Research and Reviews: Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Pharmacogenomics and its Implementations

Shabana Sultana. MD*

Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh, India

Review Article

Received:02-12-2015
Revised: 28-12-2015
Accepted: 03-01-2016

***For Correspondence:**

Shabana. S. MD, Department of Biotechnology, Andhra University, Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India, Tel: 7382749069.

Keywords: Clinical Pharmacogenetics, Pharmacogenomics, Genotyping, Molecular genetics, Pharmacogenetics

E-mail: shabanasultana2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Pharmacogenomics is the study of how qualities influence a man's reaction to drugs. This generally new field consolidates pharmacology and genomics to create powerful, safe prescriptions and dosages that will be customized to a man's hereditary cosmetics. Many drugs that are as of now available are "one size fits all," but they don't work the same way for everybody. It can be hard to predict who will profit by a solution, which won't react by any stretch of the imagination, and who will encounter negative symptoms (called antagonistic medication responses). Antagonistic medication responses are a noteworthy reason for hospitalizations and deaths in the United States. With the information picked up from the Human Genome Project, scientists are figuring out how acquired contrasts in qualities influence the body's reaction to prescriptions. These hereditary contrasts will be utilized to anticipate whether a prescription will be powerful for a specific individual and to avoid adverse medication responses. The field of pharmacogenomics is still in its outset. Its utilization is at present very restricted, yet new methodologies are under study in clinical trials. Later on, pharmacogenomics will permit the advancement of custom-made medications to treat an extensive variety of wellbeing issues, including cardiovascular illness, Alzheimer infection, growth, HIV/AIDS, and asthma.

INTRODUCTION

Pharmacogenomics can be considered as the marriage of useful genomics and atomic pharmacology. From various perspectives, this was a marriage of need [1]. At the point when utilitarian genomics developed on the scene as the high-esteem included control that recognizes quality capacity, various organizations gave to this zone turned out to be financially successful in a very short time. The suggestion that qualities could be sorted by capacity even sickness association was extremely engaging as another method for creating drugs [2]. Be that as it may, it rapidly got to be apparent that the number of infections that were single-quality in inception was restricted, and that most diseases created as an after effect of a system of qualities neglecting to perform effectively.

The history of Pharmacogenetics extends as far back as 510 b.c. at the point when Pythagoras noticed that ingestion of fava beans brought about a conceivably lethal response in a few, however not all, people [3-6]. From that point forward there have been various milestones that have molded this field of exploration, and have prompted the present rush of interest. Variety inside the human genome is seen about each 500-1000 bases. In spite of the fact that there are various diverse sorts of polymorphic markers, most consideration as of late has concentrated on single nucleotide polymorphisms, and the potential for utilizing these to decide the individual medication reaction profile [7,8]. SNPs happen

at a recurrence of 1% or more noteworthy in the populace. A consortium between the pharmaceutical business and philanthropies, for example, the Welcome Trust was framed to make a library of 300000 SNPs; this anticipate was constantly well in front of the proposed plan, and has as of late brought about the distribution of a SNP map including 1.42 million SNPs at a normal thickness of one SNP each 1.9 kilobases [912]. Pharmacogenomics focuses on the distinguishing proof of genome variations that impact drug impacts, commonly by means of modifications in a medication's pharmacokinetics or through adjustment of a medication's pharmacodynamics. For ailments other than tumor and irresistible maladies, the genome varieties of interest are fundamentally in the germ line DNA; either acquired from guardians or again germ line succession changes that modify the capacity of quality items [13]. In tumor, both acquired genome varieties and physically obtained genome variations can impact reaction to anticancer specialists. For irresistible maladies, genomic variety in the irresistible operators themselves may change their affectability to antimicrobials [14,15]. Propels in genome cross examination innovation and in logical methodologies have encouraged advancement of the revelation worldview from hopeful quality studies to more skeptic genome wide investigations of populaces of patients who have been described for particular medication reaction phenotypes. Truth be told, ebb and flow innovations for genome succession cross examination are adequately powerful that thoroughly characterizing the medication reaction phenotype has turned into the more troublesome part of pharmacogenomics exploration [16-18].

Implementation of Pharmacogenomics with Comparison to Other Genomics

It is generally expressed that all together for a test to be utilized as a part of clinical consideration; it must meet criteria of expository legitimacy, clinical legitimacy, and clinical utility. Several pharmacogenes are not trifling as far as creating tests with explanatory validity [19-22]. Clinical utility includes evaluating whether the utilization of the test prompts enhanced wellbeing results for patients why should subject testing, and an appraisal of the dangers that happen as a consequence of testing. Be that as it may, there is generous heterogeneity as to absolutely what result measures constitute clinical utility [23-26]. Some have widened such evaluations to go past the clinical utility for the tried people to incorporate an appraisal of the effect of more extensive utilization of testing on the whole human services framework, including measuring the expenses of hereditary testing versus the expenses of other medicinal services mediations, and unintended outcomes on conduct of clinicians [27-30].

A Pharmacogenomics result has the important confirmation to support scientific validity, clinical validity, and clinical utility to warrant use in recommending relies on upon numerous factors [31-33]. Numerous sorts of information can be utilized to assess clinical legitimacy and utility, including the penetrance of hereditary minor departure from medication impacts in light of review studies, the mechanism by which hereditary variety impacts drug impacts or an applicable endophenotype, in vivo pharmacokinetic or other useful studies, in vitro utilitarian studies, pre-clinical and clinical studies connecting pharmacologic impacts or medication focuses to genomic variety, case reports, family contemplates, and randomized clinical trials contrasting results of hereditarily based endorsing versus standard of consideration [34-36]. Other components that are considered in settling on the significance of pharmacogenomics variety incorporate the helpful record of a medication, the seriousness of medication poisonous quality, the seriousness of the hidden infection, and the outcomes of imperfect recommending [37-40].

Basic Issues for Clinical Execution of Pharmacogenomics

There are more than 1200 individual molecular substances approved as medications by administrative organizations in the US, Europe and Asia [41-43]. Although around 15% of EU-EMA and US-FDA endorsed solutions contain pharmacogenomics data in their name, just a subset of these are regarded significant. The use of just about7% of pharmaceuticals has noteworthy germ line Pharmacogenetics. Interestingly, in the US, these drugs constitute ~18% of all solutions, showing that there is a slight overrepresentation of pharmacogenomically high-hazard prescriptions among profoundly endorsed pharmaceuticals [44-46]. Up to this point, just 17 of ~ 18,000 human qualities are considered clinically noteworthy for germ line pharmacogenomics. Not just is most human germ line hereditary variety unrealistic to be noteworthy for medicine recommending, pharmacogenomics is unrealistic to be valuable for enhancing endorsing for the lion's share of medications [46-50]. Notwithstanding, for that moderately little arrangement of pharmaceuticals for which genomics is significant, recommending could be enhanced and results improved if hereditary testing were all the more generally and fittingly conveyed clinically [51-53].

The effect of ecological variables can likewise entangle the capacity to repeat pharmacogenomics research [54-56]. It has been assessed that lone 10% to 15% of hereditary biomarkers directly affect drug reaction. Rather, sedate reaction phenotypes are all the more usually affected by a perplexing interchange between ecological, hereditary, and gene–environment associations [57-60]. Case in point, it is realized that tumor-related incendiary reactions can down-direct CYP3A-intervened drug digestion system, accordingly adding to medication freedom variability and harmfulness of in growth patients [61-63]. Likewise, medicate associations can impact drug reaction and can regularly clarify why a phenotype does not precisely mirror a genotype for medication metabolism. Only fragmentary data is known with respect to how the exchange amongst hereditary qualities and nature impacts pharmacological reaction [64-66]. These mind

boggling components highlight the requirement for solutions that are customized to consider phenotypic, natural, and hereditary information so as to altogether lessen restorative disappointments and ADRs [67-70]. A further entanglement is the protracted and broad examination that is required to clinically check hereditary danger figures that are associated with influencing drug pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics [71-73]. With just 3% of distributed clinical information in this field concentrating on stage 2 thinks about and past, there is an absence of proof based rules for some Pharmacogenetics applications [74-76].

Further examination is likewise expected to confirm Pharmacogenetics testing that is utilized to decide measurement and patient reaction to warfarin. Despite the fact that this practice is to some degree routine and a calculation even exists for this test, there is still concern with respect to its legitimacy and dependability [77,78]. To help in determining such issues, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Office of Public Health Genomics, has supported the ACCE Model Project to make a procedure for assessing rising hereditary tests [79]. The point of this anticipate was to build up a model framework for gathering, dissecting, dispersing, and overhauling existing information on the wellbeing and viability of DNA-based hereditary tests and algorithms [80]. The process incorporates gathering, assessing, translating, and reporting information on hereditary testing in an organization that permits policymakers to have entry to present and solid data [81].

Pharmacogenomics has additionally been in charge of noteworthy advances in treating lung tumor. Erlotinib and gefitinib are tyrosine kinase inhibitors intended to focus on the epidermal development component receptor, which has been appeared to impact inclination to lung growth [82,83]. A late East Asian study examined the part of an EGFR change as an indicator for enhanced movement free survival with gefitinib treatment contrasted and carboplatin–paclitaxel treatment [84]. Results showed that the reaction to gefitinib was totally constrained to the change positive gathering, while transformation negative patients profited more from chemotherapy [85-88]. A European concentrate additionally screened patients with non–small-cell-lung disease for EGFR transformations to distinguish the individuals who were well on the way to react to erlotinib treatment [89-91].

Pharmacogenomics research in cardiology slacked in the 1990s yet has become rapidly as of late. Specifically, encouraging revelations have been made with respect to two hostile to thrombotic medications, warfarin and clopidogrel [92-94]. More up to date anticoagulant specialists have been acquainted with the business sector, for example, dabigatran etexilate mesylate, which was endorsed by the FDA in October 2010. However, the oral coumarin anticoagulants warfarin, acenocoumarol, and phenprocoumon have been the standard treatment for thromboembolic issue for over 60 years [95-97]. Notwithstanding their viability, these medications have a thin remedial window and represent a high danger of significant dying, particularly amid the underlying period of treatment. There is likewise generous individual variety in light of OCAs, contingent upon the patient's age, sex, body mass list, smoking, vitamin K admission, and attendant medication treatment, accordingly requiring continuous checking and measurements conformity [98-100].

Recently, several genome-wide association studies have identified genetic variants that provide new insights into possible molecular targets for antipsychotic and antidepressant agents. Typical antipsychotic medications exert effects on components of the dopamine pathway. Published studies have reported a significant association between polymorphisms in dopamine receptor genes DRD2 and DRD3 and response outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Heidari A. Pharmacogenomics and Pharmacoproteomics Studies of Phosphodiesterase-5 (PDE5) Inhibitors and Paclitaxel Albumin-stabilized Nanoparticles as Sandwiched Anti-cancer Nano Drugs between Two DNA/RNA Molecules of Human Cancer Cells. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2006;7:e153.
2. Cacabelos R. The Complexity of Alzheimer's Disease Pharmacogenomics and Metabolomics in Drug Development.Metabolomics. 2016;6:e145.
3. Aceti A. Pharmacogenomics for Infectious Diseases. J Med Microb Diagn. 2016;5:223.
4. Basu A and Panja A. Pharmacogenomics of the Drugs used for the Treatment of Thalassemia. J Cytol Histol. 2015;6:360.
5. Cacabelos R. New Insights into the Pathogenesis and Pharmacogenomics of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. Metabolomics. 2015;5:146.
6. Jamil K. Pharmacogenomics Influencing Drug-Gene Interactions Leading Towards Personalized Medicine. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2015;6:151.
7. SN Venugopalan Nair. Knowledge of Pharmacogenomics in Indian Traditional Medicine-Ayurveda. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2015;6:150.
8. Patil J. Pharmacogenetics and Pharmacogenomics: A Brief Introduction. J Pharmacovigilance. 2015;3:e139.

9. Yiannakopoulou EC. Could Pharmacogenomics Improve Efficacy and Safety of Trastuzumab?. Biochem Pharmacol (Los Angel). 2015;4:e174.
10. Chang CW and Ning B. A Reachable Goal: Application of Pharmacogenomics Biomarkers to Improve Drug Efficacy and Safety. Adv Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf. 2015;4:e129.
11. Siest G. The European Society of Pharmacogenomics and Personalised Therapy – ESPT. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2015;6:144.
12. Mahajan PB. Will Pharmacogenomics Take the Pain Out of Pain Medication?. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;6:e142.
13. Krynetskiy E. Pharmacogenomics of Simple Repeats: How Do You Solve a Problem like VNSR?. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:e139.
14. Feng X, et al. Future Medicine for Today's Cancer Patients: Therapeutic Application of Pharmacogenomics in Oncology. J Pharma Care Health Sys. 2014;1:119.
15. Cacabelos R. The Pathogenic Component of the APOE-TOMM40 Region in Alzheimer's disease: Its Implications in Metabolomics and Pharmacogenomics. Metabolomics. 2014;4:1000e129.
16. Cacabelos R, et al. APOE-TOMM40 in the Pharmacogenomics of Dementia. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:135.
17. Prasanthi SV, et al. Pharmacogenomics Study of Clopidogrel by RFLP based Genotyping of CYP2C19 in Cardiovascular Disease Patients in North-East Population of India. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:132.
18. Hartshorne T, et al. A High-throughput Real-time PCR Approach to Pharmacogenomics Studies. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:133.
19. Persson A and Ingelman-Sundberg M. Pharmacogenomics of Cytochrome P450 Dependent Metabolism of Endogenous Compounds: Implications for Behavior, Psychopathology and Treatment. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:127.
20. Monaco AD, et al. Early Outline Evaluation of Genotyping Costs of Pharmacogenomics. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:123.
21. Xu R and Wang Q. A Semi-Supervised Pattern-Learning Approach to Extract Pharmacogenomics-Specific Drug-Gene Pairs from Biomedical Literature. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2013;4:117.
22. Meeran TAR, et al. Pharmacogenomics of Oral P2Y12 Receptor Blockers. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2013;4:119.
23. Gupta D. Pharmacogenomics in Drug Discovery and Development. J Develop Drugs. 2013;2:e126.
24. Chen XW, et al. Pharmacogenomics-Guided Approaches to Avoiding Adverse Drug Reactions. Clinic Pharmacol Biopharm. 2012;1:104.
25. Zhou SF. Is Pharmacogenomics Ready for Prime Time? J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2012;3:e126.
26. Cacabelos R. The Metabolomic Paradigm of Pharmacogenomics in Complex Disorders. Metabolomics. 2012;2:e119.
27. Kuo HC and Chang WC. The Genomics and Pharmacogenomics of Kawasaki Disease. J Cell Sci Ther. 2012;3:e111.
28. Baianu IC. Clinical Trials in Cancer and Pharmacogenomics: A Critical Evaluation. J Clin Trials. 2012;2:109.
29. Baianu IC. Cancer Clinical Trials Optimization and Pharmacogenomics. J Clinic Trials. 2012;1:e103.
30. Blake K and Lima J. Pharmacogenomic Testing in the Clinic: When to Begin? J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2012;3:e115.
31. Mannello F. The MMPs Genes Polymorphisms: Potential Role in Pharmacogenomics and Target Therapy. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2012;3:e114.
32. Wang H. Pharmacogenomics: A Promising Approach Towards Treatment of Autism. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2012;3:e110.
33. Nishant T, et al. Pharmacogenomics- Personalized Treatment of Cancer, Diabetes and Cardiovascular Diseases. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2011;2:107.
34. Chantratita W, et al. Integrating HIV-1 Pharmacogenomics into the Universal Coverage Health-Care System in Thailand: From Scientific Evidence to Policy. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2011;S6:001.
35. Ibrahim F, et al. Micellar High Performance Liquid Chromatographic Method for Simultaneous Determination of Clonazepam and Paroxetine HCl in Pharmaceutical Preparations Using Monolithic Column. J Chromatogr Sep Tech. 2016;7:331.

36. Yeung PK. Importance of Gender Effect in Cardiovascular Pharmacology. Cardiovasc Pharm Open Access. 2016;5:e130.
37. Durisova M. (2016) Editorial: Drug Metabolism and Toxicology. J Drug Metab Toxicol 7:e131.
38. Rass IT Can We Tame Glucocorticoids? Blood Tyrosine as a New Laboratory Test. J Biomol Res Ther. 2016;5:144.
39. Afroz R, et al. Molecular Pharmacology of Honey. Clin Exp Pharmacol. 2016;6:212.
40. Durisova M. Opinion: Journal of Drug Metabolism and Toxicology. J Drug Metab Toxicol. 2016;7:e128.
41. Durisova M. Editorial: The International Journal of Pharmacology and Therapeutics. J Drug Metab Toxicol. 2016;7:e130.
42. Bastons-Compta A, et al. (2016) Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) Diagnostic Guidelines: A Neuropsychological Diagnostic Criteria Review Proposal. J Neuropsychopharmacol Mental Health. 2016;1:e104.
43. Lopez-Munoz F. An Anniversary to Remember from the Pharmacology: The Nuremberg Trials. Clin Exp Pharmacol. 2016;6:e137.
44. Lucibello M and De Braud F. Phospho-TCTP and Dihydroartemisinin: A Novel Therapeutic Opportunity in Advance Breast Cancer. Chemo Open Access. 2016;5:196.
45. Sun X, et al. The Potential Role of Melatonin on Mental Disorders: Insights from Physiology and Pharmacology. Bipolar Disord. 2016;2:105.
46. Ciampolini M. Physiology versus Pharmacology. Endocrinol Metab Syndr. 2016;5:216.
47. Perez Gutierrez RM. Review of *Cucurbita pepo* (Pumpkin) its Phytochemistry and Pharmacology. Med chem. 2016;6:012-021.
48. Cacabelos R. Impact of Genomic Medicine on the Future of Neuropsychopharmacology. J Neuropsychopharmacol Mental Health. 2015;1:e101.
49. Singh B and Katoch D. Phytochemistry and Pharmacology of Genus *Zephyranthes*. Med Aromat Plants. 2015;4:212.
50. Liu JJ, et al. Systems Pharmacology for the Study of Anticancer Drugs: Promises and Challenges. Clin Pharmacol Biopharm. 2015;4:140.
51. Mary V Relling and William E Evans. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. Nature. 2015;526:343-350.
52. Liewei Wang, et al. Genomics and Drug Response. N Engl J Med. 2011;364:1144-1153.
53. Qiang Ma and Anthony YHLu. Pharmacogenetics, Pharmacogenomics, and Individualized Medicine. Pharmacological Reviews. 2011;63:2437-2459.
54. Richard M Weinshilboum and Liewei Wang. Pharmacogenetics and Pharmacogenomics: Development, Science, and Translation. Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet 2006;7:223-245.
55. Kibria G, et al. Anti-tumor effect via passive anti-angiogenesis of PEGylated liposomes encapsulating doxorubicin in drug resistant tumors. Int J Pharm. 2016;509:178-187.
56. Fan L, et al. Multifunctional all-in-one drug delivery systems for tumor targeting and sequential release of three different anti-tumor drugs. Biomaterials. 2016;76:399-407.
57. Liu N, et al. pH-responsive zwitterionic polypeptide as a platform for anti-tumor drug delivery. Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces. 2016;145:401-409.
58. Kole L, et al. Pioglitazone, an anti-diabetic drug requires sustained MAPK activation for its anti-tumor activity in MCF7 breast cancer cells, independent of PPAR-γ pathway. Pharmacological Reports. 2016;68:144-154.
59. Kanehira Y, et al. Tumor distribution and anti-tumor effect of doxorubicin following intrapulmonary administration to mice with metastatic lung tumor. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology. 2016;33:143-148.
60. Cao Y, et al. l-arginine and docetaxel synergistically enhance anti-tumor immunity by modifying the immune status of tumor-bearing mice. Int Immunopharmacol. 2016;35:7-14.
61. Cao Y, et al. l-arginine and docetaxel synergistically enhance anti-tumor immunity by modifying the immune status of tumor-bearing mice. Int Immunopharmacol. 2016;35:7-14.
62. Shoja MH, et al. In vitro mechanistic and in vivo anti-tumor studies of Glycosmispentaphylla (Retz.) DC against breast cancer. Journal of Ethnopharmacology. 2016;186:59-168.
63. Wang C, et al. In vivo pharmacokinetics, biodistribution and the anti-tumor effect of cyclic RGD-modified doxorubicin-loaded polymers in tumor-bearing mice. Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces. 2016;146:31-38.
64. Lin SI, et al. Chimeric peptide containing both B and T cells epitope of tumor-associated antigen L6 enhances anti-tumor effects in HLA-A2 transgenic mice. Cancer Letters. 2016;377:126-133.
65. Göbel A, et al. Combined inhibition of the mevalonate pathway with statins and zoledronic acid potentiates their anti-tumor effects in human breast cancer cells. Cancer Letters. 2016;375:162-171.

66. Wang H, et al. In vitro and in vivo anti-tumor efficacy of 10-hydroxycamptothecin polymorphic nanoparticle dispersions: shape- and polymorph-dependent cytotoxicity and delivery of 10-hydroxycamptothecin to cancer cells Nanomedicine: Nanotechnology. Biology and Medicine. 2016;12:881-891.
67. Mendes F, et al. The role of immune system exhaustion on cancer cell escape and anti-tumor immune induction after irradiation. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Reviews on Cancer. 2016;1865:168-175.
68. Zeng Z, et al. Mannosylated protamine as a novel DNA vaccine carrier for effective induction of anti-tumor immune responses. International Journal of Pharmaceutics. 2016;506:394-406.
69. Li SY, et al. Restoring anti-tumor functions of T cells via nanoparticle-mediated immune checkpoint modulation. J Controlled Release. 2016;231:17-28.
70. Alwarawrah Y, et al. Fasnall, a Selective FASN Inhibitor, Shows Potent Anti-tumor Activity in the MMTV-Neu Model of HER2+ Breast Cancer. Cell Chemical Biology. 2016;23:678-688.
71. Alur I, et al. Anti-tumor effects of bemiparin in HepG2 and MIA PaCa-2 cells. Gene. 2016;585:241-246.
72. Cao J, et al. Anti-tumor activity of exopolysaccharide from Rhizopusnigricans Ehrenb on S180 tumor-bearing mice. Bioorganic & Medicinal Chemistry Letters. 2016;26:2098-2104.
73. Hu B, et al. Pre-clinical toxicity and immunogenicity evaluation of a MUC1–MBP/BCG anti-tumor vaccine. International Immunopharmacology. 2016;33:108-118.
74. Elmasri WA, et al. Structure-antioxidant and anti-tumor activity ofTeucriumpolium phytochemicals. Phytochemistry Letters. 2016;15:81-87.
75. Kang CH, et al. Minor modifications to ceritinib enhance anti-tumor activity in EML4-ALK positive cancer. Cancer Letters. 2016;374:272-278.
76. Zhao Y, et al. Tumor-specific pH-responsive peptide-modified pH-sensitive liposomes containing doxorubicin for enhancing glioma targeting and anti-tumor activity. J Controlled Release. 2016;222:56-66.
77. Luan Y, et al. A fully human monoclonal antibody targeting PD-L1 with potent anti-tumor activity. International Immunopharmacology. 2016;31:248-256.
78. Eldin NE, et al. Encapsulation in a rapid-release liposomal formulation enhances the anti-tumor efficacy ofpemetrexed in a murine solid mesothelioma-xenograft model. European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2016;81:60-66.
79. Conde J, et al. RNA inanomaterials targeting immune cells as an anti-tumor therapy: the missing link in cancer treatment? Materials Today. 2016;19:29-43.
80. Zhang H, et al. MUC1 and survivin combination tumor gene vaccine generates specific immune responses and anti-tumor effects in a murine melanoma model. Vaccine. 2016;34:2648-2655.
81. Guo H, et al. Enhanced anti-tumor activity and reduced toxicity by combination andrographolide and bleomycin in ascitictumor-bearing mice. Eur J Pharmacol. 2016;776:52-63.
82. Wang SD, et al. The role of CTLA-4 and PD-1 in anti-tumor immune response and their potential efficacy against osteosarcoma.Int Immunopharmacol. 2016;38:81-89.
83. Hou Z, et al. 808 nm Light-triggered and hyaluronic acid-targeted dual-photosensitizers nanoplatform by fully utilizing Nd3+-sensitized upconversion emission with enhanced anti-tumor efficacy. Biomaterials. 2016;101:32-46.
84. Cacabelos R, et al. Can cloud-based tools accelerate Alzheimer's disease drug discovery? Expert Opin Drug Discov. 2016;11:215-223
85. Cacabelos R, et al. Pharmacogenomics of Alzheimer's disease: novel therapeutic strategies for drug development. Methods MolBiol. 2014;1175:323-556.
86. Cummings JL, et al. Alzheimer’s disease drug-development pipeline: few candidates, frequent failures. Alzheimer's Res Ther. 2014;6:1-7.
87. Cacabelos R, et al. APOE-TOMM40 in the Pharmacogenomics of demetia. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2014;5:1-12.
88. Cacabelos R, et al. Opportunities in Pharmacogenomics for the treatment of Alzheimer’s Disease. Future Neurology. 2015;10:229-252.
89. Cacabelos R, et al. Gene interactions in the Pharmacogenomics of Alzheimer’s Disease. Sciforschen Genetics and Gene Therapy. 2015;1:1-22.
90. Cacabelos R and Torrellas C. Epigenetics of aging and Alzheimer’s disease: Implications for pharmacogenomics and drug response. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2015;16:30483-30543.
91. Cacabelos R, et al. Epigenetics-related drug efficacy and safety: The path to pharmacoepigenomics. Current Genomics. 2016.

92. Cacabelos R and Torrellas C. Epigenetic drug discovery for Alzheimer's disease. Expert Opin Drug Discov. 2014;9:1059-1086.
93. Baquero F. Antibiotic resistance in Spain: what can be done? Task Force of the General Direction for Health Planning of the Spanish Ministry of Health.Clin Infect Dis. 1996;23:819-823.
94. McCaig LF and Hughes JM. Trends in antimicrobial drug prescribing among office-based physicians in the United States. JAMA. 1995;273:214-219.
95. Picard FJ and Bergeron MG. Rapid molecular theranostics in infectious diseases.Drug Discov Today. 2002;7:1092–1101.
96. Zhang R and Zhang CT. The impact of comparative genomics on infectious disease research.Microbes Infect. 2006;8:1613-1622.
97. Behr MA, et al. Comparative genomics of BCG vaccines by whole-genome DNA microarray. Science. 1999;284:1520-1523.
98. Dean M, et al. Genetic restriction of HIV-1 infection and progression to AIDS by a deletion allele of the CKR5 structural gene. Science. 1996;273:1856-1862.
99. Vejbaesya S, et al. HLA Class I Supertype Associations With Clinical Outcome of Secondary Dengue Virus Infections in Ethnic Thais. J Infect Dis. 2015;212:939-947.
100. Tanaka Y, et al. Genome-wide association of IL28B withresponse to pegylated interferon-alpha and ribavirin therapy for chronic hepatitis C. Nat Genet. 2009;41:1105-1109.