



Mosaicism in NF2 an update of risk based on uni/bilaterality of vestibular schwannoma at presentation and sensitive mutation analysis including MLPA

D Gareth Evans, Richard Ramsden, Andrew Shenton, Carolyn Gokhale, Naomi L Bowers, Susan M Huson, Gabi Pichert and Andrew Wallace

J. Med. Genet. published online 16 Feb 2007;
doi:10.1136/jmg.2006.047753

Updated information and services can be found at:
<http://jmg.bmj.com/cgi/content/abstract/jmg.2006.047753v1>

These include:

Rapid responses

You can respond to this article at:
<http://jmg.bmj.com/cgi/eletter-submit/jmg.2006.047753v1>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article

Notes

Online First contains unedited articles in manuscript form that have been peer reviewed and accepted for publication but have not yet appeared in the paper journal (edited, typeset versions may be posted when available prior to final publication). Online First articles are citable and establish publication priority; they are indexed by PubMed from initial publication. Citations to Online First articles must include the digital object identifier (DOIs) and date of initial publication.

To order reprints of this article go to:
<http://www.bmjournals.com/cgi/reprintform>

To subscribe to *Journal of Medical Genetics* go to:
<http://www.bmjournals.com/subscriptions/>

Mosaicism in NF2 an update of risk based on uni/bilaterality of vestibular schwannoma at presentation and sensitive mutation analysis including MLPA

D. Gareth R Evans, RT Ramsden, A Shenton, C Gokhale, NL Bowers, SM Huson, G Pichert,* A Wallace

Academic Unit of Medical Genetics and Regional Genetics Service, St Mary's Hospital, Manchester M13 0JH, UK; *Genetics Centre, Guys Hospital London SE1 9RT

Professor D Gareth R Evans
Department of Medical Genetics, St Mary's Hospital
Hathersage Road
Manchester M13 0JH
United Kingdom

Tel: 0044 161 276 6228

Fax: 0044 161 276 6145

Email: gareth.evans@cmmc.nhs.uk

Word Count: Abstract 161; main body 3038

Abstract

Background: NF2 is almost unique amongst inherited disorders in the frequency of mosaicism in the first affected generation. However, the implications of this on transmission risks have not been fully elucidated.

Methods: We have analysed our expanded database of 460 NF2 families and 704 affected individuals for mosaicism and transmission risks to offspring.

Results: we have identified 64 mosaic patients with a projected mosaicism rate of 33% for sporadic classical NF2 with bilateral Vestibular schwannoma at presentation and 60% for those presenting unilaterally. Offspring risks can be radically reduced on the basis of a sensitive mutation analysis of blood DNA including MLPA (detects 15% of all mutations), but MLPA is not able to detect even high levels of mosaicism.

Discussion: We have further delineated the chances of mosaicism in NF2 and resultant risks of mutation transmission to offspring in a number of different clinical situations. We also report for the first time the use of MLPA in our large NF2 series.

Introduction

Neurofibromatosis type 2 (NF2) is characterised by the development of schwannomas, meningiomas and ependymomas, with the hallmark of bilateral involvement of the eighth cranial nerve [1]. Over 50% of patients have no family history and represent *de novo* mutations in the NF2 gene [1]. Furthermore, pedigree analysis and mutation studies in blood and tumour specimens have indicated that a minimum of 25-30% of these new cases of NF2 are mosaic, with the mutation often only detected in tumour material and not lymphocyte DNA [2,3]. We have previously shown that risk of transmission is low if a mutation is undetectable in blood [4]. We have now analysed our expanded dataset of over 700 NF2 patients to clarify transmission risks in mosaic NF2.

Methods

Analysis of NF2 database

We undertook an updated analysis of our NF2 database, which now includes 704 patients with NF2. Patients are either referred to us for mutation analysis or have been seen as part of our specialist service. Family trees are drawn to identify deceased cases and information from hospital records is sought to verify their diagnosis. All patients on the database fulfil Manchester criteria [1] or have an NF2 germline or proven mosaic mutation (identical mutation in two separate tumours). Age at onset and laterality of vestibular schwannoma (VS) at presentation were examined. Patients who presented with a unilateral Vestibular Schwannoma (UVS), where no contralateral VS was identified on scan, but other NF2 tumours were present, had been removed, or occurred subsequently before the presence of a contralateral VS were identified.

Mutation analysis

Mutation analysis was carried out on DNA extracted from blood lymphocytes and where possible tumour material as previously described [4,5,6] by screening all 17 exons of the *NF2* gene. This utilised either Single Strand Confirmation Polymorphism (SSCP) or since 2000 direct sequencing of all exons. Since 2000 we have also utilised an approach to detect exon duplications and deletions [5] more latterly this has been using Multiple Ligation-dependant Probe Amplification (MLPA).

Offspring risk

The risk to offspring was assessed by analysing available pedigrees.

Results

Analysis of NF2 database

Of the 704 patients on the NF2 database 282 have been seen by at least one of the authors (DGE). The database also includes 48 deceased affected relatives who have been identified from family trees. Age at onset or laterality of VS at presentation were not available for 44/704 patients and 49 of the remaining 660

(7%) were yet to develop VS (18 of these were pre-symptomatic diagnoses with genetic testing). Only 12/49 were aged >20 years. Sixteen of the remaining 611 patients did not have information on the presence of VS of which six were inferred deceased carriers of NF2. Of the remainder, 142/595 (24%) patients presented initially with UVS. In the sub group seen by ourselves the ratio was very similar 64/282 (23%). Many of these patients (30) were children or young adults undergoing a first asymptomatic screen. 110/142 were known to be the first NF2 patient affected in the family. Of the 103 patients presenting with UVS on whom we had lymphocyte DNA, 27 had a mutation detected in blood (including 5 in whom it was mosaic) and 18 (18%) were identified as mosaics from analysis of tumour DNA. The proportion of mosaics detected among patients with analysed tumours was 18/24 (75%). If a similar proportion of the patients with untested tumours (52) were mosaic this would suggest that at least 39 further patients were mosaic. This would mean that at least 62/103 (60%) of those presenting with UVS were mosaic.

We also analysed the proportion of sporadic NF2 patients presenting with VS bilaterally who had detectable mutations. 137/217 (63%) who presented bilaterally had a detectable mutation in blood (19 were mosaic) and a further 13 mosaic mutations were detected only in tumour. These 13 patients were from 20 (65%) in which tumour analysis was possible. If the 65% detection rate of mosaicism from tumour analysis was extrapolated to the remaining 60 patients a further 39 mosaic patients would be identified. This implies that a minimum of 71/217 (33%) patients would be mosaic if they presented as *de novo* bilateral cases (Table 1).

Table 1: Mutations detected based on laterality at presentation

	Detection in blood [mosaic]	Mosaic from tumour analysis	Extrapolated mosaic disease
Sporadic case Bilateral VS at presentation	137/217 (63%) [19]	13/20 (65%)	33%
Sporadic case Unilateral at presentation	28/103 (27%) [5]	18/24 (75%)	60%

41 isolated NF2 patients were excluded as there was insufficient information on laterality at presentation or they have not yet developed VS.

We have identified a mutation in 84 out of 92 "second" generation families (91%) (table 2). We have specifically tested affected members from the second or later generation of a family as a mosaic mutation can be missed in blood DNA analysis from the founder [2,4]. There has been no testing bias as all available multigenerational families have had testing in the second or later generation. A mutation is assumed to be present in full form in a subsequent generation

individuals in it will have inherited the mutation from either the egg or the sperm of the affected parent. The sensitivity of our techniques are therefore >90%.

Table 2: mutations identified in 460 families with NF2 (includes patients not in laterality analysis)

Type of mutation	Detection in 2 nd generation (n=92)	Detection in sporadic non mosaic patients (% non mosaic)	Mosaic mutations (% of mosaic)	Total*
Splice site	28 (30%)	35 (22%)	3 (5%)	66 (15%)
MLPA positive	20 (22%)	21 (14%)	11 (17%)	52 (11%)
FSD	14 (15%)	31 (19%)	16 (25%)	61 (13%)
Nonsense	11 (12%)	57 (35%)	24 (37.5%)	92 (20%)
Missense	6 (6.5%)	4 (2.5%)	1 (1.5%)	11 (2.5%)
FSI	3 (3%)	11 (7%)	3 (5%)	17 (4%)
IFD	1 (1%)	1	3 (5%)	5 (1%)
Ring 22	0	0	3 (5%)	3
Not found	8 (9%)	208 (56.5%)		152/460 (33%)
Total	84/92 (91%)	160/368 (43.5%)	64/368 (17%)	308/460 (67%)

*Mosaic patients are already counted under previous 2 columns therefore the denominator is the addition from columns 2 and 3.

However, 20/92 (22%) NF2 defects were detected on MLPA. MLPA is only able to distinguish dosage between two copies of an exon and one or three. It would not therefore detect even relatively high-level mosaicism. An assessment of mutation detection and miss rates is presented in table 3.

Of the 92 multigenerational families we have reliable information on VS for 58 founders. 6/58 (10%) presented with UVS (3 were mosaic, 2 had full mutations and patient 6006/201 below was untested). Three founders had no VS at the time of death. 7/34 (27%) founders that we have been able to test were mosaic. In a further two families including a previously reported family [7] and patient 6006/201 mosaicism in the founder appeared likely due to the vastly worse phenotype in the second generation. Patient 6006/201 had a UVS aged 24 years and was noted to have a cutaneous tumour aged 45 years. His son, who has developed classical NF2, has an exon1/intron 1 deletion, but it has not been possible to obtain a blood sample from the father. The mean age at onset of symptoms in the 7 definite mosaic founder patients was 33.9 years (median 36 years; range 23-43) and 17 years in the 8 affected children (median 19 years; range 1-30 years).

Table 3: Estimates of the proportion of different mutation types and mutation negative *de novo* cases and potential offspring risks

	Sporadic case Bilateral VS at presentation [proportion of unfound mutations in blood]	Sporadic case Unilateral VS at presentation [proportion of unfound mutations]
Point mutation in blood non mosaic (actual)	94/217 (43%)	28/103 (27%)
MLPA mutation in blood (actual)	24/217 (11%)	1/103 (1%)
Point mutation detected in blood mosaic (actual)	19/217 (9%)	5/103 (5%)
A. Point mutation detectable from tumour (estimate)	43/217 (20%) [43/80-54%]	46/103 (45%) [46/69-67%]
B. undetectable mutation in blood (estimate)	11/217 (5%) [11/80-14%]	3/103 (3%) [3/69-4%]
C. MLPA detectable abnormality in mosaic form (estimate)	19/217 (9%) [19/80-24%]	14/103 (14%) [14/69-20%]
D. undetectable mosaic mutation (estimate)	6/217 (3%) [7/80-9%]	6/103 (6%) [6/69-9%]
E. Offspring risk if mutation negative in blood	2.7%+7%+2.3%+0.9% 13% (1 in 8)	3.3%+2%+2%+1% 8.3% (1 in 12)

- A. The proportion of point mutations that would be detectable if tumour material were available on all patients.
- B. Mutations that are present in full form but refractory to current mutation detection techniques (9% in multigenerational families). Assume that an additional 9-10% of detectable mutations in blood would be undetectable. For UVS 29+1/103 detectable in full form assume 3 undetectable.
- C. Estimate of the number of MLPA detectable abnormalities present in mosaic form. Assumptions are that 20-25% of missed mutations will be MLPA detectable mosaic mutations.
- D. The number of mosaic mutations that would not be detected using current techniques. Again assume 9% of non detectable mosaic mutations will be in this category.

The offspring risk is calculated from the following. The risk from Row A is minimal as evidenced from 0/39 children (95% CI of 0/34: 0-8.4% -assume 5%). B. 50% offspring risk if present in all cells; C/D assume 10% (7/70 children of proven mosaics have developed NF2) as proportion in blood not estimable. In total we have identified 64 definite mosaic patients. In addition to the 55 mosaic patients from the laterality analysis (23 UVS, 32 bilateral VS at

presentation), there were two extra sporadic mosaic cases with no VS, and 7 mosaic founders from multigenerational families. Amongst the 64 mosaic patients 36 have had 72 children. Of the 26 patients with a detectable mosaic point mutation in blood, 10 have had 26 children of whom five have inherited the point mutation (2 from one parent) and developed NF2 as reported previously [3]. Of 11 parents mosaic for an MLPA detectable deletion/duplication (found in tumour, or in the child) eight have had 14 children. 3/14 children have inherited the MLPA abnormality. MLPA was not able to detect mosaicism reliably in blood from any of the 11 *de novo* mosaic parents. In the three NF2 patients with affected children, the mosaicism has been inferred after confirmation of an MLPA abnormality in the child. One mother (patient 158/201) who presented with bilateral VS aged 31 years had a splice mutation (on direct sequencing) and MLPA deletion of the whole NF2 gene on tumour analysis. Analysis of her second tumour demonstrated only the MLPA deletion, which was later shown in full form in an affected daughter. This was confirmed on FISH analysis, but none of 30 maternal lymphocytes showed the deletion. The second mosaic MLPA patient (149/101) who presented aged 56 years with UVS and 6 cranial meningiomas (4 spinal tumours were also found on scan) had an exon 7 duplication identified in her classically affected son. This was not present on MLPA analysis in her own blood sample and we have to assume she was mosaic for the duplication. The third mosaic patient (3602/201) had bilateral VS aged 38 years and was noted to have a cutaneous tumour aged 40 years. His son who has developed classical NF2 (bilateral VS and a spinal tumour aged 20), has an intron1/exon1 deletion on MLPA, which could not be confirmed in the father's blood sample, but the son had hemizygoty for the intron 1 CA repeat having not inherited a paternal copy.

24 mosaic patients were identified with a point mutation that was detected in two tumours but not detectable in blood. 17 of these patients have had 34 children. None of the 34 children were affected (95% CI of 0/34: 0-8.4%) and the mutation been excluded 26 of them (0/26; 95% CI: 0-10%). None of the 3 patients with ring 22 have had children.

If a mutation is not detected in blood in a *de novo* patient there are four possibilities:

1. A mutation exists in all cells but not detectable (9% miss rate in 2nd generation)
2. A mosaic point mutation is present at too low a concentration to detect in blood, which is detectable on tumour analysis.
3. A large-scale re-arrangement detectable by MLPA is present in mosaic form and not detectable in blood (this could be identified in tumour).
4. A mutation missed by our detection techniques is present in mosaic form.

Extrapolating the data from our analysis the estimates of mosaicism for presentation with UVS or bilateral VS are presented in table 3. These are based

on a number of assumptions and these are explained in the footnotes.

In table 4 we present a summary of possible findings DNA analyses on lymphocyte and tumour, their interpretation and what test can then be used to exclude NF2 in the offspring.

Table 4: Outcomes of tumour analysis after negative blood analysis in determining mosaicism and utility in testing offspring

Hits in tumour	Mosaicism confirmed	Test in offspring After single tumour analysis	Second Tumour	Test in offspring for confirmed mosaic mutation in affected patient
Point mutation (A) + LOH	YES- need 2 nd tumour*	MLPA + point mutation A	Point mutation (A)	point mutation A
Point mutation (A) + LOH + MLPA normal	YES –confirms mitotic recombination	point mutation A	Not required	point mutation A
Point mutation A + Point mutation B	YES- need 2 nd tumour*-ensure at full dosage as could be multifocal	Point mutation A + Point mutation B	Point mutation A	Point mutation A
point mutation A no second hit no LOH	NO- need 2 nd tumour*	No definitive test to exclude NF2	Point mutation A	Point mutation A
point mutation A no second hit no LOH	NO- need 2 nd tumour*	No definitive test to exclude NF2	Point mutation A not present	No definitive test to exclude NF2
point mutation A no second hit no LOH	NO- need 2 nd tumour*	No definitive test to exclude NF2	Point mutation A not present, but LOH	Test for inheritance of lost allele: patient mosaic for mutation on retained allele
Point mutation A + MLPA whole gene deletion and LOH	YES- need 2 nd tumour*	MLPA + point mutation A	No point mutation A, but MLPA + LOH	MLPA-Patient mosaic for whole gene deletion
Point mutation A + MLPA exons 1-4 deletion and LOH for intragenic marker only	YES- need 2 nd tumour*	MLPA + point mutation A	No point mutation A, but MLPA 1-4	MLPA-Patient mosaic for exons 1-4 deletion
No point mutation, but LOH	NO -need 2 nd tumour*	Test for inheritance of lost allele and MLPA, patient mosaic for mutation on retained allele		Patient may be mosaic for MLPA detectable deletion or a point mutation on the retained allele
Nil identified	No-need 2 nd tumour*	No test available	Point mutation A	No test available
Nil identified	No-need 2 nd tumour*	No test available	Point mutation A + LOH	MLPA + point mutation A : First

			tumour may have been contaminated with normal material and patient mosaic for point mutation or deletion
--	--	--	--

* need second tumour to confirm which abnormality the patient is mosaic for.

Discussion

We have further clarified the contribution of mosaicism to the causation of *de novo* NF2. The original reports suggesting that 25-30% of *de novo* [3,4] cases are mosaic was a minimum estimate and dependant on the ability to “prove” mosaicism by identifying an identical mutation in two tumours, or at least excluding the presence of either of the 2 mutational hits from tumour in a blood sample. Our improved mutation detection techniques has meant that a higher proportion of mutations have been detected in tumours boosting the minimum mosaicism rate in classical (bilateral VS) presentation NF2 to 33%, and in individuals with UVS presentation to 60%. These patients all fulfilled the Manchester criteria, which whilst being more sensitive than other criteria retain specificity [8,9]. These results have implications for transmission of the NF2 mutation to the offspring. In contrast to a recent report [10], there is a real transmission risk to offspring of parents presenting with UVS, even when a mutation is not detectable in blood. It is not clear if our findings reflect a greater sample number (110 vs 44) or the inclusion of patients who did not fulfil at least Manchester criteria in the US report [11]. If a point mutation is detected at mosaic level in blood an estimate of transmission risk can be made, although for an accurate risk a sample of sperm (or rarely ova) can clarify the proportion of zygotes carrying the mutation. The main question a geneticist will ask after a negative blood mutation analysis is “what does this mean for offspring risk?” Whilst we have addressed this in the current study, the figures will depend on the type of mutation testing utilised and whether mutation detection techniques have a similar sensitivity to ours. Our combined use of sequencing and MLPA has a 91% sensitivity to detect a mutation in the second generation of an NF2 family. It is not reasonable to assume that the same sensitivity would apply to *de novo* cases. The mutation spectrum is different, with protein truncating point mutations (nonsense and frameshift mutations) predominating in sporadic new mutation cases [12-15]. In our current analysis 99/161 (61%) of detectable mutations were protein truncating in the germline of *de novo* cases compared to 28/84 (33%) in the second generation of an NF2 family. This reflects the increased severity of protein truncating mutations on NF2 phenotype and its resultant effect of reducing genetic fitness [12-16]. If anything this higher proportion of point mutations in the exons would mean a higher sensitivity at detecting mutations in sporadic *de novo* patients where the mutation was non-mosaic. However, we still do not know the mechanism for the missed mutations. These could be deep intronic splicing variants or gene silencing mutations, which would require RNA analysis.

Notwithstanding these reservations a fairly robust estimate of the frequency of different reasons for a negative blood mutation analysis can be made. From this an estimate of offspring recurrence risk can be deduced. The very much higher mosaicism rate in patients presenting with UVS means that the offspring risk will be considerably reduced from the expected 1 in 2 for a fully penetrant mutation to a figure of around "1 in 12". Even in patients presenting bilaterally with no identified mutation in blood the risk is likely to reduce to around 1 in 8.

We have presented for the first time an analysis of our large NF2 series using MLPA. These 52 patients amount to about half of all reported large exonic deletions/duplications in the literature [17]. Our present study highlights the importance of a detection technique for large exonic alterations. 15% of all detectable abnormalities were detected by MLPA amounting to 11% of NF2 families analysed. This is identical to the result in a smaller study of 188 families, although the spectrum of alterations was different [18]. Failure to employ a technique to detect these changes would result in a major loss of sensitivity of the testing process. As such the reduction in offspring recurrence risk would be substantially smaller.

Our assessment of mosaicism in the first generation of a multigenerational family with NF2 is higher than previously [4], when we found only 3/27 (11%) testable founders were mosaic. This is because we have now been able to identify a further 3 families using the previously unavailable MLPA analysis. The figure should be viewed with caution, nonetheless. The reason we have not been able to examine some founder individuals is that they died young from fairly classical NF2 and were thus unavailable for testing and were, therefore unlikely to be mosaic. In contrast the mildly affected mosaic cases may have near normal life expectancy and therefore substantially boost the number of these available for testing.

Tumour analysis does enable the testing of offspring to exclude NF2. In our experience the ability to detect changes in the tumour after a normal full mutation analysis of blood is high, reflecting the high sensitivity of our techniques and high rates of mosaicism for a detectable abnormality. Even if a common change is not detectable in two tumours it is still possible to exclude NF2 in many scenarios as shown in table 5. Even if a tumour only shows LOH, NF2 can still be excluded as the patient is either mosaic for an undetectable mutation on the retained allele or a large gene deletion [4,6,19]. As such linkage analysis still has a place in excluding NF2, although the reverse situation (a high risk result) should be interpreted with caution if testing the second generation of an NF2 family [20]. Inheritance of the high-risk allele may not be associated with increased risk if the parent is mosaic for a mutation on that allele [20]. Although it is possible to confirm NF2 if only a single point mutation is identified in a tumour, a negative test for this in the offspring is uninformative.

The difficult area in assessing mosaicism from tumour analysis is if a tumour shows both a point mutation and a large-scale re-arrangement detectable by

MLPA (this could be a whole gene deletion). It is possible to exclude high-level mosaicism in blood for the point mutation (SSCP detects this at the 5% level and sequencing 10-20%), but not the change detectable by MLPA. One patient with an affected child was clearly mosaic for an exon 1-16 deletion that was present in the child and her own tumour DNA, but not detectable in blood. If an MLPA abnormality is detected in a tumour and only one tumour is available for analysis, then chromosome FISH may reveal whether the deletion is present in a significant number of lymphocytes. The fact that this patient had <3% of lymphocytes affected shows that there is a risk of transmission even below the 5% level. Approximately half of our MLPA deletions are likely to result in an abnormality detectable by FISH (table 3). In the clinical setting, the approach to who/what tissues to send for mutation testing depends on the presentation. In isolated/founder cases mosaicism should be suspected in those presenting initially with UVS, those with ≥ 2 NF2 related tumours but falling short of diagnostic criteria- including those who might be classified as schwannomatosis [4,21] or those with meningiomatosis [22]. In families with two or more affected, a further clue may be mild disease in the first generation, with more severe disease in subsequent generations [7]. In familial cases initial mutation testing should be undertaken in the affected offspring rather than in the founder. In *de novo* cases, ideally mutation testing using tumour DNA is the first step. Given the high frequency of mosaicism it is essential that part of all tumours removed (including two parts of a multifocal tumour) is sent for DNA analysis. When counselling a *de novo* mosaic case, the possibility of more severe disease in a non-mosaic offspring must be discussed.

NF2 is almost unique amongst genetic conditions in that mosaic disease presents as such a large proportion of classical disease. The proliferation of CNS tumours in NF2 will lead to the diagnosis as long as at least one tumour becomes symptomatic (others will be detected on scan). It is possible that mosaic disease is under-recognised in other tumour prone disorders such as familial polyposis, where mutation detection rates are still reduced in the first generation. However, in von Hippel Lindau disease and NF1 detection rates in sporadic patients are as high as 90-95% in blood [22]. NF2 therefore presents an unusual counselling situation for a monogenic disease where failure to identify a mutation in blood is more likely to mean that a patient has a low risk of transmission to their offspring, than that sensitivity of the detection techniques were reduced.

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in Journal of Medical Genetics and any other BMJ PGL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence

(<http://JMG.bmjournals.com/misc/ifora/licenceform.shtml>)

References

1. Evans DGR, Huson S, Donnai D, Neary W, Blair V, Newton V, Harris R. A clinical study of type 2 neurofibromatosis. *Q J Med* 1992; 84: 603-618.
2. Evans DGR, Truman L, Wallace A, Strachan T. Mosaicism in classical NF2: a common mechanism for sporadic disease in tumour prone syndromes?. *Am J Hum Genet* 1998; 63: 727-36.
3. Kluwe L, Mautner VF, Heinrich B, Dezube R, Jacoby LB, Friedrich RE, et al. Molecular study of frequency of mosaicism in neurofibromatosis 2 patients with bilateral vestibular schwannomas. *J Med Genet* 2003;40:109-14.
4. Moyhuddin A, Baser ME, Watson C, Purcell S, Ramsden RT, Heiberg A, Wallace AJ, Evans DGR. Somatic mosaicism in neurofibromatosis 2: prevalence and risk of disease transmission to offspring. *J Med Genet* 2003; 40: 459-63..
5. Wallace AJ, Watson CJ, Howard E, Evans DGR, Elles RG. Mutation Scanning of the NF2 Gene: An Improved Service Based on Meta-PCR/Sequencing, Dosage Analysis and Loss of Heterozygosity Analysis. *Genet Test*. 2004;8(4):368-80
6. Mohyuddin A, Neary WJ, Wallace AJ, Purcell S, Wu C-L, Reid H, Ramsden RT, Read AP, Evans DGR. Molecular genetic exclusion of NF2 in young patients diagnosed with a unilateral vestibular schwannoma. *J Med Genet* 2002; 39:315-322.
7. Huson SM, Thrush D. Central neurofibromatosis. *Q J Med*. 1985 ;55(218): 213-24.
8. Baser ME, Friedman JM, Wallace AJ, Ramsden RT, Joe H, Evans DGR. Evaluation of diagnostic criteria for neurofibromatosis 2. *Neurology* 2002; 59(11):1759-65
9. National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement on Neurofibromatosis. *Arch Neurol*. 1987; **45**, 575-579.
10. Aghi M, Kluwe L, Webster MT, Jacoby LB, Barker FG 2nd, Ojemann RG, Mautner VF, MacCollin M. Unilateral vestibular schwannoma with other neurofibromatosis type 2-related tumors: clinical and molecular study of a unique phenotype. *J Neurosurg*. 2006;104(2):201-7.
11. Parry DM, MacCollin M, Kaiser-Kupfer MI, *et al*. Germ-line mutations in the neurofibromatosis 2 gene: correlations with disease severity and retinal abnormalities. *Am J Hum Genet* 1996;**59**:529-39.
12. Evans DGR, Truman L, Wallace A, Mason S, Strachan T.

- Genotype/phenotype correlations in type 2 neurofibromatosis: evidence for more severe disease with truncating mutations. *J Med Genet* 1998;**35**:450-5.
13. Baser ME, Kuramoto L, Joe H, Friedman JM, Wallace AJ, Gillespie JE, Ramsden RT, Evans DG. Genotype-Phenotype Correlations for Nervous System Tumors in Neurofibromatosis 2: A Population-Based Study. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2004;**75**(2):231-9.
 14. Baser ME. and the contributors to the International *NF2* Mutation Database. The distribution of constitutional and somatic mutations in the *neurofibromatosis 2* gene. *Hum Mutation* 2006;**27**(4):297-306
 15. Evans DGR, Huson SM, Donnai D, *et al.* A genetic study of type 2 neurofibromatosis in the north west of England and the UK: I. Prevalence, mutation rate, fitness and confirmation of maternal transmission effect on severity. *J Med Genet* 1992;**29**:841-6.
 16. Ahronowitz I, Xin W, Kiely R, Sims K, Maccollin M, Nunes FP. Mutational spectrum of the *NF2* gene: a meta-analysis of 12 years of research and diagnostic laboratory findings. *Hum Mutat*. 2006 Sep 18; [Epub ahead of print]
 17. Kluwe L, Nygren AO, Errami A, Heinrich B, Matthies C, Tatagiba M, Mautner V. Screening for large mutations of the *NF2* gene. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer*. 2005; **42**(4),384-91.
 18. Kluwe L, Friedrich RE, Tatagiba M, Mautner VF. Presymptomatic diagnosis for children of sporadic neurofibromatosis 2 patients: a method based on tumor analysis. *Genet Med*. 2002;**4**(1):27-30
 19. Bijlsma E, Wallace A, Evans DGR. Misleading linkage results in a family with mosaic *NF2*. *J Med Genet* 1997; **34**: 934-6.
 20. Murray A, Hughes TAT, Neal JW, Howard E, Evans DGR, Harper PS. A case of multiple cutaneous schwannomas; schwannomatosis or neurofibromatosis type 2? *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr* 2006; **77**(2):269-71
 21. Evans DG, Watson C, King A, Wallace A, Baser ME. Multiple meningiomas: differential involvement of *NF2* in children and adults. *J Med Genet* 2005;**42**(1):45-8
 22. Messiaen LM, Callens T, Mortier G, Beysen D, Vandenbroucke I, Van Roy N, Speleman F, Paepe AD. Exhaustive mutation analysis of the *NF1* gene allows identification of 95% of mutations and reveals a high frequency of unusual splicing defects. *Hum Mutat* 2000;**15**(6):541-55