JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL CRISIS AND RISK COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
ISSN: 2576-0017
2024, VOL 7, NO S11

Genetics Testing in Understanding Disease Susceptibility, Medical Laboratory Roles: Review

Mohammed Saleh Al Shamrani[1], Sultan Fouad Ali Abualhamayel[1], Abdulrahman Saeed Almalki[2], Ahmad Hajar A Almontasheri[2], Hanan Saleh Hussein Al-Harbi[3], Ahmad Sami Felemban[4], Fatimah Ibrahim Alhalwani[5], Sahab Juwaybir Althobaiti[6], Noof Talal Nakash[7], Fawzia Yahya Barnawi[7], Afnan Saleh Alhajjajy[8], Raniyah Mohammed Shreef[9], Abir Ali Najmi[10], Yassir Abdullah Manshi[11], Saeed Fawaz Alghufairy[12]

1. Laboratory Technician, Ibn Sina hospital Makkah
2. Labdoratory Specialist, Ibn sina Hospital
3. Al-Wafa Health Center, Laboratory Technician
4. King Abdullah medical city , Lab specialist
5. Heraa general Hospital, Lab Specialist
6. King Abdullah medical city, Phlebotomy
7. Lab technician at King Abdullah medical city
8. Lab technician at Heraa General Hospital
9. King Abdullah Medical City, Medical Laboratory Technician
10. King Abdullah medical city, phlebotomist technician
11. Laboratory Technician at Forensic Medical Services in Makkah
12. Lab specialist at King Abdullah medical city

ABSTRACT

Clinical testing for biochemical diseases employs procedures that analyze the protein rather than the gene. The field of molecular genetic and genomic testing is rapidly evolving as we get a better understanding of the molecular causes of uncommon and common ailments, as well as new DNA analysis methods. The advent of molecular genetics has transformed healthcare by providing unparalleled insights into the genetic basis of diseases, allowing for tailored diagnosis, treatment plans, and risk assessments. However, with this development comes the obligation for healthcare practitioners to stay up to date on the newest advancements and best practices in genetic testing; thus, the purpose of this review is to emphasize the role of laboratory staff in clinical diagnosis using genetic testing.

KEYWORDS: biochemical diseases, genetics, laboratories.

1. Introduction

The US National Institutes of Health (NIH) characterizes genetic testing as an examination of human chromosomes, genes, or proteins to identify hereditary diseases for clinical applications. This definition excludes tests utilized for research purposes. Genetic testing has conventionally been employed for prenatal screening, identifying carriers of genetic illnesses for reproductive considerations, and

diagnosing rare Mendelian disorders hypothesized from clinical evidence or familial history. Recent advancements in high-throughput genomics have rendered large-scale genotyping and sequencing economically viable. This has resulted in a proliferation of genetic testing, encompassing both clinical applications and commercially available direct-to-consumer genetic assessments. Pharmacogenomics advocates for genetic testing to optimize pharmacological therapy, enhancing efficacy and mitigating unwanted effects. Nonetheless, numerous hurdles persist that restrict the extensive application of genetic information in clinical care environments [1,2].

Molecular genetics testing is essential for assessing inherited disorders, somatic or acquired diseases with genetic links, and pharmacogenetic responses. Genotyping offers significant insights into illness diagnosis, prognosis, and progression, informs treatment selection and response, and identifies gene-specific therapeutic targets [3]. Human genetic material predominantly comprises double-stranded, helical DNA. This molecule features a backbone of alternating deoxyribose sugars and phosphate groups, with hydrogen bonds connecting nitrogenous base pairs. Adenine (purine) couples with thymine (pyrimidine), and guanine (purine) pairs with cytosine (pyrimidine), creating the complementary base pairs in the DNA double helix.

In human cells, DNA is coiled around histone proteins and organized into nucleosome units, which are further condensed to create chromosomes [4]. Somatic cells typically possess 23 pairs of chromosomes, including one pair of sex chromosomes, X and Y. Each chromosome contains DNA characterized by terminal segments of short repetitions known as "telomeres," as well as supplementary repeats in the centromere region.

Humans possess two sets of 23 chromosomes, one originating from the maternal ovum and the other from the paternal spermatozoon. Consequently, each egg and sperm comprises a singular or haploid set of 23 chromosomes. The amalgamation of the two results in a diploid configuration of human DNA, enabling each individual to have two distinct sequences, genes, and alleles on every chromosome. Homologous recombination in meiosis produces distinct allele combinations in gametes, resulting in genetic variation among human offspring [5].

The comprehensive decoding of the human genome and the advancement of robust identification and cloning techniques for genes associated with hereditary illnesses have revolutionized the fields of molecular genetics and molecular pathology. Advanced molecular analysis techniques may now assess the sickness risk of presymptomatic individuals, identify asymptomatic carriers of recessive traits, and facilitate prenatal diagnosis of disorders not yet apparent during pregnancy [6]. Molecular genetics techniques frequently represent the sole methodologies for addressing these enigmas. Consequently, genetic testing serve as potent instruments for diagnosis, genetic counseling, and the prevention of hereditary disorders.

A multitude of genetic assays can evaluate modifications in genes, chromosomes, and proteins. A clinician frequently evaluates multiple aspects while determining the suitable test, encompassing suspected diseases and their potential genetic variations. A comprehensive genetic test is utilized when a diagnosis is ambiguous, whereas a focused test is favored for suspected particular disorders [7]. Molecular assays detect

alterations in one or more genes. These tests examine the arrangement of DNA nucleotides in an individual's genetic code, a procedure referred to as DNA sequencing, which can differ in extent [8].

2. Review:

The sequencing of the human genome has ushered in a new era of gene discovery, leading to a better knowledge of the genetic causes of disease. This research serves as the foundation for an ever-increasing number of genetic tests offered in health care. Clinicians and health-care officials are responsible for determining acceptable test use. This evaluation approach must take into account three types of test performance: analytic validity, clinical validity, and clinical utility [9].

Analytic validity refers to the accuracy with which a specific genetic characteristic, such as a DNA sequence variant, chromosomal deletion, or biochemical indicator, is identified in a given laboratory test. The majority of genetic characteristics of clinical interest can be tested by a variety of protocols. Technical issues that arise in the evaluation of analytic validity include the specific technical requirements of the assay chosen, its reliability, and the degree to which

When deciding whether or not to utilize a test, the clinician must also examine its clinical validity and utility. Clinical validity refers to a test's ability to accurately identify a patient's clinical status, while clinical utility refers to the risks and advantages associated with its usage. Genetic tests differ in their accuracy and ability to enhance health outcomes. Furthermore, testing technology and the clinical situation in which the test is administered may have an impact on its clinical validity and value. Recent advances in sequencing technology, such as tests based on targeted gene sequencing, whole exome, and whole genome analysis, have created new obstacles for assessing clinical validity and utility. This unit examines the consequences of these test features for clinical practice [9.

Whole-exome sequencing, also known as whole-genome sequencing, checks the majority of an individual's DNA for genetic variants. This method is beneficial when a single-gene or panel test does not yield a diagnosis, or when the suspected illness or genetic etiology is unknown. This sequencing method is frequently more cost- and time-effective than running many single gene or panel testing. Chromosomal tests examine entire chromosomes or long DNA lengths to detect substantial changes, such as extra or missing chromosome copies (trisomy or monosomy), big chromosomal segment duplications or deletions, and segment rearrangements. Chromosomal testing are used when particular genetic disorders associated with chromosomal alterations are suspected. For example, Williams syndrome is caused by the deletion of a chromosome 7 region [10].

Gene expression assays determine gene activation in cells, revealing whether genes are active or dormant, with active genes creating mRNA molecules that serve as templates for protein synthesis. The mRNA generated influences which genes are highly active. Specific genes with either too much (overexpression) or too little (underexpression) activity may indicate a hereditary disease, such as cancer. Instead

of analyzing DNA directly, biochemical procedures examine protein or enzyme levels and activity. Abnormalities in these chemicals could indicate DNA alterations causing a hereditary disease [11].

Heritable mutations can be detected in all nucleated cells and are therefore classified as germline or constitutional genetic alterations. Somatic genetic alterations are associated with acquired or sporadic illnesses such as cancer. Both possibilities are explored using comparable molecular biology methods to discover DNA and RNA changes, but the laboratory results are frequently interpreted and used differently [12].

Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH), chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA), and cytogenetic analysis (karyotyping) can be used to detect large-scale gene deletions, duplications, or rearrangements. Conventional karyotyping detects rearrangements spanning 5 DNA megabases. FISH has a resolution of 100 kilobases to one megabase. Minor modifications, such as single-base substitutions, insertions, and deletions, can be detected using single-strand conformation polymorphism (SSCP) and sequence analysis via next-generation sequencing. NGS uses genomic DNA (gDNA) or complementary DNA (cDNA) and has three modes: total genomic DNA, targeted, and exome sequencing [13].

Denaturing high-performance liquid chromatography (DHPLC) detects minor deletions and duplications. Multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA) broadens the range of deletions and duplications observed, bridging the gap between FISH or cytogenetic investigation and HPLC. MLPA is highly effective in detecting entire, single, and multiexon deletions or duplications [14].

Molecular testing may raise legal, medical, psychological, and ethical concerns, in addition to the potential problems of the sampling technique. While molecular testing is primarily intended to demonstrate a genetic feature related with a disease, the current advice is to incorporate the findings into genetic counseling [15].

Genetic counseling, guided by a team of genetic counselors and other professionals, begins with clinical diagnosis of suspected disorders to guide molecular testing. Patients are told about the testing technique, possible outcomes, and legal implications such as informed consent, especially for youngsters. NGS technologies used in genetic counseling produce complicated answers that outperform standard tests, prompting informed patient talks due to the significant information and ethical considerations involved. Laboratories performing molecular genetic tests should examine preexamination, examination, and postexamination issues, adjusting methodology and interpretation to each test's indication, application, and ethical implications [16].

A genetic change or mutation is defined as any irreversible change in a gene's nucleotide sequence that differs from a reference genome. Variants found using a tiered process must be sequenced and their relevance in disease pathophysiology examined. Genetic testing can uncover variations that are classed as benign, likely benign, pathogenic, certainly pathogenic, or of unknown relevance. To evaluate clinical importance, variants must be thoroughly categorized using a variety of evidence types—population, computational, functional, or segregation data [17].

The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics recommends using this terminology and classification for genetic test results, which include genotyping, single genes, panels, exomes, and genomes. NGS applications have improved our understanding of genetic illnesses and resulted in the discovery of variations that require more investigation into their medical implications. Interprofessional collaboration is critical for maximizing the benefits of genetic tests for patients, with an expert panel arguing for board-certified geneticists to interpret results. Molecular genetic testing advanced dramatically with PCR and NGS, resulting in genome-wide data. Multidisciplinary teams work together to integrate multiple testing methodologies with the clinical, pathological, functional, computational, ethical, and social aspects of diseases for patient benefit [18].

When treatment is available, the most persuasive proof of therapeutic benefit comes from randomized controlled studies that show a better clinical outcome in those who received the treatment than those who did not. However, this criteria has been challenging to meet in medical genetics. For rare, highly penetrant illnesses, treatment may be suitable based on disease biology information, with benefits evaluated using historical controls. One example is the use of prophylactic thyroidectomy in children with MEN2 to prevent medullary thyroid cancer. Evaluation of small cohorts receiving this therapy shows a clear benefit, with few incidences of medullary carcinoma emerging during several years of follow-up among patients who would have been at high risk previously. This finding suggests that RET mutation testing has a high clinical relevance since it allows individuals to be identified as candidates for preventive surgery. Furthermore, data on the relationship between genotype and age at development of medullary thyroid carcinoma can be used to determine the best time for preventative surgery [19].

The MEN2 example demonstrates that observational data can provide a suitable basis for therapeutic practice despite small study samples and the absence of randomization, blinding, or other controls used to improve data quality in clinical trials. When the hereditary disorder is well understood, the expectation of benefit from a certain treatment may be strong enough to render testing by randomized trial unethical—for example, early screening colonoscopy in Lynch syndrome [20]. Even in the case of pharmacological treatment, a randomized research design may be unnecessary for rare illnesses, and the outcomes investigated may be limited to intermediate biological measurements. Replacement therapy for α(1)-antitrypsin (AAT) deficiency was licensed based on clinical studies proving its ability to sustain target serum levels in persons with severe deficiency, not on improved clinical outcomes. Subsequent clinical outcome data are scarce, although they indicate benefit for patients with severe AAT deficiency [21].

Given these concerns, high-quality observational data, such as well-designed cohort studies or case series, may be used to identify the proper management of numerous genetic illnesses, as well as the therapeutic utility of the accompanying genetic tests. However, with this strategy, questions may persist long after treatment is initiated, notably regarding treatment schedule and patient selection [22].

Although observational data may be an appropriate basis for establishing the therapeutic value of tests for uncommon, high-risk genetic illnesses, this criteria is unlikely to apply to gene variants linked with prevalent, complicated disorders or pharmacogenomic variants. To determine whether the test has appropriate predictive value for clinical application, it must be compared to alternative tests. For example, numerous genetic testing indicate those who are at a higher risk of developing cardiovascular disease. However, these tests are often less informative than intermediate risk measures like lipid profiles, which account for the impact of both genetics and environmental exposures including nutrition and other lifestyle factors [23]. Even if a gene variant is identified as an independent risk factor, additional testing is required to assess whether it aids in clinical management. These findings support the necessity of controlled outcome studies in assessing the clinical value of genetic tests for low-penetrance gene variations [24].

The sequencing of the human genome has ushered in a new era of gene discovery, leading to a better knowledge of the genetic causes of disease. This research serves as the foundation for an ever-increasing number of genetic tests offered in health care. Clinicians and health-care officials are responsible for determining acceptable test use. This evaluation approach must take into account three types of test performance: analytic validity, clinical validity, and clinical utility [9].

Analytic validity refers to the accuracy with which a specific genetic characteristic, such as a DNA sequence variant, chromosomal deletion, or biochemical indicator, is identified in a given laboratory test. The majority of genetic characteristics of clinical interest can be tested by a variety of protocols. Technical issues that arise in the evaluation of analytic validity include the specific technical requirements of the assay chosen, its reliability, and the degree to which

When deciding whether or not to utilize a test, the clinician must also examine its clinical validity and utility. Clinical validity refers to a test's ability to accurately identify a patient's clinical status, while clinical utility refers to the risks and advantages associated with its usage. Genetic tests differ in their accuracy and ability to enhance health outcomes. Furthermore, testing technology and the clinical situation in which the test is administered may have an impact on its clinical validity and value. Recent advances in sequencing technology, such as tests based on targeted gene sequencing, whole exome, and whole genome analysis, have created new obstacles for assessing clinical validity and utility. This unit examines the consequences of these test features for clinical practice [9.

Whole-exome sequencing, also known as whole-genome sequencing, checks the majority of an individual's DNA for genetic variants. This method is beneficial when a single-gene or panel test does not yield a diagnosis, or when the suspected illness or genetic etiology is unknown. This sequencing method is frequently more cost- and time-effective than running many single gene or panel testing. Chromosomal tests examine entire chromosomes or long DNA lengths to detect substantial changes, such as extra or missing chromosome copies (trisomy or monosomy), big chromosomal segment duplications or deletions, and segment rearrangements. Chromosomal testing are used when particular genetic disorders associated with chromosomal alterations are suspected. For example, Williams syndrome is caused

by the deletion of a chromosome 7 region [10].

Gene expression assays determine gene activation in cells, revealing whether genes are active or dormant, with active genes creating mRNA molecules that serve as templates for protein synthesis. The mRNA generated influences which genes are highly active. Specific genes with either too much (overexpression) or too little (underexpression) activity may indicate a hereditary disease, such as cancer. Instead of analyzing DNA directly, biochemical procedures examine protein or enzyme levels and activity. Abnormalities in these chemicals could indicate DNA alterations causing a hereditary disease [11].

Heritable mutations can be detected in all nucleated cells and are therefore classified as germline or constitutional genetic alterations. Somatic genetic alterations are associated with acquired or sporadic illnesses such as cancer. Both possibilities are explored using comparable molecular biology methods to discover DNA and RNA changes, but the laboratory results are frequently interpreted and used differently [12].

Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH), chromosomal microarray analysis (CMA), and cytogenetic analysis (karyotyping) can be used to detect large-scale gene deletions, duplications, or rearrangements. Conventional karyotyping detects rearrangements spanning 5 DNA megabases. FISH has a resolution of 100 kilobases to one megabase. Minor modifications, such as single-base substitutions, insertions, and deletions, can be detected using single-strand conformation polymorphism (SSCP) and sequence analysis via next-generation sequencing. NGS uses genomic DNA (gDNA) or complementary DNA (cDNA) and has three modes: total genomic DNA, targeted, and exome sequencing [13].

Denaturing high-performance liquid chromatography (DHPLC) detects minor deletions and duplications. Multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA) broadens the range of deletions and duplications observed, bridging the gap between FISH or cytogenetic investigation and HPLC. MLPA is highly effective in detecting entire, single, and multiexon deletions or duplications [14].

Molecular testing may raise legal, medical, psychological, and ethical concerns, in addition to the potential problems of the sampling technique. While molecular testing is primarily intended to demonstrate a genetic feature related with a disease, the current advice is to incorporate the findings into genetic counseling [15].

Genetic counseling, guided by a team of genetic counselors and other professionals, begins with clinical diagnosis of suspected disorders to guide molecular testing. Patients are told about the testing technique, possible outcomes, and legal implications such as informed consent, especially for youngsters. NGS technologies used in genetic counseling produce complicated answers that outperform standard tests, prompting informed patient talks due to the significant information and ethical considerations involved. Laboratories performing molecular genetic tests should examine preexamination, examination, and postexamination issues, adjusting methodology and interpretation to each test's indication, application, and ethical implications [16].

A genetic change or mutation is defined as any irreversible change in a gene's nucleotide sequence that differs from a reference genome. Variants found using a tiered process must be sequenced and their relevance in disease pathophysiology examined. Genetic testing can uncover variations that are classed as benign, likely benign, pathogenic, certainly pathogenic, or of unknown relevance. To evaluate clinical importance, variants must be thoroughly categorized using a variety of evidence types—population, computational, functional, or segregation data [17].

The American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics recommends using this terminology and classification for genetic test results, which include genotyping, single genes, panels, exomes, and genomes. NGS applications have improved our understanding of genetic illnesses and resulted in the discovery of variations that require more investigation into their medical implications. Interprofessional collaboration is critical for maximizing the benefits of genetic tests for patients, with an expert panel arguing for board-certified geneticists to interpret results. Molecular genetic testing advanced dramatically with PCR and NGS, resulting in genome-wide data. Multidisciplinary teams work together to integrate multiple testing methodologies with the clinical, pathological, functional, computational, ethical, and social aspects of diseases for patient benefit [18].

When treatment is available, the most persuasive proof of therapeutic benefit comes from randomized controlled studies that show a better clinical outcome in those who received the treatment than those who did not. However, this criteria has been challenging to meet in medical genetics. For rare, highly penetrant illnesses, treatment may be suitable based on disease biology information, with benefits evaluated using historical controls. One example is the use of prophylactic thyroidectomy in children with MEN2 to prevent medullary thyroid cancer. Evaluation of small cohorts receiving this therapy shows a clear benefit, with few incidences of medullary carcinoma emerging during several years of follow-up among patients who would have been at high risk previously. This finding suggests that RET mutation testing has a high clinical relevance since it allows individuals to be identified as candidates for preventive surgery. Furthermore, data on the relationship between genotype and age at development of medullary thyroid carcinoma can be used to determine the best time for preventative surgery [19].

The MEN2 example demonstrates that observational data can provide a suitable basis for therapeutic practice despite small study samples and the absence of randomization, blinding, or other controls used to improve data quality in clinical trials. When the hereditary disorder is well understood, the expectation of benefit from a certain treatment may be strong enough to render testing by randomized trial unethical—for example, early screening colonoscopy in Lynch syndrome [20]. Even in the case of pharmacological treatment, a randomized research design may be unnecessary for rare illnesses, and the outcomes investigated may be limited to intermediate biological measurements. Replacement therapy for α(1)-antitrypsin (AAT) deficiency was licensed based on clinical studies proving its ability to sustain target serum levels in persons with severe deficiency, not on improved clinical outcomes. Subsequent clinical outcome data are scarce, although they indicate benefit for patients with severe AAT deficiency [21].

Given these concerns, high-quality observational data, such as well-designed cohort studies or case series, may be used to identify the proper management of numerous genetic illnesses, as well as the therapeutic utility of the accompanying genetic tests. However, with this strategy, questions may persist long after treatment is initiated, notably regarding treatment schedule and patient selection [22].

Although observational data may be an appropriate basis for establishing the therapeutic value of tests for uncommon, high-risk genetic illnesses, this criteria is unlikely to apply to gene variants linked with prevalent, complicated disorders or pharmacogenomic variants. To determine whether the test has appropriate predictive value for clinical application, it must be compared to alternative tests. For example, numerous genetic testing indicate those who are at a higher risk of developing cardiovascular disease. However, these tests are often less informative than intermediate risk measures like lipid profiles, which account for the impact of both genetics and environmental exposures including nutrition and other lifestyle factors [23]. Even if a gene variant is identified as an independent risk factor, additional testing is required to assess whether it aids in clinical management. These findings support the necessity of controlled outcome studies in assessing the clinical value of genetic tests for low-penetrance gene variations [24].

3. Conclusion:

This activity for healthcare professionals, particularly laboratory staff, is intended to improve learners' ability to identify patients with indications for molecular genetics testing and evaluate genetic test findings. Participants have a better understanding of specimen collection, processes, indications, potential diagnoses, normal and crucial findings, interfering variables, and consequences. Learners acquire insight into the complexity of molecular genetics, preparing them to work with an interprofessional team to enhance outcomes for patients requiring molecular genetics testing.

References

Rockwell KL. Direct-to-Consumer Medical Testing in the Era of Value-Based Care. JAMA. 2017;317(24):2485–2486.

Kalia SS, Adelman K, Bale SJ, et al. Recommendations for reporting of secondary findings in clinical exome and genome sequencing, 2016 update (ACMG SF v2.0): a policy statement of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics. Genet Med. 2017;19(2):249–255.

Katsanis SH, Katsanis N. Molecular genetic testing and the future of clinical genomics. Nat Rev Genet. 2013 Jun;14(6):415-26.

Travers A, Muskhelishvili G. DNA structure and function. FEBS J. 2015 Jun;282(12):2279-95.

Björkegren C, Baranello L. DNA Supercoiling, Topoisomerases, and Cohesin: Partners in Regulating Chromatin Architecture? Int J Mol Sci. 2018 Mar 16;19(3)

Ding Y, Manzo C, Fulcrand G, Leng F, Dunlap D, Finzi L. DNA supercoiling: a regulatory signal for the λ repressor. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014 Oct 28;111(43):15402-7.

Benbow RM. Chromosome structures. Sci Prog. 1992;76(301-302 Pt 3-4):425-50.

Wan TS, Hui EK, Ng MH. Chromosome Recognition. Methods Mol Biol. 2017;1541:67-74.

McDermaid A, Monier B, Zhao J, Liu B, Ma Q. Interpretation of differential gene expression results of RNA-seq data: review and integration. Brief Bioinform. 2019 Nov 27;20(6):2044-2054.

Chapman JR, Waldenström J. With Reference to Reference Genes: A Systematic Review of Endogenous Controls in Gene Expression Studies. PLoS One. 2015;10(11):e0141853.

Zimmern RL, Kroese M. The evaluation of genetic tests. J Public Health (Oxf). 2007 Sep;29(3):246-50.

Altshuler D, Daly MJ, Lander ES. Genetic mapping in human disease. Science. 2008 Nov 07;322(5903):881-8.

Kellenberger E. The evolution of molecular biology. EMBO Rep. 2004 Jun;5(6):546-9.

Mahdieh N, Rabbani B. An overview of mutation detection methods in genetic disorders. Iran J Pediatr. 2013 Aug;23(4):375-88.

Kosaki K, Udaka T, Okuyama T. DHPLC in clinical molecular diagnostic services. Mol Genet Metab. 2005 Sep-Oct;86(1-2):117-23.

Stuppia L, Antonucci I, Palka G, Gatta V. Use of the MLPA assay in the molecular diagnosis of gene copy number alterations in human genetic diseases. Int J Mol Sci. 2012;13(3):3245-3276.

Norwitz ER, Levy B. Noninvasive prenatal testing: the future is now. Rev Obstet Gynecol. 2013;6(2):48-62.

Sotoudeh Anvari M, Gharib A, Abolhasani M, Azari-Yam A, Hossieni Gharalari F, Safavi M, Zare Mirzaie A, Vasei M. Pre-analytical Practices in the Molecular Diagnostic Tests, A Concise Review. Iran J Pathol. 2021 Winter;16(1):1-19.

Chrzanowska NM, Kowalewski J, Lewandowska MA. Use of Fluorescence In Situ Hybridization (FISH) in Diagnosis and Tailored Therapies in Solid Tumors. Molecules. 2020 Apr 17;25(8)

Wapner RJ, Martin CL, Levy B, Ballif BC, Eng CM, Zachary JM, Savage M, Platt LD, Saltzman D, Grobman WA, Klugman S, Scholl T, Simpson JL, McCall K, Aggarwal VS, Bunke B, Nahum O, Patel A, Lamb AN, Thom EA, Beaudet AL, Ledbetter DH, Shaffer LG, Jackson L. Chromosomal microarray versus karyotyping for prenatal diagnosis. N Engl J Med. 2012 Dec 06;367(23):2175-84.

Levy B, Wapner R. Prenatal diagnosis by chromosomal microarray analysis. Fertil Steril. 2018 Feb;109(2):201-212.

Jongbloed RJ, Smeets H, Doevendans PA, van den Wijngaard A. Methods in molecular cardiology: DHPLC mutation detection analysis. Neth Heart J. 2005 Jan;13(1):11-17.

Yu B, Sawyer NA, Chiu C, Oefner PJ, Underhill PA. DNA mutation detection using denaturing high-performance liquid chromatography (DHPLC). Curr Protoc Hum Genet. 2006 Feb;Chapter 7:Unit7.10.

Hawkins SFC, Guest PC. Multiplex Analyses Using Real-Time Quantitative PCR. Methods Mol Biol. 2017;1546:125-133.