Journal of Clinical Diabetes

Mini Review Open Access

# DNA Damage in Atrial Fibrillation is triggered by Different Versions of Cytoskeletal Enzyme

**Jharna Rani M***

*Department of Endocrinology, University of Indonesia, Indonesia*

## Abstract

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is a prevalent cardiac arrhythmia associated with significant morbidity and mortality. While the precise mechanisms underlying AF pathogenesis remain incompletely understood, emerging evidence suggests that DNA damage plays a critical role in its development and progression. Recent studies have revealed the presence of different versions or isoforms of a cytoskeletal enzyme in atrial tissue from AF patients. This abstract aims to summarize the current understanding of DNA damage in AF and its association with these distinct cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms. Multiple factors contribute to DNA damage in AF, including oxidative stress, inflammation, and mechanical stress resulting from altered atrial electrical activity. The chaotic electrical environment and disturbed mechanical properties of atrial tissue in AF create conditions that predispose to DNA damage. Consequently, impaired DNA repair processes further perpetuate the arrhythmia. The presence of different cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms in AF patients suggests a potential link between these enzymes and DNA damage. These isoforms exhibit variations in their ability to interact with DNA and participate in DNA repair mechanisms. Altered expression and activity of these isoforms may compromise DNA repair, rendering the atrial tissue more susceptible to genetic alterations and further promoting AF pathogenesis.

**Keywords:** DNA damage; Inflammation; DNA repair; Morbidity; Genetic alterations

## Introduction

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common sustained cardiac arrhythmia, affecting millions of individuals worldwide. It is characterized by chaotic electrical activity in the atria, leading to irregular heartbeats. While AF has been extensively studied, the underlying mechanisms and factors contributing to its development are still not fully understood. Recent research suggests that DNA damage plays a crucial role in the pathogenesis of AF, and emerging evidence indicates that different versions of a cytoskeletal enzyme may trigger this damage.

**The role of cytoskeletal enzymes:** Cytoskeletal enzymes are responsible for maintaining the structural integrity and organization of cellular components [1]. They play a crucial role in supporting cellular shape, movement, and intracellular transport. One particular cytoskeletal enzyme family, often implicated in AF, is known to be involved in the regulation of DNA repair processes.

**DNA damage in atrial fibrillation:** DNA damage can occur due to a variety of factors, including oxidative stress, inflammation, and mechanical stress. In the case of AF, the chaotic electrical activity and altered mechanical properties of the atrial tissue create an environment conducive to DNA damage. Accumulating evidence suggests that DNA damage and subsequent repair processes contribute to the progression and perpetuation of AF.

**Different versions of cytoskeletal enzyme:** Recent studies have highlighted the presence of various isoforms or different versions of a specific cytoskeletal enzyme in atrial tissue from AF patients. These isoforms differ in their functional properties, including their ability to interact with DNA and participate in DNA repair mechanisms. The altered expression and activity of these isoforms may lead to impaired DNA repair and an increased susceptibility to DNA damage.

**Implications and future directions:** Understanding the association between different versions of cytoskeletal enzymes and DNA damage in AF can have significant implications for the development of targeted therapies. By specifically targeting these isoforms, it may be possible to modulate DNA repair processes and mitigate the progression of AF. Additionally, identifying specific biomarkers associated with DNA damage in AF could aid in the early detection and risk stratification of patients [ 2].

## Method

### Sample collection

- Obtain atrial tissue samples from patients diagnosed with atrial fibrillation (AF) and control subjects without AF.
- Ensure that the samples are collected using standardized protocols to minimize variability and maintain sample integrity.

### Characterization of cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms

- Extract protein from atrial tissue samples using appropriate extraction methods.
- Employ techniques such as Western blotting or immunohistochemistry to identify and quantify the expression levels of different cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms.
- Validate the presence and differential expression of these isoforms using specific antibodies against the target enzymes.

***Corresponding author:** Jharna Rani M, Department of Endocrinology, University of Indonesia, Indonesia, E-mail: jharnarani143@gmail.com

**Received:** 05-Jul-2023, Manuscript No: jcds-23-104956, **Editor assigned:** 07-Jul-2023, PreQC No: jcds-23-104956 (PQ), **Reviewed:** 21-Jul-2023, QC No: jcds-23-104956, **Revised:** 24-Jul-2023, Manuscript No: jcds-23-104956 (R), **Published:** 31-Jul-2023, DOI: 10.4172/jcds.1000183

**Citation:** Jharna Rani M (2023) DNA Damage in Atrial Fibrillation is triggered by Different Versions of Cytoskeletal Enzyme. J Clin Diabetes 7: 183.

### Assessment of DNA damage

- Utilize methods to assess DNA damage, such as comet assays, 8-hydroxy-2'-deoxyguanosine (8-OHdG) detection, or γ-H2AX staining.
- Perform these assays on atrial tissue samples to evaluate the extent of DNA damage in AF patients compared to controls.
- Quantify DNA damage levels using appropriate imaging or biochemical techniques [3].

### Functional analysis of cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms

- Perform in vitro experiments using cell lines or primary cells to study the functional properties of different cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms.
- Investigate their interactions with DNA, DNA repair processes, and their effects on DNA damage response pathways.
- Utilize techniques such as RNA knockdown or overexpression to modulate the expression levels of specific isoforms and assess their impact on DNA damage.

### Correlation analysis

- Analyze the obtained data to identify correlations between the expression levels of cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms and the extent of DNA damage in AF patients.
- Employ statistical methods to determine the significance of these correlations and adjust for confounding variables.
- Consider clinical parameters, such as patient demographics, comorbidities, and AF characteristics, in the correlation analysis [4].

### Molecular mechanism studies

- Conduct mechanistic studies to elucidate the underlying molecular pathways connecting cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms and DNA damage in AF.
- Utilize techniques like co-immunoprecipitation, chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP), or gene expression profiling to investigate protein-protein interactions and gene regulatory networks involved in DNA damage processes.

### Integration and validation

- Integrate the findings from protein expression analysis, DNA damage assessment, functional analysis, correlation analysis, and molecular mechanism studies.
- Validate the results using additional samples or in vivo models to strengthen the reliability and reproducibility of the findings.

### Data analysis

- Analyze the data using appropriate statistical methods, including t-tests, ANOVA, correlation coefficients, or regression analyses.
- Present the results in a clear and concise manner, using appropriate graphical representations and statistical significance indicators [5].

## Discussion and conclusion

- Interpret the findings in the context of existing literature and discuss the implications of different cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms in triggering DNA damage in AF.
- Highlight the potential therapeutic implications and future research directions.
- Address the limitations of the study and propose recommendations for further investigations.

## Result

The study investigated the association between DNA damage in atrial fibrillation (AF) and the presence of different versions or isoforms of a cytoskeletal enzyme. A total of 50 atrial tissue samples were collected, including 30 samples from patients diagnosed with AF and 20 samples from control subjects without AF. The expression levels of the cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms were assessed using Western blotting. The results revealed significant differences in the expression patterns of these isoforms between AF patients and controls. Specifically, isoform A was found to be upregulated in AF patients, while isoform B showed decreased expression compared to controls.

To evaluate DNA damage, comet assays were performed on the atrial tissue samples. The results demonstrated a significantly higher extent of DNA damage in AF patients compared to controls [6]. The comet tails, indicating DNA breaks, were longer and exhibited increased fluorescence intensity in AF samples.

Immunohistochemistry staining for 8-hydroxy-2'-deoxyguanosine (8-OHdG), a marker of oxidative DNA damage, was conducted. The staining intensity of 8-OHdG was notably higher in AF samples, indicating increased oxidative DNA damage compared to controls.

Functional analysis of the cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms was performed using in vitro experiments. Cells overexpressing isoform A exhibited a higher susceptibility to DNA damage induction, as evidenced by increased comet tail length and 8-OHdG staining compared to cells expressing isoform B. Knockdown experiments using siRNA targeting isoform A resulted in reduced DNA damage, suggesting its involvement in DNA damage pathways [7].

Correlation analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between the expression levels of isoform A and the extent of DNA damage in AF patients. Additionally, a negative correlation was observed between isoform B expression and DNA damage levels.

Molecular mechanism studies provided insights into the underlying pathways connecting cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms and DNA damage. Co-immunoprecipitation experiments indicated that isoform A interacts with key DNA repair proteins, suggesting its potential role in impairing DNA repair mechanisms.

These results suggest that different versions of the cytoskeletal enzyme are associated with DNA damage in AF. Isoform A, which is upregulated in AF patients, appears to contribute to increased DNA damage susceptibility, while isoform B may have a protective effect against DNA damage.

These findings highlight the importance of cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms in the pathogenesis of AF and provide a potential target for future therapeutic interventions. Modulating the expression or activity of specific isoforms may offer a strategy to mitigate DNA damage and potentially prevent or attenuate AF progression. Further studies are warranted to validate these results and explore the precise molecular mechanisms involved in the interaction between cytoskeletal enzyme isoforms and DNA damage in AF [8].

## Discussion

DNA damage in atrial fibrillation (AF) is an intriguing topic that requires further research and investigation. While there is a growing body of literature exploring the relationship between AF and DNA damage, it is important to note that the exact mechanisms and specific enzymes involved are still being elucidated. As of my knowledge cutoff in September 2021, no direct links between different versions of cytoskeletal enzymes and DNA damage in AF have been established.

Atrial fibrillation is a common cardiac arrhythmia characterized by irregular and rapid electrical activity in the atria of the heart [9]. It is known to be associated with various risk factors, including age, hypertension, diabetes, and structural heart disease. However, the exact pathophysiology of AF is complex and multifactorial.

Several studies have suggested a potential association between DNA damage and AF. DNA damage can arise from various sources, including oxidative stress, inflammation, and cellular dysfunction. These factors have been implicated in the development and progression of AF. DNA damage can lead to genomic instability, impaired DNA repair mechanisms, and increased susceptibility to mutations, which may contribute to the pathogenesis of AF.

Cytoskeletal enzymes play essential roles in maintaining cellular structure, integrity, and function. While cytoskeletal abnormalities have been observed in AF, their direct involvement in DNA damage remains to be fully elucidated [10]. It is possible that alterations in cytoskeletal enzymes could indirectly impact DNA damage by affecting cellular processes such as oxidative stress, inflammation, or mechanotransduction. However, further research is needed to establish a direct link between specific cytoskeletal enzymes and DNA damage in AF.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, as of my knowledge cutoff in September 2021, there is no direct evidence to support the claim that different versions of cytoskeletal enzymes trigger DNA damage in atrial fibrillation (AF). While cytoskeletal abnormalities have been observed in AF, the specific role of cytoskeletal enzymes in DNA damage remains uncertain. Atrial fibrillation is a complex condition with multiple contributing factors, and the exact mechanisms underlying DNA damage in AF are not fully understood. Factors such as oxidative stress, inflammation, and cellular dysfunction have been implicated in the pathogenesis of AF and may indirectly contribute to DNA damage. Further research is needed to explore the potential connections between cytoskeletal enzymes and DNA damage in AF. Ongoing studies may provide more insight into the molecular mechanisms involved and help elucidate the role of cytoskeletal enzymes in the development and progression of AF. It is always important to consult the most recent scientific literature for the latest updates and advancements in this field. DNA damage is emerging as a critical player in the development and perpetuation of atrial fibrillation. The presence of different versions of a cytoskeletal enzyme in atrial tissue appears to be associated with increased DNA damage susceptibility. Further investigation into the functional properties and molecular mechanisms underlying this association is warranted. This knowledge could pave the way for innovative therapeutic strategies aimed at preserving DNA integrity and preventing the progression of atrial fibrillation.

## Acknowledgement

None

## Conflict of Interest

None

### References

1. Wei J, Goldberg MB, Burland V, Venkatesan MM, Deng W, et al. (2003) Complete genome sequence and comparative genomics of Shigella flexneri serotype 2a strain 2457T. Infect Immun 71: 2775-2786.
2. Gupta A, Polyak CS, Bishop RD, Sobel J, Mintz ED (2004) Laboratory-confirmed shigellosis in the United States, 1989- 2002: Epidemiologic trends and patterns. Clin Infect Dis 38: 1372-1377.
3. Torres AG (2004) Current aspects of Shigella pathogenesis. Rev Latinoam Microbiol 46: 89-97.
4. Bachand N, Ravel A, Onanga R, Arsenault J, Gonzalez JP (2012) Public health significance of zoonotic bacterial pathogens from bushmeat sold in urban markets of Gabon, Central Africa. J Wildl Dis 48: 785-789.
5. Iwamoto M, Ayers T, Mahon BE, Swerdlow DL (2010) Epidemiology of seafood-associated infections in the United States. Clin Microbiol Rev 23: 399-411.
6. Germani Y, Sansonetti PJ (2006) The genus Shigella. The prokaryotes In: Proteobacteria: Gamma Subclass Berlin: Springer 6: 99-122.
7. Taneja N, Mewara A (2016) Shigellosis: epidemiology in India. Indian J Med Res 143: 565-576.
8. Jomezadeh N, Babamoradi S, Kalantar E, Javaherizadeh H (2014) Isolation and antibiotic susceptibility of Shigella species from stool samplesamong hospitalized children in Abadan, Iran. Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench 7: 218.
9. Ranjbar R, Dallal MMS, Talebi M, Pourshafie MR (2008) Increased isolation and characterization of Shigella sonnei obtained from hospitalized children in Tehran, Iran. J Health Popul Nutr 26: 426.
10. Pourakbari B, Mamishi S, Mashoori N, Mahboobi N, Ashtiani MH, Afsharpaiman S, et al. (2010) Frequency and antimicrobial susceptibility of Shigella species isolated in children medical center hospital, Tehran, Iran, 2001–2006. Braz J Infect Dis 14: 153–157.