

AF

MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster The MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

https://nmgn.mrc.ukri.org/

DISEASE







Cluster

MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster: Linking clinicians and model system experts

 \succ Challenge: clinic \rightarrow genomics \rightarrow establish causality \rightarrow disease mechanisms



Prioritise VUS in multisystem disorders where we have expertise

Systems and disease focus











Neural crest cells

est Kidney

Neural Tube

Ciliopathies /Skeleton Heart





MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster



2. Variant Screening Pipeline



3. Variant Submission Portal



Functional information - Gene function, Functional analysis, Existing models?, IMPC

Submitter comments and motivation - Free space for additional information and motivation statement

- (3) Generation of a candidate variant information sheet for submission to the Clinical Advisory Board (CAB)
- (4) Candidate variant ranking by CAB
- 5 Assessment of CAB scores and candidate variant selection by the Internal Advisory Board (IAB)



MRC National **Mouse Genetics** Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster



2. Variant Screening **Pipeline**



Clinical Advisory Board



Fowzan Alkuraya



Diana Baralle



















Daniel Gale



Andrew Wilkie



Congenital Anomalies Cluster

RARG



2. Variant Screening Pipeline



Clinical Advisory Board

Steve Twigg/Andrew Wilkie (Clinician) Research Consent - YES Clinical Features Father and daughter – with frontonasal lipoma, scalp defects, and congenital heart anomalies. Father: born with cuits aplasia of scalp and a large facial lipoma, to unaffected nonconsanguineous parents. He required surgery in infancy for tetralogy of Fallot and a hypoplastic urethra. Daughter: at birth prominent symmetrical mass extending from the forehead to the nasal bridge suggestive of al liporna, and extensive cuits aplasia - posterior half of the scalp. PDA. Moderately-	Gene/variant metrics 0.04; 0; 32 Domain Information Asn104 - ETB domain The protein usually forms as a pentamer, with the BTB domain playing a key role in assembly.	KCTD15 Inhibits AP2 transcriptional activity by interaction with its activation domain; has a role in defining the neural crest region. There is no current link to Mendelian disease. Functional analysis: Biophysical analyses showed that the Asp104His substitution resulted in a monomeric BTB domain likely to be partially unfolded at physiological temperatures. A crystal structure of the BTB domain variant Gly88As revealed an abnormal closed hexameric assembly. Functional analysis – mouse: K/O correlate propertance of temperature	Supporting information There is a second family with de novo KCTD5 c.2830-A; p.Gly88Asp. Clinical features; sporadically affected proband presented at birth with a midline frontonasal mass. On review at the age of 15 years, she was noted to have thin, fair hair. KCTD15 Gly80Asp - previously	VUS sheet
delayed expressive language skills, coordination difficulties and mild conductive hearing loss.	playing a key tole in assembly.	K/O: complete penetrance of preweaning lethality	reported to cause Scalp-ear- nipple (SEN) syndrome.	
transcriptional repression, protein degradation ar mutations in the highly homologous paralogue, k external ears, digits/nails, and breasts. It is there consists of a father and daughter with features in carry a heterozygous c.3106>C (p. Asp104His) v midline frontonasal mass and sparse hair. The o domain of the KCD15 protein, in association wi highly suggestive that these variants are causati demonstrated that the p.Asp104His substitution domain suggesting a dominant negative mode o Family 2 variant equivalent (p.Gly62Asp) has be interaction with the neural crest transcription fac the first report of putative causative mutations in	nd nedgehog signalling. A disease (CTD1, cause scalp-ear-nipple (SE efore notable that both of our FND f ncluding large fronto-nasal lipoma a variant. In Family 2 a de novo varia ccurrence of two de novo missense th a clinically similar, extremely rarr vive of the phenotype. In collaborati destabilises the pentameric assem of action. Asp104 is conserved resic een identified in KCTD1/SEN syndr tor AP-22. Both KCTD1 and KCTD NCTD15, highlighting the critical n	association for KCTD15 has not previously beer FN) syndrome, characterised by cutis aplasia of families have a phenotype that includes cutis apj and cardiac defects (tetralogy of Fallot or patent int c.263G-A (p.Gly88Asp) is present in the prob e mutations, absent from databases of normal v e phenotype including frontonasal mass and cut on with Prof Alex Bullock (Structural Genomics C bily of both KCTD15 homodimers and KCTD15- due that makes key intermolecular contacts withi rome and modelling suggests it may destabilise I b have been shown to repress AP2 and affect r le played by KCTD15 in tissues of neural crest	I described, but heterozygous the scalp and anomalies of the lasia of the scalp. Family 1 ductus arteriosus) who both and who presented with a ariation and affecting the same is aplasia or sparse hair, is consortium, Oxford) we KCTD1 heterodimers via this in the pentamer. Similarly, the the protein structure and affect neural crest formation3-5. This is and ectodermal origin.	
A 0 C D E 7 Econol for service for the service of t	G H L J		Q A S T U	V W X Y Z AA .
Livy dicks	- Cita		Grantenaur	Tarange
Colonary Norte of Associate Laboration with Colored	Dekiso Generat Mainfeatures/diamonis UPOTerra	Beloverski biskammenen biskenskalteni (suder samo interfaces Sam	Boomdesserver 2 2x 58238 928 minutes	amenado) (nijilikiweki (400.ease W/II.ease Senseki 4004 Des
General Bancat Anadar Unterschendel Galer C	Disking Consume Multiplication/Minimum DEXTmem Reserver International of the state of	g Sm Dhahr being the second that assume that the second that assume that the second that assume that the second term of term of the second term of	Next 2 2 2011	Annandel (1923 and 1923 and

Full data spreadsheet



MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster



2. Variant Screening Pipeline



Clinical Advisory Board

VUS ranking

Priorities (in order of importance):

- New disease gene
- Known disease gene, but new phenotype association or novel allelic disorder
- Known disease gene with difficult to interpret VUS, eg nearby SV, deep intronic SNV
- Known disease gene where deep phenotypic investigation of the mouse model could lead to new insights into pathogenic mechanisms

Considerations

- The clinical features should overlap with the specialities of our developmental biology team: <u>craniofacial, skeletal,</u> <u>heart, neural tube, kidney, ciliopathies.</u>
- We are most interested in syndromic conditions to simultaneously study multiple systems in the mouse.



MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster



2. Variant Screening Pipeline



Clinical Advisory Board

Gene¤	Variant X	Allele	Inheritance	Depositor	[CADD	REVEL X	AlphaMissense	pLl¤	Score ^x	Rank¤
	Arg413*¤	Het¤	AD, 3 gens			38 <mark>¤</mark>	n/a¤	n/a¤	1 <mark>¤</mark>	1.5¤	1 ¤
0 [Leu343Arg¤	Het¤	De∙novo¤] [27.6 <mark>¤</mark>	0.705¤	0.986 (path) 🛛	0¤	3.9 ¤	2¤
Π Γ	c.370+441G>A¤	Het¤	De∙novo¤	Π Γ		19.28 <mark>¤</mark>	n/a¤	n/a¤	0.96 <mark>¤</mark>	4.3¤	3¤
] [Gly2716Arg	Hom¤	AR¤			29.1 <mark>¤</mark>	0.58 <mark>¤</mark>	0.996 (path) ×	0.05 <mark>¤</mark>	5.0¤	4 ⊭
ΠΓ	Pro436Serfs*81	Het¤	De∙novo¤	Π Γ		n/a¤	n/a¤	n/a¤	1 <u>¤</u>	5.1¤	5¤
Π Γ	Asp2435Asnx	Het¤	De novo¤	Π Γ		33 <mark>¤</mark>	0.17	0.4735 (ambig)¤	1¤	5.56¤	6 ¤
	Phe130Cys	Het¤	De novo¤			24.2 <mark>¤</mark>	0.572¤	0.4709 (ambig)¤	0¤	5.6¤	7 ¤
	Ala54Valu	Het	Denovo			15.65 <mark></mark>	0.03	0.1149 (henign)	0.04	5.76¥	88



Understanding multisystem disorders



2. Variant Screening Pipeline









MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Understanding multisystem disorders



2. Variant Screening Pipeline



		First 7	monitorin 2 hrs
	Perinatal		2
€0 ⁵ € ^{4,5}	68 ⁵ 610 ⁵ 61 ²⁵ 61 ⁶	5 4 18 ¹⁵ 20 21 27 23 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Birth	_
Maternal related	Pup related	Additional	
behaviours	behaviours	observations	
- Time/position in	- Time/position in	- Presence of milk	
the nest	the nest	spot	
- Crouching and			
suckling	- Suckling	- Perinatal	
- Pup retrieval		gasping	
- Ultrasonic	- Pup retrieval		
vocalisations	- Grooming	- Pup colour	
- Feeding and	Grooning	- Brown adinoso	
drinking	- Ultrasonic	tissue changes	
- General	vocalisations	dissue changes	
behaviour			
- Sleep behaviour			

Phenotyping



MRC National Mouse Genetics Network

Congenital Anomalies Cluster



Enhance UK expertise in determining causes, understanding mechanisms and identifying potential therapies for congenital anomalies

VUS of interest? Contact us: https://nmgn.mrc.ukri.org/clusters/ congenital-anomalies/ Stephen.Twigg@imm.ox.ac.uk

Link-out to other model systems	Integrate with wider Mouse Genetic Network	Community tools: Novel transgenic drivers/
Human Developmental Biology Resource	Interactions with Patient Organisations	reporters Knowledge
European Xenopus Resource Centre	Industry Engagement	transfer: congenital anomalies hub

Community building

CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS WORKGROUP

ERN CRANIO annual meeting November 17th, 2023



Co-funded by the Health Programme of the European Union

This presentation is owned by the ERN and may contain information that is confidential, proprietary or otherwise legally protected.

European Reference Networks

REGISTRY UPDATE

Two workstreams included:



Craniosynostosis



Cleft lip/palate



In progress:

Craniofacial microsomia



Congenital Deafness



Orodental





CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS DATASET





European Reference Network for rare or low prevalence complex diseases Network Craniofacial anomalies and ear, nose and throat disorders (ENR CRANIO)



SCHEDULE

- Currently finalizing Molgenis system update:
 - Improved user-friendliness of registry
 - Creation of center and disease specific dashboards
- Workshops with will be organized focused on:
 - Data entry (bulk & manual)
 - SPIDER tool
- Aim: data entry from January 2024 onwards





REGISTRY UPDATES

- More user-friendly
- Visits coupled to patients automatically
- Automatic calculations
- SPIDER implemented

🗰 MOLGENIS Home Patients Visit per workstream 🔻 Genetic Anomalies 👻 Tables Up/Download

CRANIO - / tables / Visits_synostosis

< CRANIO / Visits_synostosis

Craniosynostosis workstream visits

CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS WORKSTREAM: Contains all information that was filled in for patients within the CRANI

filters 🝸	columns 🔲	download 去	Table 🚺	Search	x	¢	1 - 12
-----------	-----------	------------	---------	--------	---	---	--------

# 🕂	craniosynostosisID	typeVisit	date	suture	which_suture	syndrome
/ 🖲 🗑	test	0 -1 yr of age at follow up	2023- 11-02			
/ 🖲 👕	уџу	Preoperative visit	2023- 11-02	Sagittal		
/ 🖲 🕯	ioopipio	0 -1 yr of age at follow up	2023- 11-02	Coronal - Unilateral		
/ 🖲 🗑	yiuiuy	3 - 4 yrs of age at follow up	2023- 11-02	Lambdoid - Unilateral		
/ 🖲 🕯	орро	10 - 13 yrs of age at follow up	2023- 11-02	Frontosphenoidal		
/ 🖲 🗑	pioiop	Additional craniofacial surgery	2023- 11-02	Sagittal		
/ 🗎 📋	hiuo	2 yrs of age at follow up	2023- 11-02	Multiple sutures		
/ 🕛 👕	uytyt	Additional craniofacial	2023- 11-02			



NEW HOMEPAGE AND DASHBOARD

ERN CRANIO

ERN for rare complex craniofacial anomalies and ear, nose and throat (ENT) disorders

Welcome to ERN CRANIO Registry

The ERN CRANIO registry is the European registry focused on the outcome of treatment using standardised diagnosis specific outcome sets (starting with craniosynostosis and cleft lip/palate) including patient reported outcome measures and outcomes on patients' quality of life.



Contact

In case of any questions regarding the ERN CRANIO registry, please send us an email.





European

Reference

This database was created using MOLGENIS open source software using version v8.223.0-SNAPSHOT

DASHBOARD – PUBLIC OVERVIEW

Dashboard

Percentage of patients by workstream				
WORKSTREAM	PERCENT			
Cleft lip/palate	20%			
Craniosynostosis	30%			
ENT disorders	28%			
Orodental anomalies	12%			
Other craniofacial anomalies	10%			





DASHBOARD – CENTER-SPECIFIC

ERN CRANIO REGISTRY Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin

Dashboards

Welcome to Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin's dashboard!

Pages are grouped by workstream. You can view an overview of patients your centre has submitted to the ERN Cranio registry, and you can compare the results of your centre against Your center the entire registry. On the current page, you will find a snapshot of your centre as of today. Craniosynostosis \sim Cleft lip and palate \sim 501 patients submitted Genetic Deafness 0 Your center has submitted on average 42 patients per month Larynxcleft Patients by workstream Sex at birth for Craniosynostosis patients Click a workstream to patients by sex at birth 28-63 219 191 🔵 Female 🛑 Male 🛑 Undetermined Cleft lip and palate Craniosynostosis Genetic Deafness Larynxcleft



DASHBOARD – CENTER-SPECIFIC

ern cranio registry Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin

Dashboards

Your center Craniosynostosis ~ Cleft lip and palate ~ Genetic Deafness Larynxcleft SUBMIT PATIENT

Welcome to Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin's dashboard!

0

Pages are grouped by workstream. You can view an overview of patients your centre has submitted to the ERN Cranio registry, and you can compare the results of your centre against the entire registry. On the current page, you will find a snapshot of your centre as of today.

501 patients submitted Your center has submitted on average 42 patients per month





CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS DASHBOARD – GENERAL OVERVIEW General overview for all centers

Dashboards

Your center

Craniosynostosis

 \sim

 \sim



General overview



Larynxcleft







Suture Overview

Click a category in the "Affected suture" chart to view more information.



Patients Overview



CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS DASHBOARD – OVERALL SURGICAL OVERVIEW







CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS DASHBOARD – GENERAL OVERVIEW OF YOUR CENTER



Suture Overview

Click a category in the "Affected suture" chart to view more information.



CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS DASHBOARD – GENERAL OVERVIEW OF YOUR CENTER



CRANIOSYNOSTOSIS DASHBOARD – GENERAL OVERVIEW OF YOUR CENTER



DOCUMENTS & RESEARCH



ᢙ / Dashboard

Download Documents

Download additional information about the CRANIO Registry.

Data Request Form v2	docx	73.21 KB	*
Data Access Policy	pdf	801.96 KB	4
Terms of Reference	pdf	693.95 KB	¥

DASHBOARD ERN CRANIO

Want to have a look yourself?

Visit: https://beta-erncranio.molgeniscloud.org/



Welcome to MOLGENIS

Search

9 databases found

	label	description
	BE3	UZ Leuven
Homepage	CranioStats	Staging Tables for Dashboards
	CZ1	University Hospital Motol
	DE1	Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin
Dashhoards	HU1	Szent-Györgyi Albert Medical Center, University of Szeged
Dashboards	IT4	Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli
	IT6	San Gerardo Hospital
	NL2	Erasmus MC
	NL4	UMC Utrecht



UNICORONAL SYNOSTOSIS PHOTO SCORE

- Research proposal discussed last year
- Photos for study can be shared via CPMS
- Aim to begin scoring in January 2024
- Please contact
 - L.Gaillard@erasmusmc.nl or
 - <u>M.tjaberinga@erasmusmc.nl</u>

		The photo score:					
		Orbital vertical dystopia					
		Temporal hollowing					
		Abnormal shape of the forehead					
		Deviation of the nose					
		Overall phenotype					
LE	Norn	nal	Mild	Moderate	Severe		

SC

RESEARCH IDEA TO PUBLICATION – ERN CRANIO

• How can you start performing research within ERN CRANIO?

Become eligible for ERN CRANIO research:

- Find participants during annual meetings
 - Workstream wide studies without patient data (e.g. questionnaire to clinicians)
- Study with patient data (without registry)
 - Only with participating centers that gave consensus for data use
- At least two ERN CRANIO centers (Ideal=from at least two countries)

RESEARCH TOPICS

Annual meetings to discuss research

- Researchers present research ideas
 - Relevance of research
 - Feasibility
 - Which centers will participate
 - Keep overview of completed and ongoing research

CONTACT

- Questions on the registry or dashboard
 - ern-cranioregistry@erasmusmc.nl
- Photo score study
 - <u>M.Tjaberinga@erasmusmc.nl</u>
 - L.Gaillard@erasmusmc.nl











3D Technician Meeting

ERN Cranio

Tareq ABDEL ALIM, Guido DE JONG, Maxime TAVERNE





Radboudumc university medical center



Leads of the 3D Working Group – ERN Cranio

Université Paris Cité

Erasmus MC

Universitair Medisch Centrum Rotterdam

zalus



HÔPITAL UNIVERSITAIRE




Contents

- 3D working group & questionnaire (subset)
- Endpoints of the protocol
- Guideline / Flowchart: rough outline & mandatory and flexible requirements
- Technician meeting 16/Nov/2023
- Discussion

3D Working Group & Questionnaire

3D working group

Prime objective:

Lay down best practices and standardize data acquisition and processing for facilitating seamless execution of large multi-center studies.

Aim questionnaire:

Identify key approaches and differences in current standards, which may, to a greater or lesser extent, influence the outcomes of collaborative studies.

3D working group



Converges to an agreed upon data structure

Questionnaire

Prime objective 3D working group:

Lay down best practices and standardize data acquisition and processing for facilitating seamless execution of large multi-center studies.

Aim questionnaire:

Identify key approaches and differences in current standards, which may, to a greater or lesser extent, influence the outcomes of collaborative studies.

Questionnaire - Acquisition



First study on validation, instead of exclusion.

Questionnaire - Acquisition



ACQUISITION DATA STORAGE PREPROCESSING ANALYSIS MULTICENTRE ENDPOINTS

Limitation 3D : you need someone for consistency, understands 3D data, integrate within your patient file.

Tip: keep personnel involved to improve quality and consistency.

Questionnaire – Data storage



ACQUISITION DATA STORAGE PREPROCESSING ANALYSIS MULTICENTRE ENDPOINTS

Recommendation:

If you have the option to choose an output format use **.obj** or **.ply** *Widely used format, possibility to embed texture information*

Questionnaire – Data storage

Data format Accessibility 3D data Accessibility to clinicians?

ACQUISITION DATA STORAGE PREPROCESSING ANALYSIS MULTICENTRE ENDPOINTS

Further investigation:

Talk to your local IT department to inform about options to integrate 3D data within electronic patient records, still limited in almost all centers.

Yes

No

Questionnaire – Analysis



Questionnaire – Analysis



ACQUISITION DATA STORAGE PREPROCESSING ANALYSIS MULTICENTRE ENDPOINTS

Mainly limited to research

Questionnaire – Multicentre endpoints



Endpoints of the Protocol

Local and Global Endpoints

Local endpoints

- Endpoints to be used internally for clinical practice and research
- Local Endpoints can optionally match ERN (global) endpoints or benefit from tools/data derived from these

ERN (global) endpoints

- (Open) Clinical and Scientific goals
- Collaborative Nature
- Provide Guidelines, Tools, and Data

Endpoint contents

Reference endpoints

- Define population "normal" / ranges
- Establish severity measures / indices

Technique endpoints

- Development of new "measurement" techniques
- Improving of "measurement" techniques
- In/External Validation of "measurement" techniques

Evaluation (applied) endpoints

- Evaluate surgical technique/population endpoints
 - To Normal
 - To Severity

Endpoint contents

Reference endpoints

• Data

Technique endpoints

• Tools / Techniques

Evaluation (applied) endpoints

• Application of Data, Tools & Techniques

Endpoint contents within the ERN

Reference endpoints

- Exchangeable, Interoperable and Future-proof Data
- Everyone can participate and collaborate

Technique endpoints

- Tools / Techniques can be created, validated and improved
- Use of the reference data

Evaluation (applied) endpoints

• With the reference endpoints and techniques we can do collaborative research, faster, better, reproducable

Example in Facial Analysis



Data sharing anonymized representations





Data sharing anonymized representations



ERN Guideline / Flowchart



Converges to an agreed upon data structure





Acquisition output Registered Cropped Mesh optimization



Acquisition output

Registered Cropped Mesh optimization



Acquisition output

Registered Cropped Mesh optimization



Acquisition output

Registered Cropped Mesh optimization





Technician meeting

Technician meeting outcomes 1/3

• Mainly focused on research applications, which indirectly finds its way to clinical practice fundamental findings and published results.

Hopefully, also on direct use (e.g., surgical planning, severity assessment).

- Need for automation of the pipeline from raw to interpretable data
- Need for standardized data structure with attributes to ease data collection in collaborative studies. Some solution already exist in some centers (e.g., Tübingen).
- Sharing within ERN might present risks in patient's data leakage: this must be addressed in details. Especially, more control on our data may be possible if all centers use the same anonymisation method.

Technician meeting outcomes 2/3

- Maintenance of database should be anticipated on the long term. Get inspiration from already existing platforms like FaceBase.
- Consider also include 3D soft-tissue reconstruction from CT scans.
- Setting global agreement within ERN as soon as possible. Is certification mandatory in the case where data is directly used for clinical decision?
- Standardize timing of data acquisition throughout patient's management (pre, per, postop).

Technician meeting outcomes 3/3

- Involve photographer (or person responsible for acquisition) in research projects
- Download files as .ply or .obj, which embed texture information
- Naming conventions, for example: PatientID_DoB_AcqDate [YYYY_MM_DD]
- Contact local IT dept about storage and accessibility solutions
- Storage of 3D data for clinical use could be done as 3D PDF.

Work packages 3D group

• 2024.1 Legal

...

- 2024.2 Research methodologies Registration method Reference planes / templates
- 2024.3 Accuracy validation (different setups) 🛛 collaborative paper
- 2024.4 Writing of Guidelines \rightarrow aimed to present next ERN
- 2024.5 Data sharing and storage opportunities
- 2024/25 Software / tool development



Discussion



Converges to an agreed upon data structure

What further endpoints do you foresee and are there topics that should be further explored collaboratively (with the technicians)?

Say that we start a collaborative project today, with 10 centers. What challenges will we face when we consider the data?

What are key steps to include we have missed or should consider?

What do you think are the most important sources of variability that may influence the outcomes?

What are key elements that you would like to see in the ERN protocol for 3D imaging?








Thank you for your contribution



Radboudumc university medical center



Erasmus MC Universitair Medisch Centrum Rotterdam

·za/ms









REDO SURGERY FOR SAGITTAL SYNOSTOSIS; REDO AFTER REDO

ERN Cranio Dublin 17 November 2023

INCIDENCE REDO FOR SSS IN LITERATURE

- First redo for raised ICP: 1.4-23.5% depending on follow-up time and technique
- No studies on recurrent raised ICP after second cranial enlargement

Moore et al. 2021 23.5%, 5.6%, 3.2% and 1.9% of secondary raising ICP patients who underwent the primary surgery between 1999–2004, 2005–2010, 2011– 2015 and 2016–2018, respectively (p 0.024). *No details on ICP monitoring*

Thomas et al. 2015 The overall incidence of raised ICP following corrective surgery for SC in this study was 6.9%; among MSC treated patients the rate was 14.6%. This is higher than the 1.4%–3.8% rate reported in other series of patients undergoing strip craniectomy. *ICP monitoring baseline consistently above 15 mmHg*

Cetas et al. 2013

Five (6.2%) of 81 children with repaired, nonsyndromic, single-suture (sagittal) synostosis later presented with delayed intracranial hypertension and underwent a second cranial vault remodeling. *ICP measurements:* >15mmHg



INCIDENCE REDO ROTTERDAM

2

2

1991-2022 Total operated: 749

Cranial remodeling Split skull graft Repositioning springs Completing craniotomy Post op hemorrhage Dural defect closure Scar correction

17 (14 ICP increase= 1,9% (1-6% depending on technique))
13
1
1
1
1
1



RECURRENT SYMPTOMS AFTER REDO

SD boy 11 y

Redo at age 14m (frontobiparietal) for asymmetry after incomplete craniotomy (springs) No genetic deficiencies

Second redo at age 8y (biparietal)

for skull growth stagnation complaints of headache, not thriving at school borderline ICP measurements.

Third redo at age 11 y (occipital with ext distractors) recurrence of complaints of headache etc.





6m after first redo



5y after first redo



RECURRENT SYMPTOMS AFTER REDO

MR boy 12 y

Redo at age 3y (frontobiparietal)

After endoscopic strip and cosmetic redo elsewhere Fontanel buldge, papilledema 10p13 deletion of unknown relevance

Second redo at age 5y (biparietal)

for skull growth stagnation complaints of headache, not thriving at school borderline ICP measurements.

Third redo at age 10 y (occipital with ext distractors)

postop perfect after 1 ½ yr recurrence of complaints of headache etc.

ICP: prone 10-15 mmHg, at end of the night 20mmHg 3 REM peaks 10 minutes, 20-30mmHg





MRI at age 12

RECURRENT SYMPTOMS AFTER REDO

N=3

First redo at early age for cosmetic reasons raised ICP (No genetic deficiencies)

Second (and third) redo for

skull growth stagnation complaints of headache, not thriving at school borderline ICP measurements. *Surgery helps for 1-2 years....*



IS THIS PROBLEM RECOGNIZED?

Do other centers see comparable patients?

What could be the origin of the recurrent problems? wrong decision to do re-expansion? reduced growth due to repeated surgeries? too big/small enlargement at first redo?

Would it be worthwhile to collect (second) redo patients within ERN centers?



PATIENT PARTNERSHIP IN ERN CRANIO

17 November 2023 Dublin, Ireland



European Reference Network for rare or low prevaler complex diseases Network Craniofacial anomalies and ear, nose and throo

CONTENT

- Introduction to EURORDIS Patient Partnership Framework
- Guiding principles of the Framework
- Patient-clinician collaborations in ERN CRANIO
- Ideas for collaboration?



INTRODUCTION TO EURORDIS PATIENT PARTNERSHIP

Patient partnership in the ERNs can be defined as a **mutual relationship** between patients and health professionals where input from people living with a rare disease or caring for someone with a rare disease **routinely and formally** informs the Networks' collaborative activities and decision-making.

Patient partnership implies considering health professionals and patients involved in the Networks as **equal partners** in all ERN activities and domains.



GUIDING PRINCIPLES

MUTUAL RESPECT

Patients and health professionals respect each other, communicate openly, and actively listen to each other. Everyone can openly express their needs, perspectives, and concerns without fear of reprisal.

LEARNING

Patients and health professionals are open to learn about how things may improve and are open to learn from each other.

TRANSPARENCY

Patients and health professionals are transparent about knowledge gaps and about the challenges and constraints that they might face in partnering effectively in the Network.

COMPLEMENTARITY

There is a mutual recognition of the complementarity of scientific, professional, and experiential knowledge that health professionals and patients bring to the table. Both act in ways that demonstrate the value of the input provided by the other party.

SHARED LEADERSHIP

Everyone is aware of the Network's goals and feels empowered to make proposals and take the lead on projects based on their expertise. Patients and health professionals jointly shape and lead the work of the Network and have a shared responsibility for the Network's performance.

TEAMWORK

Patients and health professionals work together from the beginning to set priorities, agree on activities, identify gaps and needs, and cooperate to develop solutions and projects.

PROFESSIONALISM

Patients and health professionals live up to the commitment they have made to contribute to the Network, communicate regularly, and report on the progress of ERN-related projects.

CONTINUOUS INVOLVEMENT

Patients and health professionals work together from the beginning in all ERN collaborative activities and projects.

CLARITY OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Network has clearly defined the roles, core tasks and responsibilities of patients and health professionals and everyone is kept updated. Health professionals are aware of the different roles of individual patients and of patient representatives that represent a wider community when collaborating with them.







AREAS OF COLLABORATION



Network strategy and management

Patients and health professionals discuss and agree on the priorities of the Network, including resource allocation

Healthcare



Development of care pathways, clinical practice guidelines, evidence reports, clinical consensus statements and other tools to support healthcare delivery and disease management

Education and training

Development of joint educational and training activities, bringing complementary knowledge and experience from clinicians and patients



Clinical research and registries

Good examples (e.g. the revision of Orphanet's rare diseases classification and the development of ERNs registries)

Information and outreach



Creation of education and informational resources, identifying knowledge gaps, outreach and awareness raising activities among the RD community and beyond.



PATIENT-CLINICIAN COLLABORATIONS IN ERN CRANIO

- Video on genetics \rightarrow collaboration with geneticists
- Research collaborations
- Communication materials on visible differences \rightarrow collaboration with psychologists
- ✤ Guideline and consensus statement development → clinical & patient versions
- Patient-clinician engagement group
- National collaboration



EXAMPLE 1. VIDEO ON GENETICS

Goal: to inform patients and parents about the genetics underlying their condition.

Development of 3 videos:

- 1. Genetics & inheritance
- 2. Genetics in craniosynostosis
- 3. Genetic counseling



EXAMPLE 1. VIDEO ON GENETICS & INHERITANCE



Knowing the cause, may be important for you and your family members.

Family appears next to the baby thinking about the cause

Swipe up to DNA string



European

Reference Network for rare or low prevale complex diseases Network Craniofacial anomalies

nd ear, nose and three

Draft storyboard of the first video: GENETICS & INHERITANCE



Imagine our genetic makeup as a personal cookbook.

DNA string transforms into a cookbook.



While genetics is a deeply intricate topic, think of each of us having our own unique apple pie recipe as an analogy to help clarify.

The book opens





Think of autosomal dominant inheritance as a dominant ingredient in the pie.If you inherit this specific ingredient from just one parent, it will significantly influence the pie's flavor.

We are in a factory were the pies are getting different flavours. The signs of male or female also light up. Each time this pie is baked, there's a 50% chance it'll have this distinct taste. Regardless of whether the pie is large or small, the flavor remains consistent.

Pies now have diffrent shapes and sizes but only 50% of them have a diffrent taste.

A cookbook

&

apple pie



European

Reference

Network

or rare or low prevalen omplex diseases letwork raniofacial anomalies

nd ear, nose and thro isorders (ERN CRANIO)

EXAMPLE 2. Research Collaboration

WHICH PATIENT TO ASK?

Researcher's question	Lived experience Christine (see table 1)	Personal story William (see table 1)	Collective perspective Anouk (see table 1)	Patient research Partner Samira (see table 1)
What is your personal experience of living with this disease?	+ May be too early	+ + erfect match	+ Good match	- May know others who are better suited
What is your personal experience with the diagnosis?	+ Recent unarticulated experience	+ + Recent, more articulated experience	- Personal experience with diagnosis may be outdated.	 Personal experience with diagnosis will likely be outdated.
Can you read and understand the Patient Information Folder?	+ + Perfect match	+ Good match	- May be too knowledgeable, loss of the naïve patient experience. Could ask other patients.	 Too knowledgeable, has learnt research language. Could ask other patients
Do you think other patients are willing to be included in my study (as participants)?	- Doesn't know other patients	- Doesn't know other patients	+ + Collective perspective: may not fully understand the study	+ + Collective perspective: may understand the study
Is my research question relevant for this patient group?	 Doesn't know other patients (speaks to personal opinion only)	 Doesn't know other patients (speaks to personal opinion only)	+ + Collective perspective	++ Collective perspective May be aware of patients' research priorities
What are important outcomes that I should include in my study?	 Doesn't know other patients	 Doesn't know other patients	+ + Collective perspective	+ + Collective perspective May be aware of patient relevant outcomes
Can you comment on my research proposal?	 Doesn't know other patients; not research ready.	 Doesn't know other patients; not research ready.	+ Collective perspective, may not understand the proposal.	+ + Collective perspective, may understand the proposal.
Are you willing to be an equal member of the research team?	 Doesn't know other patients; not research ready.	 Doesn't know other patients; not research ready.	+ Collective perspective, not research ready; could join together with a more experienced patient.	+ + Collective perspective; research ready.
Could you act as a 'critical friend' and push back on the research team if necessary?	Grateful to be included; not sure of good/bad partnership yet; not research ready.	Grateful to be included; not sure of good/bad partnership yet; not research ready.	- Grateful to be included; not sure of good/bad partnership yet; not research ready.	+ + Understands more about being on a research team. Able to review critically and give constructive feedback. Ok to push back on research team
Strong recommendation not to end Weak recommendation not to end Weak recommendation to engag + Weak recommendation to engag * Strong recommendation to engag	engage. gage. e. age. s for discussion or interview, no str	ict directives)		

Schoemaker et al. Ann Rheum Dis. 2023 Mar;82(3):312-315. doi: 10.1136/ard-2022-223561.

Vetwork r rare or low prevalence complex diseases Network Craniofacial anomalies and ear, nose and throat disorders (ERN CRANIO)

EXAMPLE 2. RESEARCH COLLABORATION

			ROLE IN PROJECT/RESEARCH							
Phas	se	Activities	Listener Is given information	Co-thinker Is asked to give opinion	Advisor Gives (un) solicited advice	Partner Works as an equal partner	Decision- maker Takes initiative, (final) decision			
tion		Support in writing of proposal by board member of LAPOSA		x						
eparat	1	Defining outcome measures			Х					
Ā		Writing study information material for parents			Х					
tion		Interim analysis review on outcomes		X						
Execu		Re-writing the chapter of the guideline				x				
tation		Re-writing the patient- version of the adapted guideline chapter				X				
mplement		Adapting the courses for referring care providers			Х					
_		Adapting the LAPOSA patient-information					x			

From project: Comparing effectiveness of a conservative policy to craniofacial surgery in children with trigonocephaly

Erasmus Medical Center Rotterdam Netherlands

> European Reference Network for rare or low prevalence complex diseases Network Craniofacial anomalies and ear, nose and throat disorders (Run RGNNO)

BRAINSTORM

Any ideas for collaboration?





2023-12-20

QUALITY OF LIFE ASSESSMENTS

Marizela Kljajić

Psychologist, PhD.

Gothenburg Craniofacial Unit





What is Quality of Life?

- A multidimensional *construct* that considers physical, mental, and social components
- Describes well-being depending on number of factors
- -duration and severity of illness?
- -medication? Stressful events?
- Subjective concept

Why should we care about QoL?

- Treating a patient aims to improve QoL
- The QoL could be affected by the condition but could also be affected by the treatment itself
 - e.g. surgery is painful
- Unless life-saving, what is the indication for treatment?

How can we measure QoL?

- Questionnaires
- Generic and disease-specific
- Available for craniofacial conditions: FaceQ
- Psychometric properties (reliability,validity,norming?)

In the past ONE month , how much of a problem has this been for you ...

About My Health and Activities (problems with)	Ne	A	S	0	AI
1. It is hard for me to walk more than one block	0	1	2	3	4
2. It is hard for me to run	0	1	2	3	4
3. It is hard for me to do sports activity or exercise	0	1	2	3	4
4. It is hard for me to lift something heavy	0	1	2	3	4
5. It is hard for me to take a bath or shower by myself	0	1	2	3	4
6. It is hard for me to do chores around the house	0	1	2	3	4
7. I hurt or ache	0	1	2	3	4
8. I have low energy	0	1	2	3	4
About My Feelings (problems with)	Ne	A	S	0	AI
1. I feel afraid or scared	0	1	2	3	4
2. I feel sad or blue	0	1	2	3	4
3. I feel angry	0	1	2	3	4
4. I have trouble sleeping	0	1	2	3	4
5. I worry about what will happen to me	0	1	2	3	4
How I Get Along with Others (problems with)	Ne		S	0	AI
		A .		0	

L	 I have trouble getting along with other kids 	0	1	2	3	4
C	2. Other kids do not want to be my friend	0	1	2	3	4
E	3. Other kids tease me	0	1	2	3	4
Γ	4. I cannot do things that other kids my age can do	0	1	2	3	4
Γ	5. It is hard to keep up when I play with other kids	0	1	2	3	4
_						

About School (problems with)	Ne	А	S	0	AI
1. It is hard to pay attention in class	0	1	2	3	4
2. I forget things	0	1	2	3	4
3. I have trouble keeping up with my schoolwork	0	1	2	3	4
4. I miss school because of not feeling well	0	1	2	3	4
5. I miss school to go to the doctor or hospital	0	1	2	3	4

About Your Health

	Thinking about the last week					
1.	Have you felt fit and well?	not at all	slightly O	moderately O	very	extremely O
2.	Have you felt full of energy?	never Q	seldom	quite often	very often	always O
3.	Have you felt sad?	never O	seldom	quite often	very often	always
4.	Have you felt lonely?	never O	seldom	quite often	very often	always
5.	Have you had enough time for yourself?	O	seldom	quite often O	very often	always O
6.	Have you been able to do the things that you want to do in your free time?	O	seldom O	quite often	very often	always O
7.	Have your parent(s) treated you fairly?	never O	seldom	quite often	very often	always O
8.	Have you had fun with your friends?	never O	seldom	quite often	very often	always
9.	Have you got on well at school?	not at all	slightly	moderately O	very O	extremely O
10.	Have you been able to pay attention?	never O	seldom	quite often	very often	always O

In general, how would you say your health is?
Oexcellent
O very good
O good
O fair
Opoor

© The KIDSCREEN Group, 2004; EC Grant Number: QLG-CT-2000- 00751 KIDSCREEN-10 Index, Child and Adolescent Version Page 3 of 3

Figure 1/UK (English) EQ-5D-5L Paper Self-Complete (sample version)

Under each heading, please tick the ONE box that best describes your health TODAY.

MOBILITY

I have no problems in walking about	
I have slight problems in walking about	
I have moderate problems in walking about	
I have severe problems in walking about	
I am unable to walk about	
SELF-CARE	
I have no problems washing or dressing myself	
I have slight problems washing or dressing myself	
I have moderate problems washing or dressing myself	
I have severe problems washing or dressing myself	

USUAL ACTIVITIES (e.g. work, study, housework, family or leisure activities) I have no problems doing my usual activities I have slight problems doing my usual activities I have moderate problems doing my usual activities I have severe problems doing my usual activities I am unable to do my usual activities

PAIN / DISCOMFORT

I am unable to wash or dress myself

have no pain or discomfort
have slight pain or discomfort
have moderate pain or discomfort
have severe pain or discomfort
have extreme pain or discomfort
NXIETY / DEPRESSION
am not anxious or depressed

I am slightly anxious or depressed I am moderately anxious or depressed I am severely anxious or depressed I am extremely anxious or depressed

What information can measures give?

- What are they actually measuring?
- For how long is the assessment valid?
- Who is the respondent? Parent, mother or father, both? Child?

Important aspects to consider

- Is the questionnaire appropriate for your patients?
- Is it a valid questionnaire, do we know if it measures what we intend to measure?
- Does the questionnaire include self-report (pediatric)?
- Are we using it to help identify patients with needs or to evaluate the care that we provide?

