ANNALS OF MEDICAL AND SURGICAL DERMATOLOGY
Jan-Mar 2025, VOL. 3, ISSUE 1, pp. 6-9
https://doi.org/10.61577/amsd.2025.100002

RESEAPRO JOURNALS

MINI REVIEW

OPEN ACCESS

# Predictive Molecular Signatures of Pathological Scar Development Revealed by Integrative Bioinformatics

Sweekruti Mishra

**Department of Bioinformatics, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India**

## ABSTRACT

Pathological scarring, encompassing conditions such as hypertrophic scars and keloids, represents a significant and persistent clinical challenge in the management of wound healing. These aberrant scars not only lead to cosmetic disfigurement but can also cause pain, itching, restricted mobility, and psychological distress, thereby affecting the overall quality of life of affected individuals. Despite extensive research into the mechanisms of normal wound healing, the biological processes underlying pathological scar formation remain incompletely understood, and predictive clinical tools remain limited. In recent years, the advent of high-throughput technologies has revolutionized biomedical research, enabling the generation of large-scale datasets that capture genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, and epigenomic landscapes involved in disease processes. Bioinformatics application of computational tools to analyze and interpret biological data has emerged as a powerful approach to dissect the complex molecular networks contributing to pathological scarring. Through these methodologies, researchers are now able to identify gene expression signatures, signalling pathways, and molecular interactions that are dysregulated during scar formation. Moreover, the integration of machine learning algorithms with bioinformatics workflows has enabled the development of predictive models capable of identifying potential biomarkers and stratifying patients based on their risk of developing abnormal scars.

## KEYWORDS

Pathological scarring; Hypertrophic scars; Keloids; Wound healing; Bioinformatics; High-throughput data; Genomics; Transcriptomics

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 22 January 2025;
Revised 12 February 2025;
Accepted 18 February 2025

## Introduction

Wound healing is a dynamic and highly coordinated physiological process that involves a sequence of overlapping stages: haemostasis, inflammation, tissue formation (proliferation), and remodelling. Each stage is regulated by a complex interplay of cellular and molecular events, including the activation of immune responses, migration and proliferation of fibroblasts and keratinocytes, angiogenesis, and the synthesis and remodelling of the extracellular matrix (ECM) [1]. When this intricate balance is disrupted-due to genetic predisposition, infection, mechanical stress, or prolonged inflammation, it can lead to abnormal healing outcomes, most notably pathological scarring.

Pathological scarring typically presents in two major forms: hypertrophic scars and keloids. Hypertrophic scars are raised, red scars that remain within the boundaries of the original wound, while keloids extend beyond the wound margin and do not regress over time. Both types can cause physical discomfort, restricted mobility, and psychological distress due to their disfiguring appearance [2,3]. Despite advancements in surgical and pharmacological treatments, preventing or predicting these types of scars remains a significant clinical challenge.

Traditional methods for assessing scar risk are primarily based on clinical factors, such as wound depth, infection, anatomical location, and patient demographics. In contrast, the integration of bioinformatics with molecular biology provides a powerful platform to explore the biological underpinnings of wound healing at a systems level. High-throughput technologies such as RNA sequencing, proteomics, and epigenomic profiling generate large volumes of data, which, when analysed through bioinformatics pipelines, can reveal patterns of gene expression and regulatory mechanisms associated with scar development [4]. These insights pave the way for the identification of novel prognostic biomarkers and therapeutic targets, ultimately enabling personalized approaches to wound care and improving outcomes for patients at risk of developing pathological scars.

## Overview of Pathological Scarring

Pathological scarring is an abnormal outcome of the wound healing process and is characterized by the excessive accumulation of fibrous tissue. The primary cellular contributor to this abnormality is the fibroblast, a cell type that plays a central role in the formation and remodelling of the extracellular matrix (ECM). In normal wound healing, fibroblasts proliferate and produce collagen to support tissue repair, and their activity subsides once the wound is closed. However, in pathological scarring, this process becomes dysregulated [5]. Fibroblasts continue to proliferate excessively and secrete high levels of collagen, particularly type I and III collagen, leading to an overproduction of fibrotic tissue.

In addition to fibroblast overactivity, prolonged inflammation is a key driver of pathological scarring. Inflammatory cells such as macrophages and mast cells release

***Correspondence:** Ms. Sweekruti Mishra, Department of Bioinformatics, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India, e-mail: mishrasweekruti5@gmail.com

cytokines and growth factors that stimulate fibroblasts and sustain the fibrotic response. When this inflammatory phase is not resolved in a timely manner, it can trigger a chronic repair response that results in scar tissue that is denser, less elastic, and more disorganized than normal tissue [6].

Two main types of pathological scars are hypertrophic scars and keloids. Hypertrophic scars remain elevated but confined within the original boundaries of the wound [7,8]. They often improve over time, either spontaneously or with treatment. Keloids, on the other hand, grow beyond the original wound margins and do not regress on their own. Keloids can continue to grow long after the initial wound has healed and are more likely to recur after excision, making them more difficult to treat.

Despite these differences, both scar types are underpinned by shared molecular mechanisms. Central among these is the transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β) signalling pathway, which plays a crucial role in fibroblast activation and ECM production [9]. Additionally, both types involve abnormal ECM remodelling and heightened levels of pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-6 and TNF-α. These molecular pathways create a persistent wound-healing environment, tipping the balance from regeneration to fibrosis.

Understanding these shared and distinct molecular features is essential for developing targeted therapies to prevent or reduce pathological scarring in susceptible individuals.

## Bioinformatics Tools and Databases in Scar Research

The advent of bioinformatics has revolutionized the study of complex biological processes by equipping researchers with powerful computational tools to analyze vast datasets generated from high-throughput technologies such as Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS), transcriptomics, and proteomics. These technologies generate multidimensional data that require sophisticated analytical methods for interpretation. Key databases play a foundational role in this effort. The Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) and ArrayExpress are publicly accessible repositories that host thousands of curated gene expression datasets from a wide array of biological experiments, including studies on skin wound healing and fibrosis [10]. These datasets allow researchers to compare gene expression profiles across normal and pathological conditions. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project further enriches this landscape by providing comprehensive data on gene expression and regulation across multiple human tissues, enabling tissue-specific analysis of genes involved in scarring [11].

To analyze such data, researchers employ a suite of bioinformatics tools tailored to different stages of the data analysis pipeline. For differential gene expression analysis, tools like DESeq2 and Limma are widely used to identify genes that are significantly upregulated or downregulated between experimental conditions. Once differentially expressed genes are identified, functional enrichment analysis using tools like DAVID (Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery), Enrichr, and Metascape helps determine which biological processes, molecular functions, or cellular components are statistically overrepresented [12]. These tools also allow identification of disease associations and transcription factor binding motifs, offering deeper biological insight.

In addition, pathway analysis platforms such as KEGG (Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes) and Reactome enable researchers to map genes and proteins onto known signaling pathways, such as TGF-β or Wnt signaling, both of which are critical in fibrosis and wound repair. To further understand the functional interconnectivity of genes and proteins, network analysis tools like Cytoscape and STRING (Search Tool for the Retrieval of Interacting Genes/Proteins) are employed. These platforms visualize complex gene-gene and protein-protein interaction networks, identifying key hub genes or central regulators.

Moreover, the integration of machine learning algorithms such as Random Forest, Support Vector Machines (SVM), and XGBoost has advanced the predictive capabilities of bioinformatics (Table 1). These models can classify samples, predict scar outcomes, and identify candidate biomarkers based on patterns in multidimensional datasets [13]. Together, these databases and tools enable a systems-level understanding of pathological scarring and offer promising avenues for biomarker discovery and personalized therapeutic development.

## Transcriptomic Insights into Scar Formation

Transcriptomic analysis, which involves the comprehensive study of RNA transcripts produced by the genome, has significantly advanced our understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying pathological scarring [14]. Both hypertrophic scars and keloids display distinct transcriptomic profiles compared to normal skin or normally healed scars. High-throughput techniques such as RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) and microarray analysis have enabled the identification of differentially expressed genes involved in fibrosis, inflammation, and extracellular matrix remodeling.

**Table 1.** Bioinformatics tools and databases.

| CATEGORY | TOOL/DATABASE | FUNCTION |
|---|---|---|
| Gene Expression Databases | GEO, ArrayExpress | Transcriptomic data repositories |
| Tissue-Specific Data | GTEx | Gene expression across tissues |
| Differential Expression | DESeq2, Limma | Identify DEGs |
| Enrichment Analysis | DAVID, Enrichr | Functional annotation |
| Pathway Mapping | KEGG, Reactome | Signaling pathway insights |
| Network Analysis | Cytoscape, STRING | Interaction network construction |
| Machine Learning | SVM, Random Forest | Predictive modeling |



https://doi.org/10.61577/amsd.2025.100002

Among the most consistently upregulated genes in pathological scars are COL1A1, which encodes type I collagen, a major structural protein in scar tissue; ACTA2, which encodes alpha-smooth muscle actin (α-SMA), a marker of myofibroblast activation; and TGF-β, a key pro-fibrotic cytokine involved in promoting fibroblast proliferation and collagen synthesis. These genes are not only overexpressed in scar tissue but also play central roles in maintaining the fibrotic environment.

To categorize scar phenotypes more precisely, researchers apply unsupervised clustering techniques such as hierarchical clustering and principal component analysis (PCA) to transcriptomic datasets. These approaches help identify patterns of gene expression that distinguish between different types of scars or stages of wound healing. Through this analysis, specific gene signatures- combinations of genes whose expression levels collectively define a scar phenotype- can be established [15].

Such gene signatures have the potential to act as prognostic biomarkers, helping predict which patients are at greater risk for developing pathological scars. This could facilitate earlier intervention and personalized treatment strategies. Moreover, integrating transcriptomic findings with clinical metadata and other omics layers (e.g., proteomics, epigenomics) may lead to the development of more robust predictive models and therapeutic targets [16]. Thus, transcriptomic analysis is a critical step toward unraveling the complexity of scar biology and improving clinical outcomes.

## Epigenetic and Proteomic Contributions

Epigenetic and proteomic analyses have become invaluable in understanding the multifactorial nature of pathological scarring. Epigenetic modifications, including DNA methylation, histone acetylation, and non-coding RNA regulation, play a critical role in controlling gene expression without altering the underlying DNA sequence. These modifications significantly affect fibroblast behavior, influencing processes such as proliferation, differentiation, and extracellular matrix (ECM) production. In pathological scars, particularly keloids, hypermethylation of tumor suppressor genes and hypomethylation of pro-fibrotic genes have been observed, contributing to fibroblast overactivity and resistance to apoptosis [17]. Histone modifications, such as altered acetylation patterns, can also promote sustained activation of fibrotic signaling pathways, including TGF-β and Wnt signaling.

Complementing epigenetic data, proteomic studies utilize techniques such as mass spectrometry, two-dimensional gel electrophoresis, and liquid chromatography to identify and quantify proteins involved in wound healing. These studies have revealed aberrant expression of matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), tissue inhibitors of metalloproteinases (TIMPs), collagens, and other fibrotic markers in hypertrophic and keloid tissues. Such alterations reflect the dysregulation of ECM remodeling and tissue regeneration processes.

Importantly, bioinformatics platforms enable the integration of epigenetic, proteomic, and transcriptomic datasets, allowing for a systems-level understanding of scar biology. This multi-omics approach enhances the discovery of robust biomarkers and unveils potential therapeutic targets by identifying regulatory nodes and pathways consistently altered across molecular levels. Integrating these data types is essential for the development of precise, personalized treatments for pathological scarring.

## Systems Biology and Network Medicine Approaches

Systems biology and network medicine have emerged as transformative approaches in biomedical research, offering comprehensive frameworks to unravel the complexity of diseases such as pathological scarring. Unlike reductionist models that focus on single genes or pathways, systems biology emphasizes the interconnected nature of biological processes by integrating diverse molecular data to build holistic models of disease states. In the context of hypertrophic scars and keloids, network-based analyses provide critical insights into the molecular architecture underlying fibrosis [18].

Gene co-expression networks and protein-protein interaction (PPI) networks are commonly used tools to identify key molecular players involved in scar formation. These networks reveal hub genes that are highly connected and serve as central nodes in the regulatory landscape. Notable examples include FN1 (Fibronectin 1), TGFB1 (Transforming Growth Factor Beta 1), and IL6 (Interleukin 6), all of which are strongly implicated in fibroblast activation, ECM remodeling, and chronic inflammation [19]. These hubs are not only critical for understanding disease mechanisms but also represent promising targets for therapeutic intervention.

Furthermore, regulatory network mapping has expanded our understanding of post-transcriptional gene regulation in pathological scarring. Non-coding RNAs, including microRNAs (miRNAs) and long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs), are now recognized as essential regulators of gene expression. Dysregulation of specific miRNAs has been shown to influence fibrosis by targeting mRNAs involved in collagen synthesis, TGF-β signaling, and cell proliferation. Similarly, lncRNAs can modulate chromatin structure and transcriptional activity, further influencing fibrotic responses.

By leveraging these network approaches, researchers can uncover novel molecular interactions and identify candidate biomarkers and therapeutic targets [20]. Ultimately, systems biology enables a more nuanced and predictive understanding of scar pathogenesis, advancing the field toward personalized wound care and precision medicine.

## Conclusions

Bioinformatics has revolutionized the study of pathological scarring by enabling the analysis of large-scale biological data to uncover critical molecular indicators. Through the integration of transcriptomic, proteomic, and epigenetic datasets, researchers can identify biomarkers that not only enhance our understanding of scar pathogenesis but also hold promise for clinical application. These biomarkers, including genes, proteins, and regulatory RNAs, can serve as diagnostic tools, prognostic indicators, or therapeutic targets. The ability to apply computational methods such as differential gene expression analysis, network modeling, and machine learning facilitates the discovery of patterns and regulatory mechanisms



https://doi.org/10.61577/amsd.2025.100002

underlying hypertrophic scars and keloids. These insights can guide the development of targeted therapies and early intervention strategies for individuals at high risk of pathological scarring. Moreover, the use of bioinformatics supports a systems-level approach to wound healing, revealing complex interactions among molecular pathways. As these techniques become more sophisticated and accessible, their potential for personalized wound care grows, offering tailored treatments based on a patient's unique molecular profile.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## References

1. Moretti L, Stalfort J, Barker TH, Abebayehu D. The interplay of fibroblasts, the extracellular matrix, and inflammation in scar formation. J Biol Chem. 2022;298(2):101530. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbc.2021.101530
2. Berman B, Maderal A, Raphael B. Keloids and hypertrophic scars: pathophysiology, classification, and treatment. Dermatol Surg. 2017;43: S3-18. https://doi.org/10.1097/DSS.0000000000000819
3. Barone N, Safran T, Vorstenbosch J, Davison PG, Cugno S, Murphy AM. Current advances in hypertrophic scar and keloid management. InSeminars in plastic surgery 2021;35(3):145-152. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0041-1731461
4. Mascharak S, Talbott HE, Januszyk M, Griffin M, Chen K, Davitt MF, et al. Multi-omic analysis reveals divergent molecular events in scarring and regenerative wound healing. Cell stem cell. 2022;29(2):315-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2021.12.011
5. Travers JG, Kamal FA, Robbins J, Yutzey KE, Blaxall BC. Cardiac fibrosis: the fibroblast awakens. Circ Res. 2016;118(6):1021-1040. https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.115.306565
6. Wilgus TA, Ud-Din S, Bayat A. A review of the evidence for and against a role for mast cells in cutaneous scarring and fibrosis. Int J Mol Sci. 2020;21(24):9673. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21249673
7. Limandjaja GC, Belien JM, Scheper RJ, Niessen FB, Gibbs S. A study looking at the differences between hypertrophic scars and keloid scars. Br J Dermatol. 2020;182(4):e140-. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.18907
8. Limandjaja GC, Niessen FB, Scheper RJ, Gibbs S. Hypertrophic scars and keloids: Overview of the evidence and practical guide for differentiating between these abnormal scars. Exp Dermatol. 2021;30(1):146-161. https://doi.org/10.1111/exd.14121
9. Lian N, Li T. Growth factor pathways in hypertrophic scars: molecular pathogenesis and therapeutic implications. Biomed Pharmacother. 2016;84:42-50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2016.09.010
10. Clough E, Barrett T. The gene expression omnibus database. Statistical Genomics: Methods and Protocols. 2016:93-110. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3578-9_5
11. Rust R. Ischemic stroke-related gene expression profiles across species: a meta-analysis. J Inflamm. 2023;20(1):21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12950-023-00346-x
12. Zhou Y, Zhou B, Pache L, Chang M, Khodabakhshi AH, Tanaseichuk O, et al. Metascape provides a biologist-oriented resource for the analysis of systems-level datasets. Nat Commun. 2019;10(1):1523. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09234-6
13. Ozer ME, Sarica PO, Arga KY. New machine learning applications to accelerate personalized medicine in breast cancer: rise of the support vector machines. OMICS J Integr Biol. 2020;24(5):241-246. https://doi.org/10.1089/omi.2020.0001
14. Su L, Han J. Non-coding RNAs in hypertrophic scars and keloids: Current research and clinical relevance: A review. Int J Biol Macromol. 2024;256:128334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2023.128334
15. Wagner F. GO-PCA: an unsupervised method to explore gene expression data using prior knowledge. PloS one. 2015;10(11): e0143196. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143196
16. O'Reilly S. Epigenetics in fibrosis. Mol Aspects Med. 2017;54: 89-102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mam.2016.10.001
17. Alghamdi MA, Wallace HJ, Melton PE, Moses EK, Stevenson A, Al-Eitan LN, et al. Identification of differentially methylated CpG sites in fibroblasts from keloid scars. Biomedicines. 2020;8(7):181. https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines8070181
18. Yan J, Risacher SL, Shen L, Saykin AJ. Network approaches to systems biology analysis of complex disease: integrative methods for multi-omics data. Brief Bioinform. 2018;19(6):1370-1381. https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbx066
19. Liu W, Huang X, Liang X, Zhou Y, Li H, Yu Q, et al. Identification of key modules and hub genes of keloids with weighted gene coexpression network analysis. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2017;139(2): 376-390. https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0000000000003014
20. Turanli B, Karagoz K, Gulfidan G, Sinha R, Mardinoglu A, Arga KY. A network-based cancer drug discovery: from integrated multi-omics approaches to precision medicine. Curr Pharm Des. 2018;24(32):3778-3790. https://doi.org/10.2174/1381612824666181106095959



https://doi.org/10.61577/amsd.2025.100002