Journal on Oncology

www.journalononcology.org

Research Article

Open Access, Volume 6

Biological Memory of the Genome: An Extension of the Gene Latency Framework

Abdulmohsen H Alrohaimi*

Department of Pharmacology, College of Pharmacy, Shaqra University, Shaqra 11961, Saudi Arabia.

Abstract

Background: Advances in genomics over the past two decades have revealed that only a small fraction of the genome actively encodes proteins, while the majority of genomic sequences remain transcriptionally inactive across most biological contexts. Early interpretations described these regions as "junk DNA" or evolutionary remnants accumulated through neutral processes. However, accumulating evidence from functional genomics, epigenetics, and pseudogene research increasingly indicates that many apparently inactive genomic regions retain structural integrity and regulatory potential. These observations raise fundamental questions about why genomes preserve large quantities of apparently unused genetic information.

Aim: This study introduces the concept of Biological Memory of the Genome as an extension of the Gene Latency framework proposed by Alrohaimi. The objective is to develop a conceptual theoretical model explaining how genomes preserve accumulated genetic information across evolutionary time and how latent genetic elements may represent stored biological potential.

Methods: A conceptual research design was employed using integrative literature synthesis across genomics, evolutionary biology, pseudogene research, regulatory genomics, and systems biology. Through a multi-stage conceptual modeling process, patterns related to genomic preservation and latent functional potential were analyzed and integrated into a unified theoretical framework describing genomic biological memory.

Results: The analysis suggests that genomes may function not only as systems executing active genetic programs but also as repositories of preserved genetic information accumulated across evolutionary history. Within this framework, pseudogenes, duplicated genes, regulatory sequences, and silent genetic pathways may represent components of a genomic biological memory system capable of storing latent functional potential. These preserved elements may remain inactive for extended evolutionary periods while retaining the capacity to participate in future regulatory or evolutionary processes.

Conclusions: The concept of Biological Memory of the Genome extends the Gene Latency framework by proposing that genomic architecture includes a long-term evolutionary information storage system. This perspective offers a new theoretical interpretation of genomic inactivity and suggests that preserved genetic elements may contribute to evolutionary adaptability and regulatory innovation. Future genomic and computational research may help clarify the mechanisms through which biological memory is preserved and mobilized within genomic systems.

Keywords: Biological memory of the genome; Gene latency; Genome architecture; Pseudogenes; Evolutionary Genomicg; Systems biology; Regulatory networks.

Manuscript Information: *Received: Sep 09 2026; Accepted: Oct 28, 2026; Published: Nov 04, 2026*

Correspondence: *Abdulmohsen H Alrohaimi, Department of Pharmacology, College of Pharmacy, Shaqra University, Shaqra 11961, Saudi Arabia. Email: alrohaimi@su.edu.sa*

Citation: *Alrohaimi AH. Biological Memory of the Genome: An Extension of the Gene Latency Framework. J Oncology. 2026; 6(2): 1221.*

Copyright: © Alrohaimi AH 2026. *Content published in the journal follows creative common attribution license.*

Introduction

The sequencing of complex genomes has fundamentally transformed modern biology by providing unprecedented insight into the genetic architecture of living systems. The completion of the Human Genome Project revealed that the human genome contains approximately three billion base pairs of DNAS yet encodes only around twenty thousand protein-coding genes [1,2]. This discovery challenged earlier assumptions regarding the relationship between gene number and organismal complexity and raised important questions about the functional organization of genomic systems.

One of the most striking observations emerging from genomic research is that a large proportion of genomic sequences remain transcriptionally inactive across most biological conditions. In humans and other eukaryotic organisms, protein-coding regions represent only a small fraction of the genome, while the remaining sequences include introns, repetitive elements, transposable elements, regulatory DNA, noncoding RNA genes, and pseudogenes [3-5]. The persistence of these sequences across evolutionary time has led to a longstanding conceptual puzzle in genome biology concerning the biological significance of genomic regions that appear inactive.

Early interpretations proposed that much of this DNA might lack biological function. The concept of "junk DNA," first articulated by [6], suggested that many genomic sequences represent evolutionary remnants accumulated through mutation and genetic drift. The neutral theory of molecular evolution further supported the possibility that large segments of the genome could persist without contributing directly to organismal fitness [7]. Although these interpretations provided important insights into genome evolution, they do not fully explain why genomes maintain extensive regions of structurally preserved yet inactive genetic information.

Advances in functional genomics, transcriptomics, and epigenetics have increasingly challenged the simplicity of the junk DNA concept. Large-scale projects investigating genome function have revealed that many genomic regions previously assumed to be inactive exhibit biochemical activity, including transcription factor binding, chromatin remodeling, and RNA transcription [8,9]. At the same time, studies of pseudogenes have demonstrated that certain gene-like sequences may produce regulatory RNA molecules capable of influencing gene expression networks [10,11].

Despite these advances, a substantial portion of genomic DNA continues to exhibit little or no observable activity under most experimental conditions. The persistence of structurally preserved yet inactive sequences suggests that genomes may operate according to principles that extend beyond conventional models of gene regulation. In particular, current frameworks explain how genes are activated or repressed but provide limited theoretical explanation for why genomic systems preserve large reservoirs of apparently unused genetic information.

The Gene Latency framework proposed by Alrohaimi introduced the concept that genetic elements may exist in latent functional states, retaining structural integrity while their functional execution remains suspended. Within this perspective, genes do not simply exist in binary states of activity or inactivity but may occupy positions along a spectrum of functional states shaped by regulatory context, evolutionary history, and environmental conditions.

Building upon this theoretical foundation, the present study introduces the concept of Biological Memory of the Genome. This concept proposes that genomic systems function not only as mechanisms for executing active genetic programs but also as repositories of accumulated biological information generated throughout evolutionary history. Preserved genetic elements-including pseudogenes, duplicated genes, regulatory sequences, and silent pathways-may therefore represent components of a genomic memory system capable of storing latent biological potential.

Within this interpretation, genomic architecture can be viewed as a multi-layered information system in which active gene expression represents only one operational layer of a broader genomic structure containing preserved evolutionary information. The objective of this study is therefore to develop a conceptual framework describing how genomic biological memory may be preserved and how latent genetic elements may contribute to evolutionary adaptability and regulatory innovation.

Materials and methods

Study design: This study employed a conceptual theoretical research design aimed at developing a new framework for interpreting genomic biological memory. Conceptual approaches are widely used in theoretical biology to integrate empirical observations from multiple scientific domains and construct explanatory models for complex biological phenomena [12].

Rather than generating new experimental data, the present study synthesizes findings from genomics, evolutionary biology, pseudogene research, epigenetic regulation, and systems biology in order to develop the concept of Biological Memory of the Genome, proposed as an extension of the Gene Latency framework introduced by Alrohaimi.

Conceptual modeling has historically played a significant role in the development of biological theory by providing integrative perspectives capable of reinterpreting empirical observations through new explanatory frameworks [13-15].

Literature sources and analytical domains: To construct the Biological Memory framework, an interdisciplinary literature synthesis was conducted across several major scientific domains relevant to genome organization and evolutionary information preservation.

The literature analysis focused on five principal domains

Genomics and genome architecture: Genome sequencing projects have demonstrated that protein-coding genes represent only a small fraction of eukaryotic genomes, while the majority of genomic DNA consists of noncoding sequences including introns, repetitive elements, transposable elements, regulatory DNA, and pseudogenes [1-3]. These observations raise fundamental questions regarding the evolutionary significance of preserved genomic regions exhibiting limited transcriptional activity.

Pseudogene biology: Pseudogenes are gene-like sequences containing disabling mutations that prevent normal protein translation. Historically interpreted as evolutionary relics, recent research has demonstrated that some pseudogenes produce regulatory RNA molecules capable of influencing gene expression networks [16,10,11]. These findings suggest that preserved pseudogene structures may represent latent regulatory components within genomic systems.

Epigenetic regulation: Epigenetic mechanisms-including DNA methylation, histone modification, and chromatin remodeling-play central roles in regulating gene activity. These mechanisms illustrate that gene inactivity often reflects dynamic regulatory states rather than permanent genetic degradation [17,18].

Evolutionary innovation: Evolutionary studies indicate that gene duplication represents a major mechanism through which genomes generate genetic novelty. Newly duplicated genes frequently undergo periods of reduced activity before acquiring new biological functions [19,4,20]. Such patterns suggest that preserved genetic elements may function as evolutionary substrates for future innovation.

Systems biology: Systems biology research demonstrates that gene expression is governed by complex regulatory networks integrating environmental and intracellular signals. These regulatory architectures function as biological decision systems controlling gene activation and repression [21,22].

Conceptual framework development: The Biological Memory framework was developed using a multi-stage conceptual modeling process designed to integrate patterns observed across genomic research.

Stage 1: Identification of patterns in genomic preservation

The literature review revealed consistent patterns indicating that large portions of genomic DNA remain structurally preserved despite limited functional activity. These patterns include the persistence of pseudogenes, duplicated genes, regulatory sequences, and silent genomic pathways across evolutionary timescales.

Stage 2: Development of theoretical constructs

Based on these observations, several theoretical constructs were identified to describe the architecture of genomic biological memory:

- Biological memory - the preservation of genetic information accumulated throughout evolutionary history.
- Latent genetic elements - structurally preserved genetic sequences whose functional execution is suspended.
- Recallability - the potential for preserved genetic elements to regain functional activity under appropriate conditions.
- Regulatory decision architecture - the network of molecular signals governing gene activation.
- Evolutionary information storage - the accumulation of preserved genomic information representing historical biological processes.

These constructs collectively describe how genomes may store biological information beyond immediate functional requirements.

Stage 3: Integration with the gene latency framework.

The conceptual constructs developed in this study were integrated with the Gene Latency framework proposed by Alrohaimi, which describes the functional states of genetic elements along a spectrum ranging from active genes to latent genomic elements.

Within this integrated framework: Gene Latency represents the operational state of preserved genetic elements, while Biological Memory represents the evolutionary information repository in which such elements are stored.

Analytical scope and limitations: The present study is conceptual and theoretical in nature and does not involve the generation of new experimental datasets. The Biological Memory framework should therefore be interpreted as a theoretical model intended to guide future empirical research.

Future studies may evaluate the biological memory hypothesis through several research approaches, including:

- comparative genomics
- transcriptomic analysis
- epigenetic profiling
- computational modeling of regulatory networks
- artificial intelligence-based genomic discovery

These approaches may help identify preserved genetic elements exhibiting characteristics consistent with genomic biological memory.

Results

Emergence of the biological memory framework

The conceptual analysis conducted in this study resulted in the formulation of the Biological Memory of the Genome framework, proposed as an extension of the Gene Latency theory introduced by Alrohaimi. The framework suggests that genomic architecture may include not only mechanisms responsible for executing active genetic programs but also systems capable of preserving genetic information accumulated across evolutionary time.

Within this perspective, the genome can be interpreted as a multi-layered biological information system composed of two complementary functional domains. The first domain consists of actively expressed genes responsible for current cellular processes and physiological functions. The second domain consists of preserved genetic elements whose functional execution remains suspended but whose structural integrity is maintained within the genomic architecture.

These preserved elements may include pseudogenes, duplicated genes, regulatory DNA sequences, and silent genetic pathways. Although many of these elements remain transcriptionally inactive under most observed biological conditions, their persistence across evolutionary timescales

suggests that they may represent stored biological information rather than purely nonfunctional genomic remnants.

The Biological Memory framework therefore proposes that genomic systems may function as long-term repositories of accumulated evolutionary information capable of preserving latent biological potential.

Components of genomic biological memory: The conceptual analysis identified several major categories of genomic elements that may contribute to biological memory within genomic systems.

Pseudogene memory: Pseudogenes represent gene-like sequences containing mutations that disrupt normal protein translation. Although historically interpreted as nonfunctional remnants, growing evidence suggests that certain pseudogenes produce regulatory RNA molecules capable of influencing gene expression networks [10,11].

Within the Biological Memory framework, pseudogenes may represent preserved genetic information reflecting previously functional genes whose biological roles have been suspended or modified during evolutionary history.

Gene duplication memory: Gene duplication represents a major mechanism through which genomes generate new genetic material. Duplicated genes often undergo periods of reduced activity before acquiring novel functional roles or becoming partially silenced [19,4,20].

These duplicated sequences may therefore represent evolutionary memory structures, preserving genetic information that may later participate in functional diversification or regulatory innovation.

Regulatory sequence memory: Regulatory DNA sequences play essential roles in controlling gene expression through transcription factor binding and chromatin organization. Certain regulatory elements remain preserved within genomes even when associated genes exhibit limited transcriptional activity.

Such regulatory elements may represent components of genomic biological memory by preserving regulatory architectures capable of influencing gene expression under future biological conditions.

Silent pathway memory: Biological systems often contain molecular pathways that remain inactive under most physiological conditions but may become activated in response to environmental changes or developmental transitions. These pathways may involve multiple genes whose coordinated activity is regulated by complex molecular networks.

Within the Biological Memory framework, such pathways may represent preserved biological information encoding potential responses to environmental or physiological challenges.

Relationship between biological memory and gene latency

The Biological Memory framework builds directly upon the Gene Latency theory proposed by Alrohaimi by providing a broader interpretation of how preserved genetic information is organized within genomic systems.

Within this integrated model, Gene Latency describes the functional state of preserved genetic elements, whereas Biological Memory describes the information architecture in which these elements are stored.

In other words:

- Gene Latency represents the operational condition in which genes remain structurally intact while their functional execution is suppressed.
- Biological Memory represents the long-term evolutionary repository in which such latent genetic elements accumulate.

The interaction between these two concepts suggests that genomic systems may preserve layers of genetic information whose functional relevance may emerge under specific biological conditions.

The genome as an evolutionary information archive: One of the central implications of the Biological Memory framework is that genomes may function as evolutionary information archives. Rather than containing only the genetic instructions required for immediate biological processes, genomes may also preserve historical records of past evolutionary events in the form of latent genetic elements.

These preserved elements may reflect:

- previously functional genes
- duplicated genetic sequences
- regulatory systems that have undergone modification
- genetic pathways that have become conditionally inactive

The structural preservation of these elements suggests that genomic systems may maintain a form of biological memory capable of storing evolutionary information across long timescales.

Within this perspective, genomic architecture can be interpreted as a dynamic information system that simultaneously performs two fundamental functions:

1. Execution of active genetic programs necessary for current biological processes.
2. Preservation of latent genetic information representing accumulated evolutionary knowledge.

This dual role may contribute to the adaptive flexibility of biological systems by allowing previously preserved genetic information to re-enter functional biological pathways under appropriate regulatory or environmental conditions.

Discussion

The concept of Biological Memory of the Genome, proposed here as an extension of the Gene Latency framework developed by Alrohaimi, offers a theoretical perspective for interpreting the preservation of structurally intact yet functionally inactive genetic elements within genomic systems. Advances in genomics have demonstrated that only a small fraction of the genome actively encodes proteins, while the majority consists of noncoding sequences including introns, regulatory DNA, transposable elements, and pseudogenes [1,3,5]. Understanding the biological

significance of these preserved sequences remains one of the central challenges in genome biology.

Traditional interpretations often describe large portions of the genome as evolutionary remnants accumulated through mutation and genetic drift. The concept of "junk DNA," initially proposed by [6], suggested that much of the genome may lack biological function. Subsequent evolutionary models, particularly the neutral theory of molecular evolution, provided a theoretical framework explaining how large quantities of nonfunctional DNA could persist within genomes without being removed by natural selection [7,4].

However, recent developments in functional genomics have complicated this interpretation. Large-scale research initiatives such as the ENCODE Project have revealed widespread biochemical activity across many genomic regions previously considered inactive [8,9]. At the same time, studies of pseudogenes have demonstrated that certain gene-like sequences produce regulatory RNA molecules capable of influencing gene expression networks and cellular signaling pathways [10,11]. These findings suggest that the functional landscape of the genome may be more complex than previously assumed.

Within this context, the Biological Memory framework offers a complementary interpretation of genomic architecture. Rather than interpreting genomic inactivity solely as evidence of evolutionary redundancy, this framework proposes that genomes may preserve accumulated biological information generated throughout evolutionary history. Preserved elements such as pseudogenes, duplicated genes, and regulatory sequences may therefore represent components of a genomic information storage system capable of maintaining latent biological potential.

This perspective aligns with concepts emerging from systems biology, which emphasizes that biological function often arises from complex regulatory networks rather than isolated genes [21-23]. Within such networks, the preservation of apparently inactive genetic elements may contribute to the robustness and adaptability of biological systems by maintaining alternative regulatory configurations that may become relevant under changing biological conditions.

The Biological Memory concept also extends existing evolutionary models by emphasizing the role of preserved genetic information in facilitating evolutionary innovation. Evolutionary studies have demonstrated that gene duplication represents one of the most important mechanisms through which genomes generate new functional capabilities [19,20]. Newly duplicated genes frequently undergo periods of reduced expression before acquiring novel biological roles. These patterns suggest that preserved genetic elements may function as evolutionary substrates that allow biological systems to explore new functional possibilities without disrupting existing regulatory networks.

The example of the CYP2B7 locus investigated by Alrohaimi illustrates how genetic elements categorized as inactive may retain latent functional potential. In this case, a polymorphism within a premature stop codon restores the coding potential of the gene, producing a full-length enzyme capable of measurable catalytic activity. Such observations demonstrate that certain genomic sequences classified as pseudogenes may preserve functional structures that can be reactivated under specific genetic conditions.

Within the integrated framework proposed in this study, Gene Latency describes the operational state of preserved genetic elements, while Biological Memory describes the informational architecture in which such elements are stored. Together, these concepts suggest that genomic systems may operate simultaneously as execution systems responsible for active gene expression and as information archives preserving evolutionary knowledge accumulated across biological history.

Limitations of the study

Despite its conceptual contributions, the present study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the Biological Memory framework is theoretical and conceptual in nature and does not involve the generation of new experimental datasets. Consequently, the proposed model should be interpreted as a conceptual hypothesis intended to guide future empirical research rather than as a definitive explanation of genomic architecture.

Second, the identification of latent genetic elements remains challenging because current genomic technologies primarily detect gene expression rather than structural preservation or potential functional recallability. Distinguishing between sequences that represent true evolutionary remnants and those that retain latent biological potential will require more sophisticated analytical approaches integrating comparative genomics, transcriptomics, and epigenetic analysis.

Third, the Biological Memory framework does not imply that all preserved genomic sequences possess functional potential. A substantial portion of genomic DNA may still represent neutral or degraded sequences resulting from evolutionary processes. Future research will therefore be necessary to determine the proportion of genomic elements that may participate in biological memory systems.

Future research directions

Future research may help clarify the mechanisms through which biological memory is preserved and mobilized within genomic systems. Several research directions appear particularly promising.

Comparative genomics studies may help identify conserved latent genetic elements across species, providing insight into how genomic memory structures are maintained across evolutionary timescales. Transcriptomic and epigenomic analyses may reveal conditional gene activation patterns consistent with latent genomic states. In addition, advances in artificial intelligence and large-scale genomic analysis may allow researchers to identify genomic signatures associated with preserved but inactive genetic elements.

Such approaches may ultimately help determine whether genomic biological memory represents a fundamental property of genome organization and how latent genetic elements contribute to evolutionary adaptability and regulatory innovation.

Conclusions

The rapid expansion of genomic research has fundamentally transformed our understanding of genome organization and function. Despite major advances in sequencing technologies and functional genomics, a substantial portion of genomic DNA remains transcriptionally inactive under most observed biological conditions. Traditional interpretations have often described these regions as evolutionary remnants or nonfunctional DNA. However, accumulating evidence from regulatory genomics, pseudogene biology, and systems biology suggests that genomic architecture may be more complex than previously assumed.

The concept of Biological Memory of the Genome, introduced in this study as an extension of the Gene Latency framework proposed by Alrohaimi, offers a theoretical perspective for interpreting the preservation of structurally intact genetic elements whose functional roles may not be immediately observable. Within this framework, genomes are conceptualized not only as systems responsible for executing active genetic programs but also as repositories of accumulated biological information generated throughout evolutionary history.

Preserved genomic elements-including pseudogenes, duplicated genes, regulatory sequences, and silent genetic pathways-may therefore represent components of a broader genomic memory system capable of storing latent biological potential. The persistence of these elements across evolutionary timescales suggests that genomic systems may retain layers of genetic information whose functional significance may emerge under specific regulatory or environmental conditions.

By integrating insights from evolutionary biology, functional genomics, and systems biology, the Biological Memory framework provides a conceptual model in which genomic architecture operates as a dynamic information system capable of both executing current biological processes and preserving historical biological knowledge. Within this integrated perspective, Gene Latency represents the operational state of preserved genetic elements, while Biological Memory represents the evolutionary information architecture in which these elements are stored.

Future research integrating comparative genomics, epigenomics, transcriptomics, and computational biology may help determine the extent to which preserved genomic sequences contribute to latent biological functions and evolutionary innovation. Advances in artificial intelligence and large-scale genomic data analysis may further enable the identification of genomic elements exhibiting characteristics consistent with biological memory systems.

Together, these perspectives suggest that exploring the mechanisms underlying genomic biological memory may contribute to a deeper understanding of genome organization, evolutionary adaptability, and the preservation of biological information across evolutionary time.

Declarations

Author contributions: Dr. Abdul Mohsen H. Alrohaimi conceived the study, developed the theoretical framework, conducted the literature analysis, interpreted the findings, and wrote the manuscript**.**

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable. This study is a conceptual and theoretical analysis and does not involve human participants, clinical trials, or animal experimentation.

Consent to publish: Not applicable.

Clinical trial registration: Not applicable.

Data availability statement: All data and sources analyzed during this study are included in this published article.

Competing interests: The author declares that there are no competing interests.

AI use statement: Artificial intelligence tools were used only for language editing and formatting assistance during manuscript preparation. All conceptual development, analysis, and interpretation were performed solely by the author.

Conflicts of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Lander E S. et al. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. Nature. 2001; 409: 860-921.
2. Venter J C. et al. The sequence of the human genome. Science. 2001; 291: 1304-1351.
3. Gregory T R. The evolution of the genome. Burlington: Elsevier Academic Press. 2005.
4. Lynch M. The origins of genome architecture. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates. 2007.
5. Alberts B, Johnson A, Lewis J, Morgan D, Raff M, et al. Molecular Biology of the Cell. 6th ed. New York: Garland Science. 2015.
6. Ohno S. So much "junk" DNA in our genome. In: H.H. Smith (ed.) Evolution of genetic systems. Brookhaven Symposia in Biology. 1972: 366-370.
7. Kimura M. The neutral theory of molecular evolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983.
8. ENCODE Project Consortium. An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome. Nature. 2012; 489: 57-74.
9. Kellis M, Wold B, Snyder M P, Bernstein B E, Kundaje A, et al. Defining functional DNA elements in the human genome. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2014; 111(17): 6131-6138.
10. Poliseno L, Salmena L, Zhang J, Carver B, Haveman W J, et al. A coding independent function of gene and pseudogene mRNAs regulates tumor biology. Nature. 2010; 465: 1033-1038.
11. Pink R C, Wicks K, Caley D P, Punch E K, Jacobs L, et al. Pseudogenes: Pseudo functional or key regulators in health and disease. RNA. 2011; 17: 792-798.
12. Jabareen Y. Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. International Journal of Qualitative Methods. 2009; 8(4); 49-62.
13. Mayr E. The growth of biological thought: Diversity, evolution, and inheritance. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1982.
14. Kauffman S A. The origins of order: Self-Organization and selection in evolution. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1993.

15. Wagner A. Arrival of the fittest: Solving evolution's greatest puzzle. New York: Penguin. 2014.

16. Zhang Z, Harrison PM, Liu Y, Gerstein M. Millions of years of evolution preserved: Identifying pseudogenes in the human genome. Genome Research. 2003; 13: 2541-2558.

17. Bird A. Perceptions of epigenetics. Nature. 2007; 447: 396-398.

18. Allis CD, Jenuwein T. The molecular hallmarks of epigenetic control. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2016; 17: 487-500.

19. Ohno S. Evolution by gene duplication. Berlin: Springer. 1970.

20. Kaessmann H. Origins, evolution, and phenotypic impact of new genes. Genome Research. 2010; 20: 1313-1326.

21. Barabási AL, Oltvai ZN. Network biology: Understanding the cell's functional organization. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2004; 5(2): 101-113.

22. Alon U. An introduction to systems biology: Design principles of biological circuits. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC. 2007.

23. Kitano H. Systems biology: A brief overview. Science. 2002; 295: 1662-1664.