

Inflammatory Biomarkers and Emerging Therapeutic Strategies in Internal Medicine

Momina Iftikhar¹, Areeg Fatima², Muhammad Shahzar², Maryam Khalid³, Salma Roman⁴, Zahrah Khalid⁵ and Muhammad Mudassar^{2*}

¹Department of Eastern Medicine, Government College University Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Pakistan

²College of Allied Health Professionals, Government College University Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Pakistan

³Department of Parasitology, University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Lahore, Pakistan

⁴Department of Biotechnology, International Islamic University Islamabad, Islamabad, Pakistan

⁵Department of Physiology, Government College University Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Pakistan

*Corresponding author

Muhammad Mudassar, College of Allied Health Professionals, Government College University Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

Received: September 17, 2026; Accepted: September 23, 2026; Published: September 30, 2026

ABSTRACT

Inflammation is a central biological mechanism linking chronic kidney disease, cardiovascular disorders, metabolic abnormalities, smoking-related injury, infection, and tissue degeneration. In internal medicine, circulating biomarkers can assist in identifying disease activity, estimating prognosis, monitoring treatment response, and understanding interactions between immune and metabolic pathways. This review examines the clinical significance of inflammatory and immunological biomarkers and discusses emerging therapeutic strategies relevant to internal medicine. Particular attention is given to renal failure, cytokine dysregulation, immunoglobulins, erythrocyte sedimentation rate, smoking-associated inflammatory changes, antimicrobial resistance, nanotechnology-based drug delivery, and tissue engineering. Evidence indicates that biomarker interpretation should be integrated with clinical findings rather than considered independently. Chronic inflammation may contribute to progressive organ dysfunction, while infection and antimicrobial resistance complicate management of medically vulnerable patients. Emerging nanotechnology approaches may improve targeted therapy but require careful assessment of toxicity and long-term safety. Multidisciplinary, evidence-based approaches integrating biomarkers, clinical assessment, prevention, and personalized treatment may improve patient management.

Keywords: Inflammatory Biomarkers, Chronic Kidney Disease, Renal Failure, Cytokines, Immunoglobulins, Smoking, Antimicrobial Resistance, Nanotechnology, Internal Medicine

Introduction

Internal medicine encompasses a broad range of disorders involving multiple organ systems and frequently requires integration of clinical findings, laboratory biomarkers, imaging, pharmacotherapy, and preventive medicine. Chronic diseases often involve overlapping inflammatory, immune, metabolic, and vascular pathways. Consequently, biomarkers capable of reflecting these processes have become increasingly important in diagnosis, risk assessment, disease monitoring, and research.

Inflammation is particularly relevant to chronic kidney disease (CKD), cardiovascular disease, diabetes, respiratory disorders, autoimmune conditions, and infections. Persistent inflammatory

activation can contribute to endothelial dysfunction, tissue injury, altered immune responses, and progressive organ damage. In patients with advanced renal dysfunction, abnormalities in immune mediators may coexist with impaired clearance of metabolic products and altered responses to infection.

Biomarkers such as C-reactive protein, erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF- α), interleukin-6 (IL-6), interleukin-10 (IL-10), immunoglobulins, and antinuclear antibodies can provide complementary information. However, no biomarker should generally be interpreted independently of clinical context. Variations may reflect infection, inflammation, renal function, medication exposure, age, nutritional status, or other comorbidities.

Recent work by examined immunomodulatory pathways in individuals with renal failure and reported assessment of

Citation: Momina Iftikhar, Areeg Fatima, Muhammad Shahzar, Maryam Khalid, Salma Roman, et al. Inflammatory Biomarkers and Emerging Therapeutic Strategies in Internal Medicine. *J Clin Res Intern Med*. 2026. 1(1): 1-4. DOI: doi.org/10.61440/JCRIM.2026.v1.03

IgA, IgM, IgG, IgE, TNF- α , IL-6, IL-10, ANA, and ESR in patients undergoing hemodialysis [1]. These findings provide a useful clinical context for discussing the role of immune and inflammatory biomarkers in internal medicine.

The present review discusses the relationship between inflammatory biomarkers and selected clinical conditions, with emphasis on renal disease, smoking-related inflammation, infection, antimicrobial resistance, and emerging nanotechnology-based therapeutic approaches.

Inflammatory Biomarkers in Clinical Medicine

Inflammatory biomarkers provide measurable indicators of immune activation or tissue injury. Their clinical utility depends on analytical reliability, biological variability, disease specificity, and appropriate interpretation.

ESR remains a commonly available inflammatory marker. Although nonspecific, it can provide supportive evidence of chronic inflammatory activity and may be useful when interpreted alongside clinical findings and other laboratory investigations. Renal impairment may affect ESR through multiple mechanisms, including anemia, altered plasma proteins, inflammation, and changes associated with renal replacement therapy.

Cytokines provide more specific insight into inflammatory pathways. TNF- α and IL-6 participate in innate and adaptive immune responses and can contribute to systemic inflammation. IL-10, in contrast, is generally associated with immunoregulatory and anti-inflammatory activity. The balance between pro-inflammatory and regulatory cytokines may therefore be more informative than any single measurement.

Investigated these pathways in individuals with renal failure and included TNF- α , IL-6, and IL-10 among the measured cytokines. The study also examined immunoglobulins and ANA, illustrating a multidimensional approach to immune assessment in renal disease.

Biomarker panels may eventually provide greater clinical value than isolated measurements. However, broader implementation requires standardized assays, validated reference ranges, appropriate population-specific thresholds, and prospective evaluation of clinical outcomes.

Renal Failure and Immunological Alterations

CKD is associated with profound interactions between renal dysfunction, immune activation, oxidative stress, endothelial injury, and metabolic abnormalities. Patients with advanced disease may simultaneously experience chronic inflammation and impaired immune defense.

The kidney contributes to homeostasis by regulating fluid balance, electrolyte concentrations, acid-base status, endocrine functions, and elimination of metabolic products. Progressive renal dysfunction disrupts these processes and may promote systemic biological disturbances.

Patients receiving hemodialysis represent a particularly important clinical population. Repeated exposure to extracorporeal circuits,

vascular access procedures, underlying comorbidities, and uremic conditions can influence inflammatory and immune responses.

Reported a study involving 60 renal-failure patients and 60 controls aged 40–60 years. Immunoglobulins, cytokines, ANA, and ESR were measured using laboratory-based analytical methods. The study provides evidence supporting continued investigation of combined immunological and inflammatory profiles in renal disease.

From an internal-medicine perspective, biomarker assessment should be incorporated into a broader clinical evaluation that includes renal function, blood pressure, anemia, nutritional status, cardiovascular risk, infection history, medication use, and dialysis-related factors.

An important limitation is that biomarker abnormalities do not necessarily establish causality. For example, elevated inflammatory markers may indicate infection, chronic inflammation, vascular disease, or another concurrent condition. Therefore, laboratory findings should guide rather than replace clinical reasoning.

Smoking and Systemic Inflammation

Smoking is associated with extensive biological effects involving the respiratory, cardiovascular, immune, and metabolic systems. Tobacco exposure can induce oxidative stress, endothelial dysfunction, inflammatory signaling, and structural tissue injury.

Inflammatory biomarkers have been investigated as potential indicators of smoking-associated biological effects. Examined changes in inflammatory markers and biochemical parameters in males during smoking exposure. Such research supports the concept that smoking can be considered not only a respiratory risk factor but also a systemic inflammatory exposure [2].

The clinical implications extend across internal medicine. Smoking contributes to cardiovascular disease, chronic respiratory disease, malignancy, and impaired healing. Smoking cessation therefore represents an important intervention capable of influencing multiple disease pathways simultaneously.

Biomarkers may have a role in research examining the biological response to cessation, but clinical smoking-cessation strategies should not depend solely on laboratory markers. Behavioral counseling, pharmacological support where appropriate, patient education, and repeated follow-up remain central components of comprehensive care.

Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance

Infectious diseases represent an important component of internal medicine, particularly among patients with chronic illnesses, immunological abnormalities, renal failure, diabetes, and repeated healthcare exposure.

The increasing prevalence of antimicrobial resistance complicates treatment. β -lactamase-producing bacteria can hydrolyze β -lactam antibiotics and contribute to therapeutic failure. Molecular identification of resistance determinants may therefore complement conventional antimicrobial susceptibility testing.

Investigated β -lactamase genes in *Klebsiella* species isolated from the Euphrates River in Iraq, using molecular approaches to evaluate resistance-associated genes. The study illustrates the importance of combining microbiological and molecular approaches when investigating antimicrobial resistance [3].

From the perspective of internal medicine, antimicrobial resistance has consequences beyond infectious-disease departments. Patients with CKD, malignancy, diabetes, or immunosuppression may be particularly vulnerable to severe infections. Appropriate antimicrobial stewardship is therefore essential.

Clinical management should include appropriate specimen collection, pathogen identification, susceptibility testing, rational antimicrobial selection, dose adjustment when renal function is impaired, and reassessment when treatment response is inadequate.

Interaction Between Inflammation and Chronic Disease

Inflammation frequently acts as a common pathway linking apparently distinct chronic conditions. A patient with diabetes and CKD, for example, may simultaneously experience metabolic dysfunction, vascular injury, oxidative stress, and immune dysregulation.

Similarly, cardiovascular disease may coexist with renal dysfunction and systemic inflammation. This interaction creates challenges because treatment of one condition may influence another. Drug selection, dosing, monitoring, and adverse-effect assessment must therefore be individualized.

The clinical significance of inflammatory biomarkers lies partly in their ability to provide additional biological information. Nevertheless, biomarkers should be interpreted within a comprehensive framework that includes symptoms, physical examination, disease history, imaging, conventional laboratory tests, and therapeutic response.

Future research should investigate whether biomarker-guided treatment strategies improve patient outcomes compared with conventional clinical management. Prospective studies, standardized assays, and clinically meaningful endpoints are necessary before routine implementation of novel biomarker algorithms.

Nanotechnology and Drug Delivery in Internal Medicine

Nanotechnology has generated considerable interest in drug delivery because nanoscale systems may alter drug solubility, stability, bioavailability, distribution, and controlled release. Potential applications extend across oncology, infectious diseases, inflammatory disorders, tissue repair, and regenerative medicine.

Reviewed bone tissue engineering using nanotechnology-based drug-delivery systems and described the potential role of nanostructured approaches in regenerative medicine. The relevance to internal medicine includes the broader concept that targeted delivery systems may eventually improve therapeutic efficacy while reducing systemic exposure [4].

However, nanotechnology should not be regarded as inherently safer than conventional treatment. Nanomaterials may have unique physicochemical characteristics that influence absorption,

distribution, metabolism, elimination, and toxicity. Long-term biological effects require systematic investigation.

Discussed challenges and hazards associated with nanotechnology in agriculture, emphasizing the broader need for environmental and biological risk assessment. Although their discussion concerns agricultural applications, the principle of responsible evaluation is directly relevant to medical nanotechnology [5].

Clinical translation should therefore include characterization of particle size, surface properties, stability, biodistribution, toxicity, immunogenicity, manufacturing consistency, and interactions with biological systems.

Nanotechnology, Immunity, and Personalized Medicine

The intersection of nanotechnology and immunology provides opportunities for targeted therapeutic delivery and improved diagnostic platforms. Nanoparticles may potentially transport drugs, proteins, nucleic acids, or other therapeutic molecules to selected tissues.

However, immune recognition of nanoparticles can influence their pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties. Complement activation, macrophage uptake, inflammatory signaling, and immunogenicity may affect therapeutic outcomes.

The clinical development of nanoparticle-based interventions should therefore incorporate immunological assessment alongside conventional pharmacological evaluation. This is particularly important for patients with CKD or immune dysfunction because altered clearance and immune responses may modify treatment effects.

Personalized medicine may eventually combine biomarker profiles with patient characteristics to select appropriate therapies. A clinically useful system would require reliable biomarkers, validated prediction models, and evidence demonstrating improved outcomes.

Clinical Interpretation and Patient Management

The increasing availability of biomarkers and molecular technologies should strengthen-not replace-clinical reasoning. Internal-medicine physicians frequently manage patients with multiple simultaneous conditions, making integrated interpretation essential.

A Practical Approach Includes Five Stages:

First: Establish the Clinical Question Biomarker testing should be ordered for a specific diagnostic, prognostic, or monitoring purpose.

Second: Assess Pretest Probability Laboratory findings have different implications depending on disease prevalence and clinical presentation.

Third: Interpret Biomarkers in Context Renal impairment, infection, smoking, inflammation, medication use, and other comorbidities may influence laboratory results.

Fourth: Assess Trends Rather Than Isolated Values Serial measurements may provide more clinically meaningful information than a single result.

Fifth: Connect Findings to Management Biomarker results should lead to appropriate diagnostic evaluation, therapeutic modification, preventive intervention, or monitoring.

This framework can reduce unnecessary testing and minimize inappropriate interpretation of nonspecific laboratory abnormalities.

Future Research Directions

Future internal-medicine research should increasingly investigate combinations of biomarkers rather than isolated parameters. Multi-omics approaches involving genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, and immunological profiling may improve understanding of disease mechanisms.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning could potentially integrate laboratory, clinical, imaging, and demographic data. However, such models require external validation, transparent reporting, appropriate handling of missing data, and assessment for algorithmic bias.

Clinical trials should determine whether biomarker-guided interventions produce better outcomes than established clinical pathways. Important endpoints should include mortality, hospitalization, disease progression, quality of life, adverse effects, and healthcare utilization.

Nanotechnology-based treatments also require carefully designed clinical trials. Particular attention should be given to long-term toxicity, immunological effects, renal clearance, drug-drug interactions, and differences among patient populations [6-15].

Antimicrobial-resistance surveillance should similarly combine epidemiological, microbiological, and molecular data. Integration between hospital laboratories and public-health surveillance systems could improve early identification of emerging resistance patterns.

Conclusion

Inflammatory and immunological biomarkers have increasing relevance to internal medicine because they provide insight into chronic kidney disease, infection, smoking-related injury, and systemic inflammatory processes. Their greatest clinical value is achieved when laboratory findings are interpreted alongside history, examination, conventional investigations, and disease-specific assessment. Molecular surveillance of antimicrobial resistance can strengthen infectious-disease management, while nanotechnology offers opportunities for targeted drug delivery and regenerative medicine. However, emerging technologies require rigorous evaluation of efficacy, toxicity, and long-term safety. Future internal-medicine practice should emphasize validated biomarker panels, personalized interpretation, antimicrobial stewardship, responsible technological innovation, and prospective clinical research focused on meaningful patient outcomes.

References

1. Shallal AF. Immunomodulatory pathways of some biomarkers in individuals with renal failure. *ARO-The Scientific Journal of Koya University*. 2025. 13: 326-333.
2. Shallal AF. The changes in some inflammatory markers and biochemical aspects during smoking in males. *Communities*. 2020. 1: 4.
3. Guma MA, Jubier OJ, Shallal AF, Nasser BM, Alisawi O. Molecular identification and antibiotic resistance evaluation of two β -lactamase genes in *Klebsiella* species isolated from Euphrates River in Iraq. *Egyptian Journal of Medical Microbiology*. 2026. 35: 1-11.
4. Shallal AF, Akram M, Muslim RF, Owaid MN, Yaseen OQ, et al. Bone tissue engineering using nanotechnology based drug delivery system. In *Advances in Nanotechnology-Based Drug Delivery Systems*. Elsevier. 2022. 177-196.
5. Shallal AF, Owaid MN. Challenges and hazards associated with nanotechnology in agriculture. In *Advances in Nanotechnology-Based Drug Delivery Systems*. Elsevier. 2022. 12: 399-414.
6. Arici M, Walls J. End-stage renal disease, atherosclerosis, and cardiovascular mortality: Is C-reactive protein the missing link? *Kidney International*. 1999. 55: 1312-1319.
7. Carrero JJ, Stenvinkel P, Cuppari L, Ikizler TA, Kalantar-Zadeh K, et al. Etiology of the protein-energy wasting syndrome in chronic kidney disease: A consensus statement from the International Society of Renal Nutrition and Metabolism. *Journal of Renal Nutrition*. 2013. 23: 77-90.
8. Cohen G, Hörl WH. Immune dysfunction in uremia-An update. *Toxins*. 2003. 3: 13-19.
9. Fried LF, Solomon C, Shlipak M, Seliger S, Stehman-Breen C, et al. Inflammatory and prothrombotic markers and the progression of renal disease. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*. 2004. 15: 2667-2676.
10. Kalantar-Zadeh K, Ikizler TA, Block G, Avram MM, Kopple JD. Malnutrition-inflammation complex syndrome in dialysis patients: Causes and consequences. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*. 2003. 42: 864-881.
11. Liu C, Chu D, Kalantar-Zadeh K, George J, Young HA, et al. Cytokines: From clinical significance to quantification. *Advanced Science*. 2021. 8: 2004433.
12. Stenvinkel P, Ketteler M, Johnson RJ, Lindholm B, Pecoits-Filho R, et al. IL-10, IL-6, and TNF- α : Central factors in the altered cytokine network of uremia the good, the bad, and the ugly. *Kidney International*. 2005. 67: 1216-1233.
13. Zoccali C, Tripepi G, Mallamaci F. Predictors of cardiovascular death in ESRD. *Seminars in Nephrology*. 2005. 25: 358-362.
14. World Health Organization. Global antimicrobial resistance and use surveillance system (GLASS) report 2023. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2023.
15. World Health Organization. Guidance for best practices for clinical trials. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2024.