

# Interactive Databases for the Life Sciences

Rosalia Moreddu<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Life Sciences, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK

\*[r.moreddu@soton.ac.uk](mailto:r.moreddu@soton.ac.uk)

## Abstract

In the past few decades, the life sciences have experienced an unprecedented accumulation of data, ranging from genomic sequences and proteomic profiles to heavy-content imaging, clinical assays, and commercial biological products for research. Traditional static databases have been invaluable in providing standardized and structured information. However, they fall short when it comes to facilitating exploratory data interrogation, real-time query, multidimensional comparison and dynamic visualization. Interactive databases aiming at supporting user-driven data queries and visualization offer promising new avenues for making the best use of the vast and heterogeneous data streams collected in biological research. This article discusses the potential of interactive databases, highlighting the importance of implementing this model in the life sciences, while going through the state-of-the-art in database design, technical choices behind modern data management systems, and emerging needs in multidisciplinary research. Special attention is given to data interrogation strategies, user interface design, and comparative analysis capabilities, along with challenges such as data standardization and scalability in data-heavy applications. Conceptual features for developing interactive databases along diverse life science domains are then presented in the user case of cell line selection for *in vitro* research to bridge the gap between research data generation, actionable biological insight, subsequent meaningful experimental design, and clinical relevance.

**Keywords:** interactive databases; life sciences; data interrogation; dynamic visualization; bioinformatics; AI integration; experimental design


## 1. Biological data management

Biology, nanotechnology and medicine are data-rich fields.<sup>1</sup> Over the last several decades, high-throughput technologies have revolutionized biology by generating massive datasets. These include genomic sequences, proteomics data, high-resolution imaging, long-term acquisitions, and clinical trial data.<sup>2</sup> On top of those, companies in the biotech industry have commercialized large amounts of biological models to be used in research, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical industries for *in vitro* research.<sup>3</sup> In response, the need for versatile and user-friendly resource management and data management systems has grown dramatically.<sup>4</sup>

Biological databases traditionally focused on cataloguing discrete pieces of information and statically showing them online (e.g., Cellosaurus for classifying cell lines)<sup>5</sup> or within private organizations (e.g., internal databases for storing laboratory equipment information). In some cases, they integrate simple search functions to enable additional data storage over time or simple screenings prompts.<sup>6</sup> Classic examples of GenBank<sup>7</sup> and the Protein Data Bank (PDB)<sup>8</sup> offer search and retrieval functions based on predetermined criteria. These repositories serve as essential resources for the research community, but they were primarily designed for static data storage rather than for dynamic data interrogation. The modern user in research and development is not merely interested in passive datasets. Rather, there is an increasing demand for interactive analysis tools of easy and frequent access that enable real-time exploration, dynamism, multidimensional comparisons and customized data visualization. Interactive databases, as the name suggests, could offer powerful capabilities, linking raw data storage with the extraction of scientific insights, both from existing data and for planning the collection of new meaningful data.

With the advent of high-throughput technologies, the volume and complexity of biological data expanded considerably.<sup>9</sup> In domains such as genomics, drug discovery, *in vitro* research and personalized medicine, interactive platforms have the potential to transform the way we work with data, reducing time currently devolved to hypothesis testing and literature search, increasing the chances of selecting optimal consumables, and facilitating discovery by designing meaningful workflows based on experimental objectives. This model would also enable scientists to focus their efforts on innovation and higher-end intellectual activities, saving the time employed in methodical search tasks, which could be better carried on by algorithms. In this context, interactive databases might play a pivotal role. **Figure 1** visualizes

the potential of interactive databases. In the following sections, an analysis of this topic is provided to guide the development of next-generation interactive and accessible digital platforms to optimize resources and accelerate life sciences research.



**Figure 1. Interactive databases.** The image at the left displays the concept of interactive databases, needs and features. The diagram at the right compares static repositories with interactive platforms across three key dimensions: data access methods, analysis workflows, and knowledge integration capabilities. The workflow at the bottom exemplifies the steps undertaken by the user interfacing with an interactive database.

## 2. Interactive Databases

The concept of interactivity in database systems is closely related to developments in web technologies, artificial intelligence (AI), and data visualization techniques. Modern systems are capable to combine web technologies (for example JavaScript libraries for dynamic visualization)<sup>10</sup> and back-end data management solutions (e.g., NoSQL databases for unstructured data or graph databases for relationship modeling).<sup>11</sup> Interactive databases are meant to filter and subset openly available data, for example to identify relevant subgroups or hidden information, as well as comparatively visualize data through graphs, maps and other representation tools. Moreover, they could integrate data from multiple sources and update it in real time. In some cases, they could provide analysis tools to run simple integrated statistical investigations or connect multiple sources. Despite the dramatic development in computer science and web technologies, the life science domain still sees crucial gaps to enable smooth selection and dataset navigation.<sup>12, 13</sup> The need of transitioning toward these features is becoming evident through the growing complexity of biological questions, in parallel with the technological advances in other fields that make complex computations and visualizations feasible in real time and with less efforts from the user.<sup>14, 15</sup> The next subsections highlight

selected desirable characteristics and their technological feasibility within interactive databases for the life sciences domain. Cell line selection for *in vitro* research is presented as a possible implementation case.

## 2.1. Features

The heterogeneity of biological data, from structured clinical trial tables and semi-structured cell line annotations to unstructured experimental notes, poses a fundamental challenge for the development of interactive databases.<sup>16</sup> Successfully integrating these different data types requires a strategic balance to ensure that the system accommodates evolving data landscapes without sacrificing analytical precision. At the core of this integration lies the concept of adaptive data modeling (ADP),<sup>17</sup> where the choice of database schemes dictates both functionality and scalability. Relational models with a rigid table structure are indispensable for managing structured data like genomic variants, patient demographics, cell lines properties.<sup>18</sup> However, the dynamic nature of life sciences research sometimes demands schemeless architectures. In this context, document-oriented databases (for example MongoDB)<sup>19</sup> could be employed, allowing nested structures to capture variable data, for instance that associated with single-cell sequencing experiments.<sup>20</sup> For highly interconnected data, such as protein-protein interaction networks or metabolic pathways in cells, graph databases (e.g., Neo4j) offer the required traversal speed to enable real-time queries across millions of nodes and edges.<sup>21</sup>

Data pipelines require automated workflows that analyze raw FASTQ files,<sup>22</sup> screen online publications for experimental conditions, or obtain real-time sensor data from laboratory equipment.<sup>23, 24</sup> Tools with error-handling frameworks could standardize this process, for example Apache NiFi or custom Python scripts, but challenges exist.<sup>25</sup> For instance, inconsistencies in how labs report cell line contamination status require context-aware natural language processing (NLP) models to normalize inputs.<sup>26,27</sup> Interoperability further complicates data acquisition and outcomes.<sup>28</sup> Despite standards like MIAME (for microarrays)<sup>29</sup> and MINSEQE (for sequencing)<sup>30</sup> provide guidelines, their adoption on a voluntary basis leads to inconsistencies. A 2023 analysis of 400 public datasets revealed that only 34% fully adhered to MIAME standards.<sup>31</sup> Hence, query capabilities would be required to mirror the complexity of fast research, possibly filtering out predatory or incomplete results. Intuitive GUIs could democratize access, but they risk oversimplification. An example is a doctor filtering clinical

trial data for “cancer stage” and “biomarker status”, neglecting the overall picture due to the massive number of patients stored all together in low-dimensional databases.


To bridge this gap, hybrid interfaces are gaining traction, for example Galaxy Project combining drag-and-drop workflows with Python scripting to allow users to transition from structured prompts (e.g., “show all breast cancer cell lines in the database having HER2+ status”) to programmatic analyses (e.g., suitability analysis for a given experiment evaluated using R libraries).<sup>32</sup> Then, dynamic visualization could transform these raw query results into actionable insights. Modern systems integrate libraries to render interactive plots for genome-wide association studies, optimal cell profile to test a given technology, or 3D protein structures visualization. Examples of employed libraries are Plotly or D3.js.<sup>33</sup> However, interactivity implies that visualization must extend beyond passive observation. An interactive database could let users click on a graph or comparison plot to trigger a secondary query, for example extract all genes differentially expressed in a specific cluster, or group up all cells in different subclusters based on user-prompted features. Coupling visualization with analytical tools could enable this functionality, and assistive AI could amplify this interactivity and scope. All these functions drive the design of a suitable user interface (UI) and define user experience (UX) features.

## **2.2. Methods & Structure: A case study on Biological Cell Line Selection**

Cell line selection represents an ideal case study for demonstrating the potential of interactive databases in the life sciences. The complexity of choosing appropriate cell models from the thousands or commercially available lineages exemplifies why traditional static repositories are insufficient for modern research needs.<sup>34</sup> Currently, researchers often select cell lines based on convenience, tradition, or limited familiarity rather than comprehensive biological relevance, leading to potential experimental irreproducibility, translational failures, and wasted resources.<sup>34,35</sup> The challenge lies in navigating multidimensional considerations simultaneously, spanning from genetic background, tissue origin, disease relevance, authentication status, growth characteristics, pathway activations, compatibility with experimental procedures, and more.<sup>34</sup> While valuable reference resources exist (Cellosaurus, ATCC catalogs, LINCS),<sup>36</sup> they typically present information in isolation, making comparative analysis labor-intensive and prone to oversight of critical variables if run by humans.

An interactive database approach would transform cell line selection by enabling researchers to dynamically filter, compare, and visualize multiple cell lines across diverse parameters

simultaneously. Such a system would integrate disparate data sources, including existing static repositories, literature outcomes, genomic profiles and user metadata, creating a thoughtful support platform. The following subsections examine a potential envisioned architecture for implementation, structured into three interconnected layers: back-end data management systems for storing and processing diverse cell data, middleware and APIs facilitating integration and communication, and front-end technologies enabling intuitive exploration, comparison and visualization. This is also schematized in **Figure 2**.



**Figure 2. Technical architecture of interactive database systems: a case study on informed cell line selection.**

The schematic illustrates the three-tier structure comprising back-end data management systems (databases and storage solutions), middleware integration layer (APIs, microservices, AI components), and front-end technologies (visualization tools and user interfaces), tailored to cell line selection as a sample case.

### 2.2.1. Back-End Data Management Systems

The back-end infrastructure forms the pillar of any interactive database<sup>37, 38</sup> where storage solutions are selected based on the inherent structure of biological information. Traditional relational database management systems (RDBMS) like PostgreSQL and MySQL build the foundations of many established biological repositories.<sup>39</sup> An example is Cellosaurus, a comprehensive repository of cell lines.<sup>5</sup> While invaluable as a reference, its traditional structure limits the utilization of the stored data. Currently, data can be visualized one by one for each cell line, making multidimensional comparisons across tens or hundreds of cells unfeasible.

Document-oriented NoSQL databases offer significant advantages for cell line repositories that accumulate diverse experimental metadata.<sup>40</sup> MongoDB, for instance, can store cell lines as flexible JSON documents.<sup>19</sup> This allows to incorporate new characterization data of various nature, from morphological features to authentication profiles, without disruptive changes in the fundamental structure.

Network-oriented biological data presents another storage challenge that graph databases address. Systems like Neo4j could transform the way relationships between cell lines are accessed and understood.<sup>21</sup> In cancer research, one could explore the connections between patient-derived xenografts, immortalized cell lines and original tumor samples through intuitive graphs and user-driven multidimensional queries. This approach could reveal lineage relationships and experimental compatibility that remain obscured in conventional tabular repositories. Supplementary storage technologies could then drive performance considerations. Response times during comparative analyses could be dramatically reduced by employing key-value stores like Redis to catch frequently accessed data, for example commonly requested cell lines or culture protocols. This hybrid storage approach would allow databases to maintain responsive performance even as users perform complex multiline comparisons simultaneously.

### **2.2.2. Middleware and APIs**

The middleware layer in a database typically orchestrates communication between storage systems and user applications,<sup>41</sup> in this case enabling to transform static cell line references into dynamic research tools. Instead of making separate requests for each cell line of interest, queries that directly compare multiple lines across selected parameters (growth kinetics, drug sensitivities, genetic backgrounds) in a single operation could be constructed. Examples of tools to achieve this include GraphQL over traditional RESTful APIs.<sup>8</sup> AI represents one of the most powerful middleware integrations.<sup>42</sup> Machine learning microservices could analyze patterns across thousands of cell lines to recommend optimal models for specific research questions. Drug screening experiments could be informed by recommendation assistants that identifies cell lines most relevant to their target pathway based on expression profiles, previous experimental outcomes, and literature associations. Such systems transform passive cell line catalogues into active research planning tools, integrating them with the latest research

findings. The latter could be, in turn, standardized over time by researchers themselves who engage with the interactive database.

The microservices architectural pattern can decompose monolithic applications into independent, specialized components, enhancing system flexibility.<sup>43</sup> A modernized cell line database should separate authentication verification, experimental condition optimization, and cross-reference resolution into discrete services. When researchers upload new characterization data for a cell line, a validation microservice could automatically verify consistency with existing profiles, while another service updates recommended culture conditions based on combined experimental outcomes. Another key middleware component is workflow services, including laboratory information management systems (LIMS),<sup>44</sup> facilitating the link between information and action. An example is comparing metabolic profiles across hepatocyte cell lines to generate customized experimental protocols based on optimal culture conditions for each line, with reagent lists automatically adjusted for the specific metabolic properties of selected models.

### **2.2.3. Front-End Technologies**

The front-end layer transforms static cell line catalogs into dynamic research platforms through intuitive interfaces for users.<sup>45</sup> This layer harmonically presents the features of the previous two layers through visualization and interactive features. Modern JavaScript frameworks enable sophisticated comparative visualization and interaction.<sup>45</sup> React components could render comparisons of cell lines, highlighting differences in morphology, growth characteristics, gene expression profiles, clinical relevance, usage, and much more, through interactive visualizations that respond instantly to parameter adjustments driven by the user.

Visual comparison tools represent a simple yet potentially game-changing tool in cell line selection. Interactive matrices could display drug sensitivity patterns across multiple cell lines, with hierarchical clustering revealing unexpected relationships between seemingly unrelated models. This cross-check at multiple levels would likely produce precious novel insights based on fully exploiting and interpreting already-existing data. These comparisons could be filtered based on the most disparate parameters, needs or curiosities, based on specific mutations, tissue origins, or experimental conditions, transforming what would be weeks of literature review into minutes of interactive exploration.<sup>34</sup>



AI assistants integrated directly into the front-end interface could provide tailored and specifically trained guidance through cell line selection processes based on experimental goals.<sup>46</sup> For example, they could highlight cell lines with relevant properties, flag potential authentication concerns, contradictory experimental findings from the literature or suggest complementary models to strengthen experimental design. Finally, virtual cell culture simulators would be a transformative front-end addition to integrate mathematical models of cell behavior with accumulated experimental data. This could facilitate the prediction around how different cell lines might respond to experimental manipulations before physical experiments begin, enabling to adjust culture conditions, test drug concentrations, or simulate time-course experiments through intuitive interfaces, with predictions based on historical data.

### **3. Emerging Applications of Dynamic Data Software**

The applications of interactive databases span the entire spectrum of life sciences. In domains where relationships between entities are multidimensional and contextual, static tabular presentations fail to capture the complexity of biological systems. Interactive databases are meant to integrate both structured and unstructured data. While structured data (genomic variants, protein structures, clinical measurements) forms the foundation, unstructured data (scientific literature, clinical notes, experimental protocols) provides crucial context at a given time. The following subsections examine four domains where interactive databases are demonstrating and can further have particular impact: genomics, drug discovery, systems biology, and clinical research. Each case explores how the interactive paradigm can address domain-specific challenges and transforms research practices.

#### **3.1. Genomics**

The genomics field has been an early adopter of interactive database approaches, driven by the complexity and volume of sequencing data which made this route inevitable.<sup>47</sup> Genome Aggregation Database (gnomAD) evolved from simple variant browsers to sophisticated interactive systems to explore allele frequencies across populations, visualize genomic contexts, and assess functional impacts of variants in real-time.<sup>47</sup> These capabilities have proven to be critical for rare disease research. Modern genomic interactive databases integrate machine learning algorithms that predict variant pathogenicity while allowing users to adjust parameters based on domain knowledge.<sup>48</sup> For example, the ClinGen Pathogenicity Calculator enables clinicians to interactively apply ACMG guidelines for variant classification while

visualizing supporting evidence from multiple sources.<sup>48</sup> This represents a significant advance over static variant lists, enabling interpretation that adapts to evolving clinical knowledge.

### **3.2. Drug Development**

In pharmaceutical research, interactive databases are revolutionizing multiple stages of the drug discovery and development pipeline. DrugBank systems allow to explore drug-target interactions across chemical and biological space.<sup>49</sup> Modern implementations combine structural databases with molecular docking algorithms, allowing users to interactively modify potential compounds and visualize predicted binding affinities in real-time. Virtual screening applications particularly benefit from interactive capabilities, where pharmacophore models or chemical similarity metrics can be adjusted to observe how these changes affect the ranking of potential hits. This interactivity significantly accelerates the iterative optimization process behind modern drug design. An example is Schrödinger LiveDesign integrating data from public and proprietary sources with interactive modeling tools that guide rational drug design while managing the complexity of structure-activity relationships.<sup>50</sup>

### **3.3. Systems Biology**

Systems biology approaches benefit from interactive databases that enable exploration of complex biological networks. Reactome and KEGG currently include interactive pathway browsers that enable to navigate from organism-level pathways down to molecular interactions, visualizing experimental data in context.<sup>51</sup> The ability to overlay multi-omics data (transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics) onto these pathways in real-time provides insights that would be impossible to extract from static representations. Advanced systems biology databases incorporate simulation capabilities, where researchers can interactively perturb network components and observe predicted system-wide effects. For example, Cell Collective allows users to build and simulate logical models of biological networks, interactively testing hypotheses about regulatory relationships.<sup>52</sup> These interactive modeling approaches bridge static pathway maps and dynamic biological processes to facilitate *in silico* experimentation.

### **3.4. Clinical Research**

In clinical research, interactive databases are transforming how patient cohorts are analyzed and stratified.<sup>53</sup> Modern clinical trial databases allow to dynamically segment patient

populations based on multiple clinical variables, biomarkers, treatment responses, and genomic profiles. These systems enable the identification of responder subgroups that might be missed in traditional aggregate analyses. This interactive approach is particularly valuable for precision medicine, where treatment decisions increasingly depend on complex combinations of biomarkers. In this context, cBioPortal for Cancer Genomics is used by clinicians to interactively explore relationships between genomic alterations and clinical outcomes across thousands of patients, and identify patterns that inform treatment selection for individual cases.<sup>53</sup> As these systems evolve, they increasingly incorporate natural language processing of clinical notes and AI-assisted pattern recognition to extract insights from unstructured clinical data.

#### **4. Discussion and Challenges**

Despite their transformative potential, interactive database systems in life sciences face substantial challenges. The most intuitive challenges span from people unawareness, privacy and access, user experience, and intrinsically data-related challenges. People-related challenges revolve around the lack of awareness among part of life science researchers of what computing tools can offer to optimize, speed up, and improve the intellectual quality of life science research. This challenge has to do with poor communications and exchanges across these two scientific domains, which, however, urge to be bridged to enable groundbreaking innovation potential in both areas. On the same line, user adoption represents a critical challenge. Interactive systems must accommodate diverse user groups with varying computational literacy while providing sufficient analytical depth to address complex biological questions.

Technical challenges are primarily about data standardization, performance and accessibility. Sophisticated analyses that provide meaningful biological insights often demand computational resources incompatible with real-time interaction. This creates a challenging design space where analytical depth must be balanced against performance constraints. Privacy and access challenges revolve around, for example, the use and share of patient data in clinical research, as well as the acquisition of data stored in existing biological databases. This data exchange is subjected to regulations that often kill the streamline to actual

implementation. Selected technical challenges are individually addressed in the following subsections.

#### **4.1. Data Standardization**

Biological data are produced by a wide variety of instruments and experimental methods, which often results in heterogeneous formats and varied quality. Standardizing data formats and ensuring data quality are fundamental challenges. Life science domains have developed specialized vocabularies that often overlap but use different terminologies for similar concepts. For example, cell lines may be described using inconsistent nomenclature across repositories (HeLa vs. HeLa S3 vs. Hela-S3), and the similarity across names could lead to misassignments. These misassignments, even if rare, could cause cascade problems. Ontology mapping has been already initiated, for example through OBO Foundry (Open Biological and Biomedical Ontologies) providing frameworks for ontology integration, but implementation remains challenging due to the evolving nature of biological knowledge.<sup>54</sup> Natural language processing models are increasingly employed to automatically map terms across vocabularies, but these systems require careful curation to validate mappings. The value of interactive queries depends fundamentally on the quality and completeness of underlying metadata, for instance experimental details necessary for proper interpretation. To address this challenge, interactive databases could implement validation systems that flag missing critical data and provide feedback to contributors about data quality. Some systems now employ reputation scores for data sources, allowing users to filter query results based on data completeness.

#### **4.2. Performance**

As databases grow in size and complexity, ensuring that query responses remain fast and accurate is crucial. Interactive life science queries involve complex multidimensional parameters. For example, identification of cell lines with specific genetic mutations, protein expression patterns, and growth characteristics, and dynamic visualization of multiscale relationships across tens of cell types and culture. Advanced computational approaches addressing this challenge include bitmap indexing for genomic data, columnar storage optimized for analytical queries, spatial indexing techniques adapted for multidimensional biological data. Cloud-native database architectures that scale horizontally to handle compute-intensive queries are increasingly essential for interactive performance across large

biological datasets. Interactive visualization of large biological datasets presents unique performance challenges. Modern interactive databases address this through server-side aggregation, progressive loading techniques that refine visualizations incrementally, WebGL and GPU-accelerated rendering, and intelligent sampling methods that preserve statistical properties while reducing data volume.<sup>55</sup> These techniques enable responsive exploration even for datasets too large to transmit in their entirety. This transition can be enabled step by step, handling datasets that are easier to manage first.

#### **4.3. Data Accessibility**

Advanced interactivity can only be effective if users find the system intuitive and accessible. Interactive biological databases face a fundamental issue between analytical power and interface simplicity. Systems that expose the full complexity of underlying data models risk overwhelming non-computational users, while oversimplified interfaces may limit discovery potential. This challenge is particularly acute in multidisciplinary fields where users range from computational specialists to wet-lab biologists and clinicians. Adaptive interface approaches show promise in addressing this challenge through progressive disclosure of features based on user expertise, context-sensitive guidance, customizable workspaces, and natural language query capabilities for nontechnical users. Emerging solutions include automatic query history tracking, and computational notebooks integrated with database interfaces. Another issue around data accessibility revolves collecting information from existing databases. In this context, it is key to enable easier sharing and foster open access policies.

#### **5. Outlook**

Interactive databases could represent a paradigm shift in how research data is stored, handle, and shared, offering significant advantages toward driving collective scientific progress meant for clinical translation and reliable fundamental results. Their emergence signals not merely a technological evolution but a fundamental shift in how biological knowledge is constructed, validated, and extended. This reconceptualizes the scientific process itself where the boundaries between hypothesis generation, data analysis, and experimental design become increasingly iterative, with a strong urge for data reproducibility and validation. Currently, different expertise in computational methods creates a gap between those who can and cannot effectively interrogate complex biological datasets. Interactive databases designed with

intuitive interfaces could democratize access to advanced analytical capabilities, potentially redistributing intellectual authority and patronage of produced data. The development trajectory of interactive databases will inevitably be shaped by economic forces and institutional priorities that extend beyond purely scientific considerations. Commercial entities building such platforms face tensions between creating proprietary systems that generate revenue and contributing to open scientific models that maximize knowledge generation and sharing. These economic realities suggest that hybrid models combining open source models with commercial components may emerge.

Interactive databases also have the potential to transform interdisciplinary collaboration by creating shared cognitive spaces where specialists from diverse backgrounds can explore complex biological questions. This potential extends beyond human-human interaction to human-AI partnerships, while preserving human interpretational and intellectual authority. Interactive databases may alter our perception of biological complexity, unraveling hidden knowledge within complex datasets. Static repositories indirectly reinforce reductionist perspectives by presenting biological entities as discrete objects. Interactive systems that dynamically visualize multidimensional relationships could instead represent the existing interconnections between the most seemingly disparate domains, making full use of the acquired data across domains.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

### **References**

- (1) Martani, A.; Geneviève, L. D.; Elger, B.; Wangmo, T. 'It's not something you can take in your hands'. Swiss experts' perspectives on health data ownership: an interview-based study. *BMJ Open* **2021**, *11* (4). DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045717.
- (2) Perez-Riverol, Y.; Alpi, E.; Wang, R.; Hermjakob, H.; Vizcaino, J. A. Making proteomics data accessible and reusable: current state of proteomics databases and repositories. *Proteomics* **2015**, *15* (5-6), 930-949. DOI: 10.1002/pmic.201400302
- (3) Seth, A.; Banyal, A.; Kumar, P. Commercialization and technology transfers of bioprocess. In *Basic Biotechniques for Bioprocess and Bioentrepreneurship*, 2023; pp 455-469.
- (4) Wilson, S. L.; Way, G. P.; Bittremieux, W.; Armache, J. P.; Haendel, M. A.; Hoffman, M. M. Sharing biological data: why, when, and how. *FEBS Lett* **2021**, *595* (7), 847-863. DOI: 10.1002/1873-3468.14067
- (5) Bairoch, A. The Cellosaurus, a Cell-Line Knowledge Resource. *J Biomol Tech* **2018**, *29* (2), 25-38. DOI: 10.7171/jbt.18-2902-002

- (6) Jagadish, H. V.; Olken, F. Database management for life sciences research. *ACM SIGMOD Record* **2004**, *33* (2), 15-20. DOI: 10.1145/1024694.1024697.
- (7) Clark, K.; Karsch-Mizrachi, I.; Lipman, D. J.; Ostell, J.; Sayers, E. W. GenBank. *Nucleic Acids Res* **2016**, *44* (D1), D67-72. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkv1276
- (8) Burley, S. K.; Berman, H. M.; Kleywegt, G. J.; Markley, J. L.; Nakamura, H.; Velankar, S. Protein Data Bank (PDB): The Single Global Macromolecular Structure Archive. *Methods Mol Biol* **2017**, *1607*, 627-641. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4939-7000-1\_26
- (9) Thessen, A. E.; Patterson, D. J. Data issues in the life sciences. *Zookeys* **2011**, (150), 15-51. DOI: 10.3897/zookeys.150.1766
- (10) Jeong, Y.; Young, L.; Hicks, D. Synchronized static and dynamic visualization in a web-based programming environment. In 2016 IEEE 24th International Conference on Program Comprehension (ICPC), 2016.
- (11) Meier, A.; Kaufmann, M. NoSQL Databases. In *SQL & NoSQL Databases*, 2019; pp 201-218.
- (12) Brown, A. W.; Kaiser, K. A.; Allison, D. B. Issues with data and analyses: Errors, underlying themes, and potential solutions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **2018**, *115* (11), 2563-2570. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1708279115
- (13) Anderson, N. R.; Lee, E. S.; Brockenbrough, J. S.; Minie, M. E.; Fuller, S.; Brinkley, J.; Tarczy-Hornoch, P. Issues in biomedical research data management and analysis: needs and barriers. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* **2007**, *14* (4), 478-488. DOI: 10.1197/jamia.M2114
- (14) Sheikh, A.; Anderson, M.; Albala, S.; Casadei, B.; Franklin, B. D.; Richards, M.; Taylor, D.; Tibble, H.; Mossialos, E. Health information technology and digital innovation for national learning health and care systems. *Lancet Digit Health* **2021**, *3* (6), e383-e396. DOI: 10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00005-4
- (15) Szymkowiak, A.; Melović, B.; Dabić, M.; Jeganathan, K.; Kundi, G. S. Information technology and Gen Z: The role of teachers, the internet, and technology in the education of young people. *Technology in Society* **2021**, *65*. DOI: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101565.
- (16) Birkland, A.; Yona, G. BIOZON: a system for unification, management and analysis of heterogeneous biological data. *BMC Bioinformatics* **2006**, *7*, 70. DOI: 10.1186/1471-2105-7-70
- (17) Joe Qin, S. Recursive PLS algorithms for adaptive data modeling. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* **1998**, *22* (4-5), 503-514. DOI: 10.1016/s0098-1354(97)00262-7.
- (18) Biba, M.; Vajjhala, N. R. Statistical Relational Learning for Genomics Applications: A State-of-the-Art Review. In *Handbook of Machine Learning Applications for Genomics*, Studies in Big Data, 2022; pp 31-42.
- (19) Gyrodi, C.; Gyrodi, R.; Pecherle, G.; Olah, A. A comparative study: MongoDB vs. MySQL. In 2015 13th International Conference on Engineering of Modern Electric Systems (EMES), 2015.
- (20) Schadt, E. E.; Linderman, M. D.; Sorenson, J.; Lee, L.; Nolan, G. P. Computational solutions to large-scale data management and analysis. *Nat Rev Genet* **2010**, *11* (9), 647-657. DOI: 10.1038/nrg2857
- (21) Webber, J. A programmatic introduction to Neo4j. In Proceedings of the 3rd annual conference on Systems, programming, and applications: software for humanity, 2012.
- (22) Frampton, M.; Houlston, R. Generation of artificial FASTQ files to evaluate the performance of next-generation sequencing pipelines. *PLoS One* **2012**, *7* (11), e49110. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0049110

- (23) Brazdil, P.; van Rijn, J. N.; Soares, C.; Vanschoren, J. Automating Workflow/Pipeline Design. In *Metalearning, Cognitive Technologies*, 2022; pp 123-140.
- (24) Spjuth, O.; Bongcam-Rudloff, E.; Hernandez, G. C.; Forer, L.; Giovacchini, M.; Guimera, R. V.; Kallio, A.; Korpelainen, E.; Kandula, M. M.; Krachunov, M.; et al. Experiences with workflows for automating data-intensive bioinformatics. *Biol Direct* **2015**, *10*, 43. DOI: 10.1186/s13062-015-0071-8
- (25) Bindal, P. M., K. Quantum Flow: Enterprise Data Orchestration and Processing Suite. In *IC3-2024: Proceedings of the 2024 Sixteenth International Conference on Contemporary Computing*, 2024; pp 577 - 584. DOI: 10.1145/3675888.3676116.
- (26) Horbach, S.; Halffman, W. The ghosts of HeLa: How cell line misidentification contaminates the scientific literature. *PLoS One* **2017**, *12* (10), e0186281. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0186281
- (27) Capes-Davis, A.; Theodosopoulos, G.; Atkin, I.; Drexler, H. G.; Kohara, A.; MacLeod, R. A.; Masters, J. R.; Nakamura, Y.; Reid, Y. A.; Reddel, R. R.; et al. Check your cultures! A list of cross-contaminated or misidentified cell lines. *Int J Cancer* **2010**, *127* (1), 1-8. DOI: 10.1002/ijc.25242
- (28) Bauer, D. C.; Metke-Jimenez, A.; Maurer-Stroh, S.; Tiruvayipati, S.; Wilson, L. O. W.; Jain, Y.; Perrin, A.; Ebrill, K.; Hansen, D. P.; Vasani, S. S. Interoperable medical data: The missing link for understanding COVID-19. *Transbound Emerg Dis* **2021**, *68* (4), 1753-1760. DOI: 10.1111/tbed.13892
- (29) Brazma, A.; Hingamp, P.; Quackenbush, J.; Sherlock, G.; Spellman, P.; Stoeckert, C.; Aach, J.; Ansorge, W.; Ball, C. A.; Causton, H. C.; et al. Minimum information about a microarray experiment (MIAME)-toward standards for microarray data. *Nat Genet* **2001**, *29* (4), 365-371. DOI: 10.1038/ng1201-365
- (30) Parkinson, H.; Sarkans, U.; Kolesnikov, N.; Abeygunawardena, N.; Burdett, T.; Dylag, M.; Emam, I.; Farne, A.; Hastings, E.; Holloway, E.; et al. ArrayExpress update--an archive of microarray and high-throughput sequencing-based functional genomics experiments. *Nucleic Acids Res* **2011**, *39* (Database issue), D1002-1004. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkq1040
- (31) Witwer, K. W. Data submission and quality in microarray-based microRNA profiling. *Clin Chem* **2013**, *59* (2), 392-400. DOI: 10.1373/clinchem.2012.193813
- (32) Jalili, V.; Afgan, E.; Gu, Q.; Clements, D.; Blankenberg, D.; Goecks, J.; Taylor, J.; Nekrutenko, A. The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and collaborative biomedical analyses: 2020 update. *Nucleic Acids Res* **2020**, *48* (W1), W395-W402. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkaa434
- (33) Sievert, C. *Interactive Web-Based Data Visualization with R, plotly, and shiny*; 2020. DOI: 10.1201/9780429447273.
- (34) Dias, D. F. J., C.; Moreira, A. C.; Gonçalves, G.; Djamgoz, M. B. A.; Castelo Ferreira, F.; Sanjuan-Alberte, P.; Moreddu, R. Multidimensional Classification Framework for Human Breast Cancer Cell Lines. *arXiv preprint* **2025**. DOI: arXiv:2502.15868.
- (35) Holliday, D. L.; Speirs, V. Choosing the right cell line for breast cancer research. *Breast Cancer Res* **2011**, *13* (4), 215. DOI: 10.1186/bcr2889
- (36) Laizé, V.; Rosa, J. T.; Tarasco, M.; Cancela, M. L. Status, challenges, and perspectives of fish cell culture—Focus on cell lines capable of in vitro mineralization. In *Cellular and Molecular Approaches in Fish Biology*, 2022; pp 381-404.
- (37) DiFranzo, D.; Graves, A.; Erickson, J. S.; Ding, L.; Michaelis, J.; Lebo, T.; Patton, E.; Williams, G. T.; Li, X.; Zheng, J. G.; et al. The Web is My Back-end: Creating Mashups with Linked Open Government Data. In *Linking Government Data*, 2011; pp 205-219.



- (38) Drucker, J. The Back End: Infrastructure Design for Scholarly Research. *The Journal of Modern Periodical Studies* **2017**, 8 (2), 119-133. DOI: 10.5325/jmodeperistud.8.2.0119.
- (39) Dall'Alba, G.; Casa, P. L.; Abreu, F. P.; Notari, D. L.; de Avila, E. S. S. A Survey of Biological Data in a Big Data Perspective. *Big Data* **2022**, 10 (4), 279-297. DOI: 10.1089/big.2020.0383
- (40) Kumar, K. B. S.; Srividya; Mohanavalli, S. A performance comparison of document oriented NoSQL databases. In 2017 International Conference on Computer, Communication and Signal Processing (ICCCSP), 2017.
- (41) Patiño-Martinez, M.; Jiménez-Peris, R.; Kemme, B.; Alonso, G. Middle-R. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems* **2005**, 23 (4), 375-423. DOI: 10.1145/1113574.1113576.
- (42) Wang, J.; Lu, T.; Li, L.; Huang, D. Enhancing Personalized Search with AI: A Hybrid Approach Integrating Deep Learning and Cloud Computing. *Journal of Advanced Computing Systems* **2024**, 4 (10), 1-13. DOI: 10.69987/jacs.2024.41001.
- (43) Marquez, G.; Astudillo, H. Actual Use of Architectural Patterns in Microservices-Based Open Source Projects. In 2018 25th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC), 2018.
- (44) Prasad, P. J.; Bodhe, G. L. Trends in laboratory information management system. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **2012**, 118, 187-192. DOI: 10.1016/j.chemolab.2012.07.001.
- (45) Goh, H. A.; Ho, C. K.; Abas, F. S. Front-end deep learning web apps development and deployment: a review. *Appl Intell (Dordr)* **2023**, 53 (12), 15923-15945. DOI: 10.1007/s10489-022-04278-6
- (46) Harrison Oke, E.; Regina Coelis, K.; Adebamigbe Alex, F. The future of software development: integrating AI and machine learning into front-end technologies. *Global Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews* **2024**, 2 (1), 069-077. DOI: 10.58175/gjarr.2024.2.1.0031.
- (47) Gudmundsson, S.; Singer-Berk, M.; Watts, N. A.; Phu, W.; Goodrich, J. K.; Solomonson, M.; Genome Aggregation Database, C.; Rehm, H. L.; MacArthur, D. G.; O'Donnell-Luria, A. Variant interpretation using population databases: Lessons from gnomAD. *Hum Mutat* **2022**, 43 (8), 1012-1030. DOI: 10.1002/humu.24309
- (48) Patel, R. Y.; Shah, N.; Jackson, A. R.; Ghosh, R.; Pawliczek, P.; Paithankar, S.; Baker, A.; Riehle, K.; Chen, H.; Milosavljevic, S.; et al. ClinGen Pathogenicity Calculator: a configurable system for assessing pathogenicity of genetic variants. *Genome Med* **2017**, 9 (1), 3. DOI: 10.1186/s13073-016-0391-z
- (49) Knox, C.; Wilson, M.; Klinger, C. M.; Franklin, M.; Oler, E.; Wilson, A.; Pon, A.; Cox, J.; Chin, N. E. L.; Strawbridge, S. A.; et al. DrugBank 6.0: the DrugBank Knowledgebase for 2024. *Nucleic Acids Res* **2024**, 52 (D1), D1265-D1275. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkad976
- (50) May, M. Computational Tools Take Advantage of the Data Deluge. *Genetic Engineering & Biotechnology News* **2023**, 43 (4), 42-44, 46. DOI: 10.1089/gen.43.04.14.
- (51) Nguyen, H.; Pham, V. D.; Nguyen, H.; Tran, B.; Petereit, J.; Nguyen, T. CCPA: cloud-based, self-learning modules for consensus pathway analysis using GO, KEGG and Reactome. *Brief Bioinform* **2024**, 25 (Supplement\_1). DOI: 10.1093/bib/bbae222
- (52) Helikar, T.; Kowal, B.; McClenathan, S.; Bruckner, M.; Rowley, T.; Madrahimov, A.; Wicks, B.; Shrestha, M.; Limbu, K.; Rogers, J. A. The Cell Collective: toward an open and collaborative approach to systems biology. *BMC Syst Biol* **2012**, 6, 96. DOI: 10.1186/1752-0509-6-96
- (53) Gao, J.; Aksoy, B. A.; Dogrusoz, U.; Dresdner, G.; Gross, B.; Sumer, S. O.; Sun, Y.; Jacobsen, A.; Sinha, R.; Larsson, E.; et al. Integrative analysis of complex cancer genomics and clinical

profiles using the cBioPortal. *Sci Signal* **2013**, 6 (269), p1. DOI: 10.1126/scisignal.2004088

(54) Smith, B.; Ashburner, M.; Rosse, C.; Bard, J.; Bug, W.; Ceusters, W.; Goldberg, L. J.; Eilbeck, K.; Ireland, A.; Mungall, C. J.; et al. The OBO Foundry: coordinated evolution of ontologies to support biomedical data integration. *Nat Biotechnol* **2007**, 25 (11), 1251-1255. DOI: 10.1038/nbt1346

(55) Yu, G.; Liu, C.; Fang, T.; Jia, J.; Lin, E.; He, Y.; Fu, S.; Wang, L.; Wei, L.; Huang, Q. A survey of real-time rendering on Web3D application. *Virtual Reality & Intelligent Hardware* **2023**, 5 (5), 379-394. DOI: 10.1016/j.vrih.2022.04.002.