WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.084
Volume 10, Issue 4, 408-417. Review Article ISSN 2277– 7105

A REVIEW ON BIOMARKERS AND ITS IMPORTANCES

P. Priyanaka*, B. Renu Sri, G. Sushma, T. Pravalika, Dr. P. Vishnu Priya, AVSSS Gupta Aytam and Dr. J.V.C Sharma

Department of Pharmaceutical Biotechnology, Joginpally B.R Pharmacy College, Yenkapally (V), Moinabad (M), Ranga Reddy Dist, Telangana, Hyderabad- 500 075.

Article Received on
13 Feb. 2021,

Revised on 05 March 2021,
Accepted on 25 March 2021

DOI: 10.20959/wjpr20214-20063

***Corresponding Author**
P. Priyanaka
Department of Pharmaceutical Biotechnology, Joginpally B.R Pharmacy College, Yenkapally(V), Moinabad (M), Ranga Reddy Dist, Telangana, Hyderabad-500075.

ABSTRACT

Biomarkers give a dynamic and incredible way to deal with understanding the range of neurological illness with applications in observational and logical the study of disease transmission, randomized clinical preliminaries, screening and determination and visualization. Characterized as adjustments in the constituents of tissues or body liquids, these markers offer the methods for homogeneous order of a sickness and danger factors, and the can broaden our base data about the basic pathogenesis of infection. Biomarkers can likewise mirror the whole range of illness from the most punctual indications to the terminal stages. This concise audit portrays the significant employments of biomarkers in clinical examination. Cautious evaluation of the legitimacy of biomarkers is needed concerning the phase of sickness. Reasons for fluctuation in the estimation of biomarkers range from the person to the lab. Issues that influence the investigation of biomarkers are examined alongside proposals on the best way to manage predisposition and jumbling**.**

KEYWORDS: Biomarkers, cancer, Alzheimer's infection, Parkinson's disease, antecedent biomarkers.

INTRODUCTION

Biological markers (biomarkers) have been described by way of Hulka and colleagues1 as "cell, biochemical or molecular changes which might be measurable in biological media together with human tissues, cells, or fluids." More recently, the definition has been broadened to consist of organic characteristics that can be objectively measured and

evaluated as a hallmark of ordinary organic processes, pathogenic approaches, or pharmacological responses to a healing intervention. Biomarkers consist of equipment and technology that may resource in understanding the prediction, motive, analysis, development, regression, or outcome of treatment of ailment.[1]

Biomarkers of all types have been used by generations of epidemiologists, physicians, and scientists to study human disease. The application of biomarkers in the diagnosis and management of cardiovascular disease, infections, immunological and genetic disorders, and cancer are well known.[2] Their use in research has grown out of the need to have a more direct measurement of exposures in the causal pathway of disease that is free from recall bias, and that can also have the potential of providing information on the absorption and metabolism of the exposures. Neuroscientists have also relied on biomarkers to assist in the diagnosis and treatment of nervous system disorders and to investigate their cause. Blood, brain, cerebrospinal fluid, muscle, nerve, skin, and urine have been employed to gain information about the nervous system in both the healthy and diseased state. This paper focuses on biomarkers as defined by Hulka et al., i.e., direct measures of biological media, and other papers in this issue will address brain imaging and other markers.

The rapid growth of molecular biology and laboratory technology has expanded to the point at which the application of technically advanced biomarkers will soon become even more feasible. Molecular biomarkers will, in the hands of clinical disease with obvious applications in analytic epidemiology, clinical trials and disease prevention, diagnosis, and disease management.[3]

Types of biomarkers

Biomarkers have been classified by Perera and Weinstein based on the sequence of events from exposure to disease.[4] Though biomarkers readily lend themselves to epidemiological investigations, they are also useful in the investigation of the natural history and prognosis of a disease. Schult has outlined the capabilities of biomarkers. In addition to delineating the events between exposure and disease, biomarkers have the potential to identify the earliest events in the natural history, reducing the degree of misclassification of both disease and exposure, opening a window to potential mechanisms related to the disease pathogenesis, accounting for some of the variability and effect modification of risk prediction. Biomarkers can also provide insight into disease progression, prognosis, and response to therapy. There are two major types of biomarkers: biomarkers of exposure, which are used in risk prediction,

and biomarkers of disease, which are used in screening and diagnosis and monitoring of disease progression. Biomarkers used in risk prediction, in screening, and as diagnostic tests are well established, and they offer distinct and obvious advantages. The classification of many neurological diseases is based on either standardized clinical criteria or histological diagnoses. Biomarkers also have the potential to identify neurological disease at an early stage, to provide a method for homogeneous classification of a disease, and to extend our knowledge-base concerning the underlying disease pathogenesis. These advantages have direct application to all types of clinical investigation, from clinical trials to observational studies in epidemiology.[5]

In epidemiological (or quasi-experimental) investigations, biomarkers improve validity while reducing bias in the measurement of exposures (or risk factors) for neurological disease. Rather than relying on a history of exposure to a putative risk factor, direct measurement of the level of exposure or the chromosomal alteration resulting from the exposure lessens the possibility of misclassification of exposure. Such misclassifications not only produce inaccurate and deceptive results but also reduce the power of studies to detect health effects. Thus, the use of biomarkers improves the sensitivity and specificity of the measurement of the exposures or risk factors.

Molecular biomarkers have the additional potential to identify individuals susceptible to disease.[6] Molecular genetics have already had an impact on neurological practice, leading to improved diagnosis. Classification of populations in terms of the degree of susceptibility on the basis of such biomarkers produces greater accuracy than relying on historical definitions of susceptibility. For example, a biomarker will allow the stratification of a population on the basis of a specific “genotype” associated with a disease rather than relying on a report of the “family history” of the disease. The ability to quantify “susceptibility” in this way can be an extremely important method for estimating disease risk among various populations.[7]

Molecular biomarkers have the additional potential to identify individuals susceptible to disease. Molecular genetics have already had an impact on neurological practice, leading to improved diagnosis. Classification of populations in terms of the degree of susceptibility on the basis of such biomarkers produces greater accuracy than relying on historical definitions of susceptibility. For example, a biomarker will allow the stratification of a population on the basis of a specific “genotype” associated with a disease rather than relying on a report of the

"family history" of the disease. The ability to quantify "susceptibility" in this way can be an extremely important method for estimating disease risk among various populations.[8]

Antecedent biomarkers

Environmental exposures effect modifiers, or risk factors[9]

When a disease is suspected of resulting from a toxic exposure, researchers naturally wish to measure the degree of exposure. External exposure is the measured concentration of the toxin in an individual's immediate environment. While questionnaires offer an historical account of the exposure, direct measurement of the alleged toxin in the air, water, soil, or food can provide accurate information regarding the "dose" of the exposure. Measurement of the external dose provides the basis to understand the relationship to the disease process, but a measurement of "internal" dose may provide more accuracy.

When the toxin is identified in tissues or body fluids it becomes a biomarker for the internal dose. A biomarker that measures a "biologically effective dose" generally indicates the amount of toxin or chemical measured in the target organ or its surrogate. Lead exposure is an excellent example. A history of lead exposure can be strengthened by measurement of lead in the environment, but the best indication of the dose of exposure may be determined in blood and tissues (hair, nails, teeth). The pharmacokinetic properties of the toxin or chemical of interest becomes important to consider in measurement of the internal dose because a number of body fluids could be used based on the pharmacologic properties of the agent. Some chemicals such as halogenated hydrocarbons are stored in adipose tissue but others, such as organophosphate pesticides, are better measured in blood or urine.[9]

Genetic susceptibility[10]

Epidemiologic examinations can inspect familial conglomeration and evaluate hereditary and natural commitments to an infection by utilizing life table techniques and repeat hazard. Changes in qualities that bring about Mendelian types of illness are commonly deterministic. Variation alleles in qualities or polymorphisms might be identified with powerlessness however are not deterministic. Most grown-up beginning degenerative infections of the sensory system are probably going to be a composite of related attributes, heritable and natural. The corresponded mixes of these highlights comprise the attribute or sickness. In this manner, these kinds of forerunner biomarkers could conceivably be straightforwardly associated with the etiology. In certain cases the hereditary variation is neither important nor adequate to cause the sickness. In any case, they can be amazing precursors at any phase of

the illness pathway. By definition these predecessor biomarkers exist before the sickness or the result happens and are free of different openings. They improve the accuracy in the estimation of different affiliations, since they might be synergistic or opposing**.**

For neurological issues, biomarkers of hereditary weakness are quickly getting more accessible. Recognizable proof of the variation allele in a quality, for example, APOE (apolipoprotein E), is very valuable in evaluating hazard and in giving data th respect to the pathogenesis of the Alzheimer's illness. With this data agents would now be able to inspect different qualities or natural danger elements to decide if they altered (increment or lessening) the danger of Alzheimer's infection. Additionally, varieties in a few qualities seem to impact weakness to Parkinson's sickness, which has likewise been identified with ecological danger factors. When set up, a particular genotype may be utilized to foresee a relationship with a specific natural toxin.[11]

Intermediate biomarkers[12]

Some biomarkers represent direct steps in the causal pathway of a disease and are therefore strongly related to disease. Others are related in some indirect way to the cause. There are numerous possibilities to consider. A biomarker could be dependent on another known or unknown factor to cause disease. Thus, it is not the only determinant but it is in the causal pathway and remains strongly related to the disease. The biomarker could also be related to an exposure that has already been identified or represents an alteration caused by the exposure that results in the disease. The most precarious situation is one in which the biomarker is related to some unknown factor that is also related to the exposure. This type of confounder, if unidentified, can decrease the validity of the association between the biomarker and the disease.

Biomarkers of disease[13]

Screening, diagnostic Test and Prognosis

Biomarkers portraying prodromal signs empower prior finding or consider the result important to be resolved at a more crude phase of illness. Blood, pee, and cerebrospinal liquid give the vital organic data to the analysis. In these conditions, biomarkers are utilized as a marker of a natural factor that addresses either a subclinical appearance, phase of the problem, or a proxy indication of the infection.

Biomarkers utilized for screening or determination likewise frequently address proxy signs of the sickness. The possible employments of this class of biomarkers include:

- ✓ Recognizable proof of people bound to get influenced or who are in the "preclinical" phases of the sickness,
- ✓ Decrease in illness heterogeneity in clinical preliminaries or epidemiologic investigations, 3) Impression of the characteristic history of infection enveloping the periods of enlistment, inactivity and recognition.
- ✓ Focus for a clinical preliminary. The improvement in legitimacy and exactness far exceed the trouble in acquiring such tissues from patients**.**

Most moral audit sheets and the medical services frameworks require sufficient development for people that screen positive whether or not or not they have the illness. Likewise, treatment ought to be accessible for the individuals who screen positive and it should be available and adequate. The individuals who screen positive and are sick ought to be permitted admittance to therapies and those therapies should be satisfactory and accessible. It is helpful to recollect that the principle advantage of screening is essential (before beginning of manifestations) or auxiliary (early or prodromal identification) counteraction. Consider the advantages of leading a remedial preliminary in patients before obvious appearances happen.

Symptomatic tests for neurological illnesses are utilized with expanded recurrence in clinical examination and practice. In the symptomatic exertion, assortment of data from different sources, some of which incorporates results from analytic tests, assists with accomplishing a definitive objective of expanding the likelihood of a given finding. Clinical tests are additionally performed, however presumably less regularly, for different reasons, for example, the accompanying: to quantify infection seriousness, to foresee illness event, or to screen the reaction to a specific treatment. All the more significantly, biomarkers for illness effectively loan themselves to clinical preliminaries. Another preferred position of this sort of analytic test is the decrease in infection heterogeneity in clinical preliminaries or observational epidemiologic examinations, prompting better comprehension of common history of illness incorporating the periods of enlistment, dormancy and identification.

Variability[14]

In spite of the fact that biomarkers have various favorable circumstances, inconstancy is a significant concern. Changeability applies whether or not the biomarker addresses an openness or impact modifier, a substitute of the illness, or a sign of helplessness.

Interindividual changeability can result from the measure of an outer openness or from the manner in which a putative poison is processed. For instance, people presented to a similar synthetic may contrast in their capacity (or powerlessness) to use the specialist, or they may have encountered various kinds of openings (in the field as contrasted and in the workplace). Intra individual inconstancy is typically identified with research center blunders or different conditions, or openings exceptional to the person. Gathering inconstancy is likewise experienced, however this is regularly the ideal result of an investigation. Clearly, it is best when bunch contrasts are huge. In any case, the capacity of a biomarker to recognize bunches is estimated by affectability and explicitness or comparable fluctuation gauges. Thought of the wellsprings of fluctuation in the estimation of a biomarker diminishes the potential for misclassification of the openness.

Validity[15]

The assessment of the legitimacy of a biomarker is unpredictable. Schulte and Perera13 recommend three parts of estimation legitimacy: 1) content legitimacy, which shows how much a biomarker mirrors the natural wonder considered, 2) develop legitimacy, which relates to other important attributes of the infection or quality, for instance other biomarkers or sickness indications, and 3) model legitimacy, which shows the degree to which the biomarker associates with the particular illness and is generally estimated by affectability, explicitness, and prescient power.4 To additionally assess the impact of misclassification of sickness, bogus positives and bogus negatives just as certain and negative prescient force ought to likewise be assessed. In an ideal circumstance the biomarker has an unmistakable prescient worth however by and large one should be set up. The utilization of beneficiary administrator trademark bends can give the apparatuses important to decide the most ideal decision as far as affectability and bogus positive rates, especially when different tests are used.

The agent should be clear about the utilization of the biomarker in the investigation. Blunders are frequently made when biomarker information are over deciphered. For instance, the aftereffects of one investigation may show that a particular biomarker (gathered as a proportion of an openness or helplessness) is firmly connected with a specific infection or result. The agent, then again, deciphers the outcome as a biomarker for the illness or the noticed result. Regardless of how high the chances proportion or relative danger, a biomarker of this kind couldn't be relied upon to work as an indicative test except if it is an appearance

of the sickness. For instance, the APOE-ε4 allele is emphatically connected with Alzheimer's illness, however its quality doesn't derive sickness. Numerous patients without an APOE-ε4 allele build up Alzheimer's infection and a few people with an APOE-ε4 allele don't build up this condition.

Measurement errors[16]

Flawed estimation of the biomarker would normally prompt expired legitimacy of the connection to the infection. In any case, there are various kinds of estimation blunders other than those mistakes that happen in the lab. Issues with the assortment gear or in the transportation of examples to the research facility can influence the estimation of the biomarker. Ill-advised capacity of tests or changes away climate can likewise influence estimation of biomarkers. Experts are the overseers of most examples thus suitable preparing of new work force is fundamental. At long last, receipt and control blunders, for example, in the record of distinguishing proof numbers whenever done by hand can generally be wellspring of mistake. An efficient strategies manual laying out the subtleties for documentation, stockpiling, observing of examples and looking after records, can ease a significant number of these issues. Most research facilities and enormous scope examines establishment a quality affirmation and quality-control program to diminish estimation blunders.

Confounding[17]

The impacts of potential confounders, for example, age, sex, diet, and other metabolic components ought to be explored prior to starting the examination. Biologic soundness is basic especially if the biomarker is to be put away for any period of time. Banked serum or plasma is of extraordinary incentive in any examination except if it influences the pharmacologic properties of the biomarker. For instance, a few supplements, for example, nutrients don't store well since they are light-touchy. Capacity of all tissues including lymphocytes and separated DNA can be costly and the solidness of the biomarker contemplates should be assessed if capacity is needed for long stretches. These are regularly neglected in the investigations and can genuinely influence the result. One should utilize information on potential confounders when planning the examination and gather applicable inner and outside data that may impact the estimation. This data can be remembered for the examination of the connection between the biomarker and the result of interest.[18]

CONCLUSION

Biomarkers have gained immense scientific and clinical value and interest in the practise of medicine. Before diagnosis, markers could be used for screening and risk assessment. Biomarkers can determine staging, grading, and selection of initial therapy during diagnosis. They can be used to monitor therapy, select additional therapy, or monitor recurrent diseases during treatment. Advances in genomics, proteomics and molecular pathology have generated many candidate biomarkers with potential clinical value. In the future, integration of biomarkers, identified using emerging high-throughput technologies, into medical practise will be necessary to achieve 'personalization' of treatment and disease prevention. A large concerted effort is required to advance the field of biomarker discovery. Most current biomarkers do not satisfy the required characteristics for use among the spectrum of diseases. Validation of new biomarkers is necessary. Generation of prospective data will be necessary for validation and demonstration of clinical utility.

REFERENCES

1. Hulka BS. Overview of biological markers. In: Biological markers in epidemiology (Hulka BS, Griffith JD, Wilcosky TC, eds),. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990; 3–15.
2. Naylor S. Biomarkers: current perspectives and future prospects. Expert Rev Mol Diagn, 2003; 3: 525–529.
3. Perera FP, Weinstein IB. Molecular epidemiology: recent advances and future directions. Carcinogenesis, 2000; 21: 517–524. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Gordis L. Epidemiology and public policy. In: Epidemiology (Gordis L, ed), Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1996; 247–256.
5. Verbeek MM, De Jong D, Kremer HP. Brain-specific proteins in cerebrospinal fluid for the diagnosis of neurodegenerative diseases. Ann Clin Biochem, 2003; 40: 25–40. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Galasko D. New approaches to diagnose and treat Alzheimer's disease: a glimpse of the future. Clin Geriatr Med, 2001; 17: 393–410. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Rohlff C. Proteomics in neuropsychiatric disorders. Int J Neuropsychopharmacol, 2001; 4: 93–102. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Reiber H, Peter JB. Cerebrospinal fluid analysis: disease-related data patterns and evaluation programs. J Neurol Sci, 2001; 184: 101–122. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

9. Schulte PA. A conceptual and historical framework for molecular epidemiology. In: Molecular epidemiology: principles and practices (Schulte PA, Perera FP, eds), 1993; 3–44.
10. Merikangas K. Genetic epidemiology: bringing genetics to the population-the NAPE Lecture Acta Psychiatr Scand, 2001; 105: 3–13. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Muller U, Graeber MB. Neurogenetic diseases: molecular diagnosis and therapeutic approaches. J Mol Med, 1996; 74: 71–84. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. Atkinson A J et al NCI-FDA Biomarkers Definitions Working Group; Biomarkers and surrogate endpoints: preferred definitions and conceptual framework; Clin. Pharmaco. Ther, 2001; 69: 89–95.
13. Sullivan Pepe M Phases of biomarker development for early detection of cancer; J. Natl. Cancer Inst, 2001; 93: 1054–1061.
14. Sackett D L, Hayens R B, Guyatt G H and Tugwell P. The interpretation of diagnostic data; In: Clinical epidemiology. A basic science for clinical medicine (2nd edition) (Boston: Little Brown), 1991; 69–152.
15. Wilson P W, D'Agostino R B, Levy D, Belanger A M, Silbershatz H and Kannel W B Prediction of coronary heart disease using risk factor categories; Circulation, 1997, 1998; 1837–1847.
16. Tateishi R, Yoshida H, Matsuyama Y, Mine N, Kondo Y and Omata M 2008 Diagnostic accuracy of tumour markers for hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review; Hepatol. Int., 2008; 2: 17–30.
17. Folsom A R, Chambless L E, Ballantyne C M et al. An assessment of incremental coronary risk prediction using C-reactive protein and other novel risk markers: The atherosclerosis risk in communities study; Arch. Intern. Med, 2006; 166(13): 1368–1373.
18. Cook N R, Use and misuse of the receiver operating characteristic curve in risk prediction; Circulation, 2007; 115(7): 928–935.