

# Are We Relying too heavily on Genetic Linkages in Cancer Research

Fernandez Muller\*

*Department of Molecular Biology, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom*

\*Corresponding author: Email: muller@fer.ac.uk

Citation: Muller F (2021). Are We Relying too heavily on Genetic Linkages in Cancer Research. Electronic J Biol, S9:11-12

Received: November 05, 2021; Accepted: November 19, 2021; Published: November 26, 2021

## Commentary

There is undeniably more disease research than some other biomedical point. Maybe due fundamentally to the general simplicity with which researchers can lead hereditary malignant growth research, practically every human quality has relationship with the sickness somehow. Another paper questions the legitimacy of a significant number of these affiliations and recommends that specialists think about seeking after different roads of examination. Disease is, by a wide margin, the most broadly investigated natural or biomedical theme, and for a valid justification. In the United Kingdom, malignant growth will influence 1 out of each 2 Trusted Source individuals sooner or later in their lives [1].

Nonetheless, another examination of the PubMed library of biomedical exploration writing observes that the quest for associations among qualities and malignant growth has made an excess of announced affiliations, making new exploration much more troublesome. Now, practically all human qualities have an association with disease somehow. As per the article, which shows up in Trends In Genetics Trusted Source, the PubMed library holds somewhere around one paper on 17,371 human qualities. Of these, 87.7% notice malignant growth in something like one distribution. Of the 4,186 qualities that are the subjects of at least 100 PubMed articles, just three qualities have no relationship with malignant growth [2].

The creator of the new paper, Dr. Joo Pedro de Magalhes of the University of Liverpool in the U.K., composes, A unimaginable 24.4% of all distributions related with qualities in PubMed notice disease. Dr. de Magalhes associates this abundance with affiliations has to do with how generally simple it is to perform disease research according to a hereditary viewpoint: Contrasted and other normal infections, like heart or neurodegenerative illnesses, disease is likewise apparently more clear to consider, given the wide accessibility of materials, for example, cell lines. At the end of the day, the test strategies important to concentrate on malignant growth appear to have lower specialized constraints contrasted and numerous other sickness situations [3].

Affiliations are not really proof of real causal connections, such a great deal this exploration might add up to pointless factual commotion that makes useful examination more troublesome. The investigation refers to multiple manners by which the excess of revealed affiliations repress advantageous examination: It sabotages the respectability of award grants since The investigation of almost any human quality can be legitimized (e.g., in award applications) in light of existing writing by its expected pertinence to disease, says the review [4].

Genome-wide examinations and high-throughput investigations are bound to catch a pointless scope of quality/malignant growth relationship, with so many existing in the writing. The paper sees as a more prominent than-close to 100% possibility of at least three qualities tracking down their direction into an outcome. Predispositions in malignant growth research distributions can influence the honesty of organization investigations, for example, protein-protein cooperations, that are affected by the quantity of investigations of every protein. Dr. de Magalhes composes that analysts ought to be aware of the inclination toward looking for quality relationship for disease, thinking about it in their conversations with different scientists, and in evaluating their work: In hereditary qualities and genomics, in a real sense everything is related with malignant growth. On the off chance that a quality has not been related with malignant growth yet, it presumably implies it has not been concentrated on enough and will undoubtedly be related with disease later on. Says Dr. de Magalhes, In a logical reality where everything and each quality can be related with disease, the test is figuring out which are the vital drivers of malignant growth and seriously encouraging remedial targets [5].

## References

- [1] Weiss KM, Terwilliger JD (2000). How many diseases does it take to map a gene with SNPs? Nat Gen. 26:151-7.

- [2] Richards CE, Sheehan KM, Kay EW, et al. (2021) Development of a novel weighted ranking method for immunohistochemical quantification of a heterogeneously expressed protein in gastro-esophageal cancers. *Cancers*.13:1286.
- [3] Cha Y, Erez T, Reynolds IJ, Kumar D, et al. (2018). Drug repurposing from the perspective of pharmaceutical companies. *Br J Pharmacol*. 175:168-80.
- [4] Muggia F, Safra T (2014). 'BRCAness' and its implications for platinum action in gynecologic cancer. *Anticancer Res*. 34:551-6.
- [5] Young JJ, Silber T, Bruno D, et al. (2016). Is there progress? An overview of selecting biomarker candidates for major depressive disorder. *Front Psychiatry*. 25;7:72.