were not determined to be diagnostic were not returned to families but will be reevaluated as additional data emerges or in the eventual emergence of functional data supporting pathogenesis.

A total of 522 patients with previously unexplained

Figure 2. Clinical Features in Patients With Diagnostic Variants

Multiple logistic regression analysis of 7 phenotypic variables found that developmental epileptic encephalopathy (DEE) or diagnosis of intellectual disability and history of motor impairment were the strongest factors associated with identifying a diagnostic Exome Sequencing (ES) finding. ADHD indicates attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; ASD, autism spectrum disorder; and OR, odds ratio.

 a p < 001

 b $P < .05$.

 $\stackrel{\frown}{\Pi}$ JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 (Reprinted) July 20, 2023 6/15

(continued)

 $\hat{\bigcirc}$ JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 July 20, 2023 7/15

(continued)

 $\hat{\bigcirc}$ JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 July 20, 2023 8/15

Abbreviations: ACMG/AMP, American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics/ Association for Molecular Pathology; ASM, antiseizure medication; CAE, childhood absence epilepsy; CNV, copy number variant; DEE, developmental and epileptic encephalopathy; DS, Dravet syndrome; EEM, epilepsy with eyelid myoclonia; EIMFS, epilepsy of infancy with migrating focal seizures; EMA, epilepsy with myoclonic absences; EMATS, epilepsy with myoclonic-atonic seizures; GEFS+, generalized epilepsy with febrile seizure plus; GGE, genetic generalized epilepsy; HHE, hemiconvulsionhemiplegia epilepsy syndrome; ID, identification number; IESS, infantile epileptic spasm syndrome; IGE, idiopathic generalized epilepsy; JME, juvenile myoclonic epilepsy; LGS, Lennox-Gastaut syndrome; LP, likely pathogenic; NAFE, nonacquired focal epilepsy; NR, not reported; P, pathogenic; SELECTS, self-limited epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes; SELIE, self-limited infantile epilepsy; SHE, sleep-related hypermotor epilepsy; SNV, single nucleotide variant; VUS, variants of uncertain significance.

^a Gene, variant, and ACMG/AMP classification are given for SNVs. Coordinate, size/type of CNV, and syndrome or genes involved are given for CNVs.

Diagnostic CNVs

We identified diagnostic CNVs in 11 individuals (2.1%) (Table 2; eTable 5 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380), none of whom had a diagnostic SNV. Four variants were de novo, 5 variants were inherited, and 2 variants were unknown. In a child with refractory epilepsy and intellectual disability, we identified an 181 kb deletion in DEPDC5 (chromosome 22) inherited from a parent with well-controlled epilepsy without intellectual disability. For the 4 other inherited CNVs, the parents bearing the CNVs were unaffected, consistent with variable penetrance associated with many CNVs.^{27,31,32}

Phenotypes Associated With Genetic Diagnoses

Multivariable analysis demonstrated higher diagnostic yield among individuals with DEE or intellectual disability (adjusted odds ratio [aOR], 2.44 [95% CI, 1.40-4.26]) and motor impairment (aOR, 2.19 [95% CI, 1.34-3.58]) (Figure 2; eTable 6 in [Supplement 1\)](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380). Patients with younger age at onset had more genetic diagnoses: each year of increasing age conferred a 7% reduction in the likelihood of identifying a genetic cause (aOR per 1-year, 0.93 [95% CI, 0.88-0.98]).

Clinical Utility of Genetic Diagnoses

Data were available to assess clinical utility for 71 of 100 participants with genetic diagnoses (**Table 3**). For 29 of these patients (40.8%), we observed evidence of impact in a change in treatment or management or a change in prognosis. Genetic diagnosis led to either a discussion of or actual change in treatment, including change in antiseizure medication or implementation of the ketogenic diet, in 27 patients (38.0%). Other management changes included referrals to other specialties due to risk of nonneurological manifestations and weaning of an antiseizure medication after genetic diagnosis suggested a self-resolving epilepsy (eg, PRRT2). Five patients (7%) had a striking change in prognosis, including an early and unsuspected diagnosis of neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosis (CLN8).

Genetic counseling, including reproductive risk counseling, was offered to all families seen at BCH with diagnostic results. This was particularly relevant for families with inherited variants and for the 2 unaffected parents with low-level mosaic variants.

For the 29 participants for whom follow-up data after genetic diagnosis were not available, we noted that 8 (27.6%) had diagnoses across 5 genes associated with clinical management recommendations: SCN1A (3 patients), DEPDC5 (2 patients), POLG, STXBP1, and MTR.

Abbreviations: ASD, autism spectrum disorder; DEE, developmental and epileptic encephalopathy; ECHO, echocardiography; EKG, electrocardiography; GGE, genetic generalized epilepsy; GERD, gastroesophageal reflux disease; NAFE, nonacquired focal epilepsy; SUDEP, sudden unexpected death in epilepsy.

^a Includes only patients for whom such discussion is explicitly documented.

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 (Reprinted) July 20, 2023 10/15

Discussion

In this cohort study, we report the genetic results for a large, clinically ascertained cohort with previously unexplained pediatric-onset epilepsy. Our research-based ES data analysis included evaluation for both SNVs and CNVs, the latter from ES data, and evaluation for somatic mosaic variants. The overall yield of 19% (17% SNVs, 2% CNVs) encompasses patients with diverse epilepsy syndromes and varying severity. Equally diverse are the 69 genes identified and the pathways implicated for both early and later onset epilepsies, demonstrating the strength of genomewide approaches.^{33,34} SCN1A represented the most commonly identified gene, accounting for 9% of our diagnostic findings and associated with a range of phenotypes.

Consistent with prior reports,^{16,35} our diagnostic yield was highest in patients with higher severity, with earlier age at onset, DEE or intellectual disability, and motor impairment. Specifically, diagnostic yield for DEE (32%) was more than twice that for the other groups (14%-15%). IESS was the most common DEE syndrome in our cohort, which may reflect hospitalization rates^{16,36,37} or referral bias. We also demonstrate genetic diagnoses in patients with non-DEE epilepsies, for whom there may be lower suspicion of genetic epilepsy and less clinical urgency. While non-DEE epilepsies (eg, GGE, NAGE) are considered influenced by polygenic factors,^{10,38} we found single-gene explanations for some patients and overlap of genes implicated in the DEE and non-DEE groups.

The ability to return clinically significant results allowed direct translation of our research into the clinical realm and allowed clinicians to conduct follow-up biochemical and imaging studies, as needed, to provide evidence supporting variant pathogenicity. This is imperative, particularly in the interpretation of VUS, which can benefit from additional phenotypic information. We highlight the importance of including all clinically relevant variants, including VUS that may warrant formal reclassification, and the important dynamic aspect of variant classification that incorporates emerging phenotypic, segregation, and functional data.^{39,40}

Our continued access to enrolled patients and longitudinal EMR data enabled us to evaluate clinical utility. Delineation of clinical utility of genetic diagnoses in epilepsy is projected to increase testing by clinicians and support reimbursement from payers, thus increasing access to testing for patients. In contrast, we included a patient population with broad epilepsy phenotypes, some of whose insurance had denied coverage for clinical testing and some with low suspicion of genetic etiology. Our evidence of clinical utility in treatment, clinical management, and prognosis support clinical testing for a broad range of epilepsies.¹⁶ Beyond clinical utility, we noted anecdotally that several families expressed reduced guilt or shame after genetic diagnosis, relief at the end of a diagnostic odyssey that in some cases had lasted several years, and hope for still undiagnosed families that answers were still being explored through research. We advocate for prospective studies of the clinical and personal utility of genetic diagnoses among cohorts with epilepsy to more comprehensively demonstrate their impact.

We enrolled individuals from an academic hospital where patients seek care for new-onset epilepsy as well as long-term care for refractory epilepsy. While there were no overtly unusual features for patients with IGE or self-limited focal epilepsy, it is possible that patients with refractory seizures, who are seen more frequently, had more opportunities to enroll or more questions raised regarding etiology. This may bias our sample toward individuals with identifiable genetic diagnoses, although conversely, our overall yield may have been diminished by inclusion of patients with milder epilepsy phenotypes, such as GGE and NAFE.^{7,10} During the course of this study, we observed variability in genetic testing approval by insurance payers. Increased access to clinical ES, especially for DEE, may have reduced the seizure severity for patients referred for research ES, possibly accounting for our diagnostic yield of 19% being lower than some previous reports.⁴¹

We recognize the importance of continued evaluation of patients for whom genetic causes were not found. Exome reanalysis should include evaluation for novel genes and mosaic variants. For some patients, particularly those with syndromes suggesting 1 or more specific genes, genetic diagnoses may be identifiable through targeted deep sequencing of specific genes to assess for mosaic variants,

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023 11/15

or trio genome sequencing to evaluate for intronic, structural, or other types of variants undetectable with standard ES.⁴² Identification of additional patients and ongoing functional studies may ultimately lead to increased certainty regarding candidate genes. While the time required to scrutinize each variant of potential interest may be prohibitive in some settings, we demonstrate the merits of this approach, with referrals to neurogenetics specialists or subspecialty clinics as needed for variant assessment and explanation of results and their implications to patients and families. As technologies continue to evolve, we advocate for continued harmonization between the research and clinical realms for variant interpretation and translation of research findings to achieve diagnostic precision and clinical utility for all patients with unexplained epilepsy. Finally, future research concerning the psychological effects of these sometimes early genetic diagnoses on families will be important to inform future neurogenetics practice.

Limitations

This study has some limitations. We used exome capture and undertook CNV analysis of the resulting data to identify deletions or duplications. We acknowledge that exome capture may not detect all CNVs and that genome sequencing might be needed to detect variants beyond SNVs. We were also limited in our interpretation by lack of parental data for some patients, but we chose to include all individuals regardless of parental availability. Furthermore, as with a recent study reporting clinical utility of epilepsy panels,⁴³ our EMR-based assessment could not accurately determine impact on hospitalization rates, morbidity or mortality, clinical trials eligibility, and avoidance of testing procedures (such as lumbar puncture, magnetic resonance imaging, or electroencephalography).

Conclusions

In this cohort study, we illustrated the diverse genetic landscape of pediatric-onset epilepsy in a hospital-based cohort, leveraging research-clinical partnerships to incorporate evolving clinical data in phenotyping, implement the most current guidelines with expertise in genomic analysis and variant interpretation, and increase diagnostic yield and clinical utility.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Accepted for Publication: May 31, 2023.

Published: July 20, 2023. doi[:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380)

Open Access: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [CC-BY License.](https://jamanetwork.com/pages/cc-by-license-permissions/?utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380) © 2023 Koh HY et al.JAMA Network Open.

Corresponding Author: Annapurna H. Poduri, MD, MPH, Boston Children's Hospital, 300 Longwood Ave, Boston, MA 02115 [\(annapurna.poduri@childrens.harvard.edu\)](mailto:annapurna.poduri@childrens.harvard.edu).

Author Affiliations: Epilepsy Genetics Program, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (H. Y. Koh, Smith, Wiltrout, D'Gama, Park, Knight, Sexton, J. J. Koh, Oby, Pinsky, D. D. Shao, Mahida, Moufawad El Achkar, Yuskaitis, Olson, Sheidley, Poduri); Department of Neurology, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (H. Y. Koh, Smith, Wiltrout, Chourasia, D. D. Shao, Zhang, Mahida, Moufawad El Achkar, Yuskaitis, Olson, Sheidley, Poduri); F.M. Kirby Neurobiology Center, Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (H. Y. Koh, Yuskaitis, Olson, Poduri); The Manton Center for Orphan Disease Research, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (H. Y. Koh, Rockowitz, Sliz); Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (Wiltrout, D. D. Shao, Moufawad El Achkar, Yuskaitis, Olson, Poduri); Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (Podury, D'Gama); Department of Pediatrics and Neurology, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Memphis (Chourasia); Division of Newborn Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (D'Gama); Research Computing, Department of Information Technology, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (French, W. Shao, Rockowitz, Sliz); Division of Molecular Medicine, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (Sliz); Biostatistics and Research Design Center, Institutional Centers for Clinical and Translational Research, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (Zhang, Moufawad El Achkar); Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Poduri).

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023 12/15

Author Contributions: Dr Poduri had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Dr Koh and Ms Smith contributed equally to this work.

Concept and design: H. Y. Koh, Podury, Sliz, Olson, Sheidley, Poduri.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: H. Y. Koh, Smith, Wiltrout, Podury, Chourasia, D'Gama, Park, Knight, Sexton, J. J. Koh, Oby, Pinsky, D. D. Shao, French, W. Shao, Rockowitz, Zhang, Mahida, Moufawad El Achkar, Yuskaitis, Olson, Poduri.

Drafting of the manuscript: H. Y. Koh, Smith, Knight, Sexton, Sliz, Zhang, Poduri.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: H. Y. Koh, Wiltrout, Podury, Chourasia, D'Gama, Park, J. J. Koh, Oby, Pinsky, D. D. Shao, French, W. Shao, Rockowitz, Zhang, Mahida, Moufawad El Achkar, Yuskaitis, Olson, Sheidley, Poduri.

Statistical analysis: H. Y. Koh, Zhang.

Obtained funding: H. Y. Koh, D'Gama, Poduri.

Administrative, technical, or material support: H. Y. Koh, Smith, Park, Knight, J. J. Koh, Pinsky, D. D. Shao, W. Shao, Rockowitz, Sliz, Mahida, Moufawad El Achkar, Sheidley.

Supervision: Chourasia, Zhang, Moufawad El Achkar, Sheidley, Poduri.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Wiltrout reported receiving personal fees from Stoke Therapeutics outside the submitted work. Dr Sliz reported serving as a cofounder, scientific advisory board member, and equity holder of Redona Therapeutics. Dr Olson reported receiving personal fees from Takeda Pharmaceuticals, Zogenix, Ovid Therapeutics, Marinus Pharmaceuticals, FOXG1 Research Foundation, Efficient CME, and FamilieSCN2A and grants from the International Foundation for CDKL5 Research Centers of Excellence, LouLou Foundation, and National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS) outside the submitted work. Dr Poduri reported serving as on scientific advisory boards for TevardBio and SynGAP Research Fund outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by the Boston Children's Hospital Children's Rare Disease Cohorts Initiative and the Robinson Family Initiative for Transformational Research. Dr Poduri was supported by the BCH Translational Research Program. Dr H. Y. Koh was supported by the Manton Center Rare Disease Research Fellowship Award. Dr D'Gama was supported by Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (grant No. T32 HD 09806). Dr D. D. Shao was supported by NINDS (grant No. K12 HD052896).

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Group Information: A complete list of the members of the BCH Neurology Referral and Phenotyping Group appears in [Supplement 2.](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380)

Data Sharing Statement: See [Supplement 3.](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380)

REFERENCES

1. Fisher RS, Acevedo C, Arzimanoglou A, et al. ILAE official report: a practical clinical definition of epilepsy. Epilepsia. 2014;55(4):475-482. doi[:10.1111/epi.12550](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.12550)

2. Jacobs M, Jensen FE. Introduction to institute of medicine report: epilepsy across the spectrum: promoting health and understanding. Epilepsy Curr. 2012;12(6):243-244. doi[:10.5698/1535-7511-12.6.243](https://dx.doi.org/10.5698/1535-7511-12.6.243)

3. Fiest KM, Sauro KM, Wiebe S, et al. Prevalence and incidence of epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of international studies. Neurology. 2017;88(3):296-303. doi[:10.1212/WNL.0000000000003509](https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000003509)

4. Löscher W. Fit for purpose application of currently existing animal models in the discovery of novel epilepsy therapies. Epilepsy Res. 2016;126:157-184. doi[:10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2016.05.016](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2016.05.016)

5. Helbig I, Lowenstein DH. Genetics of the epilepsies: where are we and where are we going? Curr Opin Neurol. 2013;26(2):179-185. doi[:10.1097/WCO.0b013e32835ee6ff](https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0b013e32835ee6ff)

6. Thomas RH, Berkovic SF. The hidden genetics of epilepsy—a clinically important new paradigm. Nat Rev Neurol. 2014;10(5):283-292. doi[:10.1038/nrneurol.2014.62](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2014.62)

7. Epi4K consortium; Epilepsy Phenome/Genome Project. Ultra-rare genetic variation in common epilepsies: a case-control sequencing study. Lancet Neurol. 2017;16(2):135-143. doi[:10.1016/S1474-4422\(16\)30359-3](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(16)30359-3)

8. Epi4K Consortium; EuroEPINOMICS-RES Consortium; Epilepsy Phenome Genome Project. Application of rare variant transmission disequilibrium tests to epileptic encephalopathy trio sequence data. Eur J Hum Genet. 2017; 25(7):894-899. doi[:10.1038/ejhg.2017.61](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ejhg.2017.61)

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023 13/15

9. EuroEPINOMICS-RES Consortium; Epilepsy Phenome/Genome Project; Epi4K Consortium. De novo mutations in synaptic transmission genes including DNM1 cause epileptic encephalopathies. Am J Hum Genet. 2014;95(4): 360-370. doi[:10.1016/j.ajhg.2014.08.013](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2014.08.013)

10. Koko M, Motelow JE, Stanley KE, Bobbili DR, Dhindsa RS, May P; Canadian Epilepsy Network; Epi4K Consortium; Epilepsy Phenome/Genome Project; EpiPGX Consortium; EuroEPINOMICS-CoGIE Consortium. Association of ultra-rare coding variants with genetic generalized epilepsy: a case-control whole exome sequencing study. Epilepsia. 2022;63(3):723-735. doi[:10.1111/epi.17166](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17166)

11. McTague A, Howell KB, Cross JH, Kurian MA, Scheffer IE. The genetic landscape of the epileptic encephalopathies of infancy and childhood. Lancet Neurol. 2016;15(3):304-316. doi[:10.1016/S1474-4422\(15\)](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(15)00250-1) [00250-1](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(15)00250-1)

12. Poduri A, Sheidley BR, Shostak S, Ottman R. Genetic testing in the epilepsies—developments and dilemmas. Nat Rev Neurol. 2014;10(5):293-299. doi[:10.1038/nrneurol.2014.60](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2014.60)

13. Consortium E; EpiPM Consortium. A roadmap for precision medicine in the epilepsies. Lancet Neurol. 2015;14 (12):1219-1228. doi[:10.1016/S1474-4422\(15\)00199-4](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(15)00199-4)

14. Demarest ST, Brooks-Kayal A. From molecules to medicines: the dawn of targeted therapies for genetic epilepsies. Nat Rev Neurol. 2018;14(12):735-745. doi[:10.1038/s41582-018-0099-3](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41582-018-0099-3)

15. Krueger DA, Sadhwani A, Byars AW, et al. Everolimus for treatment of tuberous sclerosis complex–associated neuropsychiatric disorders. Ann Clin Transl Neurol. 2017;4(12):877-887. doi[:10.1002/acn3.494](https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acn3.494)

16. Sheidley BR, Malinowski J, Bergner AL, et al. Genetic testing for the epilepsies: a systematic review. Epilepsia. 2022;63(2):375-387. doi[:10.1111/epi.17141](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17141)

17. Hayeems RZ, Luca S, Assamad D, Bhatt A, Ungar WJ. Utility of genetic testing from the perspective of parents/ caregivers: a scoping review. Children (Basel). 2021;8(4):259. doi[:10.3390/children8040259](https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/children8040259)

18. Smith LA, Ullmann JF, Olson HE, et al. A model program for translational medicine in epilepsy genetics.J Child Neurol. 2017;32(4):429-436. doi[:10.1177/0883073816685654](https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0883073816685654)

19. Rockowitz S, LeCompte N, Carmack M, et al. Children's rare disease cohorts: an integrative research and clinical genomics initiative. NPJ Genom Med. 2020;5:29. doi[:10.1038/s41525-020-0137-0](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41525-020-0137-0)

20. Zuberi SM, Wirrell E, Yozawitz E, et al. ILAE classification and definition of epilepsy syndromes with onset in neonates and infants: position statement by the ILAE Task Force on Nosology and Definitions. Epilepsia. 2022;63 (6):1349-1397. doi[:10.1111/epi.17239](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17239)

21. Specchio N, Wirrell EC, Scheffer IE, et al. International League Against Epilepsy classification and definition of epilepsy syndromes with onset in childhood: position paper by the ILAE Task Force on Nosology and Definitions. Epilepsia. 2022;63(6):1398-1442. doi[:10.1111/epi.17241](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17241)

22. Riney K, Bogacz A, Somerville E, et al. International League Against Epilepsy classification and definition of epilepsy syndromes with onset at a variable age: position statement by the ILAE Task Force on Nosology and Definitions. Epilepsia. 2022;63(6):1443-1474. doi[:10.1111/epi.17240](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17240)

23. Hirsch E, French J, Scheffer IE, et al. ILAE definition of the idiopathic generalized epilepsy syndromes: position statement by the ILAE Task Force on Nosology and Definitions. Epilepsia. 2022;63(6):1475-1499. doi[:10.1111/](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17236) [epi.17236](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.17236)

24. Scheffer IE, Berkovic S, Capovilla G, et al. ILAE classification of the epilepsies: position paper of the ILAE Commission for Classification and Terminology. Epilepsia. 2017;58(4):512-521. doi[:10.1111/epi.13709](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.13709)

25. Boat TF, Wu JT; Committee to Evaluate the Supplemental Security Income Disability Program for Children with Mental Disorders; Board on the Health of Select Populations; Board on Children, Youth, and Families. Mental Disorders and Disabilities Among Low-Income Children. The National Academies Press; 2015. doi[:10.17226/21780](https://dx.doi.org/10.17226/21780)

26. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, et al; ACMG Laboratory Quality Assurance Committee. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-424. doi[:10.](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/gim.2015.30) [1038/gim.2015.30](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/gim.2015.30)

27. Zhang X, Huang Z, Liu J, et al. Phenotypic and genotypic characterization of DEPDC5-related familial focal epilepsy: case series and literature review. Front Neurol. 2021;12:641019. doi[:10.3389/fneur.2021.641019](https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2021.641019)

28. Consortium GT; GTEx Consortium. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project. Nat Genet. 2013;45(6): 580-585. doi[:10.1038/ng.2653](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ng.2653)

29. Burgess R, Wang S, McTague A, et al; EIMFS Consortium. The genetic landscape of epilepsy of infancy with migrating focal seizures. Ann Neurol. 2019;86(6):821-831. doi[:10.1002/ana.25619](https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.25619)

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023 14/15

30. Stödberg T, McTague A, Ruiz AJ, et al. Mutations in SLC12A5 in epilepsy of infancy with migrating focal seizures. Nat Commun. 2015;6:8038. doi[:10.1038/ncomms9038](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9038)

31. Mefford HC, Sharp AJ, Baker C, et al. Recurrent rearrangements of chromosome 1q21.1 and variable pediatric phenotypes. N Engl J Med. 2008;359(16):1685-1699. doi[:10.1056/NEJMoa0805384](https://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa0805384)

32. Girirajan S, Rosenfeld JA, Cooper GM, et al. A recurrent 16p12.1 microdeletion supports a two-hit model for severe developmental delay. Nat Genet. 2010;42(3):203-209. doi[:10.1038/ng.534](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ng.534)

33. Sánchez Fernández I, Loddenkemper T, Gaínza-Lein M, Sheidley BR, Poduri A. Diagnostic yield of genetic tests in epilepsy: a meta-analysis and cost-effectiveness study. Neurology. 2019;92(5):e418-e428. doi[:10.1212/WNL.](https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000006850) [0000000000006850](https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000006850)

34. Howell KB, Eggers S, Dalziel K, et al; Victorian Severe Epilepsy of Infancy Study Group. A population-based cost-effectiveness study of early genetic testing in severe epilepsies of infancy. Epilepsia. 2018;59(6):1177-1187. doi[:10.1111/epi.14087](https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.14087)

35. Boonsimma P, Ittiwut C, Kamolvisit W, et al. Exome sequencing as first-tier genetic testing in infantile-onset pharmacoresistant epilepsy: diagnostic yield and treatment impact. Eur J Hum Genet[. 2023;31\(2\):179-187.](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36198807)

36. Chourasia N, Yuskaitis C, Zhang B, Poduri A, Harini C. Etiology of Infantile spasms and yield of genetic testing: a tertiary center study (2825). Neurology. 2021;96(15 suppl):2825.

37. Allen AS, Berkovic SF, Cossette P, et al; Epi4K Consortium; Epilepsy Phenome/Genome Project. De novo mutations in epileptic encephalopathies. Nature. 2013;501(7466):217-221. doi[:10.1038/nature12439](https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature12439)

38. Epi25 Collaborative. Ultra-rare genetic variation in the epilepsies: a whole-exome sequencing study of 17,606 individuals. Am J Hum Genet. 2019;105(2):267-282. doi[:10.1016/j.ajhg.2019.05.020](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2019.05.020)

39. Preston CG, Wright MW, Madhavrao R, et al; Clinical Genome Resource (ClinGen). ClinGen Variant Curation Interface: a variant classification platform for the application of evidence criteria from ACMG/AMP guidelines. Genome Med. 2022;14(1):6. doi[:10.1186/s13073-021-01004-8](https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13073-021-01004-8)

40. Rehm HL, Berg JS, Brooks LD, et al; ClinGen. ClinGen—the Clinical Genome Resource. N Engl J Med. 2015;372 (23):2235-2242. doi[:10.1056/NEJMsr1406261](https://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsr1406261)

41. Olson H, Shen Y, Avallone J, et al. Copy number variation plays an important role in clinical epilepsy. Ann Neurol. 2014;75(6):943-958. doi[:10.1002/ana.24178](https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ana.24178)

42. Palmer EE, Sachdev R, Macintosh R, et al. Diagnostic yield of whole genome sequencing after nondiagnostic exome sequencing or gene panel in developmental and epileptic encephalopathies. Neurology. 2021;96(13): e1770-e1782. doi[:10.1212/WNL.0000000000011655](https://dx.doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000011655)

43. McKnight D, Morales A, Hatchell KE, et al; ELEVIATE Consortium. Genetic testing to inform epilepsy treatment management from an International Study of Clinical Practice. JAMA Neurol. 2022;79(12):1267-1276. doi[:10.1001/](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamaneurol.2022.3651&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380) [jamaneurol.2022.3651](https://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jamaneurol.2022.3651&utm_campaign=articlePDF%26utm_medium=articlePDFlink%26utm_source=articlePDF%26utm_content=jamanetworkopen.2023.24380)

SUPPLEMENT 1.

eMethods.

eTable 1. Clinical and Diagnostic Genetic Findings in 89 Patients With SNVs **eTable 2.** A Phenotype-Driven Epilepsy Gene List **eTable 3.** Nondiagnostic VUS in Epilepsy-Related Genes **eTable 4.** Novel Candidate Epilepsy Genes and Their Associated Phenotypes **eTable 5.** Clinical and Diagnostic Genetic Findings in 11 Cases With CNVs **eTable 6.** Bivariate and Multivariate Regression Model of Phenotypic Variables to Diagnostic Yield by ES **eFigure 1.** Diagnostic Yield and Age of Seizure Onset According to Epilepsy Type **eFigure 2.** Established and Candidate Epilepsy Genes in the Study Cohort **eFigure 2.** Variant Types Among the Diagnostic SNVs and CNVs

eFigure 3. Clinical Features in Patients With Epilepsy Associated With Diagnostic Variants

SUPPLEMENT 2.

Members of the BCH Neurology Referral and Phenotyping Group

SUPPLEMENT 3.

Data Sharing Statement

 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023;6(7):e2324380. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.24380 \bigcap JAMA Network Open. 2023 15/15