E-ISSN: 2706-9575
P-ISSN: 2706-9567
IJARM 2019; 1(1): 92-94
Received: 02-03-2019
Accepted: 06-04-2019

Dr. Saroj Kumar Sahu
Assistant Professor, Department of Nuclear Medicine, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Sudatta Ray
Assistant Professor, Department of Nuclear Medicine, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Saroj Kumar Sahu
Assistant Professor, Department of Nuclear Medicine, IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Development of specific biomarker for early detection of GI tract cancer: An insilco study

Dr. Saroj Kumar Sahu and Sudatta Ray

Abstract
Visualization of patients with Gastric malignant growth (GC) is for the most part poor due to the absence of basic, helpful, and noninvasive instruments for GC discovery at the beginning period. The revelation of microRNAs (miRNAs) and their diverse articulation profiles among various types of illnesses has opened another road for tumor finding. The point of the examination was particular preliminaries as a biomarker for early detection of GI tract malignancy.
Methods: Between mid-2017 and mid-June 2018, a total of 232 gastric cancer patients who underwent gastrectomy and 62 healthy volunteers were prospectively enrolled. Before gastrectomy, peripheral blood samples were obtained, and circulating tumour cells (CTCs) were analyzed utilizing a centrifugal microfluidic device and a novel fluid-assisted separation method.
Results: In the wake of making a beneficiary working trademark bend to recognize the discriminative CTC esteem required separate patients with gastric malignant growth from solid volunteers, affectability and specificity were about enhanced at a CTC limit of 2 for each 7.5 mL of blood. Of the 232 people with a CTC level _2 per 7.5 mL of blood, (98%) had gastric malignant growth, and of the 48 people with a CTC level <2 per 7.5 mL of blood, 65% were solid controls. Likewise, the affectability and specificity for the separation of patients with gastric disease from solid controls were 86.3% and 92.8%, separately. Be that as it may, the nearness of CTCs was not related with any clinicopathologic highlights, for example, organizing, histologic type, or mucin phenotype.

Keywords: Primer, GI tract, biomarker, micro RNA, malignant

Introduction
The third biggest cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide is gastric cancer [1, 2, 3]. Due to a lack of effective detection methods and therapies, more than 8.2 million people die from cancer each year [4]. The third most prevalent cancer in the world is colorectal cancer (CRC). It is the second biggest cause of cancer-related death, causing close to 50,000 fatalities annually [5, 6]. While careful thought and screening programmes play important roles in the survival of patients with colorectal cancer (CRC), the best treatment is careful resection in the early stages, which prolongs the survival of patients. Tragically, since there are fewer signs, early CRCs are difficult to detect. To find CRC biomarkers, the proteome of circulating blood has been used.
The components basic chemo-resistance in gastric tumor are not by any stretch of the imagination known, yet the accompanying instruments have been accounted for: diminished intracellular medication collection as well as expanded medication efflux, expanded nucleotide extraction repair action, avoidance of apoptosis, initiation of a few flagging pathways and the presence of putative disease undeveloped cells. Another hypothesis for chemo sensitivity is the malignancy undeveloped cell theory: A little level of growth cells, the remaining disease cells or the putative tumor undifferentiated organisms, are impervious to chemotherapy-interceded cell murdering, and turn into the hotspot for tumor backslide. On the off chance that the administrative instruments for keeping up this cell populace are found, specialists disturbing the components might be utilized to create novel techniques to treat gastric growth.
GC is a heterogeneous ailment in which every malignancy persistent displays a particular hereditary and sub-atomic profile. Sadly, in spite of the fact that a various investigations has been led on atomic biomarkers, the majority of the distinguished biomarkers bombed in the approval thinks about. Nearly patients with cutting edge GC still can't be treated with a focused on treatment and as of now no indicative markers can be seen for optional anticipation. For having the capacity to utilize GC related biomarkers in clinical consideration of patients, extensive survey to decide the heading for distinguishing the exact biomarker pinpoint that can be investigated for the customized treatment.

Therefore, new methods and novel diagnostic biomarkers are urgently required for mass surveys of early events of CRC.

The aggressive biological nature of the tumour, a lack of trustworthy diagnostic methods for early-stage diagnosis, and a lack of efficient customized treatment all contribute to the poor prognosis [8].

The components basic chemo-resistance in gastric tumor are not by any stretch of the imagination known, yet the accompanying instruments have been accounted for: diminished intracellular medication collection as well as expanded medication efflux, expanded nucleotide extraction repair action, avoidance of apoptosis, initiation of a few flagging pathways and the presence of putative disease undeveloped cells. Another hypothesis for chemo-sensitivity is the malignancy undeveloped cell theory: a little level of growth cells, the remaining disease cells or the putative tumor undifferentiated organisms, are impervious to chemotherapy-interceded cell murdering, and turn into the hotspot for tumor backslide. On the off chance that the administrative instruments for keeping up this cell populace are found, specialists disturbing the components might be utilized to create novel techniques to treat gastric growth.

Of the numerous elements related with long haul survival of gastric malignancy patients, strategies of gastrectomy and fundamental treatment have been examined extensively. Albeit less examined, biologic varieties in gastric tumors among races may to some degree drive a portion of the watched survival inconsistencies. Later sub-atomic portrayals of gastric adenocarcinomas exhibit a huge sub-atomic heterogeneity in this growth [9].

Material and method

Individuals and Samples IMS & SUM Hospital in Bhubaneswar, Odisha, and the Institutional Review Board both gave their approval for the study. All patients gave their written approval for the samples to be used for study. A total of 236 patients from the same department's gastroenterology department had their gastric cancer tissues taken during the relevant operation region A. These were the eligibility requirements for the current study: The following criteria must be met:

1. A pathologic examination confirming the presence of stomach cancer and having undergone radical surgery;
2. Comprehensive basic clinical data;
3. No history of cancer treatment; and
4. No significant complications or other malignant disease.

There were 78 men and the remaining women. All pertinent clinical pathologic characteristics (Table 1) were retrieved from the patient record Tumor.

Table 1: Mucin expression in gastric cancer according to the level of circulation tumor cells

	CTC<2 (n=17)	CTC≥2 (N=99)	P value
Muc expression, n (%)			
Negative	12 (14)	72 (86)	1.000
Positive	5 (16)	27 (84)	
MUC5AC expression, n (%)			
Negative	7 (19)	29 (81)	0.397
Positive	10 (12)	70 (88)	
MUC6 expression, n (%)			
Negative	13 (15	75 (85)	1.00
Positive	4 (14)	24 (86)	Negative
CD10 expression, n (%)			1.00
Negative	16(15)	88(85)	
positive	1 (8)	11 (92)	
Mucin Phenotype, n (%)			
Gastric type	7 (12)	53 (88)	
Intestinal type	3 (13)	21 (87)	0.606
Null type	4 (22)	14 (70)	

Table 2: Gastric cancer primary cancer

	Normal (N=4)	Pan Ins (N=20)	Stage-1 (N=38)	Stage-II (N=78)	Stage III (N=5)	Stage IV (N=2)
Meian survival (Months)		137.3	42.4	17.8	13.9	19.6
Male	3 (75%)	9 (45%)	9 (23.7%)	44 (57%)	1 (20%)	2 (100%)
Female	1 (25%)	11 (55%)	29 (76.3%)	34 (43%)	4 (80%)	0.0%
Well differentiated		9 (45%)	3 (7.9%)	4 (5.1%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
Moderately differentiated		8 (40%)	23 (60.5%)	41 (52%)	4 (40%)	1 (50%)
Poorly Differentiated		3 (15%)	12 (31.6%)	33 (42%)	4 (40%)	1 (50%)

Table 3: Sensitivity and specificity of CACAT2 and CDH1 in gastric cancer patients blood sample

		GACAT2		CDH1	
Gasstic cancer		Sensitivity			
stage	n	Estimated value	95% CI	Estimated value	95% CI
I	10	90% (9/10)	66-91%	90% (9/10)	33-63%
II-IV	32	75% (24/32)		34% (11/32)	
Total	42	79% (33/42)		48% (20/42	
Specificity (%)					
		Estimated value	95% CI	Estimated value	95% CI
Normal	26	86%	76-100%	92%	82-100%

Table 4: Homo sapiens gastric cancer antigen Zg14 mRNA, partial CDS

Sl No	Gene	Forward primers	Annealing temperature	Reverse primers	Annealing temperature	Size of amplicons
	Zg14	AGAGAGCCACCCTGTGAAGA	59.99	CCTCCTTGGCCTTAGCTTCT	59.98	152
		AGAGAGCCACCCTGTGAAGA	59.99	CTCCTCCTTGGCCTTAGCTT	59.98	154
		AGAGAGCCACCCTGTGAAGA	59.99	CTCCTCCTTGGCCTTAGCTT	59.98	151
		GAGAGCCACCCTGTGAAGAG	59.99	CTCCTCCTTGGCCTTAGCTT	59.98	153
		TTTTCATCCCAAGCCAGTTC	60.05	TTCCTCAGCGATCTTCTGGT	59.98	241

Table 5: AY039239.1 Homo sapiens gastric cancer antigen Ga55 (TACC1) mRNA, partial CDS

Sl No	Gene	Forward primers	Annealing temperature	Reverse primers	Annealing temperature	Size of amplicons
1.	TACC1	AGAAGGCAAAGTCGCGTTTA	60.02	GCATGGCCATCCCTATTAGA	59.88	178
2.		GGTGTTCTGGAAGGGTTCAA	59.94	GAGCTGCACTCTCAGCCTTT	59.90	187
3.		GAATCACCCAAGAAGGCAAA	60.05	CTCCTCCTTGGCCTTAGCTT	59.88	188
4.		ATCCACGTCATGTGGTCAGA	59.96	TCTGGCACGTCTCCTTCTCT	60.14	153
5.		AGAAGGCAAAGTCGCGTTTA	60.02	CCAGCTGATTTCTGACCACA	59.83	229

Discussion

Conclusions and future Perspectives

Plasmacytoma variation translocation 1 is a nearly very much described oncogenic lncRNA, which is up-controlled in malignant growths, particularly in numerous stomach related framework tumors, which incorporates oesophageal disease, GC, HCC, CRC and PC. We checked on GACAT2 communication with DNA, RNA, and in addition related proteins in event of stomach related framework malignant growths. It is enticing to guess that GACAT2 may hinder authoritative strides in various stomach related framework malignant growth suppressive and oncogenic pathways. GACAT2 could advance tumor cell multiplication, movement and attack. GACAT2 up-direction is generally connected with poor visualization. GACAT2 will be a possibly helpful biomarker for conclusion and restorative focuses of stomach related framework tumors. Be that as it may, there is still absence of the autonomous associate investigation for approval. Along these lines, multicenter studies will be required, which can improve the clinical utility of GACAT2 as a compelling biomarker [10].

Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interest exists

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest

Source of funding

Self

Ethical clearance

Approved from Institutional Ethics Committee

References

1. Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, *et al*., Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012, International Journal of Cancer. 2015;136(5):E359-E386.
2. Park HA, Nam SY, Lee SK, *et al*., The Korean guideline for gastric cancer screening, Journal of the Korean Medical Association. 2015;58(5):373.
3. Hamashima C, Shibuya D, Yamazaki H, *et al*., The Japanese guidelines for gastric cancer screening, Japanese Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2008;38(4):259-267.
4. McGuire S. World Cancer Report 2014. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on Cancer, WHO Press, Adv Nutr. 2016;7:418-9.
5. Garcia-Bilbao A, Armananzas R, Ispizua Z, Calvo B, Alonso-Varona A, *et al*. Identification of a biomarker panel for colorectal cancer diagnosis. BMC Cancer. 2012;12:43.
6. Murakoshi Y, Honda K, Sasazuki S, Ono M, Negishi A, *et al*. Plasma biomarker discovery and validation for colorectal cancer by quantitative shotgun mass spectrometry and protein microarray. Cancer Sci. 2011;102:630-638.
7. Duffy MJ, Van Dalen A, Haglund C, Hansson L, Holinski-Feder E, *et al*. Tumour markers in colorectal cancer: European Group on Tumour Markers (EGTM) guidelines for clinical use. Eur J Cancer. 2007;43:1348-1360.
8. Lambert R, Hainaut P. The multidisciplinary management of gastrointestinal cancer Epidemiology of esophagogastric cancer. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol. 2007;21:921-945.
9. Tumor Genome Atlas Research Network. Extensive sub-atomic portrayal of gastric adenocarcinoma. Nature. 2014;513:202-9.
10. Cristescu R, Lee J, Nebozhyn M, *et al*. Sub-atomic examination of gastric tumor distinguishes subtypes related with unmistakable clinical results. Nat Med. 2015;21:449-56.
11. Edge SB, Compton CC. The American Joint Committee on Cancer: the 7th edition of the AJCC cancer staging manual and the future of TNM. Ann Surg Oncol. 2010;17:1471-1474.

How to Cite This Article
Saroj KS, Sudatta R. Development of specific biomarker for early detection of GI tract cancer: An Insilco study. International Journal of Advanced Research in Medicine 2019; 1(1): 92-94.