

Table 2 – Predicting the effects of *PALB2* missense variants on protein function using three *in silico* methods

Nucleotide change	Protein change	Carrier frequency (%)	SIFT ^a	Align GVGD ^b	Polyphen ^c
c.90G>T	p.Lys30Asn	1 (0.1)	Affect protein function; p=0.04	Class C0	Probably damaging 0.999
c.94C>G	p.Leu32Val	1 (0.1)	Tolerated; p=0.37	Class C0	Probably damaging 1.000
c.596A>G	p.Asp219Gly	1 (0.1)	Tolerated; p=0.65	Class C0	Benign 0.000
c.956C>A	p.Ser319Tyr	1 (0.1)	Tolerated; p=0.91	Class C0	Possibly damaging 0.589
c.1010T>C	p.Leu337Ser	25 (3.3)	Tolerated; p=0.59	Class C0	Benign 0.291
c.1475G>T	p.Gly492Val	1 (0.1)	Tolerated; p=0.17	Class C0	Benign 0.161
c.1676A>G	p.Gln559Arg	72 (9.6)	Tolerated; p=0.57	Class C0	Benign 0.000
c.2014G>C	p.Glu672Gln	51 (6.8)	Tolerated; p=0.48	Class C0	Benign 0.225
c.2590C>T	p.Pro864Ser	1 (0.1)	Tolerated; p=0.68	Class C0	Possibly damaging 0.578
c.2993G>A [*]	p.Gly998Glu	17 (0.9)	Affect protein function; p=0.00	Class C65	Probably damaging 1.000

^{*}Predicted to affect protein function by all three programs. ^aKumar et al.(2009) [22]; Ng et al (2003) [23]. ^b Tavtigian et al. (2006) [24]; Mathe et al. (2006) [25]; Tavtigian et al. (2008) [26]. ^c Adzhubei et al. (2010) [27]