Applied & Translational Genomics 3 (2014) 43–47

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Applied & Translational Genomics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/atg

Review

Translational genomics

Martin Kussmann [a,b,c,*], Jim Kaput [d,e]

[a] Molecular Biomarkers Core, Nestlé Institute of Health Sciences (NIHS), Lausanne, Switzerland
[b] Faculty of Life Sciences, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland
[c] Faculty of Science, Interdisciplinary NanoScience Center (iNANO), Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark
[d] Systems Nutrition and Health Unit, Nestlé Institute of Health Sciences (NIHS), Lausanne, Switzerland
[e] Service Endocrinol. Diabetes, Metabol. Univ. Hospital Lausanne (CHUV), Univ. Lausanne, Switzerland

A B S T R A C T

The term "Translational Genomics" reflects both title and mission of this new journal. "Translational" has traditionally been understood as "applied research" or "development", different from or even opposed to "basic research". Recent scientific and societal developments have triggered a re-assessment of the connotation that "translational" and "basic" are either/or activities: translational research nowadays aims at feeding the best science into applications and solutions for human society. We therefore argue here basic science to be challenged and leveraged for its relevance to human health and societal benefits. This more recent approach and attitude are catalyzed by four trends or developments: evidence-based solutions; large-scale, high dimensional data; consumer/patient empowerment; and systems-level understanding.

Contents

1. Introduction

Translational genomics is both the title and mission of this new journal. Translational research has a long history of practice that was formalized by the creation of the U.S. NIH National Center for Translational Research (Collins, 2011) and the UK's Medical Research Council program in Translational Research (http://tinyurl.com/owmvp4o). Governments throughout the world are funding research programs and centers (e.g., (Daiming et al., 2012)) through grant funding mechanisms such as EU's H2020 (Andersson, 2012). The goals of these initiatives are to decrease failure rates, expenses, and timelines for drug and evidence-based product and solution development. In parallel with these government-funded programs, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Critical Path Initiative (Woodcock and Woosley, 2008), the European Union's Innovative Medicine Initiative (Goldman, 2012), and the European Advanced Translational Research Infrastructure in Medicine (EATRIS — http://www.eatris.eu/) were initiated to foster public–private partnerships to enhance translation of basic biomedical research into patient- and consumer-end products and solutions. Not long ago, "translational" was an acronym for applied research or development (i.e. the "D" in "R&D"), an anathema to many investigators conducting basic research. However, recent scientific, technological and societal developments are now causing a re-assessment of the negative connotation of "applied" and "development" and the – in our view misleading – idea that "translational" and "basic" are either/or activities: translational research simply seeks to combine the best science with applications in real time for

* Corresponding author at: Molecular Biomarkers Core, Nestlé Institute of Health Sciences, EPFL Campus, Innovation Park, Building H, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atg.2014.05.001

citizens and societies. Rather than esoterically distinguishing "basic" from "applied" science, we propose here to challenge and leverage basic science for its *relevance* to human health and societal benefits. This more recent approach and emerging scientific attitude root in four developments that we will outline hereunder: (1) evidence-based solutions; (2) "big data"; (3) consumer/patient empowerment; and (4) system thinking.

2. Development 1: The increasing need for evidenced-based solutions

The increasing prevalence of complex, age-related chronic diseases in developing and emerging economies is intensifying scientific, ethical and economic calls to improve the healthcare system (Callahan, 2013) and act on related health disparities (Dankwa-Mullan et al., 2010). Governments, companies, and philanthropic organizations recognize these realities and are now challenging investigators in "basic" research fields to translate their findings to actionable knowledge or products (Hobin et al., 2012). The burden is intense for the genomics field, which (over)promised rapid solutions to disease from leveraging data from the Human Genome (Consortium, 2001; Venter et al., 2001), HapMap (International HapMap Consortium, 2003), and related projects on human genetic diversity (Li et al., 2008; Siva, 2008).

3. Development 2: High-throughput laboratory and clinical data generation

The second development reinforcing the concept that basic research can be translatable is the ongoing evolution in the ability to quantify physiologies and genetic makeups of large numbers of study participants and patients using omics-based and imaging technologies. "Omics" analysis is meant to suggest a comprehensive analysis of molecules (i.e., genes/transcripts/proteins/lipids/metabolites) but in reality means as many molecules as the technology allows, with ranges of ~10s of chemically similar molecules (e.g., water-soluble organic micronutrients) to millions and soon billions of DNA bases.

In many cases, omic analysis is done with untargeted methods in a high-throughput screen (e.g. NMR-based metabonomics, or MS-based proteomics), which is then followed by more targeted and hence more sensitive methods focusing on a subset of molecules. Targeted quantification requires specific method development, in contrast to the generic screening methods. Such hypothesis-limited (Editorial, 1999) approaches differ from assessing a specific research question by means of measuring selected molecular readouts but promise to provide more comprehensive understanding of biological processes thanks to conceptually unbiased analysis (Kaput and Morine, 2012). These omics sciences have evolved over the last few decades and are prime examples of how technology has transformed and driven biomedical and other areas of biology research.

4. Development 3: Self-quantification and consumer empowerment

Knowledge-bases and clinical/diagnostic translations are outcomes of omics research, which essentially provide the dictionaries of components of human life. In almost all cases however, omics databases provide information about population averages or ranges for a molecule in a biofluid (e.g., Human Metabolome Database — http://www.hmdb.ca). In many such cases, these ranges are specific to the tested population since not all (or even many) ancestral genetic makeups have been sampled. Public health recommendations and clinical care are often based on the information captured in these databases but the information has to be individually adapted to the patient/consumer/person. Omics data obtained from analyzing one person has demonstrated the long-known facts of biochemical and genetic individuality (Williams, 1956).

The growing self-quantification movement and several citizen science research projects are disrupting the population average database model since individuals are now sharing n-of-1 data, including genomic information. This open genome and personal data access movement started with the Personal Genome Project at Harvard, which sequenced and allowed access to the genomes of 10 individuals (Church, 2005; Lunshof et al., 2010). An individual can obtain his/her genetic data from commercial companies (such as 23andme, FamilyTreeDNA). While the U.S. FDA has restricted these and other companies from providing associations to trait, phenotype, or disease (Green and Farahany, 2014), no restrictions were placed on the right of individuals to own their personal data (Angrist, 2014). Hence, individuals can and do share their data. OpenSNP (https://opensnp.org/) has about 2000 participants (accessed 18 April 2014) who have uploaded their genetic variation data, phenotypes, and traits with an option to allow their data to be downloaded by others for computational analysis. Associating individual genetic variants with complex phenotypes is less than robust (Ransohoff and Khoury, 2010) mitigating present-day concerns about the potential for discriminatory use of genomic data, However, ongoing research increasingly associates patterns of gene variants with susceptibilities to diseases and traits and privacy concerns are likely justified.

Access to individual genomic data holds great promise for making these associations. However, among the limiting factors for analyzing genetic data and outcomes is the lack of reliable and standardized dietary and lifestyle data, plus the missing access to personal omics data. A person's "molecular" phenotype is defined not only by classical measures such as body weight, blood pressure and clinical blood chemistry parameters, but also by their changing metabolites, transcripts, and proteins. Web-enabled research tools that capture, manage, store, and retrieve these personal molecular phenotype and lifestyle data are unavailable to the research community (Stumbo et al., 2010). NuGO, the former EU framework six-funded Nutrigenomics Organization and now scientific association (http://www.nugo.org), has launched the nutrition researcher cohort (NRC — http://www.nugo.org/nrc and (van Ommen, 2013)), an initiative to develop an open access cohort where each individual provides and owns her/his own health data that can be analyzed by the individual (e.g., (Chen et al., 2012)). However, the true strength of NRC will come from aggregating individual data with data from other members of the cohort (Monteiro et al., 2014; Nikles et al., 2011) to develop more in depth understanding of health phenotypes.

The smartphone revolution is being used by NRC and other initiatives since at least 500 apps (from http://quantifiedself.com/guide/ — 17 April 2014) exist to monitor all aspects of life including dietary intakes, sleep, moods, activity and physiological measures such as heart rate variability (Flatt and Esco, 2013), stress, blood glucose, or cholesterol levels (Oncescu et al., 2014). Healthcare (Boulos et al., 2011) and research activities may be transformed by the self-quantification movement if the diet and lifestyle data captured by apps and devices is of high quality and accuracy (Young et al., 2014). Data harmonization (Lynn et al., 2010; van Ommen et al., 2010) will also be essential for enabling system approaches to analysis of high dimensional data.

5. Development 4: System thinking and analysis

Modern biomedical research relies on very detailed mapping of biochemical reactions and interactions (e.g., http://web.expasy.org/cgi-bin/pathways/show_thumbnails.pl) that were generated largely from reductionist methods that examined each reaction either in isolation from other reactions or in limited biochemical contexts. While time-tested experimental methods continue to generate ever-finer details of these processes, the simple visual figures of biochemical transformations can give "the illusion of explanatory depth" (Rozenblit and Keil, 2002). Despite their utility for mechanistic research, biological outcomes can usually not be predicted from this knowledge base. Metabolism and its regulation form a complex interacting set of processes that change over time and in different environments.

System thinking and computational methods are now being increasingly used to help analyze and visualize biological systems such as