Opinion
Volume 09:04, 2025

Journal of Genetics and Genomes

ISSN: 2684-4567

Open Access

PRS: Promise, Challenges, and Diversity Gaps

Priyamvada Sen*

Department of Molecular Biology and Genome Dynamics, Kolkata National Research Institute, Kolkata, India

Introduction

Polygenic risk scores (PRS) explore their real-world value in clinical settings. What this really means is understanding how these scores can help us predict disease risk and guide prevention strategies across common conditions like coronary artery disease, diabetes, and certain cancers. It emphasizes that while PRS hold great promise for personalized medicine, careful consideration is needed for their implementation, focusing on rigorous validation and clear communication to patients and clinicians [1].

Ethical and regulatory hurdles surround polygenic risk scores. Here's the thing: as PRS become more common, we need to think about issues like equitable access, potential discrimination, how to protect genetic privacy. Policies and guidelines must catch up with the science to ensure responsible and fair use of these powerful predictive tools [2].

The application of polygenic risk scores in understanding and predicting psychiatric disorders is discussed. It emphasizes the journey from merely predicting who might be at risk to actively using PRS for early intervention and prevention strategies. While challenging, the potential to identify individuals at higher genetic risk for conditions like schizophrenia or bipolar disorder could transform mental health care [3].

Polygenic risk scores can significantly enhance our ability to predict coronary artery disease. A strong case is made for integrating PRS with traditional risk factors to get a much clearer picture of an individual's likelihood of developing heart disease. This improved prediction can lead to more targeted screening and preventative measures [4].

The current state and future potential of polygenic risk scores in cancer prevention and early detection are focused on. It explains how PRS, particularly for common cancers like breast, prostate, and colorectal, can identify individuals with higher genetic susceptibility. The idea is to move towards more personalized screening programs, tailoring interventions based on a person's unique genetic risk profile [5].

Significant challenges in making polygenic risk scores universally applicable are tackled. Let's break it down: issues like population stratification, where genetic risks vary greatly between different ancestral groups, and the urgent need for more diverse genomic data are critical. This means current PRS often don't perform as well in non-European populations, which is a major hurdle for equitable healthcare [6].

A thorough evaluation of polygenic scores specifically for breast cancer risk is presented. It shows how these scores, when combined with other known risk factors, can refine risk prediction, helping to identify women who might benefit from earlier or more frequent screening, or even preventative therapies. What this really means is a move towards a more tailored approach to breast cancer prevention [7].

Both the exciting opportunities and the persistent challenges of integrating polygenic risk scores into precision medicine are explored. It lays out how PRS could revolutionize diagnostics and treatment by offering highly individualized risk assessments. However, it also cautions that we still need to overcome hurdles like standardization, clinical validation, and ensuring these tools are useful across diverse populations [8].

Recent advancements in developing and applying polygenic risk scores are highlighted. It tracks the progress from initial research to practical applications, showing how better statistical methods and larger datasets are making PRS more accurate and informative. The improvements mean PRS are becoming more reliable tools for predicting disease risk across various complex traits [9].

The crucial issue of ancestral diversity and its effect on the usefulness of polygenic risk scores is discussed. Here's the thing: PRS developed in one population, typically those of European ancestry, don't always translate effectively to other diverse populations. It underscores the urgent need to include more varied genetic data in PRS development to avoid exacerbating health disparities and ensure these tools benefit everyone [10].

Description

Polygenic risk scores (PRS) hold significant real-world value in clinical settings, helping predict disease risk and guide prevention strategies across common conditions like coronary artery disease, diabetes, and certain cancers [1]. Indeed, the integration of PRS into precision medicine offers exciting opportunities. PRS could revolutionize diagnostics and treatment by offering highly individualized risk assessments [8].

On the application side, PRS can significantly enhance the prediction of coronary artery disease, with a strong case for integrating them with traditional risk factors for clearer risk pictures and targeted preventative measures [4]. The application of PRS in understanding and predicting psychiatric disorders is critical, moving from mere risk prediction to active use for early intervention and prevention strategies, with the potential to transform mental health care for conditions like schizophrenia or bipolar disorder [3]. Furthermore, PRS show crucial current state and future potential in cancer prevention and early detection, particularly for common cancers like breast, prostate, and colorectal, by identifying individuals with higher genetic susceptibility and guiding personalized screening programs [5]. For instance, a comprehensive evaluation specifically for breast cancer risk demonstrates how

these scores, combined with other known risk factors, refine risk prediction, aiding in identifying women who might benefit from earlier, more frequent screening, or even preventative therapies [7].

However, the field also faces significant ethical and regulatory hurdles. As PRS become more common, thinking about issues like equitable access, potential discrimination, and genetic privacy is essential, requiring policies and guidelines to catch up with the science for responsible and fair use [2]. Significant challenges also exist in making PRS universally applicable, including population stratification where genetic risks vary greatly across ancestral groups, and an urgent need for more diverse genomic data. Current PRS often underperform in non-European populations, posing a major hurdle for equitable healthcare [6]. Ancestral diversity crucially affects PRS usefulness, as scores developed predominantly in European populations often do not translate effectively to other diverse populations. This highlights an urgent need for varied genetic data in PRS development to avoid exacerbating health disparities and ensure widespread benefit [10].

While PRS hold promise for individualized risk assessments, hurdles like standardization, clinical validation, and ensuring utility across diverse populations must be overcome [8]. Despite these challenges, recent advancements in developing and applying polygenic risk scores show promising progress from initial research to practical applications. Improved statistical methods and larger datasets enhance PRS accuracy and informativeness, making them more reliable tools for predicting disease risk across various complex traits [9].

Conclusion

Polygenic risk scores (PRS) hold significant real-world value in clinical settings, helping predict disease risk and guide prevention strategies across common conditions like coronary artery disease, diabetes, and certain cancers. The field emphasizes that while PRS hold great promise for personalized medicine, careful consideration is needed for their implementation, focusing on rigorous validation and clear communication to patients and clinicians. Here's the thing: the integration of PRS into precision medicine brings exciting opportunities and persistent challenges, as they could revolutionize diagnostics and treatment by offering highly individualized risk assessments. However, we also face hurdles like standardization, clinical validation, and ensuring these tools are useful across diverse populations. Significant challenges exist in making PRS universally applicable. Let's break it down: issues like population stratification, where genetic risks vary greatly between different ancestral groups, and the urgent need for more diverse genomic data are critical. Current PRS often don't perform as well in non-European populations, which is a major hurdle for equitable healthcare. What this really means is that ancestral diversity crucially affects PRS' usefulness, as scores developed predominantly in European populations often don't translate effectively to other diverse populations. This underscores the urgent need for varied genetic data in PRS development to avoid exacerbating health disparities. Despite these hurdles, recent advancements track progress from initial research to practical applications, with improved statistical methods and larger datasets making PRS more accurate, informative, and reliable tools for predicting disease risk across various complex traits.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Aniruddh V. Khera, Mark Chaffin, Megan E. Haas, Xiaofeng Li, A. John Philippakis, Kumar G. Aragam. "The utility of polygenic risk scores in medical practice." *Nat Rev Genet* 21 (2020):532-546.

2. Jason L. Vassy, Robert C. Green, Aniruddh V. Khera. "Polygenic risk scores: the ethical and regulatory challenges." *Nat Rev Genet* 23 (2022):641-651.

3. Ditte Demontis, Magnus H. Pedersen, Søren D. Østergaard, Anders D. Børglum. "Polygenic risk scores for psychiatric disorders: moving from prediction to prevention." *Neuropsychopharmacology* 46 (2021):2049-2059.

4. Michael Inouye, J. Benjamin Brumpton, James E. Pirruccello, Amit V. Khera. "Using Polygenic Risk Scores to Improve Prediction of Coronary Artery Disease." *J Am Coll Cardiol* 75 (2020):2577-2586.

5. Nora Pashayan, Jacques Simard, Alison M. Dunning, Douglas F. Easton, Rosalind A. Eeles. "Clinical Utility of Polygenic Risk Scores for Cancer: Current Status and Future Directions." *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* 22 (2021):317-336.

6. Alicia R. Martin, Christopher R. Gignoux, Raymond K. Walters, Genevieve L. Wojcik, Benjamin M. Neale, Simon Gravel. "The challenges of polygenic risk scores: Population stratification, heterogeneity, and the need for diverse genomic data." *Genome Med* 13 (2021):1.

7. Nasim Mavaddat, Halina M. Krumholz, Paul D.P. Pharoah, Douglas F. Easton. "A comprehensive assessment of the polygenic score for breast cancer risk." *Genet Med* 24 (2022):288-301.

8. Leanne Duncan, Christina M. Palmer, Colm O'Dushlaine, Thomas J. Hoffmann, Francois Aguet, Benjamin Aronson. "Opportunities and Challenges for Polygenic Risk Scores in Precision Medicine." *Circ Res* 126 (2020):1113-1132.

9. Younghun Choi, Tsz-Kwong Mak, Paul F. O'Reilly. "Advances in the development and application of polygenic risk scores." *Nat Rev Genet* 21 (2020):504-517.

10. Giulia Sirugo, Scott M. Williams, Sarah A. Tishkoff. "The impact of ancestral diversity on the utility of polygenic risk scores in diverse populations." *Nat Rev Genet* 22 (2021):260-271.

How to cite this article: Sen, Priyamvada. "PRS: Promise, Challenges, and Diversity Gaps." *J Genet Genom* 09 (2025):184.

Address for Correspondence: Priyamvada, Sen, Department of Molecular Biology and Genome Dynamics, Kolkata National Research Institute, Kolkata, India, E-mail: p.sen@knomics.in

Received: 01-Aug-2025, Manuscript No. jgge-25-174632; **Editor assigned:** 04-Aug-2025, PreQC No. P-174632; **Reviewed:** 18-Aug-2025, QC No. Q-174632; **Revised:** 22-Aug-2025, Manuscript No. R-174632; **Published:** 29-Aug-2025, DOI: 10.37421/2684-4567.2025.9.184