IRASS Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies
https://irasspublisher.com/journal-details/IRASSJMS
ISSN *(Online) 3049-0073*

Integrating Multi-Omics Approaches for Precision Oncology: Current Status and Future Perspectives

Yasir Haider Al-Mawlah[1*], Hussein Fadil Ibrahim[1]

[*1] DNA Research Center, University of Babylon, Babylon city, Hillah, 51001, Iraq

Corresponding Author: Yasir Haider Al-Mawlah

DNA Research Center, University of Babylon, Babylon city, Hillah, 51001, Iraq

Article History

Received: 25 / 11 / 2025

Accepted: 23 / 12 / 2025

Published: 03 / 01 /2026

Abstract: The paradigm of oncology is undergoing a fundamental shift from a one-size-fits-all approach towards precision medicine, which seeks to tailor diagnostic and therapeutic strategies to the unique molecular characteristics of an individual's tumor [1]. Genomics has been the cornerstone of this revolution, enabling the identification of driver mutations and facilitating the development of targeted therapies [2]. However, the persistent challenges of intra-tumoral heterogeneity, clonal evolution, and therapeutic resistance have underscored the limitations of a purely genomic viewpoint [3]. The genome represents a static blueprint, and its functional output is dynamically regulated through multiple layers of biological complexity. This recognition has catalyzed the emergence of multi-omics, a holistic approach that integrates data from various molecular layers, including the transcriptome, proteome, and metabolome [4]. This systematic review synthesizes the current status and future perspectives of integrating these multi-omics approaches for advancing precision oncology. We detail how each omics layer—genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics—contributes unique and complementary insights into tumor biology. We then focus on the synergistic power of their integration, which provides a systems-level understanding capable of deciphering intricate tumor phenotypes, predicting therapy response and resistance, and identifying novel biomarkers [5]. Despite the significant promise, substantial challenges remain in data integration, computational analysis, standardization, and clinical implementation [6]. The future of precision oncology hinges on overcoming these hurdles through the development of robust bioinformatic tools, the validation of multi-omics biomarkers in large-scale prospective trials, and the translation of these sophisticated approaches into routine, actionable clinical practice [7]. The ultimate goal is the construction of a dynamic, multi-dimensional molecular atlas for each patient, paving the way for truly personalized and predictive cancer care.[8]

Keywords: *Multi-omics, Precision Oncology, Genomics, Transcriptomics, Proteomics, Metabolomics, Biomarkers, Cancer Heterogeneity, Systems Biology*.

How to Cite in APA format: Al-Mawlah, Y. H. & Ibrahim, H. F. (2026). Integrating Multi-Omics Approaches for Precision Oncology: Current Status and Future Perspectives. *IRASS Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3(1),6-10.*

Introduction

Cancer is a complex and heterogeneous disease, fundamentally driven by an accumulation of genetic, epigenetic, and metabolic alterations that confer hallmark capabilities such as sustained proliferation, evasion of growth suppressors, and activation of invasion and metastasis [9]. The advent of high-throughput sequencing technologies marked the dawn of the precision oncology era, strategically moving therapeutic decisions from a primarily histology-based framework to one increasingly informed by genetics. Landmark initiatives like The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and the International Cancer Genome Consortium (ICGC) have meticulously cataloged genomic landscapes across dozens of cancer types, leading to the identification of key driver mutations and the subsequent development of targeted therapies, such as tyrosine kinase inhibitors for EGFR-mutant lung cancer or BRAF inhibitors for melanoma.[11 ,10]

Despite these monumental achievements, the initial promise of genomics has been tempered by the relentless reality of intra-tumoral heterogeneity, Darwinian clonal evolution, and the frequent development of therapeutic resistance [12]. A singular focus on the genome is inherently insufficient, as the DNA sequence represents a static blueprint whose functional output is dynamically regulated at multiple downstream biological layers. The genome does not fully capture the nuanced patterns of RNA expression, the functional proteome with its critical post-translational modifications, or the active metabolic state that sustains tumor growth and proliferation [13]. For instance, not all genomic alterations are transcribed into RNA, and not all RNA transcripts are efficiently translated into functional proteins. Furthermore, the profound influence of the tumor microenvironment on cancer behavior is largely indirect and cannot be fully deduced from genomic data alone.[14]

This critical limitation has spurred the rapid emergence of multi-omics—the integrative analysis of multiple "omes." By constructing a more holistic and multi-dimensional model of a tumor, multi-omics approaches aim to decode the intricate mechanistic networks underlying carcinogenesis, disease progression, and ultimate treatment response or failure [15]. Transcriptomics can reveal previously unappreciated molecular subtypes and the composition of the immune context, proteomics can directly identify activated signaling pathways and druggable

targets, and metabolomics can uncover critical dependencies for nutrient acquisition and energy production that represent metabolic vulnerabilities [16]. This systematic review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the current status and future trajectories of integrating these multi-omics approaches in precision oncology. We will delineate the unique and complementary contributions of genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics, and then focus on how their synergistic integration is actively reshaping personalized cancer diagnostics, prognostication, and therapeutic selection. We will also discuss the significant computational and translational challenges that must be overcome and outline a pragmatic roadmap for the future clinical implementation of multi-omics in oncology.

The Foundational Layers of Multi-Omics Analysis

The strength of a multi-omics approach lies in the distinct yet interconnected biological information provided by each analytical layer. Understanding the individual contributions of genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics is essential to appreciate their collective power.

Genomics serves as the foundational blueprint, identifying the hereditary and somatic variations that initiate and propagate oncogenesis. Through technologies like whole-exome and whole-genome sequencing, genomics has been instrumental in cataloging driver mutations, characterizing tumor mutational burden as a biomarker for immunotherapy, and identifying microsatellite instability across cancer types [17]. It provides a list of potential molecular culprits. However, its static nature is its primary limitation; it cannot discern which mutations are functionally consequential in the specific cellular context of the tumor.

Transcriptomics moves beyond the blueprint to reveal the dynamic activity of genes. By analyzing the complete set of RNA transcripts using RNA sequencing, this layer illuminates which genes are actively being expressed and can identify novel gene fusions, alternative splicing variants, and non-coding RNA species that regulate cellular processes [18]. It has been pivotal in reclassifying cancers into molecular subtypes with distinct clinical outcomes, such as the intrinsic subtypes of breast cancer [19]. Furthermore, through computational deconvolution, transcriptomic data can infer the cellular composition of the tumor immune microenvironment, providing critical insights into the abundance of T-cells, macrophages, and other immune cells, which has profound implications for predicting response to immunotherapy [20]. Despite its utility, a well-known discrepancy exists between mRNA abundance and protein function, a gap that can only be bridged by moving to the next level of analysis.

Proteomics delivers this crucial functional perspective by characterizing the entire complement of proteins, the primary effector molecules within the cell. Since most therapeutic agents, including small-molecule inhibitors and monoclonal antibodies, target proteins directly, proteomics offers the most direct readout of druggable pathways [21]. Mass spectrometry-based technologies allow for the quantification of thousands of proteins and their post-translational modifications, such as phosphorylation, which is a key regulator of signal transduction in cancer [22]. For example, phosphorylated AKT levels provide a direct measure of PI3K pathway activation, which is more informative for predicting response to AKT inhibitors than the presence of a PIK3CA mutation alone. Proteomic profiles can thus validate genomic findings, reveal activated protein networks, and identify resistance mechanisms that are not apparent at the genetic level, such as feedback loop activation or pathway rewiring.[23]

Metabolomics completes the picture by profiling the small-molecule metabolites that represent the ultimate end products of cellular processes. The metabolome is highly dynamic and serves as a sensitive reporter of the physiological state of a cancer cell, reflecting the consequences of genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic alterations [24]. Cancers are characterized by metabolic reprogramming, such as the Warburg effect, where cells preferentially utilize glycolysis for energy production even in the presence of oxygen. Metabolomics can identify such pathway activations, uncover dependencies on specific nutrients, and reveal metabolic vulnerabilities that could be therapeutically exploited [25]. For instance, the accumulation of the oncometabolite 2-hydroxyglutarate in IDH1-mutant gliomas is a direct diagnostic and therapeutic biomarker [26]. The metabolome thus provides a functional readout of the integrated activity of the entire biological system.

The Power of Integration: Synergistic Applications in Oncology

The true transformative potential of multi-omics is realized not through the sequential consideration of each dataset, but through their integrative computational analysis. This synergy allows researchers and clinicians to construct a more coherent and causal model of cancer biology, leading to several powerful applications.

One of the most significant applications is the refinement of cancer classification and prognostication. Traditional histopathological classification is increasingly being supplemented, and in some cases supplanted, by molecular subtyping derived from integrated omics data. The Clinical Proteomic Tumor Analysis Consortium (CPTAC), in collaboration with TCGA, has conducted pioneering proteogenomic studies across multiple cancers. In a landmark study of colorectal cancer, the integration of genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, and phosphoproteomic data led to the identification of five distinct subtypes, each with unique biological drivers and clinical outcomes [27]. These subtypes were characterized by specific signaling pathway activations, immune cell infiltration patterns, and metabolic features that were not apparent from genomic analysis alone. This refined stratification provides a more robust framework for predicting patient prognosis and selecting tailored therapeutic strategies, moving beyond a one-dimensional view of the disease.

Another critical application lies in elucidating the mechanisms of drug response and resistance. Targeted therapies often yield dramatic initial responses, only to be followed by relapse due to acquired resistance. Multi-omics can dissect these complex resistance mechanisms by revealing how tumors adapt at multiple levels. For example, in EGFR-mutant non-small cell lung cancer treated with osimertinib, resistance can occur through various mechanisms, including secondary EGFR mutations, bypass track activation via MET amplification, or phenotypic transformation to small cell lung cancer [28]. An integrated analysis can detect a MET amplification at the genomic level, confirm its functional consequence through elevated MET protein and phosphorylation at the proteomic level, and observe downstream metabolic shifts at the metabolomic level. This

comprehensive understanding is essential for developing rational combination therapies to overcome or prevent resistance. Similarly, proteogenomic analyses have shown that the functional proteomic landscape often explains response to chemotherapy and immunotherapy more accurately than genomic markers alone, as the proteome integrates the effects of mutations, the microenvironment, and post-translational regulation.[29]

Table 1: Examples of Multi-Omics Insights in Specific Cancers

Cancer Type	Multi-Omics Integration	Key Finding	Clinical Implication
Breast Cancer [30]	Genomics + Transcriptomics + Proteomics	Identification of a high-risk subgroup driven by Rb-loss and cyclin D1 activation, not fully discernible from mRNA data alone.	Suggests potential benefit for CDK4/6 inhibitors in this specific subgroup, beyond the standard Luminal classification.
Glioblastoma [31]	Genomics + Proteomics + Phosphoproteomics	Revealed four distinct subtypes with convergent phosphorylation signaling patterns, despite genomic heterogeneity.	Identifies common druggable kinase pathways across genomically diverse tumors, enabling new clinical trials.
Pancreatic Cancer [32]	Transcriptomics + Proteomics + Metabolomics	Defined "basal-like" and "classical" subtypes with distinct metabolic dependencies; basal-like tumors showed glutamine addiction.	Proposes targeting glutamine metabolism as a potential therapeutic strategy for the aggressive basal-like subtype.
Renal Cell Carcinoma [33]	Genomics + Metabolomics	Identification of distinct metabolic clusters associated with mutations in *VHL*, *PBRM1*, and *BAP1*, impacting patient survival.	Provides a metabolic basis for the different clinical behaviors observed and suggests metabolite-based biomarkers.

The discovery of novel, more specific biomarkers is also greatly accelerated by multi-omics. By correlating data across layers, it is possible to identify biomarker signatures that are more robust and biologically grounded. For instance, a protein or metabolite that is consistently associated with a specific genomic alteration and a particular drug response provides a much stronger candidate biomarker than any single-omics finding. Furthermore, multi-omics analyses of liquid biopsies—which analyze circulating tumor DNA (genomics), RNA (transcriptomics), proteins (proteomics), and metabolites (metabolomics) from blood—hold the promise of creating a comprehensive, minimally invasive "liquid molecular profile" of a tumor [34]. This approach could allow for real-time monitoring of tumor evolution and treatment response, enabling dynamic adjustments to therapy.

Challenges and Future Perspectives

Despite the immense promise, the widespread clinical implementation of integrated multi-omics faces several formidable challenges that must be systematically addressed.

The first set of challenges is technical and computational. The generation of multi-omics data produces immense, high-dimensional datasets that are heterogeneous in nature, requiring sophisticated bioinformatic tools and substantial computational resources for storage, processing, and integration [35]. A major hurdle is the development of robust and reproducible computational methods for data integration. Techniques range as mentioned in Table 2, but there is no one-size-fits-all solution, and the field is still evolving. Furthermore, batch effects and a lack of standardization across different sequencing platforms and mass spectrometry instruments can introduce technical variations that confound biological signals, necessitating careful normalization and harmonization procedures.[36]

Table 2: Computational Approaches for Multi-Omics Data Integration

Approach	Description	Key Consideration
Concatenation-based [37]	Raw or processed data from different omics layers are merged into a single large matrix for analysis.	Simple but can be dominated by high-dimensional data types; requires careful scaling.
Model-based [38]	Uses statistical models (e.g., Bayesian networks, matrix factorization) to infer latent variables that represent shared biological patterns across omics layers.	Powerful for identifying hidden structures but can be computationally intensive and complex to interpret.
Similarity-based [39]	Constructs separate similarity networks for each data type and then integrates these networks to find consensus patterns.	Useful for identifying patient subgroups; relies on the choice of similarity metric.
Knowledge-based [40]	Integrates data within the context of prior biological knowledge from pathways and protein-protein interaction databases.	Provides mechanistic context but is limited by the completeness and accuracy of existing knowledge bases.

The second set of challenges is translational and clinical. The cost and turnaround time for generating and analyzing multi-omics data, while decreasing, are still prohibitive for routine clinical use outside of major academic centers [41]. There is a pressing need for large-scale, prospective clinical trials that validate the utility of multi-omics-guided therapy in improving patient outcomes, such as overall survival, compared to standard-of-care. Demonstrating clinical utility and cost-effectiveness is paramount for convincing healthcare providers and payers to adopt these complex approaches. Furthermore, the clinical interpretation of multi-omics findings requires multidisciplinary molecular tumor boards comprising molecular pathologists, bioinformaticians, geneticists, and oncologists to translate complex data into actionable clinical decisions.[42]

Looking forward, the future of integrated multi-omics in oncology is bright and will be shaped by several key developments. The rise of single-cell multi-omics technologies, which allow for the simultaneous measurement of genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, and epigenetic information from the same single cell, will provide an unprecedented resolution to map intra-tumoral heterogeneity and cellular ecosystems [43]. The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning, particularly deep learning, will be crucial for extracting subtle, non-linear patterns from these vast, complex datasets to predict drug responses and identify novel therapeutic vulnerabilities [44]. Finally, a major push towards data sharing and the creation of large, publicly available, well-annotated multi-omics datasets will be essential for training and validating these AI models and for fostering global collaboration. Initiatives like the NCI's Cancer Research Data Commons are critical steps in this direction.[45]

Conclusion

The integration of multi-omics approaches represents a paradigm shift in precision oncology, moving the field beyond the limitations of a single-molecule perspective. By weaving together the threads of genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics, we can now construct a multi-dimensional and dynamic atlas of individual tumors. This holistic view is dramatically enhancing our understanding of cancer biology, enabling more precise disease classification, unraveling the complex mechanisms of therapy response and resistance, and accelerating the discovery of next-generation biomarkers. While significant challenges in data integration, standardization, and clinical translation remain, the relentless pace of technological and computational innovation provides a clear path forward. The future of cancer care lies in the ability to routinely generate and interpret these comprehensive molecular portraits, thereby empowering clinicians to deliver truly personalized, predictive, and preemptive cancer medicine tailored to the unique biological reality of each patient's disease.

References

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

[2] Stratton MR, Campbell PJ, Futreal PA. The cancer genome. Nature. 2009;458(7239):719-24.

[3] McGranahan N, Swanton C. Clonal heterogeneity and tumor evolution: past, present, and the future. Cell. 2017;168(4):613-28.

[4] Hasin Y, Seldin M, Lusis A. Multi-omics approaches to disease. Genome Biol. 2017;18(1):83.

[5] Subramanian I, Verma S, Kumar S, Jere A, Anamika K. Multi-omics data integration, interpretation, and its application. Bioinform Biol Insights. 2020;14:1177932219899051.

[6] Reel PS, Reel S, Pearson E, Trucco E, Jefferson E. Using machine learning approaches for multi-omics data analysis: A review. Biotechnol Adv. 2021;49:107739.

[7] Mirza B, Wang W, Wang J, Choi H, Chung NC, Ping P. Machine learning and integrative analysis of biomedical big data. Genes (Basel). 2019;10(2):87.

[8] Hoadley KA, Yau C, Hinoue T, Wolf DM, Lazar AJ, Drill E, et al. Cell-of-origin patterns dominate the molecular classification of 10,000 tumors from 33 types of cancer. Cell. 2018;173(2):291-304.e6.

[9] Hanahan D. Hallmarks of cancer: new dimensions. Cancer Discov. 2022;12(1):31-46.

[10] The Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network. The Cancer Genome Atlas Pan-Cancer analysis project. Nat Genet. 2013;45(10):1113-20.

[11] International Cancer Genome Consortium. International network of cancer genome projects. Nature. 2010;464(7291):993-8.

[12] Dagogo-Jack I, Shaw AT. Tumour heterogeneity and resistance to cancer therapies. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2018;15(2):81-94.

[13] Zhang B, Wang J, Wang X, Zhu J, Liu Q, Shi Z, et al. Proteogenomic characterization of human colon and rectal cancer. Nature. 2014;513(7518):382-7.

[14] Junttila MR, de Sauvage FJ. Influence of tumour micro-environment heterogeneity on therapeutic response. Nature. 2013;501(7467):346-54.

[15] Chandran UR, Medvedeva OP, Barmada MM, Blood PD, Chakka A, Luthra S, et al. TCGA Expedition: A data acquisition and management system for TCGA data. PLoS One. 2016;11(10):e0165395.

[16] Creixell P, Reimand J, Haider S, Wu G, Shibata T, Vazquez M, et al. Pathway and network analysis of cancer genomes. Nat Methods. 2015;12(7):615-21.

[17] Chalmers ZR, Connelly CF, Fabrizio D, Gay L, Ali SM, Ennis R, et al. Analysis of 100,000 human cancer genomes reveals the landscape of tumor mutational burden. Genome Med. 2017;9(1):34.

[18] Wang Z, Gerstein M, Snyder M. RNA-Seq: a revolutionary tool for transcriptomics. Nat Rev Genet. 2009;10(1):57-63.

[19] Perou CM, Sørlie T, Eisen MB, van de Rijn M, Jeffrey SS, Rees CA, et al. Molecular portraits of human breast tumours. Nature. 2000;406(6797):747-52.

[20] Newman AM, Liu CL, Green MR, Gentles AJ, Feng W, Xu Y, et al. Robust enumeration of cell subsets from tissue expression profiles. Nat Methods. 2015;12(5):453-7.

[21] Aebersold R, Mann M. Mass-spectrometric exploration of proteome structure and function. Nature. 2016;537(7620):347-55.

[22] Zhang H, Liu T, Zhang Z, Payne SH, Zhang B, McDermott JE, et al. Integrated proteogenomic characterization of human high-grade serous ovarian cancer. Cell. 2016;166(3):755-65.

[23] Krug K, Jaehnig EJ, Satpathy S, Blumenberg L, Karpova A, Anurag M, et al. Proteogenomic landscape of breast cancer tumorigenesis and targeted therapy. Cell. 2020;183(5):1436-56.e31.
[24] Faubert B, Solmonson A, DeBerardinis RJ. Metabolic reprogramming and cancer progression. Science. 2020;368(6487):eaaw5473.
[25] Vander Heiden MG, DeBerardinis RJ. Understanding the intersections between metabolism and cancer biology. Cell. 2017;168(4):657-69.
[26] Dang L, White DW, Gross S, Bennett BD, Bittinger MA, Driggers EM, et al. Cancer-associated IDH1 mutations produce 2-hydroxyglutarate. Nature. 2009;462(7274):739-44.
[27] Vasaikar S, Huang C, Wang X, Petyuk VA, Savage SR, Wen B, et al. Proteogenomic analysis of human colon cancer reveals new therapeutic opportunities. Cell. 2019;177(4):1035-49.e19.
[28] Leonetti A, Sharma S, Minari R, Perego P, Giovannetti E, Tiseo M. Resistance mechanisms to osimertinib in EGFR-mutated non-small cell lung cancer. Br J Cancer. 2019;121(9):725-37.
[29] Roper N, Gao S, Maity TK, Banday AR, Zhang X, Venugopalan A, et al. APOBEC mutagenesis and copy-number alterations are drivers of proteogenomic tumor evolution and heterogeneity in metastatic thoracic tumors. Cell Rep. 2019;26(10):2651-66.e6.
[30] Mertins P, Mani DR, Ruggles KV, Gillette MA, Clauser KR, Wang P, et al. Proteogenomics connects somatic mutations to signalling in breast cancer. Nature. 2016;534(7605):55-62.
[31] Wang LB, Karpova A, Gritsenko MA, Kyle JE, Cao S, Li Y, et al. Proteogenomic and metabolomic characterization of human glioblastoma. Cancer Cell. 2021;39(4):509-28.e20.
[32] Daemen A, Peterson D, Sahu N, McCord R, Du X, Liu B, et al. Metabolite profiling stratifies pancreatic ductal adenocarcinomas into subtypes with distinct sensitivities to metabolic inhibitors. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112(32):E4410-7.
[33] Hakimi AA, Reznik E, Lee CH, Creighton CJ, Brannon AR, Luna A, et al. An integrated metabolic atlas of clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Cancer Cell. 2016;29(1):104-16.
[34] Heitzer E, Haque IS, Roberts CES, Speicher MR. Current and future perspectives of liquid biopsies in genomics-driven oncology. Nat Rev Genet. 2019;20(2):71-88.
[35] Pinu FR, Beale DJ, Paten AM, Kouremenos K, Swarup S, Schirra HJ, et al. Systems biology and multi-omics integration: Viewpoints from the metabolomics research community. Metabolites. 2019;9(4):76.
[36] Leek JT, Scharpf RB, Bravo HC, Simcha D, Langmead B, Johnson WE, et al. Tackling the widespread and critical impact of batch effects in high-throughput data. Nat Rev Genet. 2010;11(10):733-9.
[37] Rappoport N, Shamir R. Multi-omic and multi-view clustering algorithms: review and cancer benchmark. Nucleic Acids Res. 2018;46(20):10546-62.
[38] Shen R, Olshen AB, Ladanyi M. Integrative clustering of multiple genomic data types using a joint latent variable model with application to breast and lung cancer subtype analysis. Bioinformatics. 2009;25(22):2906-12.
[39] Wang B, Mezlini AM, Demir F, Fiume M, Tu Z, Brudno M, et al. Similarity network fusion for aggregating data types on a genomic scale. Nat Methods. 2014;11(3):333-7.
[40] Kuperstein I, Bonnet E, Nguyen HA, Cohen D, Viara E, Grieco L, et al. Atlas of Cancer Signalling Network: a systems biology resource for integrative analysis of cancer data with Google Maps. Oncogenesis. 2015;4(7):e160.
[41] Servant N, Bollet MA, Halfwerk H, Bleakley K, Kreike B, Jacob L, et al. The cost of molecular-guided therapy in oncology: a prospective cost study alongside the MOSCATO trial. Genet Med. 2017;19(6):683-90.
[42] Horak P, Heining C, Kreutzfeldt S, Hutter B, Mock A, Hüllein J, et al. Comprehensive genomic and transcriptomic analysis for guiding therapeutic decisions in patients with rare cancers. Cancer Discov. 2021;11(11):2780-95.
[43] Ma A, McDermaid A, Xu J, Chang Y, Ma Q. Integrative methods and practical challenges for single-cell multi-omics. Trends Biotechnol. 2020;38(9):1007-22.
[44] Tran KA, Kondrashova O, Bradley A, Williams ED, Pearson JV, Waddell N. Deep learning in cancer diagnosis, prognosis and treatment selection. Genome Med. 2021;13(1):152.
[45] Jensen MA, Ferretti V, Grossman RL, Staudt LM. The NCI Genomic Data Commons as an engine for precision medicine. Blood. 2017;130(4):453-9.