

January 2014 Author Katharine Hartley

Contact Dr Philippa Brice philippa.brice@phgfoundation.org

The genomic contribution to diabetes

Diabetes mellitus is a major public health concern estimated to affect over 7% of the population in England ¹. Risk factors related to lifestyle - e.g. obesity and lack of exercise - are well documented and are the focus for public health interventions.

However, results from twin studies have established a genetic basis for susceptibility to diabetes, although the genetic markers remained elusive until recently. With the new ability to rapidly sequence DNA and conduct genome wide association studies (GWAS) – the genetic contributors to the development and progression of diabetes are now being revealed. Below we assess the consequences for preventing, diagnosing and managing diabetes based on the latest knowledge of the genomic contribution to the disease.

Recommendations

- Genetic susceptibility to type 1 diabetes: At present there is no evidence to suggest that identification of individuals with high risk genetic alleles for developing T1D will lead to beneficial preventative strategies.
- Genetic susceptibility to type 2 diabetes: There is no evidence at present to suggest the addition of genetic risk profiling of individuals in screening programmes to identify those at high risk of developing T2D. Family history of T2D is an important factor that should be included in all risk profiling calculators for T2D. Population based prevention of diabetes remains primarily with the promotion of healthy lifestyle choices.
- Monogenic neonatal diabetes: Genetic testing should be considered for all patients presenting with diabetes in the first six months of life. Approximately 50% of permanent neonatal diabetes cases will be identified with variant monogenic forms. (*KCNJ11* and *ABCC8*) amenable to specific medical management using sulphonylurea drugs rather than insulin therapy.
- Monogenic MODY diabetes: For all people under the age of 25 diagnosed with diabetes, MODY should be considered and differentiated from T1D and T2D. The MODY calculator - www.diabetesgenes.org (Shields et al 2012) should be used to determine risk of MODY. Genetic diagnosis should be offered for individuals meeting threshold levels for testing. A positive result for variants in *HNF1A* or *HNF4A* will help inform clinicians on treatment options where the use of sulphonylureas is preferred.

At a population level, promotion of healthy lifestyle choices should remain the focus of public health interventions combined with, at the individual level, consideration of family history to identify those at higher risk of developing the disease.

Lifestyle v. genes in the development of diabetes

Diabetes mellitus is a major public health concern estimated to affect over 7% of the population in England ¹. Lifestyle factors such as obesity and lack of exercise are well documented risk factors and consequently provide the focus for interventions to prevent diabetes in the population. Analysis of twin data recognised a genetic contribution and susceptibility to diabetes several decades ago² but until recently, genetic markers for diabetes remained largely elusive. The revolution in genomics - the ability to rapidly sequence DNA and conduct GWAS - has uncovered many genetic contributors to the development and progression of diabetes.

Genetic susceptibility to type 1 (T1D) diabetes

T1D is characterised by the failure of the pancreatic beta-cells to produce insulin and the reliance upon external sources of insulin to compensate for this failure. T1D affects around 1/300 and represents about 10% of diabetes cases. T1D is caused by a combination of genetic and non-genetic factors. This is highlighted in monozygotic (MZ) - *i.e.* genetically identical - twin studies that show, where one twin is T1D–affected around 50% of co-twins go on to develop the disease^{2,3}.

The genetic susceptibility to T1D is associated with factors affecting autoimmunity to insulin producing pancreatic beta cells⁴. There is a strong association between developing T1D and the MHC (Major Histocompatibility Complex) region located on chromosome 6 (6p21.3)⁴. It is estimated that 50% of the genetic risk for T1D lies in this region. Within the MHC region two haplotypes together (*DR3-DQ2/ DR4-DQ8*) are identified in 30-40% of children with T1D and present in 2.4% of the general population. The absolute risk for developing T1D is 1/15 for those haplotypes compared with 1/300 for general population^{5,6}.

Outside the MHC region, over 50 loci of interest as susceptibility genes for developing T1D have now been identified through GWAS. Fifteen loci have been confirmed in robust studies across multiple ethnicities^{7,8} three of which (*PTPN22, CTLA4* and *IL2RA/CD25*) are associated with immune responses by altering T-cell regulation or function^{9,10,11}. Individually, many of the associated mutations confer little additional risk of disease. However, there is compelling evidence of cumulative risk of developing T1D associated with combinations of risk alleles¹². Despite this, no practical application in the identification of these risk alleles for primary prevention of T1D has been reported¹³.

Genetic susceptibility to type 2 (T2D) diabetes

T2D accounts for approximately 90% of diabetes cases and is characterised by insulin resistance or insensitivity. T2D is normally associated with obesity and older age.

Monozygous twin studies show that for T2D concordance ranges between 30% and 80% and family studies estimate heritability at 30-70% ^{14,15,16} highlighting the importance of genetic factors in determining disease outcome. In addition, there is considerable ethnic variation in prevalence of diabetes, underpinning the argument that diabetes has a strong genetic component ^{17,18}. However, T2D is increasing in prevalence indicating genetic susceptibility factors may be modified by environmental influences for diabetes to become overt.

What is diabetes?

Diabetes is an inability to regulate raised levels of blood glucose and is a failure of either insulin production or response to insulin by cells within the body. The disease is classified according to how it presents and the underlying cause of the failure to regulate raised blood glucose.



Candidate gene and linkage-based studies identified a small set of genes, including variants in the gene PPARG, and KCNJ11 as implicated in T2D susceptibility with an odds ratio of 1.25 and 1.15 respectively ^{19,20,21,22}.

The advent of GWAS has led to the identification of over 60 genetic susceptibility loci associated with risk for T2D muliptle genes, including several that were not known to play any role in T2D ^{23, 24, 25, 26, 27}. All variants have only been shown to add a small risk of developing T2D (odds ratios mostly between 1.0 and 1.2) and in sum account for approximately 10% of the genetic component attributable to T2D ^{25, 28}. Despite the large number of genes now identified as associated with susceptibility to T2D, there is no evidence at present to suggest the addition of genetic risk profiling of individuals in screening programmes to identify those at high risk of developing T2D ^{28, 29 30}. It therefore remains a public health priority to promote healthy lifestyle choices in preventing the onset of diabetes at the population level. Consideration of family history should continue to be included at the individual level to identify those at higher risk of developing the disease.

The genetic contribution to monogenic forms diabetes

Monogenic forms of diabetes, including neonatal diabetes and Maturity Onset Diabetes of the Young (MODY) are highly penetrant genetic conditions and extremely predictive of outcome in terms of developing diabetes. Monogenic neonatal diabetes is extremely rare (around 1 in 200,000 births) and diagnosed within the first six months of life. MODY affects between 0.3% and 2.4% of diabetes cases^{31,32,33} and usually presents in people under the age of 25 years old. Monogenic forms of diabetes are often misdiagnosed as T1D or T2D diabetes in neonates and young people.

Monogenic neonatal diabetes

Monogenic neonatal diabetes can be transient or permanent and is characterised by known defects in a number of genes some of which also contribute to complex developmental conditions and genetic syndromes. Forms of neonatal diabetes that are not strongly associated with complex genetic syndromes include *PLAG1*, *KCNJ11*, *ABCC8*, *INS* and *GCK* genetic variants. Some of these variants require specific treatments - sulphonylurea therapy is effective over insulin treatment in patients identified with *KCNJ11* and *ABCC8* variants^{34,35,36}, whereas insulin therapy is essential in patients with *INS* mutations - a condition that leads to irreversible beta cell destruction³⁷. As specific therapies are recommended for particular forms of neonatal diabetes, it follows that genetic testing has clinical utility for patients presenting with diabetes in the first six months of life.

Monogenic causes of MODY

Genetic variants of *HNF1A*, Glucokinase (*GCK*), *HNF1B*, *HNF4A*, *IPF1* and *NEUROD1* have been identified as causative agents in MODY cases of diabetes, accounting for 87% of UK MODY prevalence (www.diabetesgenes.org).

People with *HNF1A* diabetes - approximately 52% of MODY cases³⁸ - and *HNF4A* diabetes are particularly sensitive to the blood glucose lowering effects of sulphonylureas and can often stop insulin treatment^{38,39}. Mutations in the *GCK* gene account for approximately 32% of all MODY cases³⁸ and result in a mild rise in blood glucose that usually does not need treatment.



- Monogenic forms of diabetes are often misdiagnosed as T1D or T2D diabetes in neonates and young people
- As specific therapies are recommended for particular forms of neonatal diabetes, it follows that genetic testing has clinical utility for patients presenting with diabetes in the first six months of life
- It is worth considering MODY as a differential diagnosis in those under 25 diagnosed with diabetes to ensure they are offered the most appropriate treatment

As the prevalence of MODY is estimated between 0.3 and 2.4% of diabetes cases, it is worth considering MODY as a differential diagnosis in under-25s diagnosed with diabetes to ensure they are offered the most appropriate treatment options. Shields and colleagues have developed an online calculator for predicting whether patients have monogenic MODY as differentiated from type 1 or type 2 diabetes, available at www.diabetesgenes.org^{40, 41}.

Genetic diagnosis should be offered for individuals meeting threshold levels for testing. A positive result for variants in HNF1A or HNF4A will help inform treatment. As monogenic forms of diabetes are highly penetrant, it would be worth considering genetic testing of close family members (siblings and offspring) of probands to identify individuals with the same genetic variant if research were to determine a benefit to those individuals in terms of monitoring for the signs of early development of diabetes and /or interventions to prevent or limit disease.

References

1 Holman N et al Diabetic Medicine 2011 28(5) 575-82 2. Pyke DA Diabetes: the genetic connections. Diabetologia. 1979 Dec:17(6):333-43

3. Gale EA, Bingley PJ, Eisenbarth GS, Redondo MJ, Kyvik KO, Petersen JS. Reanalysis of twin studies suggests that diabetes is mainly genetic. BMJ. 2001 Oct 27;323(7319):997-8

4. Baker PR 2nd, Steck AK. The past, present, and future of genetic associations in type 1 diabetes. Curr Diab Rep. 2011 Oct;11(5):445-53 5. She JX. Susceptibility to type I diabetes: HLA-DQ and DR revisited. Immunol Today. 1996 Jul;17(7):323-9.

6. Rewers M, Bugawan TL, Norris JM, Blair A et al. Newborn screening for HLA markers associated with IDDM: diabetes autoimmunity study in the young (DAISY). Diabetologia. 1996 Jul;39(7):807-12. 7. Cooper JD, Smyth DJ, Smiles AM, Plagnol V, et al. Meta-analysis of ge

nome-wide association study data identifies additional type 1 diabetes risk loci, Nat Genet, 2008 Dec:40(12):1399-401.

8. Concannon P, Erlich HA, Julier C, Morahan G, et al; Type 1 Diabetes Ge netics Consortium. Type 1 diabetes: evidence for susceptibility loci from me-wide linkage scans in 1,435 multiplex families. Diabe 2005 Oct;54(10):2995-3001

9. Peng H, Zhou M, Xu WD, Xu K, et al. Association of PTPN22 C1858T polymorphism and type 1 diabetes: a meta-analysis. Immunol Invest. 2012;41(5):484-96

10. Howson JM, Dunger DB, Nutland S, Stevens H, et al. A type 1 diabetes subgroup with a female bias is characterised by failure in tolerance to thyroid peroxidase at an early age and a strong association with the cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated antigen-4 gene. Diabetologia. 2007 Apr:50(4):741-6

11. Garg G, Tyler JR, Yang JH, Cutler A, et al. Type 1 diabetes-associated IL2RA variation lowers IL-2 signaling and contributes to diminished CD4+CD25+ regulatory T cell function. J Immunol. 2012 May 1.188(9).4644-53

12. Winkler C, Krumsiek J, Lempainen J, Achenbach P, et al. A strategy for combining minor genetic susceptibility genes to improve prediction of disease in type 1 diabetes. Genes Immun. 2012 Oct; 13(7):549-55 13. Skyler JS. Primary and secondary prevention of Type 1 diabetes. Diabet Med. 2013 Feb;30(2):161-9

14. Barnett A, Eff C, Leslie D, Pyke D: Diabetes in identical twins: a study of 200 pairs. Diabetologia 20:87–93, 1981

15. Poulsen P, Kyvik KO, Vaag A, Beck-Nielsen H. Heritability of type II (non-insulin-dependent) diabetes mellitus and abnormal glucose toler ance--a population-based twin study. Diabetologia. 1999 Feb;42(2):139-45 16. Almgren P, Lehtovirta M, Isomaa B, Sarelin L, et al. Heritability and familiality of type 2 diabetes and related quantitative traits in the Botnia Study. Diabetologia. 2011 Nov;54(11):2811-9.

17. Knowler WC, Pettitt DJ, Saad MF, Bennett PH. Diabetes mellitus in the Pima Indians: incidence, risk factors and pathogenesis, Diabetes Metab Rev. 1990 Feb;6(1):1-27.

18. Grigorescu et al 2010

19. Altshuler D, Hirschhorn JN, Klannemark M, Lindgren CM, et al. The common PPARgamma Pro12Ala polymorphism is associated with decreased risk of type 2 diabetes. Nat Genet. 2000 Sep;26(1):76-80 20. Douglas JA, Erdos MR, Watanabe RM, Braun A, et al. The peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-gamma2 Pro12A1a variant: association with type 2 diabetes and trait differences. Diabetes. 2001 Apr:50(4):886-90. 21. Gloyn AL, Weedon MN, Owen KR, Turner MJ, et al. Large-scale association studies of variants in genes encoding the pancreatic beta-cell KATP channel subunits Kir6.2 (KCNJ11) and SUR1 (ABCC8) confirm that the KCNJ11 E23K variant is associated with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes. 2003 Feb;52(2):568-72

22. Love-Gregory L, Wasson J, Lin J, Skolnick G, et al. E23K single nucle

otide polymorphism in the islet ATP-sensitive potassium channel gene (Kir6.2) contributes as much to the risk of Type II diabetes in Caucasians as the PPARgamma Pro12Ala variant. Diabetologia. 2003 Jan;46(1):136-7. 23 Dupuis J New genetic loci implicated in fasting glucose homeostasis and their impact on type 2 diabetes risk. Nat Genet. 2010 Feb;42(2):105-16. 24. Ohshige T, Association of new loci identified in European ge nome-wide association studies with susceptibility to type 2diabetes in the Japanese. PLoS One. 2011;6(10):e26911 25. Morris AP Nature Genetics Sep2012, 44(9)

26. Scott RA Large-scale association analyses identify new loci influenc-ing glycemic traits and provide insight into the underlying biological pathways. Nat Genet. 2012 Sep;44(9):991-1005.

27. Saxena R, Large-scale gene-centric meta-analysis across 39 studies identifies type 2 diabetes loci.Am J Hum Genet. 2012 Mar 9;90(3):410-25. 28. Lango H, Diab2008 PMID 18591388

29. Bao W, Predicting risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus with genetic risk models on the basis of established genome-wideassociation markers: a systematic review. Am J Epidemiol. 2013 Oct 15;178(8):1197-207. 30. Meigs JB Genotype score in addition to common risk factors for prediction of type 2 diabetes. N Engl J Med. 2008 Nov 20;359(21):2208-19. 31. Shields BM, Hicks S, Shepherd MH, Colclough K, Hattersley AT, Ellard S. Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): how many cases a missing? Diabetologia, 2010 Dec:53(12):2504-8

32. Schober E, Rami B, Grabert M, Thon A, Kapellen T, Reinehr T, Holl RW; Phenotypical aspects of maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY diabetes) in comparison with Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) in children and adolescents: experience from a large multicentre database. Diabet Med. 2009 May;26(5):466-73

33. Galler A, Stange T, Müller G, Näke A, et al; Childhood Diabetes Registry in Saxony, Germany. Incidence of childhood diabetes in children aged less than 15 years and its clinical and metabolic characteristics at the time of diagnosis: data from the Childhood Diabetes Registry of Saxony Germany Horm Res Paediatr 2010;74(4):285-91

34. Klupa T, Edghill EL, Nazim J, Sieradzki J, et al. The identification of a R201H mutation in KCNJ11, which encodes Kir6.2, and successful transfer to sustained-release sulphonylurea therapy in a subject with neonatal diabetes: evidence for heterogeneity of beta cell function among carriers of the R201H mutation. Diabetologia. 2005 May;48(5):1029-31 35. Codner E, Flanagan S, Ellard S, García H, Hattersley AT. High-dose glibenclamide can replace insulin therapy despite transitory diarrhea in early-onset diabetes caused by a novel R201L Kir6.2 mutation. Diabetes Care. 2005 Mar;28(3):758-9

36. Zung A, Glaser B, Nimri R, Zadik Z. Glibenclamide treatment in perma-nent neonatal diabetes mellitus due to an activating mutation in Kir6.2. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2004 Nov;89(11):5504-7 37. Støy J, Steiner DF, Park SY, Ye H, Philipson LH, Bell Gl. Clinical and

molecular genetics of neonatal diabetes due to mutations in the insulin gene. Rev Endocr Metab Disord. 2010 Sep;11(3):205-15

38. Shepherd M, Shields B, Ellard S, Rubio-Cabezas O, Hattersley AT. A genetic diagnosis of HNF1A diabetes alters treatment and improves glycaemic control in the majority of insulin-treated patients. Diabet Med. 2009 Apr;26(4):437-41.

39. Pearson ER, Pruhova S, Tack CJ, Johansen A, et al. Molecular genetics and phenotypic characteristics of MODY caused by hepatocyte nuclea factor 4alpha mutations in a large European collection. Diabetologia. 2005 May:48(5):878-85.

40. Njølstad PR, Molven A. To test, or not to test: time for a MODY calculator? Diabetologia. 2012 May;55(5):1231-4. doi: 10.1007/s00125-012-2514-4. Epub 2012 Mar 2.

41. Shields BM, McDonald TJ, Ellard S, Campbell MJ, Hyde C, Hatterslev AT, The development and validation of a clinical prediction model to determine the probability of MODY in patients with young-onset diabetes. Diabetologia. 2012 May;55(5):1265-72

The PHG

Foundation is an independent genomics and health policy think tank based in Cambridge, UK

For more information about us visit: phgfoundation.org

or follow us: @PHGFoundation