Journal of Carcinogenesis
Covering Genesis to Therapeutics

Journal of Carcinogenesis, ISSN: 1477-3163
2025; Vol 24: Issue 2s, https://carcinogenesis.com/

A prospective study on Genomic Insights into Human Health and Disease

Dr.Sujayendra Kulkarni [1], Dr Suyamindra Kulkarni [2], Sadashiv S. O[3], Dr Pavan Kulkarni [4], Dr Naveen Charantimath[5]

[1]Dept of Genetics and Genomics, S Nijalingappa Medical college and HSK Hospital,Navanager, Bagalkot 587102

Email ID : sujayendra.kulkarni@gmail.com

[2]Associate Professor, Dept of Microbiology,Raichur University, Raichur 584134

Email ID : suyamindrask@gmail.com

[3]Department of studies in Food Technology, Davanagere University, Davanagere, Karnataka.

Email ID : Sadashivso@gmail.com

[4]Dept of Pathology,S Nijalingappa Medical College And Hsk Hospital, Navanager, Bagalkot 587102

[5]Dept of Endocrinology,S Nijalingappa Medical college and HSK Hospital, Navanager,Bagalkot 587102

Email ID : naveen.charantimath@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author:**

Dr Suyamindra Kulkarni

Associate Professor,Dept of Microbiology, Raichur University, Raichur 584134

Email ID : uyamindrask@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The field of genomics has become integral to understanding human health and disease. Genomics has emerged as a transformative discipline, reshaping our understanding of human health and disease. By identifying genetic variations, regulatory mechanisms, and molecular pathways, genomics bridges the gap between biology and clinical practice. Recent advances in sequencing and computational biology have facilitated the identification of genetic variants underlying both common and rare disorders.

Materials and Methods: This was a prospective, multicenter, observational study conducted among 480 patients with cancer, cardiovascular, neurological, and rare genetic disorders was undertaken between January 2024–June 2025. Whole-exome sequencing (WES), genome-wide association studies (GWAS), and transcriptomic profiling were applied. Inclusion criteria included adults aged 18–70 years consenting to testing; exclusion criteria encompassed terminal illness (<6 months survival) and inability to consent.

Results: Pathogenic or likely pathogenic variants were identified in 38% of patients. GWAS highlighted novel associations in 14% of cases, while transcriptomic profiling revealed disease-specific gene expression in 32%. Six tables summarize demographics, diagnostic yield, clinical impact, pharmacogenomic findings, cost-effectiveness, and comparison with previous studies.

Conclusion: Genomics provides critical insights into the etiology, diagnosis, and management of human disease. Its integration into clinical medicine enhances precision healthcare but requires improved infrastructure, ethical governance, and equitable access.

Keywords: *Genomics, Human Health, Disease, Precision Medicine, Pharmacogenomics, Epigenetics*

How to Cite: Dr.Sujayendra Kulkarni , Dr Suyamindra Kulkarni , Sadashiv S. O, Dr Pavan Kulkarni , Dr Naveen Charantimath, (2025) A prospective study on Genomic Insights into Human Health and Disease, *Journal of Carcinogenesis*, *Vol.24, No.2s*, 613-617

1. INTRODUCTION

The advent of genomics has revolutionized biomedical research and clinical practice, providing unprecedented insights into human health and disease. Following the Human Genome Project, rapid advances in sequencing technologies have allowed for the large-scale study of genetic variation, structural variants, and their contributions to disease susceptibility

and treatment response.1 Since 2015, genomics has been increasingly integrated into medicine, particularly in oncology, rare disease diagnosis, and pharmacogenomics.2

Cancer genomics has been one of the most transformative applications. Large-scale initiatives such as The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and international consortia have identified actionable mutations, leading to targeted therapies in breast, lung, and colorectal cancers. For example, genomic testing of BRCA1/2 mutations informs the use of PARP inhibitors, while EGFR and ALK testing guides tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). [3] These examples highlight how genomic insights translate directly to survival benefits.

Rare diseases, which collectively affect more than 300 million people worldwide, are another domain where genomics has proven indispensable. Traditional diagnostic approaches often fail to identify the underlying etiology, resulting in a "diagnostic odyssey" lasting years. [4] Whole-exome sequencing (WES) and whole-genome sequencing (WGS) now allow for the identification of causative variants in 25–60% of patients with suspected genetic disorders. This not only provides definitive diagnoses but also informs genetic counseling and targeted therapies. [5]

Pharmacogenomics represents an equally significant area of progress. Variation in genes such as CYP2C19, CYP2D6, and DPYD has been linked to interindividual differences in drug metabolism, efficacy, and toxicity^10^. Incorporating genomic data into prescribing decisions reduces adverse drug reactions and improves treatment efficacy. [6]

Epigenomics has further expanded our understanding of disease mechanisms. DNA methylation, histone modifications, and non-coding RNAs have been identified as biomarkers for cancer, cardiovascular diseases, and neurodegenerative disorders. Epigenetic therapies, including histone deacetylase inhibitors, are now under clinical investigation. [7]

Population genomics projects such as the UK Biobank and GenomeAsia100K are addressing genetic diversity and health disparities. These initiatives generate vast datasets that allow polygenic risk scoring and disease prediction across different populations. Importantly, they also underscore the need for equitable representation in genomic research to prevent healthcare inequities. [8]

Despite these advances, challenges remain. Integrating genomics into healthcare requires infrastructure for bioinformatics, clinical training, and ethical frameworks addressing privacy and equity. [9] Disparities in access to genomic medicine persist, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. [10]

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This was a prospective, multicenter, observational study conducted between January 2024–June 2025 across four tertiary-care centers.

Study Population

A total of 480 patients were recruited across oncology, cardiovascular, neurological, and rare genetic disorder cohorts.

Inclusion Criteria

Adults aged 18–70 years.

Confirmed or suspected genetic disorder.

Consent for genomic testing and data use.

Willingness to undergo longitudinal follow-up.

Exclusion Criteria

Severe comorbidities limiting life expectancy to <6 months.

Pregnancy (ethical considerations).

Inability to provide informed consent.

Prior enrollment in another genomic trial within 1 year.

Genomic Testing Methodology

Whole-Exome Sequencing (WES): Conducted on 260 patients with 100× coverage.

Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS): Performed in 120 patients with polygenic disorders.

Transcriptomic Profiling (RNA-seq): Applied to 100 patients for expression analysis.

Variant Interpretation: Conducted using **ACMG guidelines**; classified as pathogenic, likely pathogenic, VUS, or benign.

Validation: Clinically relevant variants validated with Sanger sequencing.

Clinical Data Collection

Baseline demographics, disease history, and therapeutic interventions were recorded. Clinical decision-making was evaluated pre- and post-genomic testing.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics summarized variant detection and outcomes. Chi-square tests were used for categorical comparisons. A cost-effectiveness model was applied to evaluate economic impact. P-values <0.05 were considered significant.

3. RESULTS

Table 1. Demographics of Study Population

Variable	Oncology (n=170)	Cardiovascular (n=120)	Neurology (n=110)	Rare Disorders (n=80)	Total (n=480)
Mean Age (years)	55.3 ± 8.1	50.2 ± 9.4	44.5 ± 10.2	32.8 ± 11.0	46.9 ± 9.7
Male (%)	57	59	53	46	54
Female (%)	43	41	47	54	46

Table 2. Diagnostic Yield of Genomic Testing

Disease Group	WES Positive (%)	GWAS Positive (%)	RNA-seq Positive (%)	Overall Yield (%)
Oncology	40	13	31	36
Cardiovascular	34	15	28	32
Neurology	31	18	27	32
Rare Disorders	49	17	39	45
Total	**38**	**14**	**32**	**37.7**

Table 3. Clinical Impact of Genomic Testing

Impact	Oncology (%)	Cardiovascular (%)	Neurology (%)	Rare Disorders (%)	Total (%)
Change in Diagnosis	15	12	13	21	15
Change in Therapy	29	20	18	22	22
Pharmacogenomic-guided Drug Use	23	27	25	29	26

Table 4. Pharmacogenomic Variants Identified

Gene Variant	Frequency (%)	Drug Class Affected	Clinical Action
CYP2C19	13	Antiplatelets	Dose adjustment
CYP2D6	11	Antidepressants, opioids	Alternative selection
DPYD	9	Chemotherapy (5-FU)	Avoid toxicity

SLCO1B1	7	Statins	Drug substitution

Table 5. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Parameter	Pre-Genomic Testing	Post-Genomic Testing	Reduction (%)
Mean Cost per Patient (USD)	$12,000	$8,700	-27%
Hospitalization Rate (%)	19	13	-31%
Adverse Drug Reactions (%)	12	7	-42%

Table 6. Comparison with Previous Studies

Study	Year	Population	Diagnostic Yield (%)	Our Study (%)
100,000 Genomes[20]	2018	Rare Diseases	34	45
TCGA[21]	2019	Cancer	29	36
Genomics England[22]	2021	Mixed	36	37.7

4. DISCUSSION

This study highlights the expanding utility of genomics in elucidating the mechanisms of disease and translating them into clinical impact. Our overall diagnostic yield of 37.7% is consistent with reports from global initiatives, which have shown yields ranging from 30–40% across diverse patient populations[11]. Importantly, the highest yield was observed in rare disorders **(**45%**),** consistent with findings from the 100,000 Genomes Project, which reported a yield of 34% in similar cohorts[20]. The higher rate in our study may be due to selective recruitment of patients with strong clinical suspicion and comprehensive follow-up.

In oncology, genomic testing revealed actionable variants in 36% of cases, which closely mirrors findings from the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) where ~29% of tumors harbored clinically relevant mutations[21]. These variants enabled targeted treatment decisions, such as the use of EGFR inhibitors or PARP inhibitors in BRCA-mutated cancers. Such precision oncology approaches are increasingly validated by clinical trials showing improved survival when therapies are guided by mutational profiling[13].

In cardiovascular diseases, the diagnostic yield of 32% aligns with prior studies emphasizing the role of genomics in inherited arrhythmias and cardiomyopathies[14]. Genes such as MYH7 and LMNA were recurrently identified, confirming their relevance in dilated and hypertrophic cardiomyopathies. Genomic testing in this group often resulted in early diagnosis, prevention of sudden cardiac death through device implantation, and family screening for at-risk relatives[15].

Neurological disorders demonstrated a 32% yield, consistent with prior exome sequencing studies in epilepsy and neurodevelopmental disorders where diagnostic yields ranged between 25–40%[16]. Variants in SCN1A, MECP2, and TSC2 were among the most frequent, reflecting well-documented associations with Dravet syndrome, Rett syndrome, and tuberous sclerosis respectively[17]. Importantly, establishing a genetic diagnosis in neurology provided therapeutic implications, including antiepileptic drug selection and prognostic counseling.

Pharmacogenomics played a pivotal role in our study, with 26% of patients experiencing drug therapy modifications based on genetic findings. Variants such as CYP2C19, CYP2D6, and DPYD guided adjustments in antiplatelets, antidepressants, and chemotherapeutics, preventing adverse drug reactions (ADRs). The observed 42% reduction in ADRs post-genomic testing echoes findings from implementation studies showing that pharmacogenomic-guided prescribing reduces drug-related morbidity and healthcare costs[18].

Cost-effectiveness analysis revealed a 27% reduction in per-patient healthcare costs**,** mainly through reduced hospitalizations and avoidance of ineffective therapies. These findings align with previous economic evaluations that concluded genomic sequencing, while initially costly, yields long-term savings in healthcare expenditure[19].

When compared with global initiatives, our study confirms that genomic testing outcomes are reproducible across populations. The Genomics England study (2021) reported an overall yield of 36%, very similar to our 37.7%[22]. This consistency underscores the robustness of genomics in improving diagnostic precision and clinical care.

Despite these promising results, barriers remain. Interpretation of variants of uncertain significance (VUS) remains a challenge in ~20–30% of reported variants[23]. Ethical issues such as incidental findings, genome editing (CRISPR), and data privacy demand robust regulatory oversight[24]. Moreover, disparities in global access to genomic technologies persist, especially in low- and middle-income countries, raising questions of equity in precision medicine[25].

Our findings validate the role of genomics in bridging research and clinical care. Genomics not only enhances diagnostic yield but also informs therapy, reduces ADRs, and lowers healthcare costs. Expanding multi-omics approaches (epigenomics, proteomics), integrating artificial intelligence for variant interpretation, and establishing equitable access policies are key to realizing the full potential of genomics in global healthcare.

5. CONCLUSION

Genomic insights have fundamentally transformed our understanding of human health and disease. This study demonstrated that genomic testing achieves significant diagnostic yield, directly influences therapeutic strategies, reduces adverse drug events, and provides cost savings. Rare disorders showed the highest diagnostic benefit, while oncology, cardiology, and neurology demonstrated clear clinical applications. Despite challenges in variant interpretation, ethics, and access, genomics is moving steadily into mainstream medicine

REFERENCES

[1] Collins FS, Varmus H. A new initiative on precision medicine. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(9):793–5.

[2] Manolio TA, et al. Implementing genomic medicine in practice. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet. 2019;20:109–30.

[3] Goodwin S, et al. Coming of age: Ten years of next-generation sequencing technologies. Nat Rev Genet. 2016;17(6):333–51.

[4] Visscher PM, et al. 10 years of GWAS discovery: biology, function, and translation. Am J Hum Genet. 2017;101(1):5–22.

[5] Dienstmann R, et al. Genomic medicine frontier in oncology. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2017;14(5):271–88.

[6] Relling MV, Evans WE. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. Nature. 2015;526(7573):343–50.

[7] Frangoul H, et al. CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(3):252–60.

[8] Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium. Integrative analysis of 111 reference human epigenomes. Nature. 2015;518(7539):317–30.

[9] Middleton A, et al. Ethical challenges in genomics. Eur J Hum Genet. 2019;27(1):1–9.

[10] Stark Z, et al. Integrating genomics into healthcare. Genet Med. 2019;21(3):631–40.

[11] Manickam K, et al. Clinical impact of exome sequencing. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(9):e2120606.

[12] Wright CF, et al. Exome sequencing for developmental disorders. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(9):715–27.

[13] Andre F, et al. Precision oncology: challenges and opportunities. Cancer Discov. 2022;12(5):1141–57.

[14] Lopes LR, et al. Genetic basis of cardiomyopathies: clinical impact. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2015;12(10):567–82.

[15] Hershberger RE, et al. Genetic evaluation of cardiomyopathy. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2018;72(5):645–66.

[16] Srivastava S, et al. Clinical whole exome sequencing in pediatric neurology. Ann Neurol. 2019;85(2):153–62.

[17] Deciphering Developmental Disorders Study. Large-scale sequencing and developmental disorders. Nature. 2017;542(7642):433–8.

[18] Caudle KE, et al. CPIC guidelines for pharmacogenomics. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2017;102(5):897–904.

[19] Hicks JK, et al. Implementing pharmacogenomics in practice. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2021;109(1):152–64.

[20] Turro E, et al. Genomic diagnoses for rare diseases in England. Nat Med. 2020;26(11):1721–32.

[21] The Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network. Comprehensive genomic characterization. Cell. 2019;176(3):529–44.

[22] Turnbull C, et al. The 100,000 Genomes Project: lessons for translation. Nat Rev Genet. 2021;22(10):597–612.

[23] Li MM, et al. Standards for interpreting sequence variants. Genet Med. 2017;19(2):147–57.

[24] Thorogood A, et al. Incidental findings in genomics. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet. 2018;19:177–201.

[25] Burke W, et al. Global frameworks for genomic medicine. Nat Rev Genet. 2023;24(2):101–15.