Universal Library of Medical and Health Sciences Original Article

ISSN: 3064-6545 | Volume 3, Issue 1

Open Access | PP: 20-22

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70315/uloap.ulmhs.2025.0301004

Theory of Systems and Understanding Keratoconus *A Comparative Approach with Marfan Syndrome, Down Syndrome, and Immune System Inflammatory Factors*

Kian Zehtabian

Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Iran.

Abstract

Keratoconus (KC) is a progressive corneal ectasia driven by genetic, oxidative, and inflammatory mechanisms. This study employs systems theory and Bayesian modeling to dissect KC's genetic overlaps with Marfan syndrome (MFS) and Down syndrome (DS). Key findings include population-specific genetic associations (PNPLA2 in Europeans vs. Han Chinese/ Saudis), chaotic entropy in DS-KC interactions, and inflammatory drivers (IL-6, TNF-α). Bayesian frameworks refine genetic risk predictions (70% posterior probability for PNPLA2 in Europeans), while entropy quantifies systemic instability (adjusted to 1.06 nats for consistency). This work advocates multi-omics strategies to stabilize corneal networks.

Keywords: *Keratoconus, Bayesian Modeling, Differential Statistics, Chaotic Entropy, Systems Biology, Ocular Disease, Precision Medicine, Multi-Omics.*

INTRODUCTION

Keratoconus (KC) is a multifactorial disorder characterized by corneal thinning and biomechanical instability (Rabinowitz, 1998). Although loci such as PNPLA2, COL5A1, and LOX have been implicated, population heterogeneity complicates mechanistic interpretations. This study integrates systems theory with Bayesian modeling to explore the overlap of KC with Marfan syndrome (MFS; characterized by connective tissue dysregulation) and Down syndrome (DS; associated with oxidative stress). By isolating intrinsic mechanisms—such as gene mutations and cytokine network imbalances—and excluding external prevalence biases, KC is modeled as a chaotic system whose instability is quantified via entropy.

Systems Thinking and Disease Modeling

Systems theory asserts that biological systems exhibit emergent properties resulting from complex network interactions (von Bertalanffy, 1968; Montuori, 2011). In KC, even minor cytokine fluctuations (e.g., IL-6) can cascade into significant stromal remodeling through processes like collagen degradation.

Methodological Framework

Differential Statistical Calculations

(a) Using a Population-Specific Prevalence (Saudi Data: P(D) = 0.0023)

Baseline Odds:

$Odds_0 = 0.0023 / (1 - 0.0023) = 0.0023 / 0.9977 \approx 0.002305$

Adjusted Odds (using OR = 0.64 for PNPLA2):

$Odds_{adj} = 0.64 \times 0.002305 \approx 0.001474$

Converted Probability:

$P(D \mid PNPLA2) = 0.001474 / (1 + 0.001474) \approx 0.001472$ (≈0.147%)

(b) Using an Overall Prevalence (P(D) = 0.0005)

Baseline Odds:

$Odds_0 = 0.0005 / (1 - 0.0005) \approx 0.0005003$

Adjusted Odds:

$Odds_{adj} = 0.64 \times 0.0005003 \approx 0.0003202$

Converted Probability:

$P(D \mid PNPLA2) = 0.0003202 / (1 + 0.0003202) \approx 0.0003202$ (≈0.032%)

Bayesian Modeling

Law of Total Probability:

$P(D) = P(D \mid G) \times P(G) + P(D \mid \neg G) \times P(\neg G)$

Given: $0.7 = (0.98 \times 0.5) + P(D \mid \neg G) \times 0.5$

Solving for $P(D \mid \neg G)$:

Citation: Kian Zehtabian, "Theory of Systems and Understanding Keratoconus *A Comparative Approach with Marfan Syndrome, Down Syndrome, and Immune System Inflammatory Factors*", Universal Library of Medical and Health Sciences, 2025; 3(1): 20-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.70315/uloap.ulmhs.2025.0301004.

$P(D \mid \neg G) = (0.7 - 0.49) / 0.5 = 0.42$

Bayesian Update:

$P(G \mid D) = (0.98 \times 0.5) / [(0.98 \times 0.5) + (0.42 \times 0.5)]$

$P(G \mid D) = 0.49 / 0.70 \approx 0.70$

Bayesian Update with Bayes Factor:

Posterior Odds = Prior Odds × BF

$P(G \mid D)$ = Posterior Odds / (1 + Posterior Odds)

Chaotic Entropy Calculation

Normalization of Component Probabilities (given raw probabilities 0.4, 0.6, and 0.3; Sum = 1.3):

$p_1 = 0.4 / 1.3 \approx 0.3077$

$p_2 = 0.6 / 1.3 \approx 0.4615$

$p_3 = 0.3 / 1.3 \approx 0.2308$

Entropy Formula:

$H = - (p_1 \times \ln(p_1) + p_2 \times \ln(p_2) + p_3 \times \ln(p_3))$

Computed Values:

$0.3077 \ln(0.3077) \approx -0.3628$

$0.4615 \ln(0.4615) \approx -0.3573$

$0.2308 \ln(0.2308) \approx -0.3380$

Final Entropy:

$H = -(-0.3628 - 0.3573 - 0.3380) \approx 1.0581$ nats (rounded to 1.06 nats for consistency)

INNOVATION STATEMENT

To the best of my knowledge, no prior research has explicitly integrated Bayesian statistics with differential statistical methods to analyze genetic risk in keratoconus. This methodological approach was independently developed as part of this study. While it is possible that similar work exists, I have not found any direct references to this combination in the existing literature.

Note: The value of 0.7 used in this Bayesian model represents a cohort-specific parameter (such as an enriched dataset's marginal likelihood) and does not reflect the general population prevalence of keratoconus. The differential statistics, with prevalence values of 0.0023 and 0.0005, accurately describe the rarity of the disease in the general population.

CONCLUSION

Keratoconus is a network disorder that requires a systems-level approach for its analysis. The integration of Bayesian frameworks with differential statistical methods—and the quantification of systemic instability via chaotic entropy—provides a novel and robust means of understanding the genetic, inflammatory, and oxidative dynamics underlying KC. This innovative approach paves the way for the development of precision therapies in ocular disease management.

Acknowledgments

I extend my sincere gratitude to my dear friend and colleague, Researcher Leila Elahinezhad at Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, for her invaluable guidance—especially in enhancing my understanding of ocular structure. I am also deeply grateful to my dear friend Aidin Kazemizadeh for his support in facilitating the APC payment process, which greatly streamlined the administrative aspects of this work.

REFERENCES

1. Rabinowitz, Y. S. (1998). Keratoconus. Survey of Ophthalmology, 42(4), 297–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0039-6257(97)00119-7pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
2. McComish, B. J., et al. (2020). Association of Genetic Variation With Keratoconus. JAMA Ophthalmology, 138(2), 174–181. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaophthalmol.2019.5293 pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
3. Karolak, J. A., & Gajecka, M. (2017). Genomic strategies in keratoconus. Molecular Genetics and Genomics, 292(1), 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00438-016-1211-0
4. Iglesias, A. I., et al. (2018). Cross-ancestry genome-wide association analysis of corneal thickness. Nature Communications, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03721-2
5. Zhang, L., et al. (2019). Replication study of PNPLA2 polymorphisms in Han Chinese keratoconus patients. Molecular Vision, 25, 456–462. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2020.00827
6. Al-Mohanna, F., et al. (2021). Evaluation of PNPLA2 variants in Saudi Arabian keratoconus patients. Saudi Journal of Ophthalmology, 35(2), 89–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sjopt.2021.01.001
7. Akoto, T., et al. (2022). The Underlying Relationship between Keratoconus and Down Syndrome. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 23(18), 10796. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms231810796 mdpi.com
8. Kristianslund, O., &Drolsum, L. (2021). Prevalence of keratoconus in persons with Down syndrome: a review. BMJ Open Ophthalmology, 6(1), e000754. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjophth-2020-000754
9. Hashemi, H., et al. (2020). Keratoconus detection by novel indices in patients with Down syndrome. Japanese Journal of Ophthalmology, 64(3), 285–291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10384-020-00747-0
10. Zehtabian, K. (2024). The Role of Neurodegeneration in Depression: Inflammatory Responses and Treatment Options. Universal Library of Medical and Health Sciences, 2(4), 20–21. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.14378519

11. Zehtabian, K. (2025). Integrating Bayesian and Differential Statistics for Genetic Risk Estimation in Keratoconus. Universal Library of Medical and Health Sciences. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.14378519
12. von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-87908-6
13. Montuori, A. (2011). Systems Approach. In Encyclopedia of Creativity (pp. 414–421). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-375038-9.00107-0