Supplementary material

Clinical sequencing yield in epilepsy, autism spectrum disorder, and intellectual disability

A systematic review and meta-analysis

Arthur Stefanski, Yamile Calle-Lopez, Costin Leu, Eduardo Pérez-Palma, Elia Pestana-Knight, Dennis Lal

Corresponding author:

Dennis Lal, PhD Genomic Medicine Institute, Lerner Research Institute, Cleveland Clinic Cleveland, OH 44195, US Tel: +1 216 704 1519 Email: lald@ccf.org

1.	Supplementary Figures					
	1.1. Overall and by disorder					
	1.1.1.	Figure e-1. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all				
	epilepsy studies (adjusted)					
	1.1.2.	Figure e-2. Funnel plot over all epilepsy studies (adjusted)	5			
	1.1.3.	Figure e-3. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all				
	ASD stu	dies (adjusted)	6			
	1.1.4.	Figure e-4. Funnel plot over all ASD studies (adjusted)	6			
	1.1.5.	Figure e-5. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all				
	ID studie	es (adjusted)	7			
	1.1.6.	Figure e-6. Funnel plot over all ID studies (adjusted)	8			
	1.1.7.	Figure e-7. Error bar plot by disorder (adjusted)	8			
	1.2. By e	pilepsy subtype	9			
	1.2.1.	Figure e-8. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all				
	GE stud	ies (adjusted)	9			
	1.2.2.	Figure e-9. Funnel plot over all GE studies (adjusted)	9			
	1.2.3.	Figure e-10. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over				
	all FE st	udies (adjusted)	10			
	1.2.4.	Figure e-11. Funnel plot over all FE studies (adjusted)	10			
	1.2.5.	Figure e-12. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over				
	all GE&F	[–] E studies (adjusted)	11			
	1.2.6.	Figure e-13. Funnel plot over all GE&FE studies (adjusted)	12			
	1.3. By d	isorder subtype	12			
	1.3.1.	Figure e-14. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over				
	all ASD with ID or DD studies					
	1.3.2.	Figure e-15. Funnel plot over all ASD with ID or DD studies	13			
	1.3.3.	Figure e-16. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over				
	all WS s	tudies (adjusted)	13			
	1.3.4.	Figure e-17. Funnel plot over all West syndrome studies (adjusted)	14			
	1.3.5.	Figure e-18. Error bar plot by subtype (adjusted)	14			
	1.4. By te	echnology	15			
	1.4.1.	Figure e-19. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over				
	all Pane	l studies (adjusted)	15			

	1.4.2.	Figure e-20. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over					
	all ES studies (adjusted)						
	1.4.3.	Figure e-21. Funnel plot over all Panel studies (adjusted)	17				
	1.4.4.	Figure e-22. Funnel plot over all ES studies (adjusted)	18				
	1.4.5. Figure e-23. Error bar plot by technology (adjusted)						
	1.5. Reported genes						
	1.5.1.	Figure e-24. Number and rate of genes with pathogenic variants	19				
2.	Referenc	es of all studies included in meta-analysis	20-26				

1. Supplementary Figures

1.1. Overall and by disorder

1.1.1. Figure e-1. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all epilepsy studies

(adjust	ed)				
Study	TE	seTE		Proportion	95%-CI
(adjust Study Shellhaas et al., 2017 Palmer et al., 2018 Turnienė et al., 2017 Lemke et al., 2017 Routier et al., 2019 Gokben et al., 2019 Lee et al., 2019 Lee et al., 2019 Lee et al., 2018 Kwong et al., 2018 Helbig et al., 2018 Zhou et al., 2018 Zhou et al., 2018 Zhang et al., 2018 Zhang et al., 2018 Zhang et al., 2018 Vang et al., 2018 Vang et al., 2018 Vang et al., 2014 Aspromonte et al., 2019 Fung et al., 2015 Yamamoto et al., 2019 Halvardson et al., 2019 Halvardson et al., 2019 Miao et al., 2018 Miao et al., 2018 Miao et al., 2018 Miao et al., 2018 Madan et al., 2017 Snoeijen-Schouwenaars et al., 2018 Liu et al., 2018 Møller et al., 2016 Allen et al., 2016	ed)) TE 0.64 0.13 0.05 -0.06 -0.37 -0.41 -0.43 -0.46 -0.57 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.77 -0.79 -0.90 -0.90 -0.90 -0.95 -0.96 -0.90 -0.95 -0.96 -1.10 -1.19 -1.27	seTE 0.4122 0.3660 0.2157 0.3483 0.3917 0.2621 0.2721 0.2721 0.2621 0.2721 0.2397 0.2518 0.3254 0.0791 0.2307 0.2367 0.3257 0.3575 0.3575 0.3575 0.3289 0.3558 0.3150 0.3289 0.3558 0.3150 0.3289 0.3258 0.31816 0.1883 0.1816 0.1883 0.1807 0.2309 0.2309 0.3244 0.3258 0.3150 0.3289 0.3258 0.3258 0.3258 0.3258 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3258 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3259 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259 0.3259 0.3259 0.3258 0.3259		Proportion 0.65 0.53 0.51 0.48 0.41 0.40 0.39 0.39 0.39 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.38 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.31 0.32 0.32 0.32 0.31 0.29 0.29 0.29 0.29 0.29 0.29 0.29 0.29	95%-C1 [0.46; 0.81] [0.36; 0.70] [0.41; 0.62] [0.24; 0.65] [0.24; 0.58] [0.28; 0.52] [0.27; 0.52] [0.27; 0.52] [0.27; 0.52] [0.28; 0.49] [0.29; 0.46] [0.29; 0.46] [0.21; 0.44] [0.16; 0.44] [0.17; 0.45] [0.21; 0.36] [0.13; 0.36]
Allen et al., 2015 Balciuniene et al., 2019 Wang et al., 2014 Berkovic et al., 2019 Kodera et al., 2019 Kodera et al., 2019 Oates et al., 2016 Oates et al., 2016 Ortega-Moreno et al., 2017 Arafat et al., 2017 Wang et al., 2019 Butler et al., 2017 Zhang et al., 2019 Michaud et al., 2016 Michaud et al., 2014 Symonds et al., 2018 Hesse et al., 2018 Hesse et al., 2018 Mercimek-Mahmutoglu et al., 2015 Truty et al., 2016 Perucca et al., 2017 Tsang et al., 2017	-1.27 -1.27 -1.30 -1.32 -1.34 -1.40 -1.42 -1.44 -1.49 -1.50 -1.53 -1.50 -1.53 -1.57 -1.78 -1.73 -1.73 -1.73 -1.75 -1.99 -2.24	0.3414 0.3414 0.1969 0.4606 0.1903 0.1903 0.1330 0.2562 0.2704 0.3084 0.2359 0.1405 0.1300 0.4122 0.1560 0.0300 0.1600 0.2900 0.0284 0.4082 0.4781 0.4352 0.4682	· 单本本 中国 中国 日田 中国 日田 中国 中国 中国 中国	0.22 0.21 0.21 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20	
Angune et al., 2019 Tsai et al., 2018 Hildebrand et al., 2016 Filled: Wirrell et al., 2015 Filled: Long et al., 2018 Filled: Aspromonte et al., 2019 Filled: Aspromonte et al., 2019 Filled: Chang et al., 2016 Filled: Papuc et al., 2018 Filled: Thevenon et al., 2016 Filled: Thevenon et al., 2016 Filled: Thevenon et al., 2016 Filled: Kwong et al., 2018 Filled: Helbig et al., 2018 Filled: Long et al., 2018 Filled: Long et al., 2018 Filled: Long et al., 2019 Filled: Cokben et al., 2019 Filled: Lenke et al., 2019 Filled: Tumiené et al., 2017 Filled: Tumiené et al., 2017 Filled: Shellhaas et al., 2017 Random effects model	-2.34 -2.42 -2.42 -2.52 -2.52 -2.55 -2.55 -2.55 -2.55 -2.55 -2.55 -2.55 -2.55 -2.52 -2.53 -2.53 -2.53 -2.53 -2.53 -3.26 -3.37 -3.36 -3.37 -3.36	0.4062 0.3043 0.7099 0.3577 0.2918 0.2360 0.1630 0.2707 0.0791 0.2548 0.2367 0.2378 0.2377 0.3254 0.2518 0.2397 0.1202 0.4031 0.2721 0.3727 0.3917 0.39483 0.2167 0.3916 0.3916 0.3916 0.3916 0.3917		0.02 0.01 0.08 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07 0.07	[0.04; 0.13] [0.00; 0.03] [0.04; 0.16] [0.04; 0.16] [0.04; 0.16] [0.05; 0.11] [0.05; 0.11] [0.05; 0.10] [0.04; 0.12] [0.04; 0.12] [0.04; 0.09] [0.04; 0.09] [0.03; 0.09] [0.03; 0.09] [0.03; 0.10] [0.02; 0.10] [0.02; 0.05] [0.02; 0.06] [0.02; 0.06] [0.01; 0.04] [0.15; 0.19]
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 94%, τ^2 = 0.3840, ρ	< 0.01		-0.5 0 0.5		

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, Filled: ... = study added by the trim and fill method, TE =

estimated treatment effect, TEse = standard error of estimated treatment effect, I² = estimated

proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, τ^2 = estimate of betweenstudy variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.





Logit Transformed Proportion

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.1.3. Figure e-3. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all ASD studies (adjusted)



Abbreviations: $CI = confidence interval, I^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, <math>\tau 2 = estimate$ of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



1.1.4. Figure e-4. Funnel plot over all ASD studies (adjusted)

Logit Transformed Proportion

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.1.5. Figure e-5. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all ID studies (adjusted)



Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, l^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, $\tau 2$ = estimate of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.



1.1.7. Figure e-7. Error bar plot by disorder (adjusted)

Abbreviations: ASD = autism spectrum disorder, ID = intellectual disability.

1.2. By epilepsy subtype

1.2.1. Figure e-8. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all GE studies (adjusted)



Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, l^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, $\tau 2$ = estimate of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



1.2.2. Figure e-9. Funnel plot over all GE studies (adjusted)

Logit Transformed Proportion

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.2.3. Figure e-10. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all FE studies (adjusted)



Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, I^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, $\tau 2$ = estimate of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



1.2.4. Figure e-11. Funnel plot over all FE studies (adjusted)

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.2.5. Figure e-12. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all GE&FE studies

(adjusted)

Study	TE	seTE			Proportion	95%-CI
Allen et al., 2015	-1.27	0.3414			0.22	[0.13: 0.36]
Arafat et al., 2017	-1.44	0.3084		- 	0.19	[0.11; 0.30]
Balciuniene et al., 2019	-1.27	0.1969		-	0.22	[0.16; 0.29]
Berkovic et al., 2019	-1.32	0.1903			0.21	[0.16; 0.28]
Butler et al., 2017	-1.50	0.1405			0.18	[0.15; 0.23]
Fung et al., 2018	-0.89	0.3957		-	0.29	[0.16; 0.47]
Gokben et al., 2016	-0.41	0.3727			0.40	[0.24; 0.58]
Halvardson et al., 2016	-0.93	0.3558		-	0.28	[0.16; 0.44]
Hamdan et al., 2017	-1.00	0.1607		-	0.27	[0.21; 0.34]
Helbig et al., 2016	-0.48	0.1202			0.38	[0.33; 0.44]
Hesse et al., 2018	-1.73	0.1600		inter a second sec	0.15	[0.11; 0.20]
Kwong et al. 2015	-1.34	0.3367			0.21	[0.12, 0.34]
Lemke et al. 2012	-0.06	0.4031			0.30	[0.22, 0.50]
Lindy et al. 2018	-1 71	0.0300			0.40	[0.15: 0.16]
Liu et al., 2018	-1.19	0.1805		- T#	0.23	[0.18: 0.30]
Long et al., 2019	0.05	0.2133		-	0.51	[0.41: 0.61]
Mercimek-Mahmutoglu et al., 2015	-1.73	0.2900			0.15	[0.09; 0.24]
Miao et al., 2018	-0.96	0.1883			0.28	[0.21; 0.36]
Michaud et al., 2014	-1.67	0.4122			0.16	[0.08; 0.30]
Møller et al., 2016	-1.23	0.1625			0.23	[0.18; 0.29]
Muona et al., 2014	-0.80	0.2360			0.31	[0.22; 0.42]
Oates et al., 2018	-1.40	0.2562			0.20	[0.13; 0.29]
Ortega-Moreno et al., 2017	-1.42	0.2704			0.20	[0.13; 0.29]
Palmer et al., 2018	0.13	0.3660		_	0.53	[0.36; 0.70]
Papuc et al., 2018	-0.77	0.2707			0.32	[0.21; 0.44]
Parrini et al., 2016	-1.36	0.1330			0.20	[0.16; 0.25]
Rim et al., 2018	-0.50	0.2397			0.38	[0.28; 0.49]
Social et al., 2019	-0.37	0.3917			0.41	[0.24; 0.60]
Shellhaas et al. 2017	0.64	0.4002			0.14	[0.07, 0.27]
Snoeijen-Schouwenaars et al. 2018	-1 10	0.4122		-	0.05	[0.40, 0.01] [0.17: 0.34]
Symonds et al. 2019	-1 78	0.1560			0.14	[0.11, 0.19]
Trump et al., 2016	-1.53	0.1309		The second se	0.18	[0.14: 0.22]
Truty et al., 2019	-1.75	0.0284			0.15	[0.14; 0.16]
Tsai et al., 2018	-3.97	0.3043		•	0.02	[0.01; 0.03]
Tsang et al., 2019	-1.99	0.4352			0.12	[0.05; 0.24]
Wang et al., 2019	-1.49	0.2359		-	0.18	[0.12; 0.26]
Wirrell et al., 2015	-0.90	0.3577			0.29	[0.17; 0.45]
Yang et al., 2018	-0.75	0.0791		+	0.32	[0.29; 0.36]
Zhang et al., 2015	-1.50	0.1630			0.18	[0.14; 0.23]
Zhang et al., 2016	-0.77	0.1630			0.32	[0.25; 0.39]
Zhou et al., 2018	-0.65	0.2518			0.34	[0.24; 0.46]
Filled: Wildo et al., 2018	-2.39	0.1883			0.08	[0.06; 0.12]
Filled: Wirrell et al. 2015	-2.42	0.3556			0.08	[0.04, 0.15]
Filled: Fund et al. 2018	-2.40	0.3957		-	0.08	[0.04; 0.15]
Filled: Muona et al., 2014	-2.55	0.2360			0.07	[0.05; 0.11]
Filled: Zhang et al., 2016	-2.58	0.1630		+	0.07	[0.05: 0.09]
Filled: Papuc et al., 2018	-2.59	0.2707		+-	0.07	[0.04; 0.11]
Filled: Yang et al., 2018	-2.60	0.0791		•	0.07	[0.06; 0.08]
Filled: Zhou et al., 2018	-2.70	0.2518		+	0.06	[0.04; 0.10]
Filled: Rim et al., 2018	-2.86	0.2397		+	0.05	[0.03; 0.08]
Filled: Helbig et al., 2016	-2.88	0.1202			0.05	[0.04; 0.07]
Filled: Kwong et al., 2015	-2.89	0.4031		+	0.05	[0.02; 0.11]
Filled: Gokben et al., 2016	-2.95	0.3727		-	0.05	[0.02; 0.10]
Filled: Routier et al., 2019	-2.98	0.3917			0.05	[0.02; 0.10]
Filled: Lemke et al., 2012	-3.29	0.3483			0.04	[0.02; 0.07]
Filled: Long et al., 2019	-3.40	0.2133			0.03	[0.02; 0.05]
Filled: Shellhass at al. 2017	-3.49	0.3000			0.03	
i ilieu. Shelli idas et al., 2017	-0.99	0.4122		-	0.02	[0.01, 0.04]
Random effects model				\$	0.16	[0.14: 0.19]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.3707$. p	< 0.01		[
			-0.5	0 0.5		

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, $I^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, <math>\tau 2 = estimate$ of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity,

Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



1.2.6. Figure e-13. Funnel plot over all GE&FE studies (adjusted)

Logit Transformed Proportion

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.3. By disorder subtype

1.3.1. Figure e-14. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all ASD with ID or DD studies



Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, l^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, $\tau 2$ = estimate of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



Logit Transformed Proportion

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = No study fill needed based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.3.3. Figure e-16. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all West syndrome



Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, $I^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, <math>\tau 2 = estimate$ of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & *Tweedie.*



1.3.5. Figure e-18. Error bar plot by subtype (adjusted)

Abbreviations: GE&FE = combined generalized and focal epilepsy, FE = focal epilepsy, GE = generalized epilepsy, WS = West syndrome, ASD with ID or DD = autism spectrum disorder with intellectual disability or developmental delay.

1.4. By technology

1.4.1. Figure e-19. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all Panel studies

(adjusted)

Study	TE	seTE			Proportion	95%-CI
Shellhaas et al., 2017	0.64	0.4122			0.65	[0.46; 0.81]
Tumienė et al., 2017	0.05	0.2157			0.51	[0.41; 0.62]
Lemke et al., 2012	-0.06	0.3483			0.48	[0.32; 0.65]
Kim et al., 2019	-0.34	0.1952			0.42	[0.33; 0.51]
Gokben et al., 2016	-0.41	0.3727			0.40	[0.24; 0.58]
Lee et al., 2018	-0.46	0.2721			0.39	[0.27; 0.52]
Kwong et al., 2015	-0.47	0.4031			0.38	[0.22; 0.58]
Rim et al., 2018	-0.50	0.2397			0.38	[0.28; 0.49]
Gieldon et al. 2018	-0.05	0.2010			0.34	[0.24, 0.40]
Zhang et al. 2016	-0.77	0.1630		-	0.32	[0.20, 0.40] [0.25, 0.39]
Fung et al., 2018	-0.89	0.3957			0.29	[0.16: 0.47]
Wirrell et al., 2015	-0.90	0.3577		· · · ·	0.29	[0.17; 0.45]
Han et al., 2019	-0.92	0.3742			0.29	[0.16; 0.45]
Tonduti et al., 2018	-0.94	0.3150			0.28	[0.17; 0.42]
Staněk et al., 2018	-0.95	0.1816			0.28	[0.21; 0.35]
Miao et al., 2018	-0.96	0.1883		-	0.28	[0.21; 0.36]
Aspromonte et al., 2019	-0.98	0.1832		-	0.27	[0.21; 0.35]
Specific Schouwencers et al. 2018	-1.01	0.1030			0.27	[0.23; 0.31]
Liu et al 2018	-1.10	0.2309			0.23	[0.17, 0.34] [0.18: 0.30]
Møller et al. 2016	-1.23	0.1625		-	0.23	[0.18, 0.29]
Yamamoto et al., 2019	-1.23	0.2075			0.23	[0.16: 0.30]
Allen et al., 2015	-1.27	0.3414			0.22	[0.13; 0.36]
Balciuniene et al., 2019	-1.27	0.1969		-	0.22	[0.16; 0.29]
Wang et al., 2014	-1.30	0.4606			0.21	[0.10; 0.40]
Tan et al., 2015	-1.32	0.3396			0.21	[0.12; 0.34]
Han et al., 2018	-1.32	0.3979			0.21	[0.11; 0.37]
Perceies et al., 2016	-1.34	0.3554			0.21	[0.12; 0.35]
Oates et al. 2018	-1 40	0.2562			0.20	[0.10, 0.20]
Ortega-Moreno et al., 2017	-1.42	0.2704			0.20	[0.13: 0.29]
Arafat et al., 2017	-1.44	0.3084			0.19	[0.11; 0.30]
Wang et al., 2019	-1.49	0.2359		-	0.18	[0.12; 0.26]
Butler et al., 2017	-1.50	0.1405		+-	0.18	[0.15; 0.23]
Zhang et al., 2015	-1.50	0.1630			0.18	[0.14; 0.23]
Trump et al., 2016	-1.53	0.1309			0.18	[0.14; 0.22]
Symonds et al. 2019	-1.07	0.4122			0.16	[0.08, 0.30]
Lindv et al., 2018	-1.71	0.0300			0.15	[0.15: 0.16]
Hesse et al., 2018	-1.73	0.1600			0.15	[0.11; 0.20]
Mercimek-Mahmutoglu et al., 2015	-1.73	0.2900		÷	0.15	[0.09; 0.24]
Truty et al., 2019	-1.75	0.0284			0.15	[0.14; 0.16]
Alvarez-Mora et al., 2016	-1.76	0.4419		<u> </u>	0.15	[0.07; 0.29]
Segal et al., 2016	-1.79	0.4082		-	0.14	[0.07; 0.27]
Zhou et al., 2019 Perucca et al. 2017	-1.90	0.1201			0.13	[0.10; 0.16]
Tsang et al. 2019	-1.99	0.4352		<u>-</u>	0.12	[0.05; 0.27]
Grozeva et al., 2015	-2.11	0.1024			0.11	[0.09: 0.13]
Morgan et al., 2015	-2.11	0.4001		-	0.11	[0.05; 0.21]
Tsai et al., 2018	-3.97	0.3043			0.02	[0.01; 0.03]
Hildebrand et al., 2016	-4.82	0.7099		3	0.01	[0.00; 0.03]
Kalsner et al., 2017	-5.30	1.4177		-	0.00	[0.00; 0.07]
Filled: Stanek et al., 2018	-2.39	0.1816			0.08	[0.06; 0.12]
Filled: Han et al. 2019	-2.40	0.3742			0.08	[0.03, 0.14]
Filled: Wirrell et al., 2015	-2.45	0.3577		+	0.08	[0.04: 0.15]
Filled: Fung et al., 2018	-2.45	0.3957		+	0.08	[0.04; 0.16]
Filled: Zhang et al., 2016	-2.57	0.1630		+	0.07	[0.05; 0.10]
Filled: Gieldon et al., 2018	-2.68	0.2051		+	0.06	[0.04; 0.09]
Filled: Zhou et al., 2018	-2.69	0.2518		-	0.06	[0.04; 0.10]
Filled: Rim et al., 2018	-2.85	0.2397			0.05	[0.03; 0.08]
Filled: Lee et al. 2018	-2.07	0.4031		+	0.05	[0.02, 0.11] [0.03: 0.001
Filled: Gokben et al., 2016	-2.94	0.3727		+	0.05	[0.02: 0.10]
Filled: Kim et al., 2019	-3.01	0.1952	i	+	0.05	[0.03; 0.07]
Filled: Lemke et al., 2012	-3.28	0.3483	i	•	0.04	[0.02; 0.07]
Filled: Tumienė et al., 2017	-3.39	0.2157	1	•	0.03	[0.02; 0.05]
Filled: Shellhaas et al., 2017	-3.98	0.4122			0.02	[0.01; 0.04]
Random effects model					0.16	[0 14· 0 18]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 92\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.2795$. p	< 0.01				0.10	
			-0.5 0	0.5		

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, l^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, $\tau 2$ = estimate of between-study variance, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



1.4.2. Figure e-20. Funnel plot over all Panel studies (adjusted)

Logit Transformed Proportion

Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.

1.4.3. Figure e-21. Forest plot of meta-analysis of the diagnostic yield over all ES studies (adjusted)

Study	TE	seTE		Proportion 95%-CI
Xiao et al., 2017	0.31	0.3522		0.58 [0.40; 0.73]
Palmer et al., 2018	0.13	0.3660		0.53 [0.36; 0.70]
Long et al., 2019	0.05	0.2133		0.51 [0.41; 0.61]
Yang et al., 2018	-0.32	0.1264	-+	0.42 [0.36; 0.48]
Gilissen et al., 2014	-0.32	0.2865		0.42 [0.29; 0.56]
Srivastava et al., 2014	-0.36	0.2302		0.41 [0.31; 0.52]
Routier et al., 2019	-0.37	0.3917		0.41 [0.24; 0.60]
Ji et al., 2019	-0.42	0.1986		0.40 [0.31; 0.49]
Helbig et al., 2016	-0.48	0.1202		0.38 [0.33; 0.44]
Bi et al., 2012	-0.62	0.4688		0.35 [0.18; 0.57]
Vrijenhoek et al., 2018	-0.64	0.1093	+	0.35 [0.30; 0.40]
Thevenon et al., 2016	-0.73	0.3254		0.33 [0.20; 0.48]
Papuc et al., 2018	-0.77	0.2707		0.32 [0.21; 0.44]
Muona et al., 2014	-0.80	0.2360	-	0.31 [0.22; 0.42]
Halvardson et al., 2016	-0.93	0.3558		0.28 [0.16; 0.44]
Hamdan et al., 2017	-1.00	0.1607	+:	0.27 [0.21; 0.34]
Chérot et al., 2017	-1.05	0.1553	-	0.26 [0.21; 0.32]
Rossi et al., 2017	-1.06	0.1791		0.26 [0.20; 0.33]
Prasad et al., 2018	-1.23	0.3282		0.23 [0.13; 0.36]
Berkovic et al., 2019	-1.32	0.1903	-	0.21 [0.16; 0.28]
Kodera et al., 2013	-1.34	0.3387		0.21 [0.12; 0.34]
Codina-Solà et al., 2015	-1.42	0.4211		0.19 [0.10; 0.36]
de Ligt et al., 2012	-1.66	0.2728	-	0.16 [0.10; 0.25]
Angione et al., 2019	-2.34	0.4682		0.09 [0.04; 0.19]
Du et al., 2018	-2.34	0.3957	-	0.09 [0.04; 0.17]
Tammimies et al., 2015	-2.39	0.3695	-	0.08 [0.04; 0.16]
Callaghan et al., 2019	-3.13	0.4569	+	0.04 [0.02; 0.10]
Filled: de Ligt et al., 2012	0.34	0.2728		0.58 [0.45; 0.71]
Filled: Angione et al., 2019	1.02	0.4682	— 1 —	0.74 [0.53; 0.87]
Filled: Du et al., 2018	1.03	0.3957		0.74 [0.56; 0.86]
Filled: Tammimies et al., 2015	1.07	0.3695		0.74 [0.59; 0.86]
Filled: Callaghan et al., 2019	1.81	0.4569		0.86 [0.71; 0.94]
Random effects model			÷	0.34 [0.29; 0.40]
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 88\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.4$	187, p	< 0.01		
			-0.0 0.0	

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval, $I^2 = estimated proportion of the variance in study estimates that is due to heterogeneity, <math>\tau 2 = estimate of between-study variance$, to quantify heterogeneity, Proportion = fraction of individuals with a positive genetic test, i.e. pathogenic or likely pathogenic variant.



Grey dots = Original studies, White dots = Filled in studies based on the trim and fill method by Duval & Tweedie.



1.4.5. Figure e-23. Error bar plot by technology (adjusted)

The diagnostic yield across Panel and ES.

Abbreviations: Panel = targeted gene panel sequencing, ES = exome sequencing.

1.5. Reported genes

1.5.1. Figure e-24. Total number and rate of reported genes with pathogenic variants separated by disorder



The bars represent the number of genes with pathogenic variants. The line represents the rate of genes per month and year. The number of identified genes increased rapidly in recent years for epilepsy. For ASD and ID the number of reported genes with pathogenic variants is low. Abbreviations: ASD = autism spectrum disorder, ID = intellectual disability, * = Data were collected until July 19, 2019.

2. References

1. Allen NM, Conroy J, Shahwan A, et al. Unexplained early onset epileptic encephalopathy: Exome screening and phenotype expansion. Epilepsia. 2016;57:e12–e17.

2. Alvarez-Mora MI, Calvo Escalona R, Puig Navarro O, et al. Comprehensive molecular testing in patients with high functioning autism spectrum disorder. Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis. 2016;784–785:46–52.

3. Angione K, Eschbach K, Smith G, Joshi C, Demarest S. Genetic testing in a cohort of patients with potential epilepsy with myoclonic-atonic seizures. Epilepsy Research. 2019;150:70–77.

4. Arafat A, Jing P, Ma Y, et al. Unexplained Early Infantile Epileptic Encephalopathy in Han Chinese Children: Next-Generation Sequencing and Phenotype Enriching. Sci Rep. 2017;7:46227.

5. Aspromonte MC, Bellini M, Gasparini A, et al. Characterization of intellectual disability and autism comorbidity through gene panel sequencing. Hum Mutat. Epub 2019 Jun 17.

6. Balciuniene J, DeChene ET, Akgumus G, et al. Use of a Dynamic Genetic Testing Approach for Childhood-Onset Epilepsy. JAMA Netw Open. 2019;2:e192129.

7. Bi C, Wu J, Jiang T, et al. Mutations of *ANK3* identified by exome sequencing are associated with autism susceptibility. Hum Mutat. 2012;33:1635–1638.

8. Butler KM, da Silva C, Alexander JJ, Hegde M, Escayg A. Diagnostic Yield From 339 Epilepsy Patients Screened on a Clinical Gene Panel. Pediatric Neurology. 2017;77:61–66.

9. Callaghan DB, Rogic S, Tan PPC, et al. Whole genome sequencing and variant discovery in the ASPIRE autism spectrum disorder cohort. Clin Genet. Epub 2019 Apr 30.:cge.13556.

10. Cerebral Calcification International Study Group, Tonduti D, Panteghini C, et al. Encephalopathies with intracranial calcification in children: clinical and genetic characterization. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2018;13:135.

11. Chérot E, Keren B, Dubourg C, et al. Using medical exome sequencing to identify the causes of neurodevelopmental disorders: Experience of 2 clinical units and 216 patients: CHÉROT et al . Clin Genet. 2018;93:567–576.

12. Codina-Solà M, Rodríguez-Santiago B, Homs A, et al. Integrated analysis of whole-exome sequencing and transcriptome profiling in males with autism spectrum disorders. Molecular Autism. 2015;6:21.

13. de Ligt J, Willemsen MH, van Bon BWM, et al. Diagnostic Exome Sequencing in Persons with Severe Intellectual Disability. N Engl J Med. 2012;367:1921–1929.

14. Du X, Gao X, Liu X, et al. Genetic Diagnostic Evaluation of Trio-Based Whole Exome Sequencing Among Children With Diagnosed or Suspected Autism Spectrum Disorder. Front Genet. 2018;9:594.

15. Epilepsy Genetics Initiative. The Epilepsy Genetics Initiative: Systematic reanalysis of diagnostic exomes increases yield. Epilepsia. 2019;60:797–806.

16. Fung C-W, Kwong AK-Y, Wong VC-N. Gene panel analysis for nonsyndromic cryptogenic neonatal/infantile epileptic encephalopathy. Epilepsia Open. 2017;2:236–243.

17. Gieldon L, Mackenroth L, Kahlert A-K, et al. Diagnostic value of partial exome sequencing in developmental disorders. Kaya N, editor. PLoS ONE. 2018;13:e0201041.

18. Gilissen C, Hehir-Kwa JY, Thung DT, et al. Genome sequencing identifies major causes of severe intellectual disability. Nature. 2014;511:344–347.

19. Gokben S, Onay H, Yilmaz S, et al. Targeted next generation sequencing: the diagnostic value in early-onset epileptic encephalopathy. Acta Neurol Belg. 2017;117:131–138.

20. Grozeva D, Carss K, Spasic-Boskovic O, et al. Targeted Next-Generation Sequencing Analysis of 1,000 Individuals with Intellectual Disability: HUMAN MUTATION. Human Mutation. 2015;36:1197–1204.

21. Halvardson J, Zhao JJ, Zaghlool A, et al. Mutations in *HECW2* are associated with intellectual disability and epilepsy. J Med Genet. 2016;53:697–704.

22. Hamdan FF, Myers CT, Cossette P, et al. High Rate of Recurrent De Novo Mutations in Developmental and Epileptic Encephalopathies. The American Journal of Human Genetics. 2017;101:664–685.

23. Han JY, Jang JH, Park J, Lee IG. Targeted Next-Generation Sequencing of Korean Patients With Developmental Delay and/or Intellectual Disability. Front Pediatr. 2018;6:391.

24. Han JY, Jang W, Park J, Kim M, Kim Y, Lee IG. Diagnostic approach with genetic tests for global developmental delay and/or intellectual disability: Single tertiary center experience. Annals of Human Genetics. 2019;83:115–123.

25. Helbig KL, Farwell Hagman KD, Shinde DN, et al. Diagnostic exome sequencing provides a molecular diagnosis for a significant proportion of patients with epilepsy. Genet Med. 2016;18:898–905.

26. Hesse AN, Bevilacqua J, Shankar K, Reddi HV. Retrospective genotypephenotype analysis in a 305 patient cohort referred for testing of a targeted epilepsy panel. Epilepsy Research. 2018;144:53–61.

27. Hildebrand MS, Myers CT, Carvill GL, et al. A targeted resequencing gene panel for focal epilepsy. Neurology. 2016;86:1605–1612.

28. Ji J, Shen L, Bootwalla M, et al. A semi-automated whole exome sequencing workflow leads to increased diagnostic yield and identification of novel candidate variants. Molecular Case Studies. 2019;5:mcs.a003756.

29. Kalsner L, Twachtman-Bassett J, Tokarski K, et al. Genetic testing including targeted gene panel in a diverse clinical population of children with autism spectrum disorder: Findings and implications. Mol Genet Genomic Med. 2018;6:171–185.

30. Kim SH, Kim B, Lee JS, et al. Proband-Only Clinical Exome Sequencing for Neurodevelopmental Disabilities. Pediatric Neurology. Epub 2019 Feb.:S0887899418313481.

31. Kodera H, Kato M, Nord AS, et al. Targeted capture and sequencing for detection of mutations causing early onset epileptic encephalopathy. Epilepsia. 2013;54:1262–1269.

32. Kwong AK-Y, Ho AC-C, Fung C-W, Wong VC-N. Analysis of mutations in 7 genes associated with neuronal excitability and synaptic transmission in a cohort of children with non-syndromic infantile epileptic encephalopathy. PLoS ONE. 2015;10:e0126446.

33. Lee CG, Lee J, Lee M. Multi-gene panel testing in Korean patients with common genetic generalized epilepsy syndromes. Russo E, editor. PLoS ONE. 2018;13:e0199321.

34. Lemke JR, Riesch E, Scheurenbrand T, et al. Targeted next generation sequencing as a diagnostic tool in epileptic disorders: Epilepsy Panel. Epilepsia. 2012;53:1387–1398.

35. Lindy AS, Stosser MB, Butler E, et al. Diagnostic outcomes for genetic testing of 70 genes in 8565 patients with epilepsy and neurodevelopmental disorders. Epilepsia. 2018;59:1062–1071.

36. Liu J, Tong L, Song S, et al. Novel and de novo mutations in pediatric refractory epilepsy. Mol Brain. 2018;11:48.

37. Long S, Zhou H, Li S, et al. The Clinical and Genetic Features of Cooccurring Epilepsy and Autism Spectrum Disorder in Chinese Children. Front Neurol. 2019;10:505.

38. Mercimek-Mahmutoglu S, Patel J, Cordeiro D, et al. Diagnostic yield of genetic testing in epileptic encephalopathy in childhood. Epilepsia. 2015;56:707–716.

39. Miao P, Feng J, Guo Y, et al. Genotype and phenotype analysis using an epilepsy-associated gene panel in Chinese pediatric epilepsy patients. Clin Genet. 2018;94:512–520.

40. Michaud JL, Lachance M, Hamdan FF, et al. The genetic landscape of infantile spasms. Human Molecular Genetics. 2014;23:4846–4858.

41. Møller RS, Larsen LHG, Johannesen KM, et al. Gene Panel Testing in Epileptic Encephalopathies and Familial Epilepsies. Mol Syndromol. 2016;7:210–219.

42. Morgan A, Gandin I, Belcaro C, et al. Target sequencing approach intended to discover new mutations in non-syndromic intellectual disability. Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis. 2015;781:32–36.

43. Muona M, Berkovic SF, Dibbens LM, et al. A recurrent de novo mutation in KCNC1 causes progressive myoclonus epilepsy. Nat Genet. 2015;47:39–46.

44. Oates S, Tang S, Rosch R, et al. Incorporating epilepsy genetics into clinical practice: a 360° evaluation. npj Genomic Med. 2018;3:13.

45. Ortega-Moreno L, Giráldez BG, Soto-Insuga V, et al. Molecular diagnosis of patients with epilepsy and developmental delay using a customized panel of epilepsy genes. Russo E, editor. PLoS ONE. 2017;12:e0188978.

46. Palmer EE, Schofield D, Shrestha R, et al. Integrating exome sequencing into a diagnostic pathway for epileptic encephalopathy: Evidence of clinical utility and cost effectiveness. Mol Genet Genomic Med. 2018;6:186–199.

47. Papuc SM, Abela L, Steindl K, et al. The role of recessive inheritance in early-onset epileptic encephalopathies: a combined whole-exome sequencing and copy number study. Eur J Hum Genet. 2019;27:408–421.

48. Parrini E, Marini C, Mei D, et al. Diagnostic Targeted Resequencing in 349 Patients with Drug-Resistant Pediatric Epilepsies Identifies Causative Mutations in 30 Different Genes: HUMAN MUTATION. Human Mutation. 2017;38:216–225.

49. Pekeles H, Accogli A, Boudrahem-Addour N, Russell L, Parente F, Srour M. Diagnostic Yield of Intellectual Disability Gene Panels. Pediatric Neurology. 2019;92:32–36.

50. Perucca P, Scheffer IE, Harvey AS, et al. Real-world utility of whole exome sequencing with targeted gene analysis for focal epilepsy. Epilepsy Research. 2017;131:1–8.

51. Prasad A, Sdano MA, Vanzo RJ, et al. Clinical utility of exome sequencing in individuals with large homozygous regions detected by chromosomal microarray analysis. BMC Med Genet. 2018;19:46.

52. Rim JH, Kim SH, Hwang IS, et al. Efficient strategy for the molecular diagnosis of intractable early-onset epilepsy using targeted gene sequencing. BMC Med Genomics. 2018;11:6.

53. Rossi M, El-Khechen D, Black MH, Farwell Hagman KD, Tang S, Powis Z. Outcomes of Diagnostic Exome Sequencing in Patients With Diagnosed or Suspected Autism Spectrum Disorders. Pediatric Neurology. 2017;70:34-43.e2.

54. Routier L, Verny F, Barcia G, et al. Exome sequencing findings in 27 patients with myoclonic-atonic epilepsy: Is there a major genetic factor? Clin Genet. 2019;96:254–260.

55. Segal E, Pedro H, Valdez-Gonzalez K, et al. Diagnostic Yield of Epilepsy Panels in Children With Medication-Refractory Epilepsy. Pediatric Neurology. 2016;64:66–71.

56. Shellhaas RA, Wusthoff CJ, Tsuchida TN, et al. Profile of neonatal epilepsies: Characteristics of a prospective US cohort. Neurology. 2017;89:893–899.

57. Snoeijen-Schouwenaars FM, van Ool JS, Verhoeven JS, et al. Diagnostic exome sequencing in 100 consecutive patients with both epilepsy and intellectual disability. Epilepsia. 2019;60:155–164.

58. Srivastava S, Cohen JS, Vernon H, et al. Clinical whole exome sequencing in child neurology practice: WES in Child Neurology. Ann Neurol. 2014;76:473–483.

59. Staněk D, Laššuthová P, Štěrbová K, et al. Detection rate of causal variants in severe childhood epilepsy is highest in patients with seizure onset within the first four weeks of life. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2018;13:71.

60. Symonds JD, Zuberi SM, Stewart K, et al. Incidence and phenotypes of childhood-onset genetic epilepsies: a prospective population-based national cohort. Brain [online serial]. Accessed at:

https://academic.oup.com/brain/advance-

article/doi/10.1093/brain/awz195/5532195. Accessed July 17, 2019.

61. Tammimies K, Marshall CR, Walker S, et al. Molecular Diagnostic Yield of Chromosomal Microarray Analysis and Whole-Exome Sequencing in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder. JAMA. 2015;314:895.

62. Tan CA, Topper S, del Gaudio D, et al. Characterization of patients referred for non-specific intellectual disability testing: the importance of autosomal genes for diagnosis: Characterization of patients referred for non-specific ID testing. Clin Genet. 2016;89:478–483.

63. Thevenon J, Duffourd Y, Masurel-Paulet A, et al. Diagnostic odyssey in severe neurodevelopmental disorders: toward clinical whole-exome sequencing as a first-line diagnostic test: Diagnostic odyssey in severe neurodevelopmental disorders. Clin Genet. 2016;89:700–707.

64. Trump N, McTague A, Brittain H, et al. Improving diagnosis and broadening the phenotypes in early-onset seizure and severe developmental delay disorders through gene panel analysis. J Med Genet. 2016;53:310–317.

65. Truty R, Patil N, Sankar R, et al. Possible precision medicine implications from genetic testing using combined detection of sequence and intragenic copy number variants in a large cohort with childhood epilepsy. Epilepsia Open [online serial]. 0. Accessed at:

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/epi4.12348. Accessed July 16, 2019.

66. Tsai M-H, Chan C-K, Chang Y-C, et al. Molecular Genetic Characterization of Patients With Focal Epilepsy Using a Customized Targeted Resequencing Gene Panel. Front Neurol. 2018;9:515.

67. Tsang MH-Y, Leung GK-C, Ho AC-C, et al. Exome sequencing identifies molecular diagnosis in children with drug-resistant epilepsy. Epilepsia Open. 2019;4:63–72.

68. Tumienė B, Maver A, Writzl K, et al. Diagnostic exome sequencing of syndromic epilepsy patients in clinical practice. Clin Genet. 2018;93:1057–1062.

69. Vrijenhoek T, Middelburg EM, Monroe GR, et al. Whole-exome sequencing in intellectual disability; cost before and after a diagnosis. Eur J Hum Genet. 2018;26:1566–1571.

70. Wang J, Gotway G, Pascual JM, Park JY. Diagnostic Yield of Clinical Next-Generation Sequencing Panels for Epilepsy. JAMA Neurol. 2014;71:650.

71. Wang J, Wen Y, Zhang Q, et al. Gene mutational analysis in a cohort of Chinese children with unexplained epilepsy: Identification of a new KCND3 phenotype and novel genes causing Dravet syndrome. Seizure. 2019;66.

72. Wirrell EC, Shellhaas RA, Joshi C, et al. How should children with West syndrome be efficiently and accurately investigated? Results from the National Infantile Spasms Consortium. Epilepsia. 2015;56:617–625.

73. Xiao B, Qiu W, Ji X, et al. Marked yield of re-evaluating phenotype and exome/target sequencing data in 33 individuals with intellectual disabilities. Am J Med Genet. 2018;176:107–115.

74. Yamamoto T, Imaizumi T, Yamamoto-Shimojima K, et al. Genomic backgrounds of Japanese patients with undiagnosed neurodevelopmental disorders. Brain Dev. Epub 2019 Jun 3.

75. Yang L, Kong Y, Dong X, et al. Clinical and genetic spectrum of a large cohort of children with epilepsy in China. Genet Med. 2019;21:564–571.

76. Zhang Q, Li J, Zhao Y, Bao X, Wei L, Wang J. Gene mutation analysis of 175 Chinese patients with early-onset epileptic encephalopathy: Gene mutation analysis of Chinese patients with EOEEs. Clin Genet. 2017;91:717–724.

77. Zhang Y, Kong W, Gao Y, et al. Gene Mutation Analysis in 253 Chinese Children with Unexplained Epilepsy and Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities. Shapiro MS, editor. PLoS ONE. 2015;10:e0141782.

78. Zhou P, He N, Zhang J-W, et al. Novel mutations and phenotypes of epilepsy-associated genes in epileptic encephalopathies. Genes, Brain and Behavior. 2018;17:e12456.

79. Zhou W-Z, Zhang J, Li Z, et al. Targeted resequencing of 358 candidate genes for autism spectrum disorder in a Chinese cohort reveals diagnostic potential and genotype-phenotype correlations. Hum Mutat. 2019;40:801–815.