INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
[ISSN: 0975-4725; CODEN(USA): IJPS00]
Journal Homepage: https://www.ijpsjournal.com

OPEN ACCESS

Review Paper

Biomarkers As Approach in Variables of Therapeutic Potential

Shubhangi Dorle*[1], Varsha Bherje[2], Priyanka Tayade[3], Shubhada Ganvir[4], Shivani Suryawanshi[5]

[1]*Shri Sambhaji College Of Pharmacy, Khadkut*
[2,3] *Raigad College Of Pharmacy*
[4,5] *P. Wadhwani College Of Pharmacy, Yavatmal*

ARTICLE INFO

Published: 15 Jan. 2025
Keywords:
Variables of Therapeutic Potential, practice of medicine
DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.14652014

ABSTRACT

In the practice of medicine, biomarkers have become extremely valuable from a scientific and clinical standpoint. Biomarkers have the potential to be helpful at every stage of the disease process. Markers could be utilized for risk assessment and screening prior to diagnosis. Markers can be used to decide on initial therapy selection, staging, and grading during diagnosis. They can be used to track recurrent disorders, choose further therapies, or monitor therapy throughout treatment. Numerous prospective biomarkers with potential clinical utility have been produced by developments in molecular pathology, proteomics, and genomics. In order to accomplish "personalization" of therapy and illness prevention, biomarkers discovered through the use of new high-throughput technologies will need to be incorporated into medical practice.

INTRODUCTION

Overview Anything that can be accurately measured and provides information on a person's health or disease state—such as the existence of an illness, a physiological alteration, a patient's reaction to therapy, or a psychological state—is referred to as a biological marker. For instance, brain scans can provide details about the course of multiple sclerosis, and glucose levels are utilized as a biomarker in the treatment of diabetes. Numerous scientific domains employ biomarkers, and their applications vary depending on the stage of drug development. Since biomarkers' accuracy varies, not all of them are appropriate for the creation of new medications. Biomarkers can be used to measure the following: the body's normal biological activities (heart rate, blood pressure, temperature), disease (pathological) processes (e.g.,

***Corresponding Author:** Shubhangi Dorle
Address: *Shri Sambhaji College Of Pharmacy, Khadkut.*
Email ✉: bhagyashreeatish7@gmail.com
Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

****Objectives of Using Biomarkers****

The primary goals of utilizing biomarkers in drug development include:

1. ****Enhancing Drug Development Processes****

Clinical trials aim to assess patient reactions to treatments. When direct measurement of these responses is impractical, biomarkers can serve as alternative measures for outcomes, functioning as surrogate endpoints. The use of validated biomarkers as surrogate endpoints offers various benefits, such as:

- Easier, earlier, and more precise measurements.
- Reduced influence from other treatments, smaller sample sizes, and quicker decision-making for researchers.
- Significant ethical advantages, particularly for diseases with poor prognoses.

A notable case of biomarkers used as surrogate endpoints is in the development of antiretroviral therapies for HIV/AIDS, where changes in cells (like CD4 lymphocyte counts) and HI-virus RNA levels in plasma have become key indicators instead of relying solely on clinical endpoints like disease progression or survival rates.

2. ****Personalizing Treatment****

Research into biomarkers is enhancing our ability to predict disease risks, understand disease progression after diagnosis, and gauge individual responses to treatments, leading to safer and more effective treatment choices. For instance:

- Monitoring blood sugar levels can indicate diabetes treatment efficacy.
- MRI scans can track disease progression in Multiple Sclerosis.

Additionally, many novel biomarkers, derived from genomic, proteomic, and metabolomic analyses, are being identified and utilized in new drug development endeavors.

****Biomarkers in Drug Development****

Cancer research was one of the early adopters of biomarkers, using them to streamline exploratory trials (early phase, Phase II Proof of Concept). In later-stage trials (Phase III), biomarkers can serve alongside clinical outcomes. Identifying patients who will likely respond to treatments is essential for effective clinical trials.

****Companion Diagnostics****

Companion diagnostics are approved tests that accompany new medications. These tests assist in:

- Identifying patients likely to benefit from a specific treatment.
- Excluding patients at risk of adverse effects.
- Determining optimal dosing for patients.

Many pharmaceutical companies developing targeted cancer therapies are now recognizing the advantages of co-developing diagnostics with treatments instead of conducting these developments separately.

****Drug Development Dynamics****

Throughout the development process, many investigational compounds will fail. Biomarkers have the potential to improve efficiency in drug development by expediting clinical trials. For example, a panel of biomarkers was employed in early phases of a psoriasis treatment trial, measuring epidermal thickness and gene activity in tissue samples.

****Streamlining Clinical Trials****

Biomarkers assist in identifying suitable patients for treatments, particularly through genomic markers that:

- Recognize patients with specific disease subtypes or severities.
- Exclude those at higher risk for severe side effects.
- Highlight patients most likely to benefit from certain medications.

****Expanding Knowledge****

Biomarkers contribute to a deeper understanding of how new medications function, which may foster innovative development approaches in both clinical and non-clinical settings. They also ethically support the exclusion of those unlikely to

benefit from ineffective treatments, enabling early termination of unproductive trials. Furthermore, biomarkers can accelerate drug approvals for those showing promising effects.

Challenges in Utilizing Biomarkers in Drug Development

As the use of biomarkers increases, companies encounter various challenges:

- **Technical Issues**

Biomarkers must undergo validation to confirm their accuracy, reliability, sensitivity, and specificity. Ensuring a biomarker's validity as a measure, such as its predictive capability regarding disease severity, is critical. Efficient IT systems are needed to manage and analyze the significant data generated, linking biomarker measurements accurately to patients.

- **Regulatory Hurdles**

The regulation surrounding novel biomarker methods is evolving. A biomarker can only be a surrogate endpoint if studies validate its direct relationship with disease development and treatment impacts. Authorities such as the European Medicines Agency (EMA) encourage developers to engage early in the regulatory process regarding novel biomarkers. Meeting regulatory demands for validation can be complex and costly, particularly when a biomarker is used as a surrogate endpoint.

- **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical concerns often stem from tissue sample storage and the handling of personal medical data. There are broader issues regarding targeted medicine, primarily based on biomarkers, as these treatments may only benefit a subset of patients. It is crucial to continue developing medications for those who do not fall within this subset.

The study examined various factors, including cholesterol levels, systolic blood pressure, antihypertensive medication use, smoking status, and diabetes, alongside high-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels. It was found that among the 19 novel biomarkers evaluated, lipoprotein-associated phospholipase A2, vitamin B6, IL-6, and soluble thrombomodulin contributed most significantly to enhancing the C-statistic, although the increase was minimal (ranging from 0.006 to 0.011) There are limitations to relying solely on C-statistic increments for assessing the usefulness of biomarkers in risk prediction. This metric is heavily influenced by the strength of the association between a binary exposure and outcome, and it has low sensitivity for evaluating the importance of different risk factors in a multivariable context [7]. In addition, model calibration represents another crucial aspect of evaluating a biomarker's effectiveness, indicating how well the expected risk aligns with the actual observed risk. This is vital for providing patients with accurate assessments of their risk for developing a condition. The Hosmer–Lemeshow statistical test can compare predicted and observed probabilities, revealing insights such as those found in the Women's Health Study, which indicated a notable difference in the performance of multivariable models when including C-reactive protein [8]. Nevertheless, simple comparisons of model discrimination may not reveal the specific risk groups that benefit from adding a biomarker. Another approach to evaluating biomarkers involves risk reclassification, where biomarker data can potentially shift individuals from intermediate to high or low-risk categories based on traditional risk factors. This is especially pertinent for individuals in the intermediate-risk zone identified by the Framingham risk score, who may be encouraged to undergo screening for sub-clinical atherosclerosis [9]. Model validation is crucial for ensuring that risk scores are reliable and broadly applicable. Ideally, risk scores should be developed using distinct samples for derivation and validation. Without an independent validation sample, techniques like bootstrap estimation can

assess the degree of optimism in the model's performance. For example, the Framingham risk score, established in a predominantly white population, needed recalibration to maintain accuracy when applied to Asian-American and Hispanic populations [10]. Considering the use of multiple biomarkers, researchers aim to create a concise set of biomarkers that provide the best disease outcome predictions. However, many biomarkers from varied studies complicate synthesizing a clear conclusion regarding which are truly significant for routine assessment. The historical success of certain screenings, like pap smears, contrasts with ongoing challenges related to overdiagnosis and a lack of specificity for numerous markers. The quest for effective biomarkers has led to the adoption of high-throughput platforms designed to identify numerous candidate biomarkers quickly. High-throughput technologies facilitate the analysis of genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, and potential metabolic data, which could revolutionize disease understanding and diagnostics (see Table 3). Genomic studies focus on genetic information and protein sequences, leveraging modern sequencers like the ABI 3700 to efficiently sequence entire genomes with a high accuracy rate [11]. Identification of genomic variations, particularly SNPs, plays a crucial role in determining individual disease susceptibility and treatment efficacy, a field termed pharmacogenomics [12].

Transcriptomics, the study of mRNA expression profiles under varying conditions, has emerged as a particularly promising area of research due to its practical advantages over protein analysis [13]. Techniques like cDNA microarrays and Affymetrix Gene Chips allow for comprehensive assessments of gene expression across many genes simultaneously. Proteomics, which investigates protein structure, function, and expression, helps identify potential biomarkers through various advanced methods [14]. Meanwhile, metabolomics analyzes changes in metabolite concentrations to understand cellular behavior, complementing genomic and proteomic data for a more holistic approach to disease research. The use of high-throughput technologies has led to an explosion of potential biomarkers, yet challenges such as overfitting arise when analyzing large datasets with limited outcomes [15]. Approaches used to analyze such data include machine learning methods, raising the importance of reproducibility and validation of findings across diverse sample sets. Increasing serum DNA levels have been linked to various cancers and diseases, with specific mutations serving as potential DNA biomarkers [16]. Epigenetic factors like DNA methylation also show promise in identifying cancer-associated changes in gene expression. On the RNA front, comprehensive assessments of mRNA expression profiles have demonstrated the potential to reveal previously unknown molecular subtypes and improve prognostic capabilities for conditions like breast cancer [20]. Protein biomarkers, mostly recognized one at a time, can be more effective when evaluated as patterns in tumor classification and treatment response prediction. New methods for higher-throughput profiling of proteins are being increasingly employed [21]. In clinical risk assessment and screening, various biomarkers contribute to understanding health risks. For instance, the Framingham score has been enhanced with different biomarkers, while strategies using alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) for liver cancer screening are often limited by poor sensitivity and specificity [23]. Biomarkers also play a role in diagnostic classifications that predict treatment outcomes, potentially leading to better-targeted therapies based on specific molecular markers found in tumors [19]. As the understanding of molecular mechanisms behind cancers improves, combining traditional methods with biomarker profiling could yield better patient stratification for treatment and

prognosis Ultimately, the future of personalized medicine lies in integrating molecular biomarkers with genomic research to develop more effective targeted therapies for complex diseases such as hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) .

Future Approach

A concerted effort is essential to advance biomarker discovery. Many existing biomarkers do not meet the necessary criteria for a wide range of diseases, making the validation of new biomarkers crucial. The generation of prospective data will be important for validating and demonstrating clinical usefulness. High-throughput technologies are beginning to elucidate disease processes and other biological mechanisms at a molecular level, thus providing opportunities to identify and characterize new biomarkers. The field of molecular biology is increasingly seen as promoting 'personalized medicine,' which involves aligning biological information from molecular diagnostics with therapy selection. Well-structured initiatives are needed to enhance the collective understanding of the molecular history of diseases and to keep pace with advancements in biomarker development. The advancement of molecular medicine, alongside the discovery and clinical application of new biomarkers, is poised to significantly reshape the field of medicine. In India, science could have a substantial impact globally if scientists and policymakers commit adequate time and resources to the biomarker field. This commitment should extend beyond task forces and excellence initiatives, focusing instead on output-driven goals within a specific timeline.

REFERENCES

1. D'Agostino R B Sr, Grundy S, Sullivan L M and Wilson P 2001 Validation of the Framingham coro-Nary heart disease prediction scores results of a Multiple ethnic groups investigation; JAMA 286 2180–187.
2. Venter J C, Adams M D, Myers E W, Li P W, Mural R J et al 2001 The sequence of the human Genome; Science 291 5507 1304–1351.
3. Syvanen A C 2001 Accessing genetic variation: geno-Typing single nucleotide polymorphisms; Nat. Rev. Genet. 2 12 930–942.
4. Verma M and Srivastava S 2003 New cancer biomark-Ers deriving from NCI early detection research; Recent Results Cancer Res. 163 72–84.
5. Tycko B 2000 Epigenetic gene silencing in cancer; J. Clin. Invest. 105 401–407.
6. Ellerhorst J A et al 2003 Heterozygosity or homozy-Gosity for 2 HLA class II haplotypes predict favorable Outcomes for renal cell carcinoma treated with cytokine Therapy; J. Urol. 169 2084–2088.
7. Feng Z et al 2004 Research issues and strategies for Genomic and proteomic biomarker discovery and vali-Dation: A statistical perspective; Pharmacogenomics 5709–719.
8. Ransohoff D F 2004 Rules of evidence for cancer Molecular-marker discovery and validation; Nat. Rev. Cancer 4 309–314.
9. Pantel K and Brakenhoff R H 2004 Dissecting the Metastatic cascade; Nature Rev. Cancer 4 448–456.
10. Ludwig J A and Weinstein J N 2005 Biomarkers in Cancer staging, prognosis and treatment selection; Nat. Rev. Cancer 5 11 845–856.
11. Gray J W and Collins C 2000 Genome changes and Gene expression in human solid tumours; Carcinogene-Sis 21 443–452.
12. Petricoin E F, Zoon K C, Kohn E C, Barrett J C And Liotta L A 2002 Clinical proteomics: Translating Benchside promise into bedside reality; Nature Rev. Drug Discov. 1 683–695. Verma M, Wright G L Jr, Hanash S M, Gopal-

Srivastava R and Srivastava S 2001 Pro-Teomic approaches within the NCI early detection Research network for the discovery and identifica-Tion of cancer biomarkers; Ann. NY Acad. Sci. 945103–115.

13. Giannelli G, Fransvea E, Trerotoli P, Beaugrand M, Marinosci F, Lupo L, Nkontchou G, Dentico P and Antonaci S 2007 Clinical validation of combined sero-Logical biomarkers for improved hepatocellular carci-Noma diagnosis in 961 patients; Clin. Chim. Acta. 383 (1–2) 147–152..

HOW TO CITE: Shubhangi Dorle*, Varsha Bherje, Priyanka Tayade, Shubhada Ganvir, Shivani Suryawanshi, Biomarkers As Approach in Variables of Therapeutic Potential, Int. J. of Pharm. Sci., 2025, Vol 3, Issue 1, 1177-1182. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14652014