LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Molecular diagnosis of myotonic dystrophy

The data summarised in the editorial by Suthers et al. on the molecular diagnosis of myotonic dystrophy (MD) are very useful, but I fear that the example of Bayesian calculation used to estimate the risk of congenital myotonic dystrophy (CMD) to a fetus may be incorrect. In table 2 the authors use the conditional probability of the size of fetal (CTG) amplification and the conditional probability of fetal (CTG) amplification being the same or greater than the mother’s as independent probabilities (that is, they multiply them). This is only valid if the two observations are independent in the statistical sense, in other words if information about the value of one of them gives you no information about the other. This is manifestly not the case, as to know that (to take an extreme example) the fetal (CTG) amplification is > 4.5 kb also tells you that it is very likely to be greater than the mother’s. In order to use both sets of data the authors would need to set up two joint conditional probability tables (one for children with CMD and one without). The data are not available in the editorial for this to be derived.

On a further point the authors use a probability of 0.01 as a conservative estimate of the true proportion of infants with CMD who have band sizes the same as their mother’s. This was based on the observation that no instances were seen out of 22 cases. Assuming a binomial distribution the 95% confidence limits of the estimate of the true proportion of infants with CMD who have band sizes the same as their mother’s from this sample size are 0.0 to 0.13, so that the estimate of 0.01 would not appear to be conservative enough.

Taking these two points together, readers should be cautioned against using the model calculations in table 2 to estimate risks in real clinical situations.

R M WINTER
Mothercare Unit of Clinical Genetics and Fetal Medicine, Institute of Child Health, 39 Guilford Street, London WC1N 1EH, UK.

This letter was shown to Dr Suthers et al. who reply as follows.

Dr Winters’s comments on our suggested approach to risk calculation in the differential prediction of congenital and non-congenital myotonic dystrophy (DM) are very reasonable. We are grateful for the opportunity to discuss the matter further.

It is not yet clear whether fetal (CTG), copy number and fetal (CTG), amplification being the same or greater than the mother’s are truly independent events. Among congenitally affected children, copy number is independent of the probability of an increase in copy number as all congenitally affected children reported to date show an increase. It is not known whether these probabilities are independent among children who have the non-congenital form of DM. The experience with the (CGG) repeat triple at the fragile X locus would suggest that these probabilities are not independent.1 In the short term the concerns raised by Dr Winter can be addressed by using the only the fetal (CTG), copy number as a conditional probability in a Bayesian risk calculation; the probability of the fetal copy number being larger than the maternal copy number contributes less to the posterior probability.

We acknowledge that our estimate (0.01) of the proportion of congenitally affected fetuses who do not show an increase in copy number may be too low. The number of congenitally affected children who have been examined is small, and we cautioned that the conditional probabilities were based on few observations. Using the data of Tsifidou et al the best estimate of the proportion of congenitally affected children who fail to show an increase in (CTG), copy number is 0.0; however, as only 22 children were studied, the 95% confidence interval for this proportion is indeed 0.0-0.13. It could be argued that one should calculate a risk interval (rather than a point estimate) for the fetus being affected with congenital DM, thereby making allowance for the small number of children studied. On the other hand, in view of the limited data, it may be more appropriate to use the best estimate of this proportion.

This discussion touches on the general difficulty of taking raw biological data and applying it in a clinical setting. The dynamics of the DM mutation are complex and not well documented. Until more data are available to address the issues raised by Dr Winter, we would urge careful clinical consideration in the application of mutation analysis to the differential prediction of congenital and non-congenital DM.

Graeme K Suthers
Kay E Davies
Molecular Genetics Group, Institute of Medical Biology, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford OX3 9DQ, UK.

SUSAN M HUSON
Department of Medical Genetics, Churchill Hospital, Oxford OX3 7LJ, UK.


Weyers’ unlar ray/oligodactyly syndrome

We read with interest the paper by Turn- penny et al on “Weyers’ unlar ray/oligodac- taly syndrome and the association of midline malformations with unlar ray defects.” In 1985 we published a case of craniosynos- tosis and unilateral unlar aplasia associated with pulmonary stenosis.1 The child was a 5 month old male who showed synostosis of the coronal and metopic sutures, supraorbital flattening, downward slanting palpebral fissures, low set and pos- teriorly rotated ears with poorly developed helices, severe microretrognatia, a high arched palate, and a short nose with re- ductant retromonial skin. He also had a heart murrum, markedly hypoplastic right forearm with radial deviation, and oligodactyly (only the thumb and the second finger were pre- sent). On x ray examination, besides the aplasia of the ulna there was aplasia of the third, fourth, and fifth metacarpals and cor- responding fingers and a short, proximally dislocated radius. He showed two anomalies of the left arm and the lower extremities. At the time of publication the following syndromes were considered for the differential dia- gnosis: Baier-Gerold syndrome which in- cludes craniosynososis but in which only the radius is involved; Lowry syndrome which shows craniosynososis but involvement of the fibula only; Herrmann-Pallister-Opitz syndrome which shows craniosynososis and severe, symmetrically malformed limbs; and Sakati syndrome which shows craniosynososis and polydactyly with shortening of the limbs.

The case was considered to be sporadic, since the parents were normal and non- consanguineous and the family history was negative for craniofacial anomalies or limb defects. We think that our patient, who had craniosynososis, high arched palate, microretrognatia, and unlar defect could add further evidence of a possible defect of the same developmental field involving the limb buds and midline.

Nevertheless, the hypothesis of the pres- ence of a single gene which could cause dysmorphogenesis of midline body struc- tures and loss of specification in radioulnar development is limiting and seems not to fit with the unilaterality of the limb anomaly present in our patient.

This observation suggests that the de- velopmental timing of these two areas of the body, even though correlated in some way, are also influenced by more complex and independent mechanisms.

M SERENA LUNGROTTI
ANNA CALABRO
Istituto di Genetica Medica, Università di Perugia,
PolizziMonte, 60100 Perugia, Italy.


The contribution of genetic factors to the pathogenesis of type I (insulin dependent) diabetes mellitus

In a recent review article on the genetics of type I (insulin dependent) diabetes mellitus, Cavan et al correctly state that diabetes is probably “influenced by several genes as well as by environmental and genetic factors”. To support this view they mention the low concordance rate in identical twins and the average disease risk of about 6% in sibs of a diabetic pro- band. The discussion emphasizes the importance of the HLA antigens, particu- larly DR and DQ, by applying such terms as