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#### Abstract

Pharmacogenetic (PGx) testing is increasingly available from clinical laboratories. However, only a limited number of quality control and other reference materials (RMs) are currently available to support clinical testing. To address this need, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) based Genetic Testing Reference Material Coordination Program (GeT-RM), in collaboration with members of the pharmacogenetic testing community and the Coriell Cell Repositories, has characterized 137 genomic DNA samples for 28 genes commonly genotyped by PGx testing assays (CYP1A1, CYP1A2, CYP2A6, CYP2B6, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, CYP2E1, CYP3A4, CYP3A5, CYP4F2, DPYD, GSTM1, GSTP1, GSTT1, NAT1, NAT2, SLC15A2, SLC22A2, SLCO1B1, SLCO2B1, TPMT, UGT1A1, UGT2B7, UGT2B15, UGT2B17, VKORC1). 137 Coriell cell lines were selected based on ethnic diversity and partial genotype characterization from previous testing. DNA samples were coded and distributed to volunteer testing laboratories for targeted genotyping using a number of commercially available and laboratory developed tests. Through consensus verification, we confirmed the presence of at least 108 variant PGx alleles. These samples are also being characterized by other PGx assays, including next-generation sequencing, which will be reported separately. Genotyping results were consistent among laboratories, with the majority of differences in allele assignments attributed to assay design and variability in reported allele nomenclature, particularly for CYP2D6, UGT1A1, and VKORC1. These publicly available samples will help assure the accuracy of pharmacogenetic testing.


## Introduction

Pharmacogenetic tests are used to predict or explain an individual's reaction to drugs by assaying for the presence or absence of known genetic polymorphisms in genes encoding drug metabolizing enzymes, drug transporters, drug receptors or targets of drug action. These tests are used clinically to assist development of therapeutic strategies. For example, clopidogrel (Plavix $\left.{ }^{\circledR}\right)$ is a platelet inhibitor that is prescribed to patients with acute coronary syndromes to prevent blood clots. This drug is metabolized to its active form [2-\{1-[1-(2-chlorophenyl)-2-methoxy-2-oxoethyl]-4-sulfanyl-3-piperidinylidene \}acetic acid] by several

CYP450 enzymes, most notably CYP2C19. Individuals with loss-of-function CYP2C19 variants are not able to effectively metabolize clopidogrel and are at increased risk for adverse cardiovascular events, especially after receiving coronary artery stents. The boxed warning on clopidogrel (http://www.fda.gov/drugs/drugsafety/ postmarketdrugsafetyinformationforpatientsandproviders/ucm203888.htm, last accessed $9 / 12 / 2014$ ) notes that testing is available to determine the CYP2C19 genotype. The FDA requires that information about applicable pharmacogenetic tests be included in the labeling of certain FDA-approved drugs, including clopidogrel, warfarin and abacavir. ${ }^{1}$ Pharmacogenetic tests are also used by researchers and pharmaceutical companies for discovery, drug development, and clinical trials. ${ }^{2}$

Clinical genetic testing laboratories are required by regulations and guided by professional or best practice standards to use reference materials (RMs) for assay development and validation, quality control and proficiency testing (http://www.acmg.net/Pages/ ACMG_Activities/stds-2002/g.htm, last accessed 4/17/2015, Washington State Legislature, http://app.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=246-338-090, last accessed 4/17/2015, College of American Pathologists http://www.cap.org/apps/cap.portal, last accessed 4/17/2015 (registration required), New York State Clinical Laboratory Evaluation Program, http://www.wadsworth.org/clep, last accessed 4/17/2015). ${ }^{3-9}$ Genetic testing laboratories often use genomic DNA samples, either from cell lines or residual de-identified patient material, as RMs. Although clinical laboratories commonly offer pharmacogenetic tests, and many pharmacogenetic assays are being used for drug development and clinical trials, there are a limited number of quality control and other RMs that have been characterized using multiple methods. These materials cover some of the more commonly tested genes and alleles included in commercially available reagents and platforms, but no characterized RMs are currently available for the majority of genes and alleles included in the more comprehensive assays, particularly for low-frequency variants or variants more commonly found in non-European populations. This lack of RMs hinders the ability of laboratories to develop and validate assays and perform necessary quality control. It also makes comparison of assays and standardization between laboratories difficult.

In 2010, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) based Genetic Testing Reference Material Coordination (GeT-RM) Program, in collaboration with members of the pharmacogenetic testing community and Coriell Cell Repositories, characterized 107 publicly available genomic DNA samples for five commonly tested PGx genes: CYP2D6, CYP2C19, CYP2C9, VKORC1 and UGT1A1. ${ }^{10}$ This study confirmed the presence of a variety of the commonly tested polymorphisms in the five genes; however, many important variants were assayed but not identified among the samples tested. An additional study was published which characterized 48 samples for CYP2D6 only using multiple methods including phenotyping. Two additional CYP2D6 alleles, $* 43$ and $* 45$, that were not tested in the GeT-RM study were identified. ${ }^{11}$

During our first study, clinical laboratories tested only a few pharmacogenetic genes for a limited number of variants. Today, a much larger number of pharmacogenetic genes and alleles are tested in clinical and research settings. Some commercially available platforms, such as the Affymetrix DMET ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Plus Panel or the Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ iPLEX® ADME

PGx Pro Panel and laboratory developed assays that utilize massively parallel sequencing, commonly referred to as next generation sequencing (NGS) technology, can examine dozens to hundreds of pharmacogenetic genes. In addition, the number of variants that are associated with pharmacogenetic phenotypes has increased and knowledge about the effects of these variants on drug metabolism is actively being curated, leading to the development of practice guidelines for several gene/drug pairs (pharmGKB, Dosing Guidelines- CPIC: http://www.pharmgkb.org/view/dosing-guidelines.do?source=CPIC\#, last accessed February 12, 2015). ${ }^{12}$

To address the increasing need for characterized genomic DNA RMs for pharmacogenetic testing of additional PGx genes and alleles, the GeT-RM Program and the genetic testing community collaborated to characterize an additional 137 publicly available genomic DNA samples for 230 pharmacogenetic genes. The 9 participating pharmacogenetic testing laboratories used a variety of commercially available platforms and laboratory developed tests, including DNA sequencing assays, to genotype the samples. The findings from this study will be reported in two parts. The haplotype analysis of 28 pharmacogenetic genes (CYP1A1, CYP1A2, CYP2A6, CYP2B6, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, CYP2E1, CYP3A4, CYP3A5, CYP4F2, DPYD, GSTM1, GSTP1, GSTT1, NAT1, NAT2, SLC15A2, SLC22A2, SLCO1B1, SLCO2B1, TPMT, UGT1A1, UGT2B7, UGT2B15, UGT2B17, $V K O R C 1$ ) are reported here, while the results of the DNA sequence analyses and genotyping studies will be reported separately.

## Materials and Methods

## Cell line and laboratory selection

One hundred and thirty-seven cell lines were selected from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) and the National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI) Repositories at the Coriell Cell Repositories for this study based on data from previous partial genotype analysis and the varied ethnicities of the donors. For logistical reasons (related to cost of reagents, staffing, and batched run size), the 137 DNA samples were divided into two non-overlapping sets: Tier 1 (96 DNA samples) and Tier 2 (41 DNA samples). Volunteer laboratories were selected based on assay, platform and willingness to participate. Clinical and research laboratories as well as commercial assay manufacturing laboratories participated in the study. DNA samples were prepared by Coriell and aliquots were sent to the volunteer laboratories for genotyping. Participants utilized a variety of commercially available tests, both FDA-cleared and non-FDA cleared, as well as laboratory developed tests (LDTs). The alleles detected by each assay, and the sample sets (Tier 1 and 2) tested by each assay are shown in Table 1. Reagents for the GenMark, Luminex, and Affymetrix assays were donated to the testing laboratories by the manufacturers.

DNA preparation-Approximately 2 mg of DNA was prepared from each of the selected cell lines by the Coriell Cell Repositories using Gentra/Qiagen Autopure (Valencia, CA) per manufacturer's instructions or previously described methods. ${ }^{13}$

## Assays used in the characterization study

Affymetrix DMET ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Plus Array (Affymetrix, Santa Clara, CA): Following
manufacturer's instructions, genomic DNA was amplified using multiplex PCR and further enriched using molecular inversion probe (MIP) PCR. Amplified DNA products were purified, fragmented, labeled and hybridized to the DMET ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Plus Array. Arrays were stained with a fluorescent antibody and scanned on GeneChip Scanner 3000 7G. Data was analyzed using the DMET ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Console Software v. 1.3. The DMET array is optimized to detect nucleotide variants and homozygous deletions, and does not distinguish between one or more copies of a gene. For CYP2D6, a gene with copy number changes associated with clinically relevant phenotypes, three additional Applied Biosystems TaqMan® Gene Copy Number Assays (Foster City, CA) were used to test for deletions and duplications. The samples were tested according to manufacturer's instructions and run on the ABI 7900HT Real Time PCR System. The copy number data was analyzed using the Applied Biosystems TaqMan® Gene Copy Number Assays Macro (http://www3.appliedbiosystems.com/cms/ groups/mcb_marketing/documents/generaldocuments/cms_042731.pdf) and was combined with the raw DMET array results to report more conclusive result for CYP2D6.

AutoGenomics INFINITI® CYP3A4-3A5, NAT2, and CYP2D6 Assays (AutoGenomics, Inc., Vista, CA): The assays were performed as previously described ${ }^{14}$ for CYP2C19 using multiplex PCR involving target-specific amplification of extracted DNA. Analyte-specific detection primer extension and subsequent hybridization of fluorescent labeled primers to capture probes arrayed on the Biofilmchip is automated using the INFINITI® analyzer which then scans the Microarray, analyzes the data and produces a report indicating detection of single nucleotide polymorphisms, copy number variants (deletions, duplications), insertions, and other types of variants.

GenMark Dx eSensor ${ }^{\circledR} 2 C 19$ Test, Warfarin Sensitivity Test, and 3A4/3A5 Assays (GenMark Diagnostics, Carlsbad, CA, USA): All genotyping was performed as per the manufacturer's instructions. The technology and performance of GenMark genotyping has been described elsewhere. ${ }^{15-17}$ In brief, the regions surrounding the interrogated variants were amplified using multiplex PCR, incubated with allele-specific oligonucleotide signal probes labeled with a ferrocene derivative, and hybridized with capture probes bound to gold-plated electrodes through test-specific eSensor® cartridges and the eSensor ${ }^{\circledR}$ XT-8 System (GenMark Diagnostics). All genotypes were determined by voltammetry using the eSensor® analysis software (GenMark Diagnostics, Carlsbad, CA, USA).
iPLEX® ADME PGx Pro Panel (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA): Specific DNA fragments were amplified from genomic DNA in eight PCR reactions and alleles were subsequently interrogated using single base extension (SBE) reactions. Genotypes were detected using a MassARRAY® Analyzer 4 system and haplotypes assigned using an ADME PGx Pro Reporter plugin for the Typer Analyzer software (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA). The UGT1A1 TA repeat assay genotypes were also incorporated into the ADME PGx Reporter output using a modified ADME PGx Pro database (http:// www.biotechniques.com/protocols/2012_Protocol_Guide/Development-and-Research-

Validation-of-the-iPLEX----ADME-PGx-Panel-on-the-MassARRAY-System/ biotechniques-330915.html, last accessed April 17, 2015).
iPLEX® ADME CYP2D6 Panel (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA): Specific DNA fragments were amplified from genomic DNA in three PCR reactions and alleles were subsequently amplified using SBE. Genotypes were detected using a MassARRAY® Analyzer 4 system and haplotypes assigned using an ADME CYP2D6 Reporter plugin for the Typer Analyzer software (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA).
iPLEX® ADME CYP2C9/VKORC1 Panel (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA): Specific DNA fragments were amplified using genomic DNA in three PCR reactions and subsequently alleles were interrogated using SBE. Genotypes were detected using a MassARRAY® Analyzer 4 system and haplotypes assigned using an ADME CYP2C9/ VKORC1 Reporter plugin for the Typer Analyzer software (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA).
iPLEX® ADME CYP2C19 Panel (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA): Specific DNA fragments were amplified using genomic DNA in two PCR reactions and subsequently alleles were interrogated using SBE. Genotypes were detected using a MassARRAY® Analyzer 4 system and haplotypes assigned using an ADME PGx Pro Reporter plugin for the Typer Analyzer software (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA)

## iPLEX® UGT1A1 TA Repeat Assay (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA): A specific DNA

 fragment was generated using PCR and genomic DNA and alleles were subsequently interrogated using a homogeneous mass extension reaction. Genotypes were detected using a MassARRAY® Analyzer 4 system and assigned manually using the Typer Analyzer software (Agena Bioscience, San Diego, CA). The TA repeat genotypes were also incorporated into the ADME PGx Reporter output using a modified ADME PGx Pro database.Laboratory developed test for LifeTech Taqman® Platform: Specimens were analyzed using the LifeTech QuantStudio 12K Flex (software v1.2.2; Grand Island, NY) and subjected to Taqman® allele discrimination using LifeTech (Grand Island, NY) reagents in a custom-designed open array. Genomic DNA was amplified and mixed with dual-labeled oligonucleotides that hybridize to a specific target sequence. Hydrolysis by the $5^{\prime}-3^{\prime}$ exonuclease activity of Taq polymerase releases the fluorescent reporter signal, permitting quantitative measurement of the accumulation of the PCR product via the fluorophore signal. ${ }^{18}$ Software utilized were Genotyper (v1.3) (LifeTech, Grand Island, NY) and Alleletyper (1.0) (LifeTech, Grand Island, NY).

For copy number analysis, CYP2D6 and a reference gene were compared using commercially available reagents from LifeTech (Grand Island, NY). Individual samples were run in quadruplicate. Each replicate was normalized to the reference gene to obtain a $\Delta \mathrm{Ct}$ (FAM dye Ct , VIC dye Ct ), and then an average $\Delta \mathrm{Ct}$ for each sample (from the 4 replicates) was calculated. All samples were then normalized to a calibrator sample to
determine $\Delta \Delta \mathrm{Ct}$. Relative quantity ( RQ ) is $2-\Delta \Delta \mathrm{Ct}$, and copy number is 2 XRQ . Copy

Luminex xTAG® CYP2C19 Kit v3, CYP2C9+VKORC1 Kit, CYP2D6 Kit v3 (Luminex Molecular Diagnostics, Toronto, ON, Canada): All genotyping was performed as per the manufacturer's instructions. The technology and performance of Luminex genotyping has been described elsewhere. ${ }^{17,19,20}$ Briefly, the regions surrounding the interrogated variants were multiplex PCR-amplified, subjected to allele-specific primer extension, hybridized to specific xMAP microspheres via oligonucleotide tags, and fluorescence measured on a Luminex xMAP platform (Luminex Corporation, Austin, TX, USA). All genotypes were determined using the appropriate xTAG® Data Analysis Software (Luminex Molecular Diagnostics).

Characterization Protocol-Each of the testing laboratories received one $10-\mu \mathrm{g}$ aliquot of DNA from each of the cell lines to be tested. The samples were coded and the expected genotypes were not revealed to the laboratories. Each laboratory tested Tier 1 samples or both Tier 1 and Tier 2 samples using their standard assay methods. The platforms and assays used in the study, the alleles detected by each, and the sample set(s) tested with each method are indicated in Table 1. The results were submitted to the study coordinators (LVK, VMP, and REE), who examined the data for quality and discrepancies, and determined the consensus genotype. If discrepancies were noted, the participating laboratory was requested to re-evaluate the sample in question (without providing the expected genotype) to determine the cause of the inconsistency.

## Results

Unless otherwise stated, the "wild-type" $(* 1)$ alleles were assigned in the absence of other detectable variant alleles.

DNA samples from Coriell cell lines containing pharmacogenetic variants that are frequently included in expanded panel pharmacogenetic assays were selected for this study. A list of 221 variants in 41 genes that were included in two or more commonly used and comprehensive pharmacogenetic assays [Affymetrix DMET, Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ (formerly Sequenom) iPLEX® ADME PGx Pro, Illumina VeraCode ADME, and some laboratory developed tests] was assembled. Sources of data, including the Coriell Repository catalog (http://www.coriell.org/research-services/cell-culture/biobank-catalog last accessed April 20, 2015), the 1000 Genomes Project (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/variation/tools/ 1000genomes/ last accessed March 3, 2015), and genotypic data from collaborating laboratories were examined to identify Coriell cell lines expected to have variants in the targeted alleles. Based on this analysis, DNA from 137 cell lines from the Coriell Repositories were selected for further characterization and consensus verification.

Nine laboratories, using a variety of pharmacogenetic assays, volunteered to test the samples. The results from five laboratories (5 platforms, 7 assays Table 1) that reported diplotype data are described here. The results of the DNA sequence analysis and other genotyping assays will be presented separately. Consensus diplotypes were determined by
examining the variant calls made by each platform. There was good concordance among the platforms; however, discrepancies in diplotype assignments related to assay design and variable nomenclature were identified. Discrepancies in diplotype calls between platforms were resolved by manually evaluating the stated haplotypes in light of the variants tested by each platform. Available databases such as The Human Cytochrome P450 (CYP) Allele Nomenclature Database (www.cypalleles.ki.se, last accessed March 3, 2015) and PharmGKB (www.pharmgkb.org, last accessed March 3, 2015) were used as haplotype standards for the various genes (Web resources - Supplemental Table 1). The consensus diplotype data for 28 genes that were tested using two to six platforms (CYP1A1, CYP1A2, CYP2A6, CYP2B6, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, CYP2E1, СYP3A4, CYP3A5, CYP4F2, DPYD, GSTM1, GSTP1, GSTT1, NAT1, NAT2, SLC15A2, SLC22A2, SLCO1B1, SLCO2B1, TPMT, UGT1A1, UGT2B7, UGT2B15, UGT2B17, and VKORC1) are shown in the Consensus Table - Supplemental Table 2. Diplotype calls from all platforms used to make the consensus calls on the 28 genes are available on the GeT-RM website (http:// wwwn.cdc.gov/clia/Resources/GetRM/default.aspx last accessed March 3, 2015).

The alleles that were interrogated for each locus, as well as those identified or absent from the study samples are listed in Table 2. The alleles detected by each assay platform varied, but most common pharmacogenetic variants were identified among the 137 DNA samples. Many alleles were included in only one assay due to differences in platform design. Some of these were identified in study samples (Table 2), and are presented in the consensus diplotype data (Supplemental - Table 2) in parentheses to indicate that this allele has not been confirmed by a separate method. Overall, of the 485 unique alleles tested, we identified 108 alleles by two or more assays and an additional 73 alleles by only one assay.

## CYP1A1

Two platforms tested the Tier 1 and one tested the Tier 2 samples for variants in CYP1A1. Both platforms were $100 \%$ concordant in their genotype calls. Of note, one platform identified all $* 2$ variants as $* 2$ C. Per The Human Cytochrome P450 (CYP) Allele Nomenclature Database, *2A is defined by c.3798T>C (formerly known as m1), *2B is defined as having c. $3798 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{c} .2454 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{I} 462 \mathrm{~V})$, and $* 2 \mathrm{C}$ is defined as having c . $2454 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{I} 462 \mathrm{~V})$. When $* 2$ or $* 2 \mathrm{C}$ was reported, the consensus was called $* 2$.

## CYP1A2

Two platforms tested the Tier 1 and one tested the Tier 2 samples for variants in CYP1A2. Both laboratories were $100 \%$ concordant in their genotype calls. Of note, neither laboratory could distinguish $* 1 \mathrm{~A} / * 1 \mathrm{~L}$ from $* 1 \mathrm{C} / * 1 \mathrm{~F}$. Per The Human Cytochrome P450 (CYP) Allele Nomenclature Database, *1A is defined as no variant detected, $* 1 \mathrm{~L}$ is defined as having c. $-3860 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$ and c. $-163 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{A}, * 1 \mathrm{C}$ is defined as $\mathrm{c} .-3860 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$ and $* 1 \mathrm{~F}$ is defined as having c. $-163 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{A}$.

## CYP2A6

Two platforms tested the Tier 1 and one tested the Tier 2 samples for variants in CYP2A6. There was relatively good consensus between the platforms, with differences observed attributable to the assay design. The Affymetrix platform was optimized for single
nucleotide variants and homozygous deletions, but it was unable to identify if only one copy of the CYP2A6 deletion ( $* 4$ heterozygotes) is present. The Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ iPLEX ADME PGx Pro Panel could detect *8 (g.1454G>T; p.R485L), however, although included in the assay, this variant was not detected by the Affymetrix platform. c. $-48 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{G}$, which is present in $* 9, * 13$, and $* 15$, was included in the Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ iPLEX ADME PGx Pro Panel and was reported by this assay as "*9; *13; *15". The Affymetrix platform detects c. $-1013 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ for $* 9$. When both $\mathrm{c} .-48 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{G}$ and $\mathrm{c} .-1013 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ were detected, the consensus genotype was called $* 9$ (c.-48T>G, c.-1013A>G).

## CYP2B6

Three platforms tested the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP2B6 and two platforms tested the Tier 2 samples. There was relatively good consensus between platforms with most differences due to platform design. Only one platform was designed to detect $* 4, * 5, * 11$, $* 15, * 20, * 22$, and $* 27$ and thus these alleles could not be independently verified. One of the challenges in analyzing haplotypes in CYP2B6 is that c.785A>G (p.K262R) is found in many alleles, e.g., *4, *6, *7, *14, *16, *20, *26. c. $1459 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{R} 487 \mathrm{C}$ ) is found in both $* 5$ and $* 7$. c. $516 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{T}$ is found in $* 6, * 7, * 9, * 13, * 19, * 20, * 26, * 29, * 34, * 36, * 37$, and $* 38$. When $\mathrm{c} .516 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .785 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$, and $\mathrm{c} .1459 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$ are present together, the most likely interpretation is $* 1 / * 7$ with all the variants in cis, though $* 5 / * 6$ in trans cannot be ruled out (see samples NA12717, NA17235, NA17658, NA20509, NA23313, NA23348).

## CYP2C8

Three platforms tested the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP2C8 and two platforms tested the Tier 2 samples. The platforms were $100 \%$ concordant in their genotype calls. Of note, one platform identified all $* 1$ variants as $* 1 \mathrm{~A}$. The other two platforms reported their results as *1 when no variant was detected. When *1 or *1A was reported, the consensus was called ${ }^{*} 1$.

## CYP2C9

Five platforms (6 assays) were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP2C9 and two platforms (3 assays) were used for the Tier 2 samples. There was relatively good consensus between laboratories with most differences due to assay design. Of note, some platforms differentiate between $* 3$ and $* 18 . * 3$ is defined as $\mathrm{c} .1075 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{p} .1359 \mathrm{~L})$ while *18 is defined as c.1075A>C (p.I359L) and c.1190A>C (p.D397A). Only one laboratory typed the samples for the $\mathrm{c} .1190 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{C}$ variant. While the consensus from the other laboratories was $* 3$, the most likely genotype is $* 18$. This affected 11 samples (NA10855, NA11839, NA12813, NA17204, NA17234, NA17290, NA17642, NA18563, NA18959, NA19917, and NA23405). One platform identified NA19226 and NA18873 as homozygous for $* 8$, and two other platforms reported the samples as $* 1 / * 8$. This may be due to an interfering variant in the samples. Additional variants were also identified by only one platform in several samples (NA15245, NA19917, and NA23275) which were not defined in The Human Cytochrome P450 (CYP) Allele Nomenclature Database.

Five platforms (6 assays) were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP2C19 and two platforms (3 assays) were used for the Tier 2 samples. We identified a problem with one of the assays used during this study. Because of the way the assay was designed, $* 2$ and $* 10$ can be interfering variants and can lead to genotyping errors. ${ }^{21}$ CYP2C19 2 is defined by c. $681 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$, and $* 10$ is defined by c.680C>T (p.P227L). This does not affect the phenotypic prediction for a patient, but there could be other implications (e.g., proficiency testing). The laboratory is working with the platform manufacturer to resolve this issue. Discrepant results were found in three samples, (NA19789, NA19908, and NA23275). One platform reported a *9 [c. $431 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{R} 144 \mathrm{H})]$ and other platforms designed to detect a $* 9$ failed to detect it. The presence of $* 9$ in NA23275 was confirmed by repeat testing with the same assay. In the case of NA19789, it is possible that the $* 9$ probe failed. The platform reports these as a possible false positive. One sample in the study (NA23878) was found to have the CYP2C19 *4B (c. $1 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ and g. $-806 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$ ) allele. ${ }^{22}$ Although g.-806C>T is the defining variant for $* 17$, two platforms correctly reported the sample as $* 1 / * 4$. Of note, we had a number of samples (NA07029, NA10865, NA12753, NA18484, NA18524, NA18855, NA19122, NA19178, NA23348, NA23872, and NA23873) where variants (identified by only one platform) are not defined in The Human Cytochrome P450 (CYP) Allele Nomenclature Database.

## CYP2D6

Five platforms (6 assays) were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP2D6 and two platforms ( 3 assays) were used for the Tier 2 samples. The CYP2D6*36 allele is a gene conversion from CYP2D6 to CYP2D7 in exon 9. Detection of this allele was problematic for several platforms in the study because most are not designed to detect $* 36$ and it was reported as *10 (NA18524, NA18526, NA18563, NA18564, NA18565, NA18572, NA18617, NA18959, NA18980, NA23090, and NA23093). *36 is a gene conversion to CYP2D7 in exon 9, or hybrid that, in addition to the gene conversion, contains c.100C>T (p.P34S) and c.4180G>C (p.S486T), while CYP2D6*10 contains only c.100C>T (p.P34S) and c. $4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{p} . S 486 \mathrm{~T}) . * 10$ is a decreased functional allele while $* 36$ is a non-functional allele. One laboratory reported one of the gene conversion samples, NA18565, as having the $* 5$ deletion allele. The mostly likely genotype for NA18565 is $* 10 / * 36$, though the consensus is $* 10 / * 10$. It is suspected that the gene conversion interferes with the primer binding sites for the copy number determination as only one copy was detected. CYP2D6*35 is defined by c.31G>A (p.V11M), but also contains c.2850C>T (p.R296C) and c. $4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{p} . S 486 \mathrm{~T})$ that are the defining variants in $* 2$. Platforms not designed to directly detect $* 35$, report samples containing all 3 variants as $* 2$ (ie, NA06993, NA07000, NA07029, NA12003, NA17204, NA17641, NA17702, and NA20509). Both $* 2$ and $* 35$ are normal function alleles, thus the predicted phenotype would not be affected. Sample NA19174 was problematic for several platforms and no consensus was determined. One platform identified NA19174 as *4/*17 (c.2850C>T, c.1846G>A, c.100C>T, c.1023C>T). A second platform did not identify the $\mathrm{c} .1023 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$ and reported NA19174 as $* 4 / * 30$, a third platform identified an unspecified genotype [c.2850C>T, c.4180G>C (homozygous), c. $1846 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{c} .100 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$, c. $1023 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$ (homozygous)]. Based on the platform designs and
variants detected, the most probable allele call for NA19174 is $* 4 / * 40$ (c.100C $>\mathrm{T}$, c. $1846 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{c} .1023 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$, c. $1661 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}$, c.1863_1864insTTTCGCCCCx2, c. $2850 \mathrm{C}>$ T, c.4180G>C). This was also observed in samples NA17102, NA19917, and NA23275. Duplications and deletions were also problematic, especially in platforms that primarily detect SNPs or insertion/deletions (indels). This affected analysis of samples NA10856, NA12336, NA15245, NA18873, NA18945, NA19035, NA19785, NA21781, NA23296, NA23297, NA23313, and NA24027. Sample NA24217 was identified by one platform as $* 41 / * 41 \mathrm{X} 3$. The other laboratories reported the genotype as $* 2 / * 41 \mathrm{XN}$. NA24217 appeared homozygous and not heterozygous for $* 41$, suggesting that there are three copies of *41 (i.e., *41XN). We could not determine a consensus CYP2D6 genotype for sample NA23878. One platform identified $* 4 / * 83$ (c.100C $>T$, c.1846G>A, c. $4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{c} .843 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{G}$, gene conversion to CYP2D7 in exon 9, c.4180G>C), one had an unspecified haplotype [c.4180G>C (homozygous), c.1846G $>\mathrm{A}, 100 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, 2$ copies)], and a third platform identified $* 1 / * 4$ (c.100C>T, c. $1846 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}$ ). The most probably genotype for this sample is $* 4 / * 83$. Two platforms identified the $* 17$ variant in sample NA19238 and one platform failed to identify it and reported a false negative. Of note, additional variants were identified by one platform in two samples (NA19174, NA23878) that were not defined in the CYP database.

## CYP2E1

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples and one was used to test the Tier 2 samples for variants in CYP2E1. There was relatively good consensus between both laboratories. The observed discrepancies were due to differences in assay design. The Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ iPLEX ADME PGx Pro Panel was designed to detect and $* 7$, whereas the Affymetrix platform detected several other variations not included in the Agena assay, such as $* 4$ and $* 5$.

Five platforms (5 assays) were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP3A4 and two platforms were used for the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between platforms. Only one platform was designed to detect *14, *15 and *16 (samples NA15245, NA18966, NA19109, NA19226, and NA19908), thus we were not able to independently confirm the presence of these variants. They are indicated in parentheses in the consensus genotypes.

## CYP3A5

Five platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP3A5 and two platforms were used for the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between platforms for all samples.

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in CYP4F2, and one platform was used for the Tier 2 samples. There are only 2 CYP4F2 alleles, $* 2[\mathrm{c} .34 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{p}$. $12 \mathrm{G})]$ and $* 3$ [c. $1297 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{V} 433 \mathrm{M})]$ detected in the study samples. One platform tested
for both alleles and the other platform tested only for the $* 3$ haplotype. When the $* 2$ was

## DPYD

Three platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in $D P Y D$ and two platforms were used for the Tier 2 samples. Only one platform tested for DPYD *4 [c. $1601 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{S} 534 \mathrm{~N})$ ], so the presence of this allele could not be independently confirmed for Tier 1 samples NA06991, NA12813, NA12878, and NA24217.

## GSTM1, GSTP1, and SLC15A2

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in GSTM1, GSTP1, and SLC15A2, respectively. There was good consensus between both platforms. One platform was used to test the Tier 2 samples.

## GSTT1

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in GSTT1, and one was used to test the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between both tests. The Affymetrix platform was only able to test for the presence or absence of the gene whereas the Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ iPLEX ADME PGx Pro panel was able to detect whether $0,1,2$, or more than 2 copies were present.

## NAT1

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in NAT1, and one was used to test the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between both platforms. A consensus genotype could not be determined for one sample (NA17204) because of assay failure in one laboratory.

NAT2
Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in NAT2, and one was used to test the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between both platforms. The major difference in haplotypes was related to the alleles that each platform was designed to detect. Both platforms agreed very well on the $* 4, * 5, * 6$ and $* 7$ haplotype calls. Interestingly, although both platforms were designed to detect $* 12$ and $* 14$, only the Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ ADME PGx Panel observed the *12 haplotype.

## SLC22A2

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in SLC22A2, and one was used to test the Tier 2 samples. Due to limited annotation for this gene, we were unable to easily compare haplotypes. Alleles that were assayed by both platforms revealed identical outcomes. Nomenclature issues affected the interpretation and reporting of the results. The Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ platform describes the detected mutations as amino acid changes whereas the Affymetrix platform reports star (*) alleles. The nomenclature of this gene is not annotated on PharmGKB.

## SLCO1B1

Three platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in SLCO1B1 and two platforms were used for the Tier 2 samples. The SLCO1B1 $* 14$ haplotype is composed of two variants (c.463C>A, c.388A>G) in cis (ie, NA07019, NA07055, NA07056, NA07439, NA10831, NA10851, NA12236, NA17244, NA18861, and NA23874). Although it is possible that these variants could be in trans (i.e., *1B/*4). A similar issue is observed for *15 (c.388A>G, c. $521 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{C}$ ) where the most likely interpretation is that the variants are in cis but trans cannot be ruled out (ie, *1B/*5). This affects samples HG00276, NA06993, NA07000, NA07357, NA10859, NA12003, NA12892, NA15245, NA17642, NA18526, NA19109, NA20509, NA24008, and NA24217. For samples NA18540 and NA18544, the most likely interpretation for $\mathrm{g} .-11187 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$ heterozygous, $\mathrm{c} .388 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ homozygous, c . $521 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{C}$ heterozygous is $* 1 \mathrm{~B} / * 17$ (c. $388 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}, / \mathrm{c} .521 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{g} .-11187 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{c} .388 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ ), though $* 15 / * 21(\mathrm{c} .388 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{c} .521 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{g} .-11187 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{c} .388 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{c} .597 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T})$ cannot be ruled out when $\mathrm{c} .597 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}$ is not tested. Only one platform, Affymetrix, tested for SLCO1B1*21 (g.-11187G>A, c.388A>G, c.521T>C). The other two platforms tested for a combination of the variants (g.-11187G>A, c.388A>G, c.521T>C), but not in a single platform. In some samples (NA11993, NA12006, NA12156, NA12813, NA17448, NA18524, NA18540, NA18544, NA18563, NA18992, and NA23246), g.-11187G>A (reported as $* 21$ ) was detected by the LifeTech platform and $* 14$ was detected by the Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ platform. The most likely interpretation of this genotype is $* 21$, as reported by Affymetrix and LifeTech platforms.

## SLCO2B1

Two platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in SLCO2B1 and one was used to test the Tier 2 samples. We could not easily compare haplotypes called by the two assays due to differences in nomenclature (results reported as either * nomenclature or amino acid change) and limited annotation for this gene. Variants that were assayed by both platforms revealed identical outcomes.

## TPMT

Three platforms were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in TPMT and two platforms were used for the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between platforms. When c . $460 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$ and $\mathrm{c} .719 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ are present together, the mostly likely interpretation is that they are in cis and reported as $* 3 \mathrm{~A}$. Note, it could also be reported as $* 3 \mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{c} .460 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}) / * 3 \mathrm{C}(\mathrm{c}$. $719 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G})$ if the two variants are in trans.

## UGT1A1

Two platforms (4 assays) were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in UGT1AI. There was good consensus between both laboratories. The major difference was that the Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ UGT1A1 TA repeat assay could distinguish 5, 6, 7, and 8 TA repeats and therefore could distinguish $* 28\left(\mathrm{TA}_{7}\right), * 36\left(\mathrm{TA}_{5}\right)$ and $* 37\left(\mathrm{TA}_{8}\right)$ from $* 1\left(\mathrm{TA}_{6}\right)$. Data from each platform that was used to create the consensus genotype is shown in the UGT1A1 data table which is available on the Get-RM website.

Two platforms tested the Tier 1 samples for variants in UGT2B7 and one platform was used to test the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between both assays. Since only one platform tested for $* 3$ (c. $211 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{T}$ ), the presence of this allele could not be confirmed for Tier 1 samples NA18952, NA18973, NA18980, NA18992, and NA19007.

## UGT2B15

Two platforms tested the Tier 1 samples for variants in UGT2B15 and one platform was used to test the Tier 2 samples. There was good consensus between both assays. Since only one platform tested for *4 [c.1568A>C (p.K523T)], the presence of this allele could not be confirmed when identified.

## UGT2B17

Two platforms tested the Tier 1 samples for variants in UGT2B17 and one platform was used to test the Tier 2 samples. The Affymetrix platform is optimized to detect nucleotide variants and homozygous deletions, and does not distinguish between one or more copies of a gene. The Agena Bioscience ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ platform detects only copy number. Therefore, both platforms presented identical data for the samples with a homozygous deletion.

Five platforms (6 assays) were used to test the Tier 1 samples for variants in VKORC1 and two platforms (3 assays) were used for the Tier 2 samples. There was relatively good consensus between laboratories with most differences due to platform design. Most laboratories reported only c.-1639G>A genotype. Some laboratories reported using the star ${ }^{(*)}$ allele nomenclature and some laboratories reported using the two different haplotype nomenclatures. The c.-1639G>A genotype is the defining variant in $* 2$ and is present in haplotypes H1, H2 and H5. We reported the consensus genotype only for c.-1639G>A in the consensus genotype table (Supplemental Table 2). Data from each platform that was used to create the consensus genotype is shown using the H , and star nomenclatures in the VKORC1 data table which is available on the Get-RM website.

## Other Loci

Consensus genotypes could not be determined for 26 additional pharmacogenetic loci that were only characterized by one laboratory ( $A B C C 2, A B C C 4, C D A, C Y P 1 B 1, C Y P 2 A 13$, CYP2F1, CYP2J2, CYP2S1, CYP3A7, CYP3A43, CYP4B1, CYP19A1, FMO2, G6PD, IFNL3, ITPA, PTGIS, SULT1A1, TBXAS1, UGT1A3, UGT1A4, UGT1A6, UGT1A7, UGT1A8, UGT1A9, and UGT1A10). These data are presented in Supplemental Table 3, and on the GeT-RM website.

## Discussion

This study describes the characterization of 137 publicly available cell-line derived genomic DNA samples for 28 loci potentially included in clinical pharmacogenetic testing. To ensure that the DNAs would be thoroughly characterized and would be commutable among a
variety of assay chemistries and platforms, each sample was tested using several pharmacogenetic assays. We identified many, but not all of the alleles commonly included in clinical pharmacogenetic assays for these genes. Additionally, we identified many alleles that we did not detect during our previous GeT-RM pharmacogenetics study. ${ }^{10}$ Some of these alleles, including CYP2D6 *10XN, *7, *15, and $* 41 \mathrm{XN}$ and CYP2C19*6 and $* 9$, were found in cell lines created at Coriell from patients known to have pharmacogenetic genotypes not identified during the first study. The GeT-RM program will continue collaboration with the pharmacogenetic testing community and the Coriell Cell Repositories to create and identify cell lines with alleles not identified during this study and undertake necessary characterization studies. We also generated haplotype data for an additional 26 pharmacogenetic loci, which will be corroborated by the results of the DNA sequencing analysis in the forthcoming publication. These publicly available DNA samples and associated data will be useful for laboratories when developing and validating new genetic tests and will also enable proficiency testing programs to provide diverse pharmacogenetic challenges. ${ }^{24}$ Use of reference materials with a variety of alleles can help laboratories to characterize and refine their assays, and also may enhance their ability to detect pharmacogenetic variants and improve performance on proficiency testing challenges. ${ }^{24}$

There are a considerable number of polymorphisms in many of the human genes associated with pharmacokinetics or pharmacodynamics of exogenous drugs. Sometimes a single variant, but often combinations of polymorphisms as a haplotype dictates the activity of the pharmacogenetic gene product. Haplotypes usually have one or a few defining variants, but may also have additional variants that can be included. Many nomenclature systems have been developed to describe pharmacogenetic haplotypes. In the most commonly used nomenclature system, combinations of pharmacogenetic sequence variants are designated by $\operatorname{star}(*)$ alleles, where $* 1$ is designated as normal (commonly referred to as wild-type or fully functional) and numbered star alleles are assigned as new variants are identified. ${ }^{23}$ The star nomenclature system is used for many pharmacogenetic genes and gene families, including the cytochrome P450 (CYP) gene family. Several nomenclatures, including the star system, are intermittently used to describe the haplotypes of other genes, such as VKORC1 and UGT1A1. Laboratories in our study often reported allele genotypes for the same gene using a variety of nomenclature formats. In many cases, such as CYP2C9 and CYP2C19, the star nomenclature was used to describe some alleles of a gene and additional alleles of the gene were named by the predicted amino acid change (Table 1).

The assays used in this study varied in many ways. Without exception, no two assays that examined a particular gene were designed to detect the same set of haplotypes (Table 1). In addition, some assays used different combinations of variants to define the haplotypes that the assay detected, which ultimately can lead to discrepancies in reported star allele genotypes between platforms. For example in CYP2D6, c.2850C>T and c.4180G>C, which are the defining variants for $* 2(\mathrm{c} .2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C})$, also occur in various other haplotypes such as *17 (c. 1023C>T, c. $2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}$ ), and *21 (c.2573_2574insC, c. $2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}) . * 2$ is a functional allele, while $* 17$ has decreased function and $* 21$ is non-functional. Determining the presence of duplications as well as multiplications in CYP2D6 is also important ${ }^{25}$ as CYP2D6 $* 2 \mathrm{XN}(\mathrm{c} .2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C},>2$ ) is an increased
function allele. Figure 1 shows how differences in the design of CYP2D6 assays (e.g., variable inclusion of certain variants and or copy number detection) may impact interpretation of alleles. Additionally, we did not assign phase to the various variants during this study, which may have implications in result interpretation and therefore deserves further review.

This study highlights how the common PGx nomenclature system and variable assay designs add to the complexity of analyzing and reporting results from pharmacogenetic assays, especially when trying to compare data from the same sample analyzed on different genotyping platforms. These discrepancies could hinder patient care and adoption of pharmacogenetic assays in clinical practice. For example, physicians may have difficulty understanding laboratory reports when results from different laboratories and in the literature are described using a variety of nomenclature systems. Such inconsistencies might lead to mistakes in treatment and hinder adoption and use of pharmacogenetic tests. Similarly, regulatory agencies, proficiency testing programs and test developers require standardized nomenclature so that results can be compared between platforms and also with previous scientific literature. Lack of a consistent nomenclature could stifle regulatory clearance or approval of new assays and add undue confusion to analysis of proficiency testing surveys. Finally, standardization of nomenclature is critical for the accurate accumulation of data in clinical databases, such as ClinVar http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/ clinvar/ last accessed 3/30/2015) and PharmGKB. Without standardization, multiple observations of the same genotype could not be related to each other, and incorrect relationships between genotype and phenotype may be inferred.

To address these nomenclature issues, the GeT-RM program formed an international workgroup to review current pharmacogenetic nomenclature practices and develop a system based on the HGVS nomenclature to describe pharmacogenetic haplotypes and facilitate translation between different nomenclature systems. Workgroup participants include many significant stakeholders in pharmacogenetics [PharmGKB, the Pharmacogenetics Research Network (PGRN), and the Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC)], regulatory agencies [the Food and Drug Administration (FDA)], Laboratory accrediting organizations [the College of American Pathologists (CAP)], nomenclature committees [The Human Genome Organisation (HUGO), and the Human Genome Variation Society (HGVS)], others that are responsible for a number of gene/mutation databases [the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), ClinVar, TPMT, CYP450 databases], pharmacogenetic assay developers, and clinical and research laboratories. The group has developed a system to standardize the way pharmacogenetic haplotypes are described and reported, as well as recommendations for ways to standardize pharmacogenetic assays. We are also developing graphical examples to represent pharmacogenetic haplotypes that would allow easy conversion between different nomenclatures.

In conclusion, this characterized set of 137 genomic DNA RMs are available for use in research, clinical test development, quality assurance and control, and proficiency testing to help to ensure the accuracy of clinical pharmacogenetic testing. These pharmacogenetic RMs, as well as other materials developed by GeT-RM, are publically available from the NIGMS and NHGRI repositories at the Coriell Cell Repositories (https://catalog.coriell.org/,
last accessed September 12, 2014). Information on this and other RM characterization projects is available at the GeT-RM website.

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.
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Figure 1. Assay design can cause inconsistent allele calls and interpretation A CYP2D6 assay that only detects $\mathrm{c} .2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{rs} 16947)$ and $\mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{rs} 1135840)$ without copy number, cannot distinguish between $* 2$ (c.2850C>T, c.4180G>C), *17 (c. $1023 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}[\mathrm{rs} 28371706]$, c. $2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}$ ), *21 (c.2573_2574insT [rs72549352], c. $2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C})$, or $* 2 \mathrm{XN}$ (c. $2850 \mathrm{C}>\mathrm{T}, \mathrm{c} .4180 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{XN}$ ), which have different predicted phenotypes. EM: Extensive metabolizer, IM: Intermediate metabolizer, UM: Ultrarapid metabolizer.

Table 1

Loci and alleles detected by each assay

| Assay (sample sets tested) | Affymetrix DMET (Tier 1) | $\text { GenMark eSensor }{ }^{1}$ (Tier 1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Luminex xTAG } \\ & \text { (Tier 1) } \end{aligned}$ | LifeTech Taqman LDT <br> (Tiers 1 and 2) | Agena Bioscience iPLEX ${ }^{\circledR}$ ADME PGx Pro (Tiers 1 and 2) | Agena Bioscience CYP2D6, CYP2C9/ VKORC1, CYP2C19, UGT1A1 (Tiers 1 and 2) | Autogenomics <br> CYP2D6, <br> CYP3A4. <br> CYP3A5, <br> NAT2 <br> (Tier 1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CYP1AI | $*_{2 \mathrm{C}}, *_{3}, *_{4}, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10,$ G45D, R279W, I286T, F381L, A463G |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, \\ & * 8, * 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| CYP1A2 | *1A, *1C, *1D, *1F, *1K, *1L, *2, <br> *3, *4, *5, *6, *7, *8, *11, *15, *16 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 1 \mathrm{~F}, * 1 \mathrm{~K}, \\ & * 1 \mathrm{~L}, * 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| CYP2A6 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 4, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 11, * 13, * 17, \\ & * 20, * 28,387 \mathrm{FS} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *2, *5, *6, *7, *8, *9, } \\ & \text { *11, *12,*17,*20, *26, } \\ & \text { *1X2b, CNV(*4) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| CYP2B6 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * *, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * *, * 11, * 12, \\ & * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 18, * 19, * 20, \\ & * 21, * 22, * 26, * 27, * 28 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | *6, *18 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 6, * 8, * 13, * 16, \\ & * 28, \text { CNV } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| CYP2C8 | $*_{14}, *_{2}, * 3, * 4, *_{5}, * 7, * 8, * 12,$ <br> L390S, P404A |  |  | *2, *3, *4 | *2, *3, *4, *5, *7, *8 |  |  |
| CYP2C9 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 9, * 10, * 11, * 12, \\ & * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 25, Y 358 \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | *2, *3 | *2, *3, *4, *5, *6 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 5, * 6, * 8, \\ & * 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 8, \\ & * 9, * 10, * 11, * 12, * 13, \\ & * 15, * 25, * 27 \end{aligned}$ | $* 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 1 \mathrm{D}$, $* 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 2 \mathrm{C}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}$, $* 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7$, $* 8, * 9, * 10, * 11 \mathrm{~A}$, $* 11 \mathrm{~B}, * 12, * 13, * 14$, $* 15, * 16, * 17, * 18$, $* 19, * 20, * 21, * 22$, *23, *24, *25, *26, *27, *28, *29, *30, *31, *32, *33, *34, *35 |  |
| CYP2C19 | *2A, *2B, *3, *4, *5, *6, *7, *8, *9, <br> *10, *12, *13, *14, *15, *17, 439FS, <br> 241FS, V331I | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, \\ & * 8, * 9, * 10, * 13, * 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, \\ & * 7, * 8, *, * 10, \\ & * 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 4 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & * 6, * 8, * 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 5 \mathrm{~B}, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 12, \\ & * 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 2, \\ & * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B}(* 20), \\ & * 4 \mathrm{~A}, * 4 \mathrm{~B}, * 5 \mathrm{~A}, * 5 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & *, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10, \\ & * 11, * 12, * *, * 14, \\ & * 15, * 6, * 17, * 18, \\ & * 19, * 20, * 21, * 22, \\ & * 22, * 2, * 25, * 26, \\ & * 27, * 28 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| CYP2D6 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10 \\ & * 11, * 12, * 14 \mathrm{~A}, * 14 \mathrm{~B}, * 15,{ }^{2} 17,{ }^{2} 18, \\ & * 19, * 20, * 1, * 29 * 38, * 40, * 41, \\ & * 42, * 44, * 56 \mathrm{~A}, * 56 \mathrm{~B}, * 64, \text { S } 486 \mathrm{~T} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, *, * 5, * 6, \\ & * 7, * 8, * 9, * * 10, \\ & * 11, * 15, * 17, * 29, \\ & * 35, * 41, \text { DUP } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, \\ & *, *, * 10, * 17, \\ & * 29, * 41, \text { XN, } \\ & \text { 1XN, 2XN, 4XN } \end{aligned}$ | *2A, *2L, *3, *4, *4M, <br> *5, *6, *7, *8, *9, *10, <br> *11, *12, *14A, *14B, <br> *15, *17, *18, *19, *20, <br> $* 21 \mathrm{~A}, * 21 \mathrm{~B}, * 30, * 35 ?$, $* 38, * 40, * 41, * 42 * 44$, <br> *38, *40, *41, *42, *44, | *2, *2A, *2D, *2L, <br> *2M, *3, *4, *4B, <br> *4J, *4K, *4M, <br> *4N;P, *5,*6, *6C, <br> *7, *8, *9, *10A, <br> *10B, *11, *12, | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, \\ & * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, \\ & * 10, * 12, * 14 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 14 \mathrm{~B}, * 17, * 29, \\ & * 41, * \mathrm{XN}, \end{aligned}$ |
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| Assay (sample sets tested) | Affymetrix DMET (Tier 1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GenMark eSensor }{ }^{1} \text { (Tier 1) } \end{aligned}$ | Luminex xTAG <br> (Tier 1) | LifeTech Taqman <br> LDT <br> (Tiers 1 and 2) | Agena Bioscience iPLEX ${ }^{\circledR}$ ADME PGx Pro <br> (Tiers 1 and 2) | Agena Bioscience CYP2D6, CYP2C9/ VKORC1, CYP2C19, UGT1A1 (Tiers 1 and 2) | Autogenomics <br> CYP2D6, <br> CYP3A4. <br> CYP3A5, <br> NAT2 <br> (Tier 1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *56A, *56B, *58, *64, *6 } \\ & * 56 \mathrm{~A}, * 56 \mathrm{~B}, * 58, * 64, * 6 \end{aligned}$ | CNIA, *14B, *15, CNY*18, *19, *20, *21A, *21B $* 27$, *29, *30, *34, *35, *36, *38, *39, *40, *41, *42, *44, *45A, *56A, *56B, *57, *58, *63, *64, *65, $* 68, * 69 * 70, * 11$, *82, *83, *84 |  |
| CYP2E1 | *2, *3, *4, *5, *7A, *7B, *7C |  |  |  | *2, *7 |  |  |
| CYP3A4 | $* 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 10, * 11$, $* 12, * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 17, * 18$, ${ }^{*} 12$, * $* 20$, K $96 \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{I} 193 \mathrm{~V}, \mathrm{~S} 252 \mathrm{~A}$, I431T, 465FS, | *1B, *2, *3, *12, *17 |  | *2, *22 | *2, *6, *20, *22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *1B, *2, *3, } \\ & * 12, * 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP3A5 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 2, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{C}, * 3 \mathrm{D}, * 3 \mathrm{~F}, * 3 \mathrm{G}, \\ & * 3 \mathrm{~K}, * 3 \mathrm{~L}, *, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, \\ & \text { S100\% } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & { }^{*} 1 \mathrm{D}, * 2, * 3, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 6, \\ & * 7, * 8, * 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | *3, *6, *7 | *3, *3K, *5, *6, *7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{D}, * 2, * 3, \\ & * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 6, * 7, * 8, \\ & * 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP4F2 | *2, *3, W12C, P13R, G185V, L278F |  |  | *3 |  |  |  |
| DPYD | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *2, *3, *4, *7, *8, *9A, *9B, *10, } \\ & \text { *11, *13, R21X, M166V } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | *2, *9 | *2, *7, *8, *9, *10 |  |  |
| GSTMI | *A, *B, *0 |  |  |  | *A, *B, CNV |  |  |
| GSTPI | *A, *B, *C, D147Y |  |  |  | A, B, C, D |  |  |
| GSTTI | *A, *B, A21T, F45C, V169I, *0 |  |  |  | CNV |  |  |
| NAT1 | $\begin{aligned} & * 4, * 5, * 11, * 11 \mathrm{C}, * 14, * 15, * 17, \\ & * 19 \mathrm{~A}, * 19 \mathrm{~B}, * 22, * 23, * 27, * 30, \\ & \text { T207I } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 4, * 5, * 11, * 14, * 15, \\ & * 17, * 19, * 22 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| NAT2 | *4, *5, *5E, *6, *6J, *7, *7D, *10, <br> *12D, *14, *14D, *14F, *17, *18, <br> *19, L137F, K268R |  |  |  | $* 4, * 5, * 5 \mathrm{~A}, * 5 \mathrm{C}, * 5 \mathrm{D}$, *5K,*5P, *6A, *6B *6C, *6E, *6F, *6I, *6N, *7A, *7B, *7C *7D, *11, *12, *12B, *12C, *13, *14, *14B, $14 \mathrm{C}, * 14 \mathrm{D}, * 14 \mathrm{E}$, $14 \mathrm{~F}, * 14 \mathrm{G}, * 14 \mathrm{I}, * 1$ |  |  |
| SLC15A2 | *2, *3, R57H, M704L |  |  |  | *2, *3 |  |  |
| SLC22A2 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 6, * 3 \mathrm{D}, * 3 \mathrm{E}, * 5, \\ & * 7, * 8, \text { R463K } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | P54S, M165V, S270A, R400C, K432Q |  |  |


| Assay (sample sets tested) | Affymetrix DMET (Tier 1) | GenMark eSensor ${ }^{1}$ (Tier 1) | Luminex xTAG <br> (Tier 1) | LifeTech Taqman LDT <br> (Tiers 1 and 2) | Agena Bioscience iPLEX ${ }^{\circledR}$ ADME PGx Pro <br> (Tiers 1 and 2) | Agena Bioscience CYP2D6, CYP2C9/ VKORC1, CYP2C19, UGT1A1 (Tiers 1 and 2) | Autogenomics CYP2D6, CYP3A4. CYP3A5, NAT2 (Tier 1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SLCO1B1 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{a}, * 1 \mathrm{~b}, * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, \\ & * 9, * 10, * 11, * 12, * 13, * 14, * 15, \\ & * 16, * 17, * 18, * 21, \text { P336R } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | *5, *17, *21 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 2, * 3, * 5, \\ & * 9, * 10, * 11, * 12, * 13, \\ & * 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| SLCO2B1 | *2, D215V |  |  |  | S464F (*3?) |  |  |
| TPMT | *2, *3A, *3B, *3C, *3D, *4, *8, *24 |  |  | *3A, *3B, *3C | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{C}, * 4, \\ & * 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| UGTIAI | $\begin{aligned} & * 6, * 8, * 12, * 14, * 15, * 27, * 28, * 43, \\ & * 45, * 60, * 62, * 80, * 39, * * 12, \\ & * 28+60+93, * 28+60, * 27+28+60, \\ & * 27+28+60+93, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 6 \mathrm{~A}, * 6 \mathrm{~B}, * 7, * 27, * 29, \\ & * 60 \end{aligned}$ | *28, *36, *37 |  |
| UGT2B7 | *1a, *1g, *2a, *2c, *2e, *3 |  |  |  | *2 |  |  |
| UGT2B15 | *2, *4, *5, A500T |  |  |  | Y85D(*2?) |  |  |
| UGT2B17 | H450Y, *2 |  |  |  | CNV? |  |  |
| VKORC1 | H1, H2, H3, H4, H6, H7, H9, V29L, V45A, R58G, V66M, R98W, L128R | c. $-1639 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$ | c. $-1639 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{c}$. <br> 85G>T (p.V29L), <br> c. $121 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{T}$ <br> (p.A41S), c. <br> $134 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{p} . \mathrm{V} 45 \mathrm{~A})$, <br> c. $172 \mathrm{~A}>\mathrm{G}$ <br> (p.R58G), c. <br> 196G>A <br> (p.V66M), c. <br> 383T>G (p.L128R) | *2 (c.-1639G>A) | *2, *3, *4 | *2/H1, *2A, *2B, *3, *3F;BHT3, *4, *7RE, BHT2RE, BHT4, H2/H5, H4, H6, H7A, H7B, H8, H9 |  |

${ }^{1}$ Assays do not include all genes or alleles
Luew doułn $\forall$
Alleles identifie
Alleles identified in the DNA samples tested

| Gene | Alleles tested in study | Alleles verified by 2 or more methods | Alleles found by only 1 laboratory | Alleles not found in study samples | Alleles tested by only one method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CYP1A1 | *2, *2C, *3, *4, *5, *6, *7, *8, *9, *10, G45D, R279W, I286T, F381L, A463G | *2, *4, *5 | *2C | $* 3, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10, \mathrm{G} 45 \mathrm{D},$ R279W, I286T, F381L, A463G | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *2C, *10, G45D, R279W, I286T, F381L, } \\ & \text { A463G } \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP1A2 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 1 \mathrm{D}, * 1 \mathrm{~F}, * 1 \mathrm{~K}, * 1 \mathrm{~L}, * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, \\ & * 6, * 7, * 8, * 11, * 15, * 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *1A, *1C, *1F, } \\ & \text { * } 1 \mathrm{~K}, * 1 \mathrm{~L} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *1D, *2, *3, *4, *5, *6, *7, *8, *11, } \\ & \text { *15, *16 } \end{aligned}$ | *1D, *2, *3, * $4, * 5, * 6, * 8, * 11, * 15, * 16$ |
| CYP2A6 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 11, * 12, * 13, * 17, \\ & * 20, * 26, * 28,387 \mathrm{FS}, * 1 \mathrm{X} 2 \mathrm{~b} \end{aligned}$ | *2, *4, *9, *17, *20 | *8 | *6, *7, *11, *13, *28, 387FS, *1X2b | *5, *12, * $13, * 26, * 28,387 \mathrm{FS}, * 1 \mathrm{X} 2 \mathrm{~b}$ |
| CYP2B6 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 11, * 12, * 13, * 14, \\ & * 15, * 16, * 18, * 19, * 20, * 21, * 22, * 26, * 27, \\ & * 28 \end{aligned}$ | *2, *6, *7, *18 | $\begin{aligned} & * 4, * 5, * 11, * 15, \\ & * 20, * 22, * 27, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 3, * 8, * 12, * 13, * 14, * 16, * 19, * 21, \\ & * 26, * 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 3, * 4, * 5, * 7, * 11, * 12, * 14, * 15, * 19, * 20, \\ & * 21, * 22, * 26, * 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP2C8 | *1A, *2, *3, *4, *5, *7, *8, *12, L390S, P404A | *2, *3, *4, | * 1 A | *5, *7, *8, *12, L390S, P404A | *1A, *12, L390S, P404A |
| CYP2C9 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 1 \mathrm{D}, * 2, * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 2 \mathrm{C}, * 3, \\ & * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10, * 11, \\ & * 11 \mathrm{~A}, * 11 \mathrm{~B}, * 12, * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 17, * 18, \\ & * 19, * 20, * 21, * 22, * 23, * 24, * 25, * 26, * 27, \\ & * 28, * 29, * 30, * 31, * 32, * 33, * 34, * 35, \text { Y358C } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 5, * 6, * 8, \\ & * 9, * 10, * 11, * 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, \\ & * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{D}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 2 \mathrm{C}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 4, * 7, \\ & * 11 \mathrm{~A}, * 11 \mathrm{~B}, * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 17, \\ & * 19, * 20, * 21, * 22, * 23, * 24, * 25, \\ & * 26, * 27, * 28, * 29, * 30, * 31, * 32, \\ & * 33, * 34, * 35, \mathrm{Y} 358 \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 1 \mathrm{D}, * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 2 \mathrm{C}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 7, * 11 \mathrm{~A}, * 11 \mathrm{~B}, * 17, * 18, * 19, * 20, \\ & * 21, * 22, * 23, * 24, * 26, * 28, * 29, * 30, * 31, \\ & * 32, * 33, * 34, * 35, \mathrm{Y} 358 \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP2C19 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 2, * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 3, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B} \\ & (* 20), * 4, * 4 \mathrm{~A}, * 4 \mathrm{~B}, * 5, * 5 \mathrm{~A}, * 5 \mathrm{~B}, * 6, * 7, * 8, \\ & * 9, * 10, * 11, * 12, * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 17, * 18, \\ & * 19, * 20, * 21, * 22, * 23, * 24, * 25, * 26, * 27, \\ & * 28,439 \mathrm{FS}, 241 \mathrm{FS}, \mathrm{~V} 331 \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 4 \mathrm{~B}, * 6, \\ & * 8, * 9, * 10, * 13, \\ & * 15, * 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, \\ & * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 4 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 12, * 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B}(* 20), * 5, * 5 \mathrm{~A}, * 5 \mathrm{~B}, * 7, \\ & * 11, * 14, * 16, * 18, * 19, * 20, * 21, \\ & * 22, * 23, * 24, * 25, * 26, * 28,439 \mathrm{FS}, \\ & 241 \mathrm{FS}, \mathrm{~V} 331 \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{C}, * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{~B}(* 20), * 4 \mathrm{~A}, * 4 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & * 11, * 16, * 18, * 19, * 20, * 21, * 22, * 23, \text {, } 24, \\ & * 25, * 26, * 27, * 28,439 \mathrm{FS}, 241 \mathrm{FS}, \mathrm{~V} 331 \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP2D6 | *2, *2A, *2D, *2L, *2M, *3, *4, *4B, *4J, *4K, *4M, *4N;P, *5, *6, *6C, *7, *8, *9, *10, *10A, *10B, *11, *12, *14, *14A, *14B, *15, *17, *18, *19, *20, *21, *21A, *21B, *27, *29, *30, *34, *35, *36, *38, *39, *40, *41, *42, *44, *45A, *56A, *56B, *57, *58, *63, *64, *65, *68, *69, *70, *71, *82, *83, *84, 1XN, 2XN, 4XN, CNV, DUP, S486T, XN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { *2, *3, *4, *5, *6, } \\ & \text { *7, *9, *10, } \\ & \text { *14,*15, *17, *29, } \\ & \text { *35, *41, XN, } \\ & \text { *2XN, *4XN, } \\ & \text { *10XN, *41XN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 21, * 21 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & * 36, * 40 \end{aligned}$ | *2D, *2L, *2M, *4B, *4J, *4K, *4M, *4N;P, *6C, *8, *11, *12, *14A, <br> *14B, *18, *19, *20, *21A, *27, *30, *34, *38, *39, *42, *44, *45A, *56A, *56B, *57, *58, *63, *64, *68, *69, *70, *71, *82, *83, *84, S486T | $\begin{aligned} & * 2 \mathrm{D}, * 2 \mathrm{M}, * 4 \mathrm{~B}, * 4 \mathrm{~J}, * 4 \mathrm{~K}, * 4 \mathrm{~N} ; \mathrm{P}, * 6 \mathrm{C}, * 10 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 10 \mathrm{~B}, * 14, * 21, * 27, * 34, * 36, * 39, * 45 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 57, * 63, * 65, * 68, * 70, * 71, * 82, * 83, * 84, \\ & \text { S486T } \end{aligned}$ |
| CYP2E1 | *2, *3, *4, *5, *7, *7A, *7B, *7C | *7 | $\begin{aligned} & * 4, * 5, * 7 \mathrm{~A}, * 7 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & * 7 \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | *2, *3 | *3, *4, *5, *7A, *7B, *7C |
| CYP3A4 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 10, * 11, * 12, \\ & * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 17, * 18, * 19, * 20, * 22, \\ & \text { K96E, I193V, S252A, I431T, 465FS } \end{aligned}$ | *1B, *2, *3, *22 | *14, *15, *16, | $\begin{aligned} & * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 10, * 11, * 12, * 13, \\ & * 17, * 18, * 19, * 20, \mathrm{~K} 96 \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{I} 193 \mathrm{~V}, \\ & \mathrm{~S} 252 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{I} 431 \mathrm{~T}, 465 \mathrm{FS} \end{aligned}$ | * $4, * 5, * 7, * 8, * 10, * 11, * 13, * 14, * 15, * 16$, *18, *19, K96E, I193V, S252A, I431T, 465FS |
| CYP3A5 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{D}, * 2, * 3, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{C}, * 3 \mathrm{D}, * 3 \mathrm{~F}, * 3 \mathrm{G}, \\ & * 3 \mathrm{~K}, * 3 \mathrm{~L}, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, \mathrm{~S} 100 \mathrm{Y} \end{aligned}$ | *1D, *3, *6, *7, | *1A, *3C, *3G | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{D}, * 3 \mathrm{~F}, * 3 \mathrm{~K}, * 3 \mathrm{~L}, * 4, * 5, \\ & * 8, * 9, \mathrm{~S} 100 \mathrm{Y} \end{aligned}$ | * $1 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{C}, * 3 \mathrm{D}, * 3 \mathrm{~F}, * 3 \mathrm{G}, * 3 \mathrm{~L}, * 4, \mathrm{~S} 100 \mathrm{Y}$ |
| CYP4F2 | *2, *3, W12C, P13R, G185V, L278F | *3 | *2 | W12C, P13R, G185V, L278F | *2, W12C, P13R, G185V, L278F |
| DPYD | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 3, * 4, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 9 \mathrm{~A}, * 9 \mathrm{~B}, \text { *10, } \\ & * 11, * 13, \text { R21X, M166V } \end{aligned}$ | *2, *9 | *4, *9A | $\begin{aligned} & * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 3, * 7, * 8, * 9 \mathrm{~B}, * 10, * 11, * 13, \\ & \mathrm{R} 21 \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{M} 166 \mathrm{~V} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 3, * 4, * 9 \mathrm{~A}, * 9 \mathrm{~B}, * 11, * 13, \mathrm{R} 21 \mathrm{X}, \\ & \mathrm{M} 166 \mathrm{~V} \end{aligned}$ |

ıdıএэsnuew ıOułn*

| Gene | Alleles tested in study | Alleles verified by 2 or more methods | Alleles found by only 1 laboratory | Alleles not found in study samples | Alleles tested by only one method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GSTM1 | *A, *B, *0 (DEL) | DEL, *A, *B |  |  |  |
| GSTPI | *A, *B, *C,*D, D147Y | *A, *B, *C |  | *D, D147Y | *D, D147Y |
| GSTT1 | *A, *B, A21T, F45C, V169I, *0 (DEL), CNV | DEL | AXN, A, B | A21T, F45C, V169I, | *A, *B, A21T, F45C, V1691 |
| NATI | $\begin{aligned} & * 4, * 5, * 11, * 11 \mathrm{C}, * 14, * 15, * 17, * 19, * 19 \mathrm{~A}, \\ & * 19 \mathrm{~B}, * 22, * 23, * 27, * 30, \mathrm{~T} 207 \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | * $4, * 11, * 14, * 17$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 5, * 11 \mathrm{C}, * 15, * 19, * 19 \mathrm{~A}, * 19 \mathrm{~B}, * 22, \\ & * 23, * 27, * 30, \mathrm{~T} 207 \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | *11C, *19A, *19B, *23, *27, *30, T207I |
| NAT2 | * $4, * 5, * 5 \mathrm{~A}, * 5 \mathrm{C}, * 5 \mathrm{D}, * 5 \mathrm{E}, * 5 \mathrm{G}, * 5 \mathrm{~J}$, <br> $* 5 \mathrm{~K}, * 5 \mathrm{P}, * 6, * 6 \mathrm{~A}, * 6 \mathrm{~B}, * 6 \mathrm{C}, * 6 \mathrm{E}, * 6 \mathrm{~F}, * 6 \mathrm{I}$, <br> *6J, *6N, *7, *7A, *7B, *7C, *7D, *10, *11, <br> *12, *12B, *12C, *12D, *13, *14, *14B, *14C, <br> *14D, *14E, *14F, *14G, * 14I, *17, *18, *19, <br> L137F, K268R | *4, *5, *6, *7, *14 | $\begin{aligned} & * 5 \mathrm{~A}, * 5 \mathrm{C}, * 7 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & * 12, * 13 \end{aligned}$ | *5D, *5E, *5G, *5J, *5K, *5P, *6A, <br> *6B, *6C, *6E, *6F, *6I, *6J, *6N, <br> *7A, *7C, *7D, *10, *11, *12B, <br> *12C, *12D, *14B, *14C, *14D, <br> *14E, *14F, *14G, *14I, *17, * 18 , <br> * 19, L137F, K268R | *5A, *5C, *5D, *5G, *5J, *5K, *5P, *6A, <br> *6B, *6C, *6E, *6F, *6I, *6J, *6N, *7A, *7B, <br> *7C, *10, *11, *12, *12B, *12C, *12D, <br> *13,*14B, *14C, *14E, *14G, *14I, *17, *18, <br> L137F, K268R |
| SLC15A2 | *2, *3, R57H, M704L | *2 |  | *3, R57H, M704L | R57H, M704L |
| SLC22A2 | $* 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{~A}, * 3 \mathrm{D}, * 3 \mathrm{E}, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, \mathrm{P} 54 \mathrm{~S},$ <br> M165V, S270A, R400C, K432Q, R463K | *3, *7 | $* 2, * 2 \mathrm{~A}, * 2 \mathrm{~B}, * 3 \mathrm{~A},$ <br> *3D, *3E, S270A, <br> K432Q, R400C | *6, *5, *8, P54S, M165V, R463K | *2A, *2B, *3A, *3D, *3E, *5, *6, *7, *8, P54S, M165V, S270A, R400C, K432Q, R463K |
| SLCOIB1 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 2, * 3, * 4, * 5, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10, \\ & * 11, * 12,{ }^{2} 13, * 14, * 15, * 16, * 17, * 18, * 21, \\ & \text { P336R } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1 \mathrm{~A}, * 1 \mathrm{~B}, * 5, * 14, \\ & * 15, * 17, * 21 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & * 2, * 3, * 4, * 6, * 7, * 8, * 9, * 10, * 11, \\ & * 12, * 13, * 16, * 18, \text { P336R } \end{aligned}$ | *4, *6, *7, *8,*14, *16, *18, *21, P336R |
| SLCO2B1 | *2, D215V, S464F (*3?) | none | S464F | *2, D215V | *2, D215V, S464F (*3?) |
| TPMT | *2, *3A, *3B, *3C, *3D, *4, *8, *24 | *3A, *3C, *8 |  | *2, *3B, *3D, *4,*24 | *3D, *24 |
| UGTIAI | *6, *6A, *6B, *7, *8, *12, *14, *15, *27, * $27+28+60$, $27+28+60+93, * 28, * 28+60+93$, *28+60, *29, *36, *36B, *37, *43, *45, *60, *62, *80, *93, *112 | *6, *27, *28, *60 | $\begin{aligned} & * 6 \mathrm{~A}, * 7, * 28 \mathrm{~B}, \\ & * 36, * 36 \mathrm{~B}, * 37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 8, * 12, * 14, * 15, * 29, * 43, * 45, * 62, \\ & * 80, * 93, * 112 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 6 \mathrm{~A}, * 6 \mathrm{~B}, * 7, * 8, * 12, * 14, * 15, * 27+28+60, \\ & * 27+28+60+93, * 28+60+93,28+60, * 29, \\ & * 36, * 36 \mathrm{~B}, * 37, * 43, * 45, * 62, * 80, * 93, \\ & * 112 \end{aligned}$ |
| UGT2B7 | *1A, *1G, *2, *2A, *2C, *2E, *3 | *2, | *1A, *1G, *2C, *3 | *2A, *2E | *1, *1A, *1G, *2A, *2C, *2E, *3 |
| UGT2B15 | *2, *4, *5, A500T, Y85D (*2?) | *2, *5 | * 4 | A500T, Y85D(*2?) | *2, *4, *5, A500T, Y85D(*2?) |
| UGT2B17 | H450Y, *2, CNV |  | *2, CNV | H450Y | H450Y, *2, CNV |
| VKORCI | H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, H7A, H7B, H8, H9, H2/H5,*2, *2A, *2B, *3, *3F, *4, V29L, V45A, R58G, V66M, R98W, L128R, A41S, $-1639 \mathrm{G}>\mathrm{A}$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { c.-1639G>A, (*2, } \\ & * 3, * 4, \mathrm{H} 1, \mathrm{H} 2, \mathrm{H} 4, \\ & \mathrm{H} 6, \mathrm{H} 7) / 1 \end{aligned}$ | H3, H5, H7B, H9 | V29L, V45A, R58G, V66M, R98W, L128R, A41S | H3, H7A, H7B, H8, H2/H5, *2A, *2B, *3F, V29L, V45A, R58G, V66M, R98W, L128R, A41S, -1639G>A, |
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