OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

ISSN: 2329-6682
Gene Technology

Short Communication

Cytogenetic Biomarkers in Clinical Practice: Implications for Diagnosis and Treatment

Gino Kenya*

Department of Pathology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

DESCRIPTION

Cytogenetic biomarkers have become indispensable tools in clinical practice, offering important insights into the diagnosis, prognosis and treatment of various diseases. These biomarkers, derived from the analysis of chromosomes and their abnormalities, provide valuable information that guides clinical decision making. The integration of cytogenetic biomarkers into routine healthcare has significantly improved the management of genetic disorders, cancers, and other conditions [1-3].

Understanding cytogenetic biomarkers

Cytogenetic biomarkers refer to specific chromosomal abnormalities that can be detected and measured to provide information about a disease state. These abnormalities include numerical changes, such as aneuploidies (extra or missing chromosomes) and structural alterations, such as translocations, deletions, duplications, and inversions. The detection and characterization of these biomarkers are performed using various techniques including karyotyping, Fluorescence *in Situ* Hybridization (FISH), and more advanced methods like Array Comparative Genomic Hybridization (aCGH) and Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) [4-6].

Diagnosis of genetic disorders

Cytogenetic biomarkers are essential for the diagnosis of hereditary diseases. Traditional karyotyping remains a fundamental tool for identifying large-scale chromosomal abnormalities. These karyotypic analyses provide definitive diagnoses for many chromosomal disorders, enabling early intervention and management.

FISH uses fluorescent probes that bind to specific DNA sequences, enabling the visualization of chromosomal regions of interest. This technique is particularly useful for identifying microdeletions and microduplications that are not detectable by conventional karyotyping. For example, FISH can diagnose DiGeorge syndrome by detecting a microdeletion in chromosome 22q11.2. Cytogenetic biomarkers have transformed the field of oncology, providing critical information for the prognosis and treatment of various cancers. Chromosomal abnormalities are features of many cancers, and their detection can guide therapeutic decisions.

Personalized medicine and targeted therapies

The advent of Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) has revolutionized the identification of cytogenetic biomarkers, facilitating the implementation of personalized medicine. NGS allows for comprehensive genomic profiling, revealing point mutations, small insertions and deletions, CNVs, and structural rearrangements in a single assay. The identification of new markers and characterization of intricate genomic landscapes in individual patients are made possible by this high-throughput method. In oncology, NGS-based genomic profiling has become a standard practice for identifying actionable mutations and guiding targeted therapies [7-9].

Implications for prenatal diagnostics

Cytogenetic biomarkers are in prenatal diagnostics, where early detection of chromosomal abnormalities can inform decision-making and management. Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT) using cell-free fetal DNA in maternal blood has revolutionized prenatal screening. With great sensitivity and specificity, NIPT can identify common aneuploidies such trisomy 21, trisomy 18, and trisomy 13. Positive results are typically confirmed with invasive diagnostic tests, such as Chorionic Villus Sampling (CVS) or amniocentesis, followed by karyotyping or aCGH. Moreover, cytogenetic analysis of amniotic fluid or chorionic villi can detect a wide range of chromosomal abnormalities, providing valuable information for prenatal counseling and management. The identification of structural abnormalities, such as balanced translocations, can also have implications for future pregnancies and familial risk assessment [10].

Correspondence to: Gino Kenya, Department of Pathology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada, E-mail: ginokeny@gmail.com

Received: 03-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. RDT-24-26186; **Editor assigned:** 06-Jun-2024, Pre QC No. RDT-24-26186 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 20-Jun-2024, QC No RDT-24-26186; **Revised:** 27-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. RDT-24-26186 (R); **Published:** 04-Jul-2024, DOI: 10.35248/2329-6682.24.13.286

Citation: Kenya G (2024) Cytogenetic Biomarkers in Clinical Practice: Implications for Diagnosis and Treatment. Gene Technol.13:286.

The significant advances in cytogenetic biomarkers, several challenges remain additionally the clinical significance of some detected abnormalities may be uncertain, necessitating genotype-phenotype correlations. The future of cytogenetic biomarkers lies in the integration of multi-omic data, combining genomics with transcriptomics, proteomics, and epigenomics to provide a more comprehensive understanding of disease mechanisms. Advances in artificial intelligence and machine learning will also enhance the analysis and interpretation of large-scale genomic data, facilitating the discovery of novel biomarkers and improving diagnostic accuracy. Cytogenetic biomarkers have strongly impacted clinical practice, providing essential tools for the diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment of genetic disorders and cancers. From traditional karyotyping to advanced genomic arrays and NGS, these biomarkers offer valuable insights into chromosomal abnormalities and their clinical implications. The integration of cytogenetic biomarkers into healthcare has improved patient outcomes, guided personalized medicine, and informed prenatal diagnostics.

REFERENCES

1. Barnes B, Caws T, Thomas S, Shephard AP, Corteling R, Hole P, Bracewell DG. Investigating heparin affinity chromatography for extracellular vesicle purification and fractionation. J Chromatogr A. 2022;1670:462987.
2. Berry D, Lynn DM, Sasisekharan R, Langer R. Poly (β-amino ester) s promote cellular uptake of heparin and cancer cell death. Chem Biol. 2004;11(4):487-498.
3. Raman K, Mencio C, Desai UR, Kuberan B. Sulfation patterns determine cellular internalization of heparin-like polysaccharides. Mol Pharmaceutics. 2013;10(4):1442-1449.
4. Yanaihara N, Caplen N, Bowman E, Seike M, Kumamoto K, Yi M, Stephens RM, et al. Unique microRNA molecular profiles in lung cancer diagnosis and prognosis. Cancer cell. 2006;9(3):189-198.
5. Mattiske S, Suetani RJ, Neilsen PM, Callen DF. The Oncogenic Role of miR-155 in Breast CancermiR-155 and Breast Cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomark Prev. 2012;21(8):1236-1243.
6. Ruan W, Xu JM, Li SB, Yuan LQ, Dai RP. Effects of down-regulation of microRNA-23a on TNF-α-induced endothelial cell apoptosis through caspase-dependent pathways. Cardiovasc Res. 2012;93(4):623-32.
7. Iorio MV, Ferracin M, Liu CG, Veronese A, Spizzo R, Sabbioni S, et al. MicroRNA gene expression deregulation in human breast cancer. Cancer res. 2005;65(16):7065-7070.
8. Hu G, Drescher KM, Chen XM. Exosomal miRNAs: biological properties and therapeutic potential. Front Genet. 2012;3:56.
9. Mousa SA, Petersen LJ. Anti-cancer properties of low-molecular-weight heparin: preclinical evidence. J Thromb Haemost. 2009;102(08):258-267.
10. Niers TM, Klerk CP, DiNisio M, Van Noorden CJ, Büller HR, Reitsma PH, et al. Mechanisms of heparin induced anti-cancer activity in experimental cancer models. Crit Rev Oncol. 2007;61(3):195-207.