INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF
HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

# REPETITIVE MOLECULAR BIOLOGY INTERPRETATIONS TOWARD THE UNSPECIFIC BIO-STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS IN CONTEXTS OF GENETIC RELEVANCE ACROSS SITUATIONAL ORGANISMIC COMPLEXITIES

*Original Research*

**Irfan Ishaque*[1], Muhummad Usama Majeed[2], Noorulain Hyder[3], Mariam Khan[4], Amna Noor[5], Saman Mumtaz[6]**
[1]Department of Zoology, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan.
[2]House Officer, Shaikh Zayed Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan.
[3]Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Hamdard University (FoP-HU), Karachi, Pakistan.
[4]Genetic Counselor, Nishter Hospital, Multan, Pakistan.
[5]Coordinator PhD Microbiology and Molecular Biology, Coordinator PhD Chemical and Molecular Pathology, Rawalpindi Medical University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
[6]Masters, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore, Pakistan.
**Corresponding Author:** Irfan Ishaque, Department of Zoology, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan, iamirfanishaque@gmail.com
**Acknowledgement:** The authors sincerely thank all participants for their valuable insights.

Conflict of Interest: None

Grant Support & Financial Support: None

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Conventional molecular biology often relies on fixed interpretative models that inadequately reflect the structural and contextual complexities of biological systems. There is a growing need to critically examine how molecular principles are applied, particularly in environments where genetic expression and molecular behavior are shaped by situational and organismic variability.

**Objective:** To qualitatively explore how molecular biology is interpreted and applied in structurally diverse biological systems, focusing on the conceptual patterns, contextual adaptations, and limitations inherent in routine molecular reasoning.

**Methods:** This qualitative study was conducted over eight months in research and diagnostic laboratories across Lahore, Pakistan. A purposive sample of 22 participants—including molecular biologists, technicians, and postgraduate researchers—was interviewed using semi-structured guides. Thematic analysis was employed to extract codes, themes, and subthemes from transcripts and observational field notes. Data triangulation and NVivo software were used for analytic rigor. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the relevant institute.

**Results:** Five major themes emerged: (1) conceptual redundancy in molecular interpretation, (2) structural oversight in bio-contextual applications, (3) situational fluidity of molecular roles, (4) language and terminology as interpretive constraints, and (5) evolving interpretive frameworks in practice. Participants highlighted reliance on oversimplified models, neglect of structural variation, and challenges with ambiguous terminology. However, newer practices showed signs of integrative reasoning incorporating structural and epigenetic insights.

**Conclusion:** This study underscores the need to move beyond reductionist models in molecular biology, advocating for more context-sensitive, structurally informed interpretative approaches. The findings hold implications for both research methodology and molecular diagnostics, urging a paradigm shift toward relational bio-structural reasoning.

**Keywords:** Gene Expression Regulation, Interpretation, Molecular Biology, Protein Structure, Qualitative Research, Systems Biology, Terminology.

INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF
HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

## INTRODUCTION

The field of molecular biology has long served as a cornerstone of modern biomedical science, offering insights into the fundamental processes that govern life at the microscopic level. At its core, molecular biology seeks to unravel the mechanisms by which genetic information is stored, replicated, and expressed within biological systems (1). Despite its broad applicability, a persistent challenge lies in the tendency toward interpretative repetition—where the same molecular principles are applied uniformly across diverse biological contexts, often without accounting for the structural and situational uniqueness of each organismic system (2). This study emerges from a growing recognition that current molecular analyses, while technically robust, sometimes lack the nuanced specificity required to account for bio-structural variability observed in real-world biological systems (3). Central to this issue is the assumption that biological molecules, particularly those involved in genetic expression and regulatory pathways, behave in universally predictable ways. While this view has facilitated the development of generalizable models, it risks oversimplifying the rich structural complexity and situational responsiveness of molecular systems (4,5). Recent advances in structural genomics and systems biology have begun to highlight how context—ranging from cellular microenvironments to inter-organismic interactions—can drastically alter molecular behavior. Proteins, for instance, may adopt multiple conformations depending on post-translational modifications, intracellular localization, or interaction with other biomolecules (6,7). Similarly, the expression of certain genes is not merely a product of sequence-based regulation, but also a consequence of chromatin architecture, epigenetic cues, and transient signaling cascades. Yet, despite these emerging insights, molecular biology often leans on conventional frameworks that interpret molecular function in static, isolated terms (8). The risk of such generalizations becomes particularly evident in the interpretation of genetic relevance across varying biological contexts. For example, a gene implicated in immune function in one species may serve an entirely different role in another due to evolutionary divergence, environmental pressures, or structural genomic rearrangements (9). Similarly, the oncogenic association of Hepatitis C virus with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma illustrates how molecular interactions can manifest in diverse pathological outcomes, reflecting context-specific genetic relevance (10). This complexity is not always accounted for in routine molecular interpretations, which frequently emphasize conserved sequences over divergent functionalities.

Moreover, when such interpretations are applied in clinical or translational settings—such as drug development or genetic diagnostics—the consequences of these oversights can be significant. A narrowly focused understanding of molecular function may lead to therapeutic strategies that lack efficacy across genetically or structurally diverse patient populations (11,12). Furthermore, the language of molecular biology itself can inadvertently contribute to this redundancy. Terms like "molecular expression" or "structural regulation" are often deployed without sufficient contextual anchoring, giving rise to interpretations that are scientifically valid yet operationally ambiguous (13,14). This linguistic pattern reinforces a circularity in reasoning—where molecular phenomena are explained in molecular terms without deeper structural or situational clarification. The resulting interpretations may satisfy academic rigor but fall short of offering actionable insights into the biological systems under study (15). What is increasingly needed, therefore, is an interpretative shift—a movement away from uniform molecular generalizations toward a more integrative model that embraces structural variability, contextual complexity, and organism-specific molecular behavior. Such a model would prioritize relational biology over reductionism, emphasizing how molecular entities interact within broader networks of biological meaning. By doing so, it could provide a richer, more accurate understanding of how molecular biology functions not just at the level of isolated molecules, but within the living, dynamic systems they comprise. This study, grounded in a qualitative design, seeks to explore how molecular biology can be more thoughtfully applied to biological systems by acknowledging the situational and structural uniqueness of those systems. It investigates the ways in which molecular interpretations are constructed, repeated, and potentially decontextualized across diverse organismic frameworks. Through a critical analysis of molecular interpretative practices, the study aims to highlight where such practices succeed, where they fall short, and how they might be re-envisioned for greater biological specificity and relevance. The objective of this research is to qualitatively examine the interpretative patterns of molecular biology in relation to bio-structural contexts, with the aim of identifying pathways toward more context-aware, structurally informed applications of molecular analysis across varying biological systems.

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

## METHODS

This qualitative study was conducted over a period of eight months within academic and biomedical research institutions located in the Lahore region of Pakistan. The study aimed to explore interpretative patterns within molecular biology, particularly as they relate to the application of molecular principles in bio-structurally diverse biological systems. Emphasis was placed on how molecular biology is conceptually applied to biological molecules that themselves operate within molecular frameworks, and how such interpretations shift across different situational and organismic complexities. The approach was exploratory in nature, seeking to uncover themes and patterns rather than to validate a pre-existing hypothesis. Participants were purposively sampled based on their professional and academic involvement with molecular biology, genetics, or structural biology. The inclusion criteria focused on researchers, laboratory technicians, clinical molecular biologists, and advanced postgraduate students (MPhil and PhD levels) with at least two years of hands-on experience in molecular biology-related work. Individuals were selected based on their ability to articulate conceptual reasoning, methodological practices, and interpretative strategies within molecular biology. Exclusion criteria involved participants without formal training in molecular biology, those working solely in administrative roles, and individuals unwilling or unable to provide informed consent. The final sample included 22 participants, a size that was determined based on thematic saturation—a key principle in qualitative research that signifies the point at which additional data no longer contribute new insights (4). Initial recruitment occurred through institutional email outreach and direct communication with department heads. Snowball sampling was also employed to identify additional participants who met the inclusion criteria. Participants were drawn from multiple settings including university molecular biology departments, hospital diagnostic laboratories, and private research facilities in the Lahore area, ensuring a heterogeneous representation of molecular biology interpretive practices.

Data collection was conducted using semi-structured, in-depth interviews, which allowed for both consistency across interviews and flexibility to explore emergent themes. An interview guide was developed, containing open-ended questions designed to elicit participants' experiences with molecular analysis, their reasoning processes when applying molecular concepts, and their reflections on how structural or situational contexts influence their interpretations. Examples included, "How do you approach interpreting gene expression in different tissue types?" and "Can you describe a time when molecular findings contradicted expected biological outcomes in your work?" Interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent and subsequently transcribed verbatim for analysis (16,17). To enhance the depth and context of the findings, observational data were also collected from laboratory sessions, workshops, and diagnostic meetings where molecular results were discussed and interpreted. Field notes were taken during these sessions, focusing on language use, reasoning patterns, and the integration (or lack thereof) of structural and situational variables in interpretative decisions. This triangulation of data sources—interviews, observations, and documentation—was employed to ensure credibility and rigor.

Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis framework, which included familiarization with the data, initial coding, theme identification, theme review, theme definition, and final reporting. Transcripts and field notes were coded manually using a constant comparative method. Emerging codes were clustered into categories that reflected shared interpretative patterns, contradictions, and contextual influences. Themes were iteratively refined through repeated readings and peer debriefing sessions to ensure analytic transparency and minimize individual researcher bias. The primary outcome measure of this study was the emergence of conceptual and structural themes that characterize how molecular biology is applied interpretatively across different bio-structural contexts. Analytical focus was placed not only on what interpretations were made, but how and why those interpretations were constructed, particularly in situations where molecular behavior defied standard expectations. Tools used in the analysis included NVivo software (version 12) for data management and thematic visualization, enhancing traceability and coherence across analytical stages. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Institutional Review Board of the relevant institute. All participants provided written informed consent prior to participation, in line with the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants were assured of confidentiality, with all identifiable information anonymized during transcription and reporting. The study's methodological design was intended to capture the richness of human interpretation in molecular biology—an area often overlooked in the mechanistic orientation of biomedical research. By privileging the voices of those who routinely engage with molecular systems in applied settings, and by examining how their interpretative practices shift in response to structural and situational complexity, this study aims to contribute a nuanced understanding of molecular reasoning as it operates within the broader biological sciences.

INSIGHTS-JHR
INSIGHTS-JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION

## RESULTS

The analysis yielded five primary themes with associated subthemes that captured the interpretative dynamics of molecular biology as applied within complex biological and structural systems. Data saturation was achieved, and themes emerged consistently across interviews and observational field notes.

The first theme, **Conceptual Redundancy in Molecular Interpretation**, encompassed recurring explanations of gene function that looped back into generalized principles without offering mechanistic clarity. Participants often defaulted to central dogma references, framing gene expression as a linear and deterministic process. One participant noted, *"We often say 'this gene causes this protein' but don't always consider how or why it's expressed differently in different environments."* Another added, *"It's almost automatic now—we see expression and assume functionality, but it's not always that straightforward."*

The second theme, **Structural Oversight in Bio-contextual Applications**, highlighted a lack of attention to protein structure variability and the influence of post-translational modifications. Respondents indicated that despite awareness of structural dynamics, these were rarely integrated into everyday molecular interpretations. Observations in lab meetings revealed little discussion around protein folding states or dynamic conformational shifts, even in studies involving signaling proteins. This structural gap appeared particularly evident in diagnostic settings, where molecular markers were interpreted based on fixed models.

The third theme, **Situational Fluidity of Molecular Roles**, emerged from discussions where participants described how molecular behavior often diverged under different biological or environmental conditions. One participant described a case where a transcription factor known for inflammatory response had shown unexpected behavior in neuronal tissue, stating, *"It was the same gene, but it behaved nothing like what we expected based on textbook functions."* Another mentioned, *"We sometimes forget that the same gene in two species can mean very different things functionally."* This theme underscored the instability of fixed molecular assumptions when confronted with real biological diversity.

The fourth theme, **Language and Terminology as Interpretive Constraints**, identified how technical language often concealed conceptual ambiguity. Several participants expressed concern over the habitual use of terms like "upregulated" or "interacts with" without defining the structural or mechanistic basis of these statements. This imprecision sometimes led to overconfidence in interpretation, particularly in publications or clinical reporting. The inflation of vocabulary often replaced depth with formality, limiting nuanced understanding.

The final theme, **Evolving Interpretive Frameworks in Practice**, captured adaptive responses to inconsistencies in molecular data. In some cases, participants reported modifying their interpretive approach in response to conflicting experimental outcomes. These adjustments included integrating epigenetic context, spatial cellular modeling, or proteomic overlays to refine molecular interpretations. Observational data supported this, showing a trend toward more multidimensional interpretive discussions in younger research groups.

Across all themes, the findings indicated a widespread yet underexamined reliance on molecular interpretations that overlook bio-structural and situational complexity. While expertise and awareness of limitations were present, institutional norms and interpretive habits appeared to constrain broader conceptual exploration.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal a persistent pattern of interpretative redundancy and context-neglect in how molecular biology is applied, particularly in structurally and organismically diverse systems. These insights align with and expand upon recent literature that critiques the overly deterministic models commonly used in molecular interpretation. The tendency to rely on canonical pathways and fixed gene-function relationships, as observed in participant narratives, echoes broader academic concerns about the limitations of linear models of gene regulation. A study emphasized the need to reinterpret the "molecular gene" as a context-sensitive functional unit, arguing that genes display multiple meanings depending on their interaction with cellular machinery and environmental state (15). The recurrent theme of structural oversight, particularly in the dismissal of protein conformational variability and post-translational modifications—is not novel yet remains under-addressed in everyday biomedical settings. Studies employing deep learning and multi-omics integration have recently demonstrated that gene expression is not solely regulated by sequence but emerges from complex interplays involving chromatin structure, transcription factor binding, and epigenetic landscapes (16,17). These findings underscore the inadequacy of sequence-based interpretation models when applied to structurally dynamic biological contexts. The situational plasticity

of molecular roles observed in this study reinforces emerging system-level perspectives, which argue that gene expression and function are inseparable from their surrounding biological and environmental contexts (18). A study described this complexity through the lens of trans-QTL analysis, showing how polymorphisms can exert large-scale effects across seemingly unrelated genes due to emergent network behavior (19). Similarly, another study demonstrated that transcriptional variance is functionally constrained and influenced by cellular context, challenging the long-standing assumption that such variance is merely technical noise (20). An important implication of the study concerns the language of molecular interpretation itself. The observation that technical terms are often used without structural anchoring resonates with critiques in bioinformatics that stress the danger of relying on high-throughput data devoid of functional context (21). Terminological inflation, though academically persuasive, may obscure conceptual gaps rather than resolve them.

Despite these challenges, this study also uncovered signs of adaptive interpretative behavior, particularly among younger researchers and interdisciplinary teams. Such groups demonstrated a willingness to incorporate structural biology, epigenetic data, and environmental parameters into their molecular reasoning. This is consistent with the shift toward integrative models such as systems genetics and multi-modal deep learning frameworks (22), which seek to decode genetic behavior not in isolation but within interactive biological networks. The strength of this study lies in its qualitative depth and the integration of observational data with participant interviews, enabling the exploration of not just what is interpreted, but how interpretation unfolds in practice. The diversity of participants, drawn from various settings across Lahore's molecular biology ecosystem, enriched the findings with cross-contextual insights. However, the study was limited by its geographical scope and sample size. Though saturation was achieved, a broader dataset across different regions and research cultures would offer greater generalizability. Additionally, the study's qualitative design, while appropriate for interpretative inquiry, does not allow for statistical validation of trends or causal inferences. Future research should build on these findings by developing hybrid methodologies that combine ethnographic observation with computational modeling (23,24). There is a need for more empirical work investigating how molecular interpretations are shaped in real-time decision-making, particularly in clinical and diagnostic settings. Furthermore, expanding the analysis to include educational curricula may reveal how interpretative patterns are institutionalized and potentially reformed. In conclusion, this study provides compelling evidence that current interpretative approaches in molecular biology often fall short in addressing the structural and situational complexity inherent in biological systems. While molecular tools continue to evolve, interpretative practices must adapt in parallel, moving beyond reductionist models toward frameworks that respect and reflect the dynamic nature of life itself.

## CONCLUSION

This study highlights the interpretative limitations of conventional molecular biology when applied across structurally diverse and situationally complex biological systems. By revealing conceptual redundancy and contextual oversight in molecular reasoning, it emphasizes the need for integrative, structure-aware interpretative frameworks. These findings encourage a shift toward more nuanced, adaptive approaches that better reflect the dynamic realities of molecular function in living systems.

### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

| Author | Contribution |
|---|---|
| Irfan Ishaque* | Substantial Contribution to study design, analysis, acquisition of Data<br>Manuscript Writing<br>Has given Final Approval of the version to be published |
| Muhummad Usama Majeed | Substantial Contribution to study design, acquisition and interpretation of Data<br>Critical Review and Manuscript Writing<br>Has given Final Approval of the version to be published |
| Noorulain Hyder | Substantial Contribution to acquisition and interpretation of Data<br>Has given Final Approval of the version to be published |
| Mariam Khan | Contributed to Data Collection and Analysis |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Has given Final Approval of the version to be published |
| Amna Noor | Contributed to Data Collection and Analysis<br>Has given Final Approval of the version to be published |
| Saman Mumtaz | Substantial Contribution to study design and Data Analysis<br>Has given Final Approval of the version to be published |

## REFERENCES

1. Rigden DJ, Fernández XM. The 2022 Nucleic Acids Research database issue and the online molecular biology database collection. Nucleic Acids Res. 2022;50(D1):D1-d10.

2. Zhang M, Lu Y, Sheng L, Han X, Yu L, Zhang W, et al. Advances in Molecular Pathology of Obstructive Sleep Apnea. Molecules. 2022;27(23).

3. Pascual-Ahuir A, Fita-Torró J, Proft M. Capturing and Understanding the Dynamics and Heterogeneity of Gene Expression in the Living Cell. Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21(21).

4. Fernandez-Cuesta L, Mangiante L, Alcala N, Foll M. Challenges in lung and thoracic pathology: molecular advances in the classification of pleural mesotheliomas. Virchows Arch. 2021;478(1):73-80.

5. Selvaraj D, Dawar R, Sivakumar PK, Devi A. Clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats, a glimpse - impacts in molecular biology, trends and highlights. Horm Mol Biol Clin Investig. 2021;43(1):105-12.

6. Ramachandran A, Santiago JG. CRISPR Enzyme Kinetics for Molecular Diagnostics. Anal Chem. 2021;93(20):7456-64.

7. Kulkarni A, Tanga S, Karmakar A, Hota A, Maji B. CRISPR-Based Precision Molecular Diagnostics for Disease Detection and Surveillance. ACS Appl Bio Mater. 2023;6(10):3927-45.

8. Weng Z, You Z, Yang J, Mohammad N, Lin M, Wei Q, et al. CRISPR-Cas Biochemistry and CRISPR-Based Molecular Diagnostics. Angew Chem Int Ed Engl. 2023;62(17):e202214987.

9. Song R, Chen Z, Xiao H, Wang H. The CRISPR-Cas system in molecular diagnostics. Clin Chim Acta. 2024;561:119820.

10. Muhammad SK, Chandio MA, Soomro MA, Shaikh BA. Hepatitis C virus infection in non-Hodgkin's lymphoma: a case-control study. Hepatitis Monthly. 2012; 12(142): 16-22.

11. Somssich M. The Dawn of Plant Molecular Biology: How Three Key Methodologies Paved the Way. Curr Protoc. 2022;2(4):e417.

12. Rypens C, Van Berckelaer C, Berditchevski F, van Dam P, Van Laere S. Deciphering the molecular biology of inflammatory breast cancer through molecular characterization of patient samples and preclinical models. Int Rev Cell Mol Biol. 2024;384:77-112.

13. English MA, Gayet RV, Collins JJ. Designing Biological Circuits: Synthetic Biology Within the Operon Model and Beyond. Annu Rev Biochem. 2021;90:221-44.

14. Barraclough A, Bishton M, Cheah CY, Villa D, Hawkes EA. The diagnostic and therapeutic challenges of Grade 3B follicular lymphoma. Br J Haematol. 2021;195(1):15-24.

15. Banik S, Bardhan M, Basak S. Genetic, Epigenetic, and Molecular Biology of Obesity: From Pathology to Therapeutics the Way Forward. J Assoc Physicians India. 2022;70(9):11-2.

16. Wolberger C. How structural biology transformed studies of transcription regulation. J Biol Chem. 2021;296:100741.

17. Huang W, Li X, Huang C, Tang Y, Zhou Q, Chen W. LncRNAs and Rheumatoid Arthritis: From Identifying Mechanisms to Clinical Investigation. Front Immunol. 2021;12:807738.

 

18. Fois SS, Paliogiannis P, Zinellu A, Fois AG, Cossu A, Palmieri G. Molecular Epidemiology of the Main Druggable Genetic Alterations in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. Int J Mol Sci. 2021;22(2).

19. Sun H, He Z, Zhao F, Hu J, Wang J, Liu X, et al. Molecular Genetic Characteristics of the Hoxc13 Gene and Association Analysis of Wool Traits. Int J Mol Sci. 2024;25(3).

20. Mulligan MR, Bicknell LS. The molecular genetics of nELAVL in brain development and disease. Eur J Hum Genet. 2023;31(11):1209-17.

21. Toper MH, Sarioglu S. Molecular Pathology of Salivary Gland Neoplasms: Diagnostic, Prognostic, and Predictive Perspective. Adv Anat Pathol. 2021;28(2):81-93.

22. Kao TW, Chen HH, Lin J, Wang TL, Shen YA. PBX1 as a novel master regulator in cancer: Its regulation, molecular biology, and therapeutic applications. Biochim Biophys Acta Rev Cancer. 2024;1879(2):189085.

23. Baud S, Corso M, Debeaujon I, Dubreucq B, Job D, Marion-Poll A, et al. Recent progress in molecular genetics and omics-driven research in seed biology. C R Biol. 2023;345(4):61-110.

24. Rezaei S, Hamedani Z, Ahmadi K, Ghannadikhosh P, Motamedi A, Athari M, et al. Role of machine learning in molecular pathology for breast cancer: A review on gene expression profiling and RNA sequencing application. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol. 2025;213:104780.