# Genetic Variants and Therapeutic Approaches in Maturity-Onset Diabetes of the Young: A Retrospective Analysis

Lily Deng, M.D.<sup>1</sup>, Amy S. Shah, M.D.<sup>1</sup>, Mansa Krishnamurthy, M.D.<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division Endocrinology, Department of Pediatrics, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical

Center, Cincinnati, OH, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, OH

\*Corresponding author

Key words: MODY, GLP-1, Genetics, Sulfonylurea

Funding disclosure: None to disclose

Disclosure statement: The authors do not have any duality of interest to disclose

#### Abstract:

*Context:* Identifying Maturity-Onset Diabetes of the Young (MODY) in patients with diabetes is essential because treatment differs significantly from other forms of diabetes. We identified patients with MODY gene variants and evaluated their clinical characteristics and responses to treatment.

*Evidence Acquisition:* We identified 106 patients with genetic MODY variants. Demographics, islet autoantibodies at diabetes diagnosis, co-morbidities, and response to treatment by genetic variant were evaluated.

*Evidence Synthesis:* Patients diagnosed with MODY variants comprised 4% of the total population with diabetes. Mean age and HbA1c of patients with MODY at diagnosis were 10.5 years and 8.2%, respectively. Surprisingly, diabetic ketoacidosis was a presenting feature for some (n=7, 6.8%), and others with MODY had positive islet cell autoantibodies (n= 7, 6.6%). Variants in HNF1A, GCK, and HNF1B were frequently observed (20%, 22%, and 17% respectively), while rare variants in PDX1, RFX6, BLK, and CNOT1 were uncovered. Initial and follow up treatment of patients with MODY were compared. For each medication (Insulin, Metformin, Sulfonylureas, and GLP-1 receptor agonists), a reduction in HbA1c was observed at follow-up (0.3-21%). Insulin and sulfonylureas were associated with an increase in average BMI (insulin: +8.23%, n=21, sulfonylurea: +0.63%, n=12) at follow-up, metformin was intermediate (-2.46%, n=4), and GLP-1 receptor agonists demonstrated the greatest decrease in BMI (-4.79%, n=4).

*Conclusions:* The presence of islet autoantibodies or diabetic ketoacidosis does not preclude the diagnosis of MODY. Given the observed improvements in BMI and HbA1c,

further investigation into the use of GLP-1 receptor agonists as treatment for MODY should be considered.

### Introduction

Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY) is a monogenic form of diabetes mellitus that is dominantly inherited and accounts for approximately 1-5% of the pediatric population with diabetes<sup>1-3</sup>. Patients often present before 25 years of age with lack of beta cell autoimmunity and some residual beta cell function<sup>4-6</sup>. To date, 14 causative MODY genes have been identified<sup>7</sup> with the most common being glucokinase (GCK), hepatocyte nuclear factor-1 alpha (HNF1A), and hepatocyte nuclear factor 4 alpha (HNF4A)<sup>2,8</sup>. Variants in these genes can lead to defects<sup>6</sup> in glucose sensing and insulin secretion<sup>3</sup>. Clinical phenotypes differ based on the genetic defect, and treatment and management options for patients considerably differ from those with a diagnosis of type 1 or type 2 diabetes. For example, patients diagnosed with GCK pathogenic variants do not require medical management<sup>8</sup>, while patients with HNF1A and HNF1 homeobox B (HNF1B) pathogenic variants are usually responsive to sulfonylureas<sup>9,10</sup>. The recognition of MODY is crucial; unfortunately, MODY is commonly misdiagnosed, leading to unnecessary insulin treatment for numerous patients. Moreover, there is often a delay in correct genetic diagnosis from the initial diabetes diagnosis due to lack of clinical recognition or access to genetic testing.

Patients with MODY may have additional clinical findings due to their underlying genetic variants which further raises the importance of timely, accurate identification of this patient population. Renal cysts are found in patients with HNF1B pathogenic variants, exocrine pancreatic insufficiency in patients with carboxyl ester lipase (CEL) pathogenic variants, and optic nerve atrophy, hearing loss and neurodegeneration in patients with wolframin ER transmembrane glycoprotein (WFS1) pathogenic variants. Thus, timely

genetic diagnosis tailors the most appropriate treatment of diabetes and allows for effective management of co-morbidities in this patient population<sup>11</sup>. Timely diagnosis of MODY also results in decreased healthcare costs and increased quality of life (due to medical management for MODY or cessation of unneeded medications) in a simulated model<sup>12</sup>.

Traditionally, treatment modalities for MODY have included lifestyle modifications, sulfonylureas, and insulin therapy. However, glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists have emerged as potential therapeutic options for the treatment of MODY<sup>4,13-15</sup>. Randomized, double-blinded clinical trials and case reports have shown a reduction in fasting plasma glucose levels with less frequent episodes of hypoglycemia<sup>14</sup> and reduced hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c)<sup>16</sup> in patients with HNF1A variants, while a significant reduction in HbgA1c was observed in a father-son cohort with a variant in HNF4A<sup>13</sup> with another case report showing reduction in HbA1c and body mass index (BMI) in an 18-year-old with HNF1B-MODY<sup>17</sup>. GLP-1 receptor agonists exert an insulinotropic effect in a strictly glucose-dependent manner resulting in a low risk for hypoglycemia which is commonly seen as a side effect in insulin and sulfonylurea therapy<sup>14</sup>. Moreover, GLP-1 receptor agonists have been demonstrated to decrease BMI in pediatric and adult patients with type 2 diabetes<sup>18,19</sup>, suggesting that improvements in glucose tolerance and insulin sensitivity may have added advantages when using GLP-1 receptor agonists in the population with MODY.

The aim of our study was to characterize our patient population with MODY based on genetics and evaluate presentation, presence of co-morbidities and islet cell autoantibodies, and treatments at diagnosis and over time.

#### **Research Design and Methods**

A retrospective chart review, utilizing diagnoses codes for MODY and MODY panel testing, was performed on patients diagnosed with diabetes at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (CCHMC) from January 2010 until June 2023. This revealed 106 patients with variants in known MODY genes. Thirty-six (36) of these patients had variants of unknown significance (VUS), 2 patients had possible pathogenic variants, and 19 patients had likely pathogenic variants. Thirty-nine (39) patients had pathogenic variants, and 1 patient had a variant originally designated as pathogenic but now classified as a polymorphism. The remaining genetic variants did not have documented clinical significance (1 patient was diagnosed with HNF1A pathogenic variant based on biopsy findings and staining.) Patients with only clinical findings suggestive MODY were not included in this study.

Genetic testing was performed in a clinical setting and included the following tests: Invitae monogenic diabetes panel, Prevention genetics, Seattle Children's Hospital, and Gene Dx monogenic diabetes panels. Invitae utilizes next-generation sequencing technology (NGS) for both sequencing analysis and deletion/duplication analysis to analyze regions of each gene tested. This panel includes ATP binding cassette subfamily C member 8 (ABCC8), adaptor protein, phosphotyrosine interacting with PH domain and leucine zipper 1 (APPL1), B Lymphocyte Kinase (BLK), eukaryotic translation initiation factor 2 alpha kinase 3 (EIF2AK3), forkhead box P3 (FOXP3), GATA binding protein 4 (GATA4), GATA binding protein 6 (GATA6), GCK, GLIS family zinc finger 3 (GLIS3), HNF1A, HNF1B, HNF4A, immediate early response 3 interacting protein 1 (IER3IP1), insulin (INS), potassium inwardly rectifying channel subfamily J member 11 (KCNJ11),

KLF transcription factor 11 (KLF11), motor neuron and pancreas homeobox 1 (MNX1), neuronal differentiation 1 (NEUROD1), neurogenin 3 (NEUROG3), NK2 homeobox 2 (NKX2-2), paired box 4 (PAX4), pancreatic and duodenal homeobox 1 (PDX1), peroxisome proliferator activated receptor gamma (PPARG), pancreas associated transcription factor 1a (PTF1A), regulatory factor x6 (RFX6), solute carrier family 19 member 2 (SLC19A2), WFS1, and ZFP57 zinc finger protein (ZFP57). The lab then uses Moon software tool to analyze exomes, supported by a gene-disease database, Apollo, to evaluate variants and determine clinical significance. Sherloc, lvitae's own variant classification algorithm includes data from their functional modeling platform and RNA analysis. If variants are re-classified, addendums are added to prior reports. The Prevention Genetics MODY panel utilizes NGS to target coding regions of each gene in addition to margins of 10 bases of noncoding DNA on either side of the targeted coding regions. Copy number variations (CNVs) can be detected with their technology, although if it is not technically possible to confirm smaller CNVs, then those are not included on the result report. Variants are described using Human Gene Variation Society recommendations. Genes tested include ABCC8, APPL1, BLK, CEL, CCR4-NOT transcription complex subunit 1 (CNOT1), GCK, glutamate dehydrogenase 1 (GLUD1), hydroxyacyl-CoA dehydrogenase (HADH), HNF1A, HNF1B, HNF4A, INS, KCNJ11, KLF11, NEUROD1, PAX4, PDX1, RFX6, and WFS1. Seattle Children's MODY panel utilizes NGS technology to sequence target regions and a margin of at least 10 base pairs of introns surrounding the target region. Their methods can detect CNVs and small deletions or insertions. Genes included in this panel include ABCC8, APPL1, BLK, CEL, GCK, HNF1A, HNF1B, HNF4A, INS, INS-IGF2 readthrough (INS-IGF2), KCNJ11, KLF11,

NEUROD1, PAX4, and PDX1. GeneDx utilizes NGS with CNV calling to evaluate for sequence variants in ABCC8, APPL1, BLK, CEL, GCK, GLUD1, HADH, HNF1A, HNF1B, HNF4A, INS, KCNJ11, KLF11, NEUROD1, PAX4, PDX1, RFX6, and WFS1. They mainly report pathogenic variants, likely pathogenic variants, and VUS. Genetic variants are classified according to clinical information provided by the ordering provider, Human Gene Mutation Database/other databases, phenotype, severity of sequence change and function, and population frequency.

Data reviewed from medical charts included patient demographics (age, race, sex/ethnicity), anthropometrics (including BMI), laboratory data, genetic testing results, initial diabetes presentation, and medication use.

#### **Statistics and Data Analysis.**

Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 9.0. If the HbA1c value was reported as >14%, a value of 14% was used in the analysis as there was no exact HbA1c value available due to the lab assay performed. For patients receiving a medication and then concurrently starting a second medication, their BMI and HbA1c parameters were assessed at initiation and follow-up of the first medication. Follow-up was defined as the first visit documented since initiation of medication, which ranged from 1-9 months with majority of follow ups between 1-3 months. This was counted separately from their BMI and HbA1c at the initiation and follow-up of the second medication. Changes in BMI and HbA1c were measured by calculating percent difference between initial BMI or HbA1c and follow-up BMI or HbA1c, respectively. Several patients on medications did not have follow ups within the specified time for follow up (above), so their BMI and HbA1c data were not included to limit confounding. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed

by Tukey's post hoc test was used to evaluate the differences in BMI and HbA1c between medication classes at initial diabetes diagnosis and follow-up. A p value of <0.05 was considered significant.

#### Results

#### **Baseline Patient Characteristics**

We identified 106 patients with variants in known MODY genes (Figure 1, Supplement Table 1). Nine of these patients had benign genetic variants or variants not associated in MODY genes. Forty of these patients had variants of unknown significance, two patients had possibly pathogenic variants, and nineteen patients had likely pathogenic variants. Thirty-five patients had pathogenic variants. Patients with any variant in a MODY gene comprised 4.0% of the total patient population with diabetes at our center receiving care during the same interval (Supplement Figure 1). Pathogenic variants and VUS in GCK, HNF1A, HNF4A, and HNF1B comprised a total of around 66% of those found in our population with MODY. Moreover, the majority of pathogenic (83%) and likely pathogenic variants (77%) (Supplement Table 2) were found within the cohort of patients with GCK, HNF1A, HNF4A, and HNF1B variants. Rarer pathogenic variants and VUS were also identified in APPL1, BLK, PDX1, CNOT1, NEUROD1, and RFX6 (Supplement Table 1).

The average mean age  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD) at diabetes diagnosis was 10.5  $\pm$  5.7 years, and the mean HbA1c at diagnosis was 8.2%  $\pm$  3.2 for our population with MODY. Sex distribution of our population with MODY was 55.7% female and 44.3% male (Table 1). Most patients with MODY self-reported race/ethnicity as non-Hispanic white (66%). MODY was also diagnosed in patients who self-identified as Hispanic, non-

Hispanic Black, and Asian/Pacific Islander. Negative islet cell autoantibodies were observed in 62.3% of patients with MODY, but 6.6% of patients had at least one islet cell autoantibody prior to the initiation of insulin therapy (including anti-glutamic acid decarboxylase (GAD) and zinc transporter 8 (ZnT8)). One patient was positive for two islet autoantibodies (with a likely pathogenic GCK variant), while another patient (with a variant in GCK) tested positive for ZnT8. Moreover, 31.1% of the total patient population with MODY did not have islet cell autoantibody screening collected at time of diabetes diagnosis (perhaps as they were suspected to have MODY from diabetes onset).

At diagnosis of diabetes, the most common initial diagnoses assigned to these patients were type 1 diabetes (36%), MODY (28%), unknown diabetes type (24%), and Type 2 diabetes (7%) (Table 1). The most common initial therapy at diagnosis of diabetes was no medication, followed by basal bolus insulin therapy (Table 1).

#### **Genetic Characteristics of Patient Population**

By gene, patients with a variant in HNF1B had the shortest average duration from diagnosis of diabetes to diagnosis of MODY, -7.2 months (Table 2) as n=10/20 of these patients were diagnosed with MODY prior to developing diabetes when renal cysts or other malformations were identified *in utero* or in early childhood. There was no significant difference across genetic variants when duration to MODY diagnosis was analyzed (p=0.1.) The average age at diagnosis of diabetes by gene varied from 3 to 16 years (Table 2). HbA1c at diabetes diagnosis was highest in a patient with an APPL1 (n=1) variant, followed by a NEUROD1 (n= 1) variant and a patient with an INS (n=1/6) variant.

### **Comorbidities in Patient Population**

Comorbidities were also evaluated for each patient at time of diabetes diagnosis. Most patients (92.4%) had a normal systolic and diastolic blood pressure, and 7.6% of patients were diagnosed with elevated blood pressure or stage 1 hypertension (Table 1). Acanthosis nigricans was noted on physical exam in 14.6% of patients. Diabetic ketoacidosis was a presenting feature in 6.8% of patients. These patients were found to have VUS in GCK, KCNJ11, RFX6, INS, ABCC8, WFS1, and HNF1A. Moreover, lipid profile, thyroid stimulating hormone (TSH), and celiac screening were obtained at diabetes diagnosis (as patients were presumed to have a diagnosis of type 1 diabetes) in 67%, 69%, and 43% of the patient population with MODY, respectively (Table 1). Abnormal lipids (elevated triglycerides, low HDL, elevated LDL, or elevated total cholesterol) were found in 22.6% of patients, 5.7% had slightly abnormal TSH, and no patients screened positive for celiac disease.

#### Initial and Current Treatment Modalities Utilized in Patients with MODY

The initial and current treatment modalities in our patient population with MODY were evaluated along with change in BMI and HbA1c from diagnosis to follow-up. No medications at diagnosis were administered in 53% of MODY patients, and 53% were not on medications at follow-up (Tables 1 and 3). Of the 47% of the patients who received medications at diagnosis, treatments included insulin (36%), metformin (7%), insulin and metformin combination (3%), and sulfonylureas (1%) (Table 1.) The therapies during the 1-9 months of follow-up included insulin (21.6%), sulfonylureas (15.9%), GLP-1 receptor agonists (4.6%), and metformin (4.6%) (Table 3.) The follow-up visit utilized for this data was the first visit the patient returned after starting the medication.

Patients with variants in HNF1A comprised the largest group treated with sulfonylureas at follow-up (36% of the total population with HNF1A variants) (Table 3). Patients with HNF1A, HNF4A, and INS variants comprised the largest group treated with insulin therapy (27%, 44%, and 67% of the population with those variants respectively) (Table 3). Regardless of medication class, the mean change in HbA1c at follow-up was - 1.2%, with the highest reduction seen in patients on insulin (-2.7%.) Patients on insulin (n=21) also experienced a mean increase in weight of 8.2% whereas patients on other medications including metformin and GLP-1 receptor agonists (Semaglutide and Liraglutide) were noted to have weight loss (-2.5% and -4.8% respectively) (Figure 2). Compared to patients on GLP-1 receptor agonists, patients on sulfonylureas (n=12) had weight gain at follow up (0.63%) (Figure 2). The greatest percent in BMI reduction was seen in patients on GLP-1 receptor agonists (-4.8%, n=4) (Figure 2).

#### Discussion

In this retrospective study, we performed an in-depth characterization of our patient population with genetically confirmed MODY to evaluate demographics, laboratory data, co-morbidities and treatment modality at diagnosis and current treatments. Our study provides clear support for identifying patients with MODY: most patients are non-Hispanic white, test negative for islet cell antibodies, have mild hyperglycemia reflected by a median HbA1c at presentation of 6.7%, and have a BMI <85<sup>th</sup> percentile for age and sex. Pathogenic genetic variants were more commonly found in GCK, HNF1A, and HNF1B; several rare variants were also uncovered in genes including APPL, BLK, PDX1, RFX6, CNOT1, PAX4, and NEUROD1. Finally, a reduction in BMI was noted in all treatment

groups except for insulin, while the greatest reduction in BMI was noted in the group receiving GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy. Most of the patients on sulfonylureas had mild elevations in BMI at follow-up, except one patient with excellent BMI reduction due to lifestyle modifications.

While several of the findings of our study are consistent with the literature, there are several differences to highlight. MODY has traditionally been described to occur more commonly in non- Hispanic white youth<sup>20,21</sup>. While our data is consistent with this, we also noted MODY in several other race/ethnic groups including Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, and Asian/Pacific Islander youth. Moreover, the percentage of patients with positive islet cell autoantibodies in our population with MODY (6.6%) is higher than previously reported in patients with MODY (<1%)<sup>22</sup>. The co-existence of positive islet autoantibodies and genetic variants consistent with MODY diagnosis have previously been reported by other groups<sup>23,24</sup>. A study in 28 Czech patients demonstrated that 25% of their patients with MODY had positive islet autoantibodies <sup>24</sup>. Taken together with our findings, the presence of islet cell antibody influences the rate of beta cell decline due to future autoimmunity are areas for future work.

We would also like to note that a percentage of the patients (6.8%) with MODY, with negative islet cell antibodies, presented in diabetic ketoacidosis at diabetes diagnosis. Interestingly, one of these patients had a VUS in GCK, and it has been widely reported in the literature that patients with GCK-MODY are mostly asymptomatic with mild non-progressive hyperglycemia <sup>25</sup>. No additional genetic variants in known MODY genes were found in this patient, and islet cell antibodies were also negative. This contrasts with most

of the literature on MODY, that patients present with lower HbA1c and that diabetic ketoacidosis is exceedingly rare. Our data indicate that the presentation of diabetic ketoacidosis does not preclude the diagnosis of MODY and that thorough evaluation for MODY should still be performed, if suspected, regardless of initial presentation of diabetes.

Interestingly, not all of our patients diagnosed with MODY were screened at diagnosis of diabetes for co-morbidities. This could be as physicians suspected MODY at diagnosis whereas others who suspected type 1 diabetes obtained the standard screenings per our institutional protocol. This could also be due to the large number of patients with GCK variants, which have been noted to rarely develop microvascular complications<sup>26</sup>. Furthermore, given that the diagnosis of MODY is due to genetic variants and not autoimmunity, there is less association with other autoimmune diseases such as thyroid disease and celiac disease, which are typically screened in patients with autoimmune type 1 diabetes. Consequently, these screenings were not obtained in some of our patient population. Thus, genetic testing is crucial not only to guide treatments but screening for co-morbidities is essential for the management of patients with MODY.

The pathogenic variants and VUS uncovered in our study are consistent with that in present literature. Similar to other studies, we also found that HNF1A and GCK were the most common genes identified in our patient population with MODY<sup>1,27</sup>. However, a sizeable number of patients were diagnosed with variants in HNF1B. Most of these patients were diagnosed with MODY due to the presence of renal cysts noted *in utero* or in early infancy prior to the onset of diabetes. Other anomalies reported in the literature in patients with HNF1B pathogenic variants include urogenital tract deformities,

hypomagnesemia, gout, and hyperparathyroidism<sup>28</sup>. Deletions involving a segment of chromosome 17q12 are notably prevalent among patients within the HNF1B patient cohort. This multisystem phenotype due to variants or absence of HNF1B likely contributes to the larger percentage of patients with HNF1B MODY in our patient population as well as the rapid diagnosis of MODY before onset of diabetes. This offers an opportunity for close monitoring for diabetes onset, with the potential of detecting symptoms of diabetes before patients experience sequelae of severe hyperglycemia. Finally, several rare variants were also uncovered in genes including APPL, BLK, PDX1, RFX6, CNOT1, PAX4, and NEUROD1; additional co-morbidities in these patients included pancreatic agenesis with exocrine insufficiency. Thus, timely genetic diagnosis is not only important for the appropriate treatment of diabetes but also would allow for effective management of complications in this patient population<sup>11</sup>.

Many patients with MODY in our study were not on medications at initial diagnosis and/or at follow-up between 1-9 months. This may reflect the fact that many of the patients in our study had GCK variants, as is the typical distribution seen in literature<sup>1,3,8,29</sup>. Almost all patients with variants in INS were treated with insulin, as pathogenic variants in the insulin gene lead to defects in stability of the insulin protein and its folding ultimately leading to insulin dependence<sup>25</sup>. Most patients with HNF1B variants were also not on medications as they were diagnosed with MODY based on genetic testing and had not yet met criteria for diabetes. Sulfonylureas were used mostly in the cohort of patients with HNF1A variants, and it has previously been reported that patients with HNF1A respond well to sulfonylureas<sup>30,31</sup>.

Treatment with sulfonylurea or insulin has been associated with weight gain<sup>4,32,33</sup>. Even though MODY has typically been reported to occur in leaner patients, the current rise in obesity could certainly be affecting patients with MODY. In a 1990 review of MODY, it was noted that patients with MODY had a higher frequency of obesity than the general population at that point in time<sup>34</sup>. However, obesity rates in the general population have rapidly risen since that time frame. In our patient cohort we noted an average normal BMI, but there were patients with BMI as high as 35.4 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. GLP-1 receptor agonists provide various metabolic advantages and could potentially be an excellent treatment option in patients with MODY, addressing both hyperglycemia and weight. In patients treated with GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy, we noted a reduction in HbA1c and the greatest reduction in BMI (-4.79%). These data indicate that future exploration of GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy in a patient population with MODY is warranted. While it is not fully understood how GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy work, pathogenic variants leading to MODY occur in transcription factors, which could affect the development of enteroendocrine cells on which GLP-1 and incretins exert effects. This could potentially enhance insulin secretion. Another study has proposed that GLP-1 receptor agonists could stimulate secretion of insulin by bypassing the decreased ATP production caused by HNF1A variants in beta cells<sup>13-15</sup>.

Limitations of our study include limitations in power for some of the rarer genetic variants (including CNOT1, APPL1, BLK) and genetic heterogeneity within treatment groups precluding our ability to make definitive conclusions regarding best treatment. Second, as this study was a retrospective chart review, follow-up times for comparison of BMI and HbA1c on various medications were not uniform due to patients' availability for

appointments. The racial demographics of our patient population reflected a majority of non-Hispanic white patients. While MODY has been reported to be more prevalent within this race/ethnic group, this could bias the decision to obtain screening for MODY, leading to disparities within the screening process. Finally, lack of information on diet, exercise, medication adherence, and insurance coverage of medications prohibits the ability to account for these when examining changes in BMI and HbA1c. However, strengths of this study include phenotypic characterization of patients with genetically confirmed MODY and cataloging VUS in our population with MODY. Our study provides support for identifying patients with MODY and future exploration of GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy in this patient population.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the Division of Endocrinology at Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center for providing medical care, identifying patients, and aiding in the genetic testing of patients with MODY.

### Data availability

Data supporting the reported results can be obtained upon request of the authors.

### Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

### Authors' Relationships and Activities

The authors have no duality of interest to disclose.

### **Contribution Statement**

L.D. and M.K. researched data, contributed to discussion, and wrote, reviewed, and edited the manuscript. A.S. contributed to discussion, reviewed, and edited the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript. L.D. and M.K. are the guarantors of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

#### References

1. Sanyoura M, Philipson LH, Naylor R. Monogenic Diabetes in Children and Adolescents: Recognition and Treatment Options. *Curr Diab Rep.* Jun 22 2018;18(8):58. doi:10.1007/s11892-018-1024-2

2. Pihoker C, Gilliam LK, Ellard S, et al. Prevalence, characteristics and clinical diagnosis of maturity onset diabetes of the young due to mutations in HNF1A, HNF4A, and glucokinase: results from the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. Oct 2013;98(10):4055-62. doi:10.1210/jc.2013-1279

3. Nkonge KM, Nkonge DK, Nkonge TN. The epidemiology, molecular pathogenesis, diagnosis, and treatment of maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY). *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol*. Nov 4 2020;6(1):20. doi:10.1186/s40842-020-00112-5

4. Urakami T. Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): current perspectives on diagnosis and treatment. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes*. 2019;12:1047-1056. doi:10.2147/dmso.s179793

5. Carlsson A, Shepherd M, Ellard S, et al. Absence of Islet Autoantibodies and Modestly Raised Glucose Values at Diabetes Diagnosis Should Lead to Testing for MODY: Lessons From a 5-Year Pediatric Swedish National Cohort Study. *Diabetes Care*. Jan 2020;43(1):82-89. doi:10.2337/dc19-0747

Mohan V, Ramachandran A, Snehalatha C, Mohan R, Bharani G, Viswanathan M.
 High prevalence of maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY) among Indians.
 *Diabetes Care*. Jul-Aug 1985;8(4):371-4. doi:10.2337/diacare.8.4.371

Schwitzgebel VM. Many faces of monogenic diabetes. *J Diabetes Investig*. Mar 23 2014;5(2):121-33. doi:10.1111/jdi.12197

8. Shepherd MH, Shields BM, Hudson M, et al. A UK nationwide prospective study of treatment change in MODY: genetic subtype and clinical characteristics predict optimal glycaemic control after discontinuing insulin and metformin. *Diabetologia*. Dec 2018;61(12):2520-2527. doi:10.1007/s00125-018-4728-6

9. Aarthy R, Aston-Mourney K, Mikocka-Walus A, et al. Clinical features, complications and treatment of rarer forms of maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY) - A review. *J Diabetes Complications*. Jan 2021;35(1):107640. doi:10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2020.107640

10. Tosur M, Philipson LH. Precision diabetes: Lessons learned from maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY). *J Diabetes Investig*. Sep 2022;13(9):1465-1471. doi:10.1111/jdi.13860

11. Naylor RN, John PM, Winn AN, et al. Cost-effectiveness of MODY genetic testing: translating genomic advances into practical health applications. *Diabetes Care*. 2014;37(1):202-9. doi:10.2337/dc13-0410

12. GoodSmith MS, Skandari MR, Huang ES, Naylor RN. The Impact of Biomarker Screening and Cascade Genetic Testing on the Cost-Effectiveness of MODY Genetic Testing. *Diabetes Care*. Dec 2019;42(12):2247-2255. doi:10.2337/dc19-0486

13. Broome DT, Tekin Z, Pantalone KM, Mehta AE. Novel Use of GLP-1 Receptor Agonist Therapy in HNF4A-MODY. *Diabetes Care*. 2020:e65. vol. 6.

14. Østoft SH, Bagger JI, Hansen T, et al. Glucose-lowering effects and low risk of hypoglycemia in patients with maturity-onset diabetes of the young when treated with a GLP-1 receptor agonist: a double-blind, randomized, crossover trial. *Diabetes Care*. Jul 2014;37(7):1797-805. doi:10.2337/dc13-3007

15. Østoft SH. Incretin hormones and maturity onset diabetes of the young-pathophysiological implications and anti-diabetic treatment potential. *Dan Med J.* Sep 2015;62(9)

16. Fantasia KL, Steenkamp DW. Optimal Glycemic Control in a Patient With HNF1A MODY With GLP-1 RA Monotherapy: Implications for Future Therapy. *J Endocr Soc.* Copyright © 2019 Endocrine Society.; 2019:2286-2289. vol. 12.

17. Almutair A, Almulhem B. Semaglutide as a potential therapeutic alternative for HNF1B-MODY: a case study. Case Report. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*. 2024-March-08 2024;15doi:10.3389/fendo.2024.1294264

18. Htike ZZ, Zaccardi F, Papamargaritis D, Webb DR, Khunti K, Davies MJ. Efficacy and safety of glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists in type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and mixed-treatment comparison analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. Apr 2017;19(4):524-536. doi:10.1111/dom.12849

19. ElSayed NA, Aleppo G, Aroda VR, et al. 14. Children and Adolescents: Standards of Care in Diabetes-2023. *Diabetes Care*. Jan 1 2023;46(Suppl 1):S230-s253. doi:10.2337/dc23-S014

20. Carmody D, Naylor RN, Bell CD, et al. GCK-MODY in the US National Monogenic Diabetes Registry: frequently misdiagnosed and unnecessarily treated. *Acta Diabetol.* Oct 2016;53(5):703-8. doi:10.1007/s00592-016-0859-8

21. Winter WE, Nakamura M, House DV. Monogenic diabetes mellitus in youth. The MODY syndromes. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am*. Dec 1999;28(4):765-85. doi:10.1016/s0889-8529(05)70101-8

22. McDonald TJ, Colclough K, Brown R, et al. Islet autoantibodies can discriminate maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY) from Type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med.* Sep 2011;28(9):1028-33. doi:10.1111/j.1464-5491.2011.03287.x

23. O'Donovan EM, Sanchez-Lechuga B, Prehn E, Byrne MM. The coexistence of autoimmune diabetes and maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): a case series. *Endocrinol Diabetes Metab Case Rep.* Jul 1 2022;2022doi:10.1530/edm-21-0212

24. Urbanová J, Rypáčková B, Procházková Z, et al. Positivity for islet cell autoantibodies in patients with monogenic diabetes is associated with later diabetes onset and higher HbA1c level. *Diabet Med.* Apr 2014;31(4):466-71. doi:10.1111/dme.12314

25. Delvecchio M, Pastore C, Giordano P. Treatment Options for MODY Patients: A Systematic Review of Literature. *Diabetes Ther.* Aug 2020;11(8):1667-1685. doi:10.1007/s13300-020-00864-4

26. Timsit J, Bellanné-Chantelot C, Dubois-Laforgue D, Velho G. Diagnosis and management of maturity-onset diabetes of the young. *Treat Endocrinol.* 2005;4(1):9-18. doi:10.2165/00024677-200504010-00002

27. Nyunt O, Wu JY, McGown IN, et al. Investigating maturity onset diabetes of the young. *Clin Biochem Rev.* May 2009;30(2):67-74.

 Verhave JC, Bech AP, Wetzels JF, Nijenhuis T. Hepatocyte Nuclear Factor 1β-Associated Kidney Disease: More than Renal Cysts and Diabetes. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. Feb 2016;27(2):345-53. doi:10.1681/asn.2015050544

29. Stride A, Shields B, Gill-Carey O, et al. Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies suggest pharmacological treatment used in patients with glucokinase mutations does not alter glycaemia. *Diabetologia*. Jan 2014;57(1):54-6. doi:10.1007/s00125-013-3075-x

30. Pearson ER, Liddell WG, Shepherd M, Corrall RJ, Hattersley AT. Sensitivity to sulphonylureas in patients with hepatocyte nuclear factor-1alpha gene mutations: evidence for pharmacogenetics in diabetes. *Diabet Med.* Jul 2000;17(7):543-5. doi:10.1046/j.1464-5491.2000.00305.x

31. Bacon S, Kyithar MP, Rizvi SR, et al. Successful maintenance on sulphonylurea therapy and low diabetes complication rates in a HNF1A-MODY cohort. *Diabet Med*. Jul 2016;33(7):976-84. doi:10.1111/dme.12992

32. Russell-Jones D, Khan R. Insulin-associated weight gain in diabetes--causes, effects and coping strategies. *Diabetes Obes Metab.* Nov 2007;9(6):799-812. doi:10.1111/j.1463-1326.2006.00686.x

33. Larger E. Weight gain and insulin treatment. *Diabetes Metab.* Sep 2005;31(4 Pt
2):4s51-4s56. doi:10.1016/s1262-3636(05)88268-0

34. Fajans SS. Scope and heterogeneous nature of MODY. *Diabetes Care*. Jan 1990;13(1):49-64. doi:10.2337/diacare.13.1.49

## **Figures/Tables**

	n	Percent	Mean	SD
Age of Diabetes Diagnosis (years)	106		10.51	5.69
BMI At Diabetes Diagnosis (m/kg^2)	106		22.39	6.13
HbA1c At Diabetes Diagnosis (%)	106		8.20	3.17
Sex	106			
Female	59	55.66%		
Male	47	44.34%		
Race	106			
White (non-Hispanic)	70	66.04%		
White (Hispanic)	11	10.38%		
Black	19	17.92%		
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	2.83%		
Unknown	3	2.83%		
Islet Cell Autoantibody Screen	106			
Positive	7	6.60%		
Negative	66	62.26%		
Not obtained	33	31.13%		
Initial Diagnosis	99			
Type 1 DM	36	36.36%		
Туре 2 DM	7	7.07%		
Beta cell mismatch hypoglycemia	1	1.01%		
Neonatal diabetes	1	1.01%		
MODY	28	28.28%		
Agenesis of the pancreas	2	2.02%		
Combination	24	24.24%		
Initial Therapy	100			
Insulin Alone	36	36.00%		

MDI	35		
70/30 Insulin	1		
Metformin	7	7.00%	
Sulfonylurea	1	1.00%	
Insulin and Metformin	3	3.00%	
None	53	53.00%	
Co-mo	orbidities of A	Il Patients at	t Diabetes Diagnosis
	N	Percent	
Blood Pressure	79		
Normal	73	92.41%	
Hypertensive (mild to Stage I)	6	7.59%	
Acanthosis	103		
Present	15	14.56%	
Absent	88	85.44%	
Ketoacidosis At Diagnosis	103		
Present	7	6.80%	
Absent	96	93.20%	
Lipid Profile	106		
Normal	47	44.34%	
Abnormal	24	22.64%	
Not obtained	35	33.02%	
тѕн	106		
Normal	67	63.21%	
Abnormal	6	5.66%	
Not obtained	33	31.13%	
Celiac Screening	100		
Negative	43	43.00%	
Positive	0	0.00%	

Not obtained	57	57.00%	

Table 1. Clinical Characteristics of all MODY patients at Diabetes Diagnosis and

### Treatment at Diagnosis and Co-morbidities of all MODY patients at Diabetes Diagnosis

	ABCC8	APPL1	BLK	CNOT1	GCK	HNF1A	HNF1B	HNF4A	INS	KCNJ11	NEUROD1	PDX1	RFX6	WFS1
Average Age at Diabetes						<u> </u>						<u> </u>		
Diagnosis (years)	14.00	16.00	11.75	3.00	9.56	12.47	8.05	12.00	10.08	8.56	12.00	10.80	9.67	15.25
SD Age at Diabetes														
Diagnosis (years)	2.71	N/A	1.71	N/A	5.18	4.66	8.15	2.58	5.71	5.80	N/A	6.30	2.08	2.22
Average Duration to MODY														
Diagnosis (months)	16.29	2.00	16.25	8.00	7.92	4.91	-7.20	22.71	17.00	26.25	16.00	5.80	34.67	40.00
SD Duration to MODY														
Diagnosis (months)	16.34	N/A	26.59	N/A	12.01	27.28	32.30	27.35	29.01	46.55	N/A	11.37	54.04	23.43
Average BMI At Diabetes														
Diagnosis (kg/m^2)	26.18	32.96	27.70	12.75	21.42	21.67	20.39	21.81	21.34	25.92	18.64	24.05	19.17	25.54
SD BMI At Diabetes														
Diagnosis (kg/m^2)	5.28	N/A	7.07	N/A	5.71	4.45	5.21	5.97	7.08	2.18	N/A	12.85	6.53	7.52
Average HbA1c At							1					<u> </u>		1
Diabetes Diagnosis (%)	9.37	14.10	6.20	5.20	6.93	8.52	5.93	9.02	10.02	7.93	>14.00	8.28	9.05	9.30
SD HbA1c At Diabetes														
Diagnosis (%)	3.88	N/A	0.73	N/A	1.89	3.05	0.96	2.55	3.74	4.23	N/A	4.38	5.30	3.84

Table 2: Average Age, duration, BMI and HbA1c at diabetes diagnosis categorized

based on gene.

Genetic Variant	Sulfonylurea	GLP-1 receptor agonist	Insulin alone	Metformin	Combination	No Medication
ABCC8	3 (37.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (37.5%)	2* (25%)	0 (0%)
APPL1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
BLK	0 (0%)	1* (25%)	1* (25%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
CNOT1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
GCK	1 (3.85%)	0 (0%)	2 (7.69%)	2 (7.69%)	0 (0%)	21 (80.77%)

HNF1A	8 (36.36%)	0 (0%)	6 (27.27%)	0 (0%)	2 (9.09%)	6* (27.27%)
HNF1B	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (90%)
HNF4A	2* (22.22%)1	0 (0%)	4 (44.44%)	0 (0%)	2* (22.22%)	1* (11.11%)
INS	0 (0%)	1 (16.67%)	4* (66.67%)	0 (0%)	1* (16.67%)	0 (0%)
KCNJ11	1 (25%)	1* (25%)	1* (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
NEUROD1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
PAX4**	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
PDX1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2* (50%)
RFX6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2* (66.67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33.33%)
WFS1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)

Table 3: Current treatment of MODY patients categorized by genetic variant. \*Patients with more than 1 genetic variant. The patient with a variant in PAX4 was on acarbose (which is not listed in this table category.)



Figure 1. Pathogenic variants and variants of unknown significance categorized based on

gene. Number of patients listed along with percentage within our MODY population.



Figure 2. A,B. Change in BMI and HbA1c categorized by medication. \*p value < 0.05. The following data was not included in assessment of medication response: patients with follow-up greater than 9 months after initiation of medication, patients without records of initial presentation data or medication use, patients without follow-up data and patients concurrently receiving two or more medications.



Supplement Figure 1. Percentage of MODY patients compared to total population with diabetes.

Genetic Variant	Zygosity	Inheritance	Significance
ABCC8			
c.4174T>G, p.Phe1392Val	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.291-3C>T (intronic)	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.208G>A, p.Gly70Arg	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Pathogenic
c.4178 G>A, p.Arg1393His	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Likely Pathogenic
c.4563G>T, p.Lys1521Asn	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.1063G>A, p.Ala355Thr	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain

APPL1			
c.876 G>A, p.(L292=)	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.682C>T, p.Pro228Ser	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.922A>G, p.Ile308Val	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.911 C>T, p.Thr304lle	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
BLK			
c.682C>T, p.Pro228Ser	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.922A>G, p.lle308Val	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.911C>T, p.Thr304lle	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
CNOT1	Heterozygous		Uncertain
C. 145902A, p.Ala467 111	Tieterozygous	AD	Uncertain
GCK			
c.835G>C, p.Glu279Gln	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.1351del, p.Leu451Trpfs*163	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Pathogenic
c.572G>A, p.Arg191Gln	Heterozygous	AD	Likely Pathogenic
c.463A>G, p.Arg155Gly	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic
c.988T>G p.Phe330Val	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.632T>A, p.Ile211Asn	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.1268T>C, p.Phe423Ser	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.463A>G, p.Arg155Gly	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic

c.616A>C, p.Thr206Pro	Heterozygous	AD	Pathogenic
c.608T>C, p.Val203Ala	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.401T>G, p.Leu134Arg	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic
c.106C>T, p.R36W, chr7: g.44193002G>A	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
7p13(44183089_44186518)x1 deletion (~3.43kb)	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.556C>T exon5, Arg186X	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.748C>T, p.Arg250Cys	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Likely Pathogenic
p.A11T c.31G.A			Polymorphism
c.370G>A, p.Asp124Asn	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic
c.883G>T, p.Gly295Cys	Heterozygous	AD	Possibly Pathogenic
c.1253+8C>T	Heterozygous		Benign
c.883G>T exon 8, p.Gly295Cys	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic
c.926T>C, p.Leu309Pro	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.1019G>A, pSer340Asn	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.1253+8C>T	Heterozygous		Not Associated
c.1351del, p.(L451Wfs*163)	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Likely Pathogenic
c.871 A>T	Heterozygous	AD	Pathogenic
p.Lys291X	Heterozygous	AR	Pathogenic

c.1244T>C, p.Leu415Pro	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.1003del, p.Val335Cysfs*18	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Pathogenic
HNF1A			
c.676_678del, p.Lys226del	Heterozygous	AD	Likely Pathogenic
c.599G>A, p.Arg200Gln	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.872dupC, P291fsinsC			
c.511C>T, p.Arg171*	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c160154dupTGGGGGT			Uncertain
c.452G>A, p.Gly151Asp	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic
c.92G>A, p.Gly31Asp	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.787C>T, p.Arg263Cys	Heterozygous	AD	Pathogenic
c.1720A>G, p.Ser574Gly	homozygous		Not Associated
c.51C>G, p.Leu17Leu	Heterozygous		Not Associated
c.79A>C, p.lle27Leu	Heterozygous		Not Associated
c.511C>T, p.Arg171*			Pathogenic
c3_25: 28 bp duplication codon 9	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.787C>T, p.Arg263Cys			Likely Pathogenic

c.511 C>T, p.Arg171X	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.1084C>A, p.Leu362Met	Heterozygous		Possibly Pathogenic
c.293C>T, p.Ala98Val	Heterozygous		Very Unlikely Pathogenic
c.872dupC, p.Gly292Argfs*25	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.629C>T, p.Ser210Phe	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.814 C>T, p.Arg272Cys	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.92G>A, p.Gly31Asp	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.1340C>T, p.Pro447Leu	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Pathogenic
c160154dupTGGGGGT, variant in the promoter			
region of HNF1A			Uncertain
c.511C>T, p.Arg171*	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.1720A>G, p.Ser574Gly	homozygous		Not Associated
c.864G>C, p.Gly288Gly	Heterozygous		Not Associated
c.51C>G, p.Leu17Leu	Heterozygous		Not Associated
c.872dupC, P291fsinsC			
c.155_156delinsCT, p.Gly52Ala	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.872dup, p.G292Rfs*25	Heterozygous	AD	Pathogenic

		1	
HNF1B			
		Not	
17q12(34822500_36248918)x1		Determined	Pathogenic
chr17(21562813-36248859)x1 (microdeletion including			
HNF1B)			Pathogenic
ish del(17)(q12q12)(RP11-143E18-)mat			Pathogenic
c.892 A>G, p. Asn298Asp	Heterozygous		Uncertain
17q12(34815551_36244358)x1	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.1045+2T>A, GT Donor	Heterozygous	AD	Likely Pathogenic
c.884G>A, p.Arg295His	Heterozygous	AD	Likely Pathogenic
17q12(34,815,551-36,307,189)x1			Pathogenic
del(17)(q12), chr17:g.34842466_36104935del	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.883 C>T, p.Arg295Cys	Heterozygous	AD	Likely Pathogenic
HNF4A			
c.200G>A, p.Arg67GIn	Heterozygous		Likely Pathogenic
c.379C>T, p.Arg127Trp			
c.925 C>T, p.Arg309Cys	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain
c.908G>A, p.Arg303His	Heterozygous		Pathogenic
c.116-5C>T (No associated AA change)	Heterozygous		Not Associated

			Less Likely	
c.224+17dupT	Heterozygous		Associated	
c.724G>A, p.Val242Met	Heterozygous		Uncertain	
INS				
c.163C>T, p.Arg55Cys	Heterozygous		Pathogenic	
c160143delins	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Likely Pathogenic	
c.94G>A	Heterozygous		Pathogenic	
c.140G>C, p.Gly47Ala	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain	
c.188-31G>A	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Pathogenic	
KCNJ11				
c.80G>A, p.Arg27His	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain	
c.848T>A, p.Ile283Asn	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain	
c.190 G>T, p.Val64Leu	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain	
NEUROD1				
c.610C>T, p.Pro204Ser	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain	
PAX4				
c.776C>T, p.Ala259Val	Heterozygous	AD	Uncertain	
PDX1				
c.226G>A, p.Asp76Asn	homozygous	Dominant	Uncertain	
c.349C>A, p.Leu117Met	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain	
c.188delC(p.P63fs)	homozygous		Pathogenic	

c.52T>C, p.Cys18Arg	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.726_728dupGC, p.Pro243dup	Heterozygous	AD	Likely Pathogenic
			Not Likely
c.162G>A, p.Leu54Leu	Heterozygous		Associated
RFX6			
c.1040_1052del, p.Arg347Lysfs*18	Heterozygous	AR	Likely Pathogenic
c.2623C>T, p.Gln875*	Heterozygous	AR	Likely Pathogenic
c.2724A>C, p.Glu908Asp	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.1291G>A, p.Gly431Ser	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
WFS1			
c.1265C>T, p.Ala422Val	Heterozygous		Uncertain
c.1192 G>A, p.Gly398Ser	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.991T>A, p.Phe331lle	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.2666C>T, p.Ala889Val	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain
c.1024G>A, p.Ala342Thr	Heterozygous	AD/AR	Uncertain

Supplement Table 1. List of all pathogenic variants and variants of unknown significance

by gene.

Gene	Number	Not	Uncertain	Likely	Pathogenic	Polymorphism	Unknown
	of	Associated		Pathogenic			
	variants						
ABCC8	6	0	4	1	1	0	0
APPL1	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
BLK	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
CNOT1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
GCK	28	2	6	9	10	1	0

HNF1A	30	7	8	4	9	0	2
HNF1B	10	0	1	3	6	0	0
HNF4A	7	1	3	1	1	0	1
INS	5	0	1	1	3	0	0
KCNJ11	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
NEUROD1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
PAX4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
PDX-1	6	1	3	1	1	0	0
RFX6	4	0	2	2	0	0	0
WFS1	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
		*Includes		*Includes			
		less likely		Possibly			
		associated		pathogenic			

Supplement Table 2. List of all pathogenic, likely pathogenic, uncertain significance, and not associated variants based on gene.