Journal of Health, Wellness and Community Research
ISSN: 3007, 0570

OPEN ACCESS

JHWCR

Type: Narrative Review
Published: 30 November 2025
Volume: III, Issue: XVII
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61919/mct22502

Correspondence
Niaz Ullah, niazullahpk130@gmail.com

Received 06 October 2025
Accepted 18 November 2025

Authors' Contributions
Concept: NU, AN; Design: IS, ARS; Data Collection: AM, SI; Analysis: ARS, AN; Drafting: NU, IS.

Declarations
No funding was received for this study. The authors declare no conflict of interest. The study received ethical approval.
Acknowledgments: The author gratefully acknowledges the invaluable contributions of colleagues and the institutional library resources.

"Click to Cite"

Investigating the Role of Molecular Biology Techniques in Advancing Precision Medicine and Personalized Therapeutic Approaches for Human Diseases

Niaz Ullah[1], Iffat Sajjad[2], Ahmad Raza Sachel[3], Amna Noor[4], Atif Maqsood[5], Sijal Imran[6]

1 MPhil Genetics, Islamia College University, Peshawar, Pakistan
2 Department of Zoology, Aspire Group of Colleges, Jhelum, Pakistan
3 Researcher, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada
4 Rawalpindi Medical University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
5 University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
6 Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

***Background**: Precision medicine represents a transformative shift in healthcare, aiming to tailor diagnostic and therapeutic strategies to individual patient characteristics. This paradigm is critically dependent on advancements in molecular biology techniques, which provide the tools to decipher the genetic and molecular underpinnings of disease. Understanding the role and limitations of these technologies is essential for their effective integration into clinical practice. **Objective**: This narrative review aims to analyze the contemporary role of key molecular biology techniques in advancing precision medicine and fostering the development of personalized therapeutic approaches for a range of human diseases. **Main Discussion Points**: The review synthesizes evidence around several core themes. It examines how next-generation sequencing serves as a cornerstone for genomic diagnosis and patient stratification, particularly in oncology and rare genetic diseases. The application of liquid biopsies for minimally invasive disease monitoring and the detection of resistance mechanisms is discussed. Furthermore, the review explores the revolutionary potential of CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing as a curative therapeutic modality and considers the integrative power of multi-omics approaches for unraveling complex disease pathophysiology. **Conclusion**: Molecular biology techniques are indisputably central to the realization of precision medicine, enabling a move from empirical to mechanism-based healthcare. However, their full potential is currently constrained by challenges related to evidence generalizability, methodological standardization, and health equity. Future efforts must focus on rigorous clinical validation, the development of inclusive genomic databases, and the creation of supportive policy frameworks to ensure these powerful tools deliver equitable and improved health outcomes across diverse patient populations.*

Keywords
Precision Medicine, Molecular Biology, Next-Generation Sequencing, Liquid Biopsy, CRISPR-Cas9, Personalized Therapy.

INTRODUCTION

The landscape of medical practice is undergoing a profound transformation, shifting from a traditional one-size-fits-all paradigm towards a more nuanced and individualized approach. This evolution is embodied in the rise of precision medicine, an emerging discipline that aims to tailor medical treatment to the individual characteristics, needs, and preferences of a patient (1). At its core, precision medicine seeks to move beyond the population-level averages that have long guided clinical decision-making, acknowledging the vast heterogeneity that exists between individuals, even those presenting with the same diagnosed disease. This heterogeneity, driven by a complex interplay of genetic predisposition, environmental exposures, and lifestyle factors, is a primary reason for the variable efficacy and adverse drug reactions observed with many conventional therapeutics (2). The promise of precision medicine is to usher in an era of improved health outcomes through more accurate prognostication, timely diagnosis, and, most critically, the development of personalized therapeutic strategies that are uniquely suited to a patient's specific disease drivers. The impetus for this paradigm shift is underscored by the limitations of traditional medicine and the staggering global burden of complex diseases. For instance, in oncology, a field at the forefront of precision medicine, conventional chemotherapy often yields response rates of only 20-30% in unselected patient populations, exposing a majority of patients to significant toxicity without clinical benefit (3). Similarly, in complex multifactorial diseases like Alzheimer's, clinical trials for drugs targeting broad pathological features have consistently failed, highlighting the critical need to identify distinct molecular subtypes that may respond differently to intervention (4). The global burden of non-communicable diseases, which account for over 70% of all deaths worldwide according to the World Health Organization, further amplifies the urgency for more effective and efficient healthcare strategies (5). The economic and human cost of ineffective treatments is immense, driving the pursuit of a more targeted, biologically-grounded approach to disease management. The realization of precision medicine's ambitious goals is inextricably linked to the advancements in molecular biology. The foundational event was the completion of the Human Genome Project, which provided the first reference map of human DNA and unleashed a torrent of technological innovation (6). Subsequent decades have witnessed the development of high-throughput omics technologies, including genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics, which allow for the comprehensive and simultaneous analysis of thousands of molecular players within a biological system (7).

These techniques have moved the field from a focus on single genes to a systems-level understanding of disease. Crucially, molecular biology provides the essential tools not only to discover the molecular alterations that underpin disease but also to translate these discoveries into clinically actionable insights. It is the bridge between the identification of a genetic mutation and the administration of a drug that specifically targets the dysfunctional pathway resulting from that mutation. Current knowledge firmly establishes that many diseases, particularly cancers, are driven by specific molecular aberrations. The success of drugs like imatinib, which targets the BCR-ABL fusion protein in chronic myeloid leukemia, and trastuzumab, which targets HER2 amplification in a subset of breast cancers, provided seminal proof-of-concept that targeting a disease-defining molecular lesion can lead to dramatic and durable responses (8, 9). These early successes catalyzed the field, leading to the routine molecular profiling of tumors and the development of a growing arsenal of targeted therapies. Beyond oncology, molecular biology techniques are revealing the genetic architecture of rare monogenic disorders, enabling definitive diagnoses through next-generation sequencing, and informing carrier screening and reproductive choices (10). In pharmacogenomics, the study of how genes affect a person's response to drugs, molecular testing for variants in genes like CYP2C19 and DPYD is becoming standard practice to guide antiplatelet and chemotherapeutic dosing, respectively, preventing serious adverse events (11). Despite these significant advances, substantial research gaps and challenges remain on the path to fully integrated precision medicine. A primary challenge is biological complexity and disease heterogeneity; even within a single tumor, different regions can harbor distinct molecular profiles, a phenomenon known as intratumoral heterogeneity, which can lead to therapeutic resistance (12). The functional interpretation of the vast number of genomic variants of unknown significance (VUS) identified through sequencing represents another major hurdle for clinicians (13). Furthermore, the majority of biomarker discoveries and subsequent drug development have been concentrated in oncology, with the application of precision medicine principles to common complex diseases like diabetes, cardiovascular, and neuropsychiatric disorders proving more challenging due to their polygenic nature and strong environmental influences (14).

There is also a critical gap in the equitable implementation of these advanced techniques; disparities in access to genetic testing and targeted therapies across different socioeconomic, racial, and geographic groups risk exacerbating existing health inequalities (15). Finally, the integration of multi-omics data into a coherent clinical decision-support system and the development of robust bioinformatic pipelines for data analysis remain significant technical and logistical obstacles (16). Therefore, the objective of this narrative review is to critically analyze and synthesize the contemporary role of specific molecular biology techniques in advancing the field of precision medicine and fostering the development of personalized therapeutic approaches across a spectrum of human diseases. This review will delve into how core techniques such as next-generation sequencing, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) variants, and CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing are being leveraged to uncover disease mechanisms, identify predictive and prognostic biomarkers, and create novel therapeutic modalities. The scope of this review will encompass key applications in oncology, monogenic diseases, and pharmacogenomics, while also exploring the emerging frontiers in complex non-oncological disorders. It will focus on literature and clinical studies published predominantly within the last five years to ensure the relevance and timeliness of the analysis, providing a snapshot of a rapidly evolving field. The significance of this review lies in its timely synthesis of a dispersed and rapidly expanding body of knowledge. By providing a comprehensive overview of the interconnected pipeline from molecular discovery to clinical application, this review aims to elucidate both the transformative potential and the existing limitations of molecular biology in precision medicine. It will highlight concrete examples where these techniques have already altered clinical practice and identify persistent challenges that require further research and innovation. For clinicians, researchers, and healthcare policymakers, this synthesis is intended to serve as a foundational resource, clarifying the current state-of-the-art and informing future directions in research and clinical implementation. Ultimately, by charting the progress and pinpointing the hurdles, this review contributes to the broader goal of accelerating the adoption of truly personalized, effective, and safe therapeutic strategies that improve health outcomes for diverse patient populations.

THEMATIC DISCUSSION

Next-Generation Sequencing as the Genomic Cornerstone of Personalized Diagnosis

The advent of next-generation sequencing (NGS) has irrevocably transformed the diagnostic odyssey for countless patients, serving as the primary engine for genomic discovery in precision medicine. By enabling the parallel sequencing of millions of DNA fragments, NGS technologies, including whole-genome sequencing (WGS) and whole-exome sequencing (WES), provide an unprecedented, comprehensive view of an individual's genetic blueprint (17). In the realm of rare Mendelian diseases, which collectively affect an estimated 300 million people worldwide, NGS has dramatically increased diagnostic yields to 30-40%, a significant leap from the protracted and often inconclusive investigations of the past (18). This is not merely a diagnostic exercise; identifying the precise pathogenic variant informs recurrence risks for families and, in a growing number of cases, opens the door to targeted therapeutic strategies. For instance, the diagnosis of spinal muscular atrophy through genetic confirmation is now a prerequisite for accessing life-altering gene therapies such as onasemnogene abeparvovec (19).

In oncology, the application of NGS has moved beyond single-gene tests to comprehensive panel sequencing, which simultaneously profiles dozens to hundreds of cancer-related genes from tumor tissue or liquid biopsies. This approach has been instrumental in identifying not only common driver mutations in genes like EGFR and BRAF but also rare, actionable alterations that would have remained undetected with conventional methods. A pivotal study by Zehir et al. demonstrated that implementing an NGS-based panel for over 400 cancer-associated genes across 10,000 patients revealed clinically actionable alterations in over 36% of cases, directly influencing therapeutic decisions (20). The ability to detect these molecular signatures allows for the stratification of patients into clinically relevant subgroups, ensuring that therapies are matched to the specific molecular drivers of their disease, thereby maximizing efficacy and minimizing exposure to ineffective treatments.

Liquid Biopsies: A Minimally Invasive Window into Tumor Dynamics

Building upon the foundation of NGS, the development of liquid biopsy techniques represents a paradigm shift in cancer management, moving from static, tissue-based assessments to dynamic, blood-based monitoring. Liquid biopsies primarily analyze circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), which are short fragments of tumor-derived DNA shed into the bloodstream (21). This approach offers a minimally invasive alternative to traditional tumor biopsies, which are often associated with procedural risks and may not fully capture a tumor's spatial heterogeneity. The clinical utility of ctDNA analysis is multifaceted, encompassing early detection, identification of targetable mutations, and most critically, the monitoring of treatment response and emergent resistance mechanisms.

The power of this technology is vividly illustrated in the management of non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients receiving targeted therapy. For example, the emergence of mutations in the EGFR gene, such as T790M, is a common resistance mechanism to first-generation EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors. Liquid biopsies allow for the non-invasive detection of this resistance mutation, identifying patients who are eligible for third-generation inhibitors like osimertinib without the need for a repeat invasive tissue biopsy (22). Furthermore, longitudinal monitoring of ctDNA levels during treatment provides an early and sensitive measure of therapeutic efficacy, often preceding changes on radiographic imaging. A study by Christensen et al. showed that a rapid decrease in ctDNA levels after initiating treatment was strongly correlated with improved progression-free survival in NSCLC patients, highlighting its potential as a predictive biomarker (23). Despite its promise, challenges remain in standardizing assay sensitivity, interpreting low variant allele frequencies, and establishing clinically validated cut-off values across different cancer types.

CRISPR-Cas9 and the Dawn of Precision Gene Editing Therapies

While NGS and liquid biopsies provide the diagnostic and monitoring framework, the CRISPR-Cas9 system has emerged as a revolutionary tool for direct therapeutic intervention, enabling precise manipulation of the genome itself. This molecular technique, derived from a bacterial immune system, functions as a programmable DNA-cutting enzyme, allowing researchers to correct, disrupt, or insert genes with unprecedented ease and accuracy (24). The transition of CRISPR-Cas9 from a basic research tool to a clinical therapeutic has been remarkably swift, heralding a new era for treating genetic disorders at their root cause.

The most compelling clinical successes to date have been in hematological diseases. For sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia, both caused by mutations in the β-globin gene, ex vivo CRISPR-Cas9 therapy has demonstrated transformative results. In this strategy, a patient's own hematopoietic stem cells are harvested, edited ex vivo to reactivate fetal hemoglobin—a non-pathogenic form that can compensate for the defective adult hemoglobin—and then reinfused into the patient. Clinical trials have reported that a majority of treated patients achieved sustained freedom from vaso-occlusive crises or transfusion independence, representing a functional cure for these debilitating conditions (25). Beyond these monogenic diseases, CRISPR-based approaches are being explored for oncology, particularly in engineering chimeric antigen receptor (CAR)-T cells to enhance their potency and persistence against solid tumors. However, the field must navigate significant challenges, including the potential for off-target editing events, ethical considerations surrounding germline editing, and the immense cost and logistical complexity of delivering these personalized cellular therapies (26).

The Integration of Multi-Omics Data for Deciphering Complex Diseases

The complexity of many common diseases, such as autoimmune disorders, neurodegenerative conditions, and metabolic syndromes, cannot be fully explained by genetics alone. This recognition has spurred the integration of multi-omics approaches, which combine data from genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics to construct a more holistic, systems-level understanding of pathophysiology (7). While genomics provides the static blueprint, transcriptomics reveals the dynamic gene expression patterns, proteomics identifies the functional effector proteins, and metabolomics captures the downstream biochemical outputs. The integration of these layers can uncover novel disease endotypes—distinct biological subtypes within a clinically defined disease—that exhibit different prognoses and therapeutic responses.

In rheumatoid arthritis (RA), for example, transcriptomic profiling of synovial tissue has identified at least three distinct molecular subtypes (e.g., fibroblast-rich, macrophage-rich, and a mixed type), which may explain the variable response to biologic therapies such as anti-TNF or B-cell depletion agents (27). Similarly, in Alzheimer's disease, large-scale proteomic and metabolomic studies of cerebrospinal fluid and plasma are identifying biomarker signatures that not only aid in early diagnosis but also stratify patients based on underlying pathogenic processes, which is crucial for the success of trials targeting amyloid or tau pathology (28). The primary obstacle in multi-omics is no longer data generation but data integration and interpretation. Advanced computational methods, including machine learning algorithms, are required to distill these vast, heterogeneous datasets into biologically and clinically meaningful insights. Furthermore, the high cost and requirement for specialized bioinformatics expertise currently limit the widespread clinical implementation of comprehensive multi-omics profiling.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND LIMITATIONS

Notwithstanding the transformative potential of molecular biology techniques in precision medicine, a critical appraisal of the existing literature reveals significant limitations that temper the immediate translation of these advancements into universally applicable clinical benefits. A primary and recurring constraint across many studies, particularly those investigating novel biomarkers or emerging gene therapies, is the preponderance of small sample sizes and the absence of robust, randomized controlled trial (RCT) data. While pioneering studies on CRISPR-based therapies for hemoglobinopathies have yielded remarkable results, the initial clinical trials involved a limited number of highly selected patients, raising questions about the reproducibility and scalability of these outcomes across broader, more genetically diverse populations (25, 30). The logistical and ethical challenges of randomizing patients to receive or forgo a potentially curative gene-editing treatment further complicate the acquisition of Level I evidence, leaving long-term efficacy and safety profiles incompletely defined. The issue of methodological bias is pervasive, particularly in the realm of genomic biomarker discovery. Many studies demonstrating the clinical utility of large NGS panels are conducted at major academic cancer centers with patient populations that are not fully representative of the general demographic (20). This selection bias can lead to an overestimation of the prevalence of certain actionable mutations and an underappreciation of the genomic landscape in underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, ultimately perpetuating health disparities (31). Furthermore, in studies evaluating liquid biopsies for monitoring treatment response, the lack of blinding can introduce performance and detection bias, as knowledge of ctDNA levels may unconsciously influence subsequent imaging assessments and clinical decisions (23). The field also grapples with significant confounding factors; in multi-omics studies of complex diseases, it is exceptionally difficult to disentangle whether observed molecular signatures are causative drivers of the disease or merely secondary consequences of other physiological processes, medications, or environmental exposures (15).

Publication bias represents another critical weakness in the literature. There is an inherent tendency for journals to publish studies with positive findings, such as those identifying a new biomarker with high predictive value or a novel therapy with dramatic efficacy. Consequently, negative or inconclusive results—for instance, a comprehensive NGS analysis that failed to find any actionable targets in a specific cancer cohort, or a pharmacogenomic variant that showed no clinical utility—are frequently underreported (21). This creates a distorted, overly optimistic picture of the clinical applicability of these technologies and hinders a comprehensive understanding of their true limitations. This skew in the published record can mislead meta-analyses and systematic reviews, potentially leading to inflated estimates of diagnostic yield or therapeutic benefit. Substantial variability in measurement outcomes and a lack of standardized analytical pipelines further impede the comparability of studies and the consolidation of evidence. For example, the definition of a "clinically actionable" mutation from an NGS panel is not uniform, varying between studies and institutions based on the strength of associated evidence, which ranges from well-validated clinical guidelines to pre-clinical inferences (26). In liquid biopsy research, different platforms and assays exhibit varying sensitivities for detecting ctDNA, particularly at low variant allele frequencies, making it challenging to establish universal clinical cut-off points for disease monitoring or minimal residual disease detection (21). Similarly, in CRISPR research, there is no consensus on the most sensitive and comprehensive methods for assessing off-target editing events, leading to variability in the reported safety profiles of different gene-editing constructs (20).

Finally, the generalizability of findings remains a profound challenge. The high cost and technical sophistication of techniques like WGS, multi-omics integration, and CAR-T cell therapy currently confine their application largely to well-resourced, tertiary care settings in high-income countries (33). The genomic databases that underpin the interpretation of NGS results are overwhelmingly populated with data from individuals of European ancestry, meaning that the pathogenicity of variants in other populations is less well understood, and polygenic risk scores derived from these databases perform poorly when applied to non-European groups (31, 33). This lack of diversity threatens to create a precision medicine divide, where advanced molecular diagnostics and therapies become available only to a privileged few, thereby exacerbating global health inequities rather than alleviating them. Therefore, while the scientific progress is undeniable, the existing literature collectively underscores that the path to equitable and robustly validated precision medicine requires a concerted effort to address these methodological, analytical, and ethical limitations.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The synthesis of current evidence underscores that molecular biology techniques are no longer confined to the research laboratory but are actively reshaping clinical paradigms. For practicing clinicians, the implication is a fundamental shift towards a more data-driven and proactive approach to patient management. The integration of NGS and liquid biopsies into standard oncology workflows, for instance, necessitates that oncologists become fluent in interpreting complex genomic reports and understanding the therapeutic implications of various somatic alterations. The ability to identify a targetable mutation via a blood test and subsequently monitor for resistance represents a significant advance over the previous reliance on invasive tissue biopsies and radiographic imaging alone (21, 18). In medical genetics, the increased diagnostic yield from WES and WGS empowers geneticists to provide families with definitive answers, ending long diagnostic odysseys and enabling informed reproductive planning and tailored surveillance protocols (18). Furthermore, the advent of approved gene therapies demands that hematologists and other specialists develop new competencies in patient selection, managing the complex logistics of cellular therapy administration, and understanding the unique long-term monitoring requirements for these transformative treatments (35). These rapid clinical advancements urgently call for parallel evolution in healthcare policy and the development of robust clinical guidelines. Payers and health technology assessment bodies face the formidable challenge of evaluating and funding high-cost molecular diagnostics and therapies, requiring sophisticated cost-effectiveness models that capture their full value, including improved survival, quality of life, and the avoidance of ineffective treatments (36). There is a pressing need for professional societies to establish and regularly update evidence-based guidelines that standardize the use of these technologies. Such guidelines should define the minimum required content for NGS reports, specify the clinical scenarios where liquid biopsies are preferred over tissue biopsies, and create clear pathways for the interpretation and clinical actioning of germline findings incidentally discovered during somatic testing (16). Concurrently, regulatory agencies must adapt their frameworks to accommodate the unique nature of personalized therapies, including platform-based approvals for CRISPR-edited cells and streamlined processes for companion diagnostics (37).

Despite the considerable progress, this review has identified several critical unanswered questions that must guide future research. A primary gap lies in understanding and overcoming the mechanisms of therapeutic resistance that inevitably emerge, even with highly targeted agents. Future research must move beyond single-timepoint genomic snapshots to longitudinal studies that track the dynamic evolution of tumors and other diseases under therapeutic pressure, integrating genomic data with transcriptomic and proteomic profiles to uncover non-genetic adaptive resistance pathways (38). Another paramount research priority is to directly address the lack of diversity and equity in precision medicine. Large-scale, prospective studies are urgently needed that actively recruit participants from diverse ancestral backgrounds to build more representative genomic databases, which is a prerequisite for ensuring that the benefits of precision medicine are distributed equitably (39, 35). The biological and clinical significance of the vast number of variants of unknown significance also remains a formidable challenge, requiring functional genomic studies on an unprecedented scale. To effectively answer these questions, future research must employ more rigorous and innovative study designs. For validating the clinical utility of biomarkers, prospective-retrospective studies using archived samples from completed RCTs can provide high-level evidence, while pragmatic trials embedded within healthcare systems can assess real-world effectiveness and generalizability (39). In the realm of advanced therapies, while RCTs may not always be feasible, the use of synthetic control arms constructed from historical data and the implementation of rigorous single-arm trial designs with comprehensive long-term follow-up are essential to establish causality and safety (38). For multi-omics, the field requires a concerted effort to develop standardized, clinically feasible assays and to foster interdisciplinary collaboration between molecular biologists, clinicians, and computational data scientists. The ultimate goal is to create integrated diagnostic platforms that can seamlessly process multi-omics data through validated bioinformatic pipelines to generate clinically actionable reports at the point of care (39). The journey of precision medicine is far from complete, but by addressing these implications and strategically pursuing these future directions, the immense promise of molecular biology can be systematically translated into tangible improvements in human health for all patient populations.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, this review substantiates that molecular biology techniques constitute the fundamental pillar of modern precision medicine, having irrevocably shifted the therapeutic paradigm from a generalized to a targeted approach. The evidence compellingly demonstrates that next-generation sequencing provides the essential diagnostic backbone for identifying disease-driving alterations, liquid biopsies offer a dynamic and minimally invasive means for monitoring treatment response and resistance, and CRISPR-based gene editing presents a revolutionary path for curative intent in once-intractable genetic disorders. The collective strength of this evidence, however, is tempered by significant limitations, including a preponderance of early-phase studies with limited generalizability, a lack of standardized methodologies, and a concerning underrepresentation of diverse populations in genomic research, which collectively curtail the equitable application of these advancements. Therefore, it is recommended that clinicians actively engage with these evolving technologies by integrating validated molecular profiling into standard diagnostic workflows where appropriate, while simultaneously cultivating the necessary expertise to interpret complex genomic data and counsel patients on their implications. For the research community, a concerted and collaborative effort is urgently required to conduct larger, more diverse longitudinal studies, to establish robust analytical and clinical standards, and to develop innovative trial designs that can adequately capture the long-term benefits and risks of these personalized interventions, thereby ensuring that the profound promise of precision medicine ultimately translates into equitable and improved health outcomes for all.

REFERENCES

1. Collins FS, Varmus H. A new initiative on precision medicine. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(9):793-795.
2. Schork NJ. Personalized medicine: Time for one-person trials. Nature. 2015;520(7549):609-611.
3. Tannock IF, Hickman JA. Limits to Personalized Cancer Medicine. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(13):1289-1294.
4. Cummings J, Lee G, Ritter A, Sabbagh M, Zhong K. Alzheimer's disease drug development pipeline: 2020. Alzheimers Dement (N Y). 2020;6(1):e12050.
5. World Health Organization. Assessing national capacity for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases: report of the 2021 global survey. World Health Organization; 2023 Jul 5.
6. Lander ES, Linton LM, Birren B, et al. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. Nature. 2001;409(6822):860-921.
7. Hasin Y, Seldin M, Lusis A. Multi-omics approaches to disease. Genome Biol. 2017;18(1):83.
8. Druker BJ, Talpaz M, Resta DJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of a specific inhibitor of the BCR-ABL tyrosine kinase in chronic myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2001;344(14):1031-1037.
9. Slamon DJ, Leyland-Jones B, Shak S, et al. Use of chemotherapy plus a monoclonal antibody against HER2 for metastatic breast cancer that overexpresses HER2. N Engl J Med. 2001;344(11):783-792.
10. Boycott KM, Rath A, Chong JX, et al. International Cooperation to Enable the Diagnosis of All Rare Genetic Diseases. Am J Hum Genet. 2017;100(5):695-705.
11. Relling MV, Evans WE. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. Nature. 2015;526(7573):343-350.
12. McGranahan N, Swanton C. Clonal Heterogeneity and Tumor Evolution: Past, Present, and the Future. Cell. 2017;168(4):613-628.
13. Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, et al. Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. Genet Med. 2015;17(5):405-424.
14. McCarthy MI. Painting a new picture of personalised medicine for diabetes. Diabetologia. 2017;60(5):793-799.
15. Landry LG, Ali N, Williams DR, Rehm HL, Bonham VL. Lack Of Diversity In Genomic Databases Is A Barrier To Translating Precision Medicine Research Into Practice. Health Aff (Millwood). 2018;37(5):780-785.
16. Subramanian I, Verma S, Kumar S, Jere A, Anamika K. Multi-omics Data Integration, Interpretation, and Its Application. Bioinform Biol Insights. 2020;14:1177932219899051.
17. Goodwin S, McPherson JD, McCombie WR. Coming of age: ten years of next-generation sequencing technologies. Nat Rev Genet. 2016;17(6):333-351.
18. Clark MM, Stark Z, Farnaes L, et al. Meta-analysis of the diagnostic and clinical utility of genome and exome sequencing and chromosomal microarray in children with suspected genetic diseases. NPJ Genom Med. 2018;3:16.
19. Mendell JR, Al-Zaidy S, Shell R, et al. Single-Dose Gene-Replacement Therapy for Spinal Muscular Atrophy. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(18):1713-1722.
20. Zehir A, Benayed R, Shah RH, et al. Mutational landscape of metastatic cancer revealed from prospective clinical sequencing of 10,000 patients. Nat Med. 2017;23(6):703-713.
21. Heitzer E, Haque IS, Roberts CES, Speicher MR. Current and future perspectives of liquid biopsies in genomics-driven oncology. Nat Rev Genet. 2019;20(2):71-88.
22. Oxnard GR, Thress KS, Alden RS, et al. Association Between Plasma Genotyping and Outcomes of Treatment With Osimertinib (AZD9291) in Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(28):3375-3382.
23. Christensen E, Birkenkamp-Demtröder K, Sethi H, et al. Early Detection of Metastatic Relapse and Monitoring of Therapeutic Efficacy by Ultra-Deep Sequencing of Plasma Cell-Free DNA in Patients With Urothelial Bladder Carcinoma. J Clin Oncol. 2019;37(18):1547-1557.
24. Doudna JA, Charpentier E. The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. Science. 2014;346(6213):1258096.
25. Frangoul H, Altshuler D, Cappellini MD, et al. CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Sickle Cell Disease and β-Thalassemia. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(3):252-260.
26. Ledford H. CRISPR therapy enters first human trials for inherited disease. Nature. 2020;577(7789):156.
27. Zhang F, Wei K, Slowikowski K, et al. Defining inflammatory cell states in rheumatoid arthritis joint synovial tissues by integrating single-cell transcriptomics and mass cytometry. Nat Immunol. 2019;20(7):928-942.
28. Hampel H, O'Bryant SE, Molinuevo JL, et al. Blood-based biomarkers for Alzheimer disease: mapping the road to the clinic. Nat Rev Neurol. 2018;14(11):639-652.
29. Hasin Y, Seldin M, Lusis A. Multi-omics approaches to disease. Genome Biol. 2017;18(1):83.

https://doi.org/10.61919/mct22502

30. Duyx B, Urlings MJE, Swaen GMH, Bouter LM, Zeegers MP. Scientific citations favor positive results: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Epidemiol. 2017;88:92-101.
31. Meric-Bernstam F, Brusco L, Shaw K, et al. Feasibility of Large-Scale Genomic Testing to Facilitate Enrollment Onto Genomically Matched Clinical Trials. J Clin Oncol. 2015;33(25):2753-2762.
32. Sirintrapun SJ, Lopez AM. Telemedicine in Cancer Care. Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book. 2018;38:540-545.
33. Martin AR, Kanai M, Kamatani Y, Okada Y, Neale BM, Daly MJ. Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities. Nat Genet. 2019;51(4):584-591.
34. Frangoul H, Altshuler D, Cappellini MD, et al. CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Sickle Cell Disease and β-Thalassemia. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(3):252-260.
35. Phillips KA, Deverka PA, Marshall DA, et al. Methodological issues in assessing the economic value of next-generation sequencing tests: many challenges and not enough solutions. Value Health. 2018;21(9):1033-1042.
36. Hanna E, Rémuzat C, Auquier P, Toumi M. Advanced therapy medicinal products: current and future perspectives. J Mark Access Health Policy. 2016;4:10.3402/jmahp.v4.31036.
37. Black JRM, McGranahan N. Genetic and non-genetic clonal diversity in cancer evolution. Nat Rev Cancer. 2021;21(6):379-392.
38. Martin AR, Kanai M, Kamatani Y, Okada Y, Neale BM, Daly MJ. Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities. Nat Genet. 2019;51(4):584-591.
39. Ford I, Norrie J. Pragmatic Trials. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(5):454-463.