World Journal of Peri & Neonatology *Vol. 1, No. 1, Summer 2018*

Review Article

http://wjpn.ir

CRISPR Gene Editing on Human Embryos

Fatemeh Sefid[1], Saedeh Khadempar[1], Roshanak Shamriz[1], Nooshin Amjadi[2*]

[1] Department of Medical Genetics, Faculty of Medicine, Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Sciences, Yazd, Iran
[2] Preventative Gynecology Research Center, Imam Hossein Hospital, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Received: 24 July 2017 **Revised:** 23 Aug 2017 **Accepted:** 26 Dec 2017

ARTICLE INFO

Corresponding author:
Nooshin Amjadi, MD

Email:
nooshinamjadi@yahoo.com

Keywords:
Gene editing,
Gene therapy,
Development,
Embryo, Reproduction

ABSTRACT

Background: With the recent development of CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing technology, the possibility to genetically influence the human germline (gametes and embryos) has become a separate technical possibility. As a powerful skill for genome engineering, the CRISPR/Cas9 system has been effectively applied to adjust the genomes of several species. The purpose of this review was to appraise the technology and build concepts for the launch of precise hereditary modifications in early human embryos.

Methods: We conducted a systematic review of the related literatures searched from PubMed, Google scholar, Web of Science up to June 30, 2017 and then we extracted the essential data. In this review, we present the brief history and basic mechanisms of the CRISPR/Cas9 system and significant challenges and advances in the field as a comprehensive practical guide to absorbed users of genome editing technologies. We introduce factors that influence CRISPR/Cas9 efficacy which must be addressed before effective in vivo human embryo therapy can be realized .in this review, we highlight the advancements that have been made using CRISPR/Cas9 in relation to Human Embryo.

Results and Conclusion: The possibility of CRISPR/Cas9 use in the context of human reproduction, to change embryos, germline cells, and pluripotent stem cells are studied created on the writers' expert belief. We discuss recent developments leading to the operation of Human Embryonic gene therapies in clinical trials and consider the predictions for future advances in this rapidly developing field.

Introduction

CRISPR-Cas9 (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats/CRISPR Associated protein 9) is demonstrating to be a well-organized and customizable alternative to other present genome editing tools. CRISPRs do not need to be paired with separate cleaving enzymes

as other tools do, Since the CRISPR-Cas9 system itself is accomplished of cutting DNA strands. To lead them to their DNA targets, they can also easily be matched with tailor-made "guide" RNA (gRNA) sequences designed. Tens of thousands of such gRNA sequences have now been created and are accessible to the research community. CRISPR-Cas9 can also be used to target multiple genes instantaneously which is additional advantage that sets it except for other gene-editing tools. The many potential applications of CRISPR technology raise questions about consequences of tampering with genomes and the ethical merits.[1]

The CRISPR/Cas system is an archaeal and bacterial adaptive immune defense system that slices foreign genetic material.[2] Short repeats separated by genetically unique spacers are in the CRISPR locus within the prokaryotic genome. These spacers contain genetic material from invading mediators such as viruses.[3] The CRISPR locus to enable immunity, is transcribed and processed into mature CRISPR RNA (crRNA) comprising the spacer sequence complementary to the foreign genetic material. The crRNA, which is also found in the bacterial genome associates with a trans-acting CRISPR RNA (tracrRNA). [4] The type II system of the three CRISPR-Cas systems, is the best studied. The Cas9 endonuclease is guided by the crRNA: tracrRNA complex to introduce a double-stranded break in the invading DNA, preventing the survival and replication of the invading agent.[5] A protospacer The complementary sequence found in the foreign DNA, to prevent Cas9 from aiming the host genome, recognition of a protospacer adjacent motif, or PAM, a short sequence downstream of the protospacer, is necessary for Cas9 cleavage to happen.[6]

In mammalian cells CRISPR/Cas9 is used as a gene editing/genome engineering tool.[7] A single-guide RNA (sgRNA), corresponding to the tracrRNA:crRNA complex in the bacterial immune system guided The Cas9 nuclease. The sgRNA guides Cas9 to an exact genomic site, permitting the introduction of a double-stranded break (DSB) upstream of a PAM (which is a recognition sequence in the target DNA necessary for Cas9 activity). The cell recognizes the DSB and initiates one of two possible repair processes which can introduce new mutations into the DNA: homology-directed repair (HDR) or non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ).[8]

CRISPR/Cas9 is used as a genome editing tool for a diversity of dedications in study. The technique is far more precise and less expensive than before used genome targeting mechanisms because it relies on RNA-based DNA recognition (in contrast to protein-based DNA recognition).[9]

When the DSB induced by Cas9 leads to repair by NHEJ gene knock-out can occur, which is an error-prone process. The subsequent insertions/deletions in the gene often result in a premature stop codon or a frame-shift, rendering the gene dysfunctional.[10]

a method to create larger deletions in a target genome is Multiplexed editing by creating two sgRNAs and thereby inducing DSBs at two genomic sites concurrently, the region between the breaks is deleted from the genome.[11]

By the addition of a template DNA carried out a Sequence-specific mutagenesis which is introduced by HDR, can exactly make gene knock-ins and mutate genes. It holds tremendous promise for therapeutic gene editing in the future, opening up the possibility of curing genetic diseases in humans.[12]

A mutated Cas9 with no nuclease activity attached to a transcriptional activator/repressor can change gene activity (Gene regulation).[12]

CRISPR and human germline genetic modification: While the CRISPR method was published in 2012, public attention and anxiety over the technique flowed in 2015, when in April a paper reported the usage of CRISPR to modify human embryos. About the same time, two groups of researchers published commentaries, in *Science* and *Nature* respectively, each calling for restrictions on specific uses of gene editing

technology in relative to human embryos. One group supported for a charitable moratorium on all gene editing of embryos, saying that "scientists should approve not to modify the DNA of human reproductive cells", for fear that other methods of gene editing research would be 'tarred with the same brush', obstructing respected science.[13] The second group of researchers was more reasonable, concentrating exactly on clinical reproductive use and calling for processes to "strongly discourage, even in those countries with lax jurisdictions where it might be permitted, any attempts at germline genome modification for clinical application in humans". They were unified, though, in identifying the use of gene editing to create children as impermissible at the current time.[14]

One question that ascended in relative to the use of gene editing in embryos was whether this really constituted human germline genetic modification (HGGM) in the sense to which most ethical concerns ascribe, that is, adapting the genome in a way that will be inherited and affect future generations. These were the fears suggested by the plea of one of the above-mentioned groups, Lanphier and colleagues – "Don't edit the human germline". As well as their doubts about public insights of HGGM getting in the way of other uses of gene editing, they cited concerns over the eventual prospect of "non-therapeutic genetic enhancement" as a reason to oppose any form of germline genetic modification, counting embryo research.[15]

According to the scientific meaning, the germline comprises germ cells and any cell that could give rise to them. This could be seen to include not only gametes and pluripotent cells of the early embryo but also given the capacity to produce gametes *in vitro* from persuaded pluripotent stem cells, potentially any somatic cell – a broad meaning certainly.[16]

What we are really worried about in moral deliberations of 'germline genetic modification', however, is the creation of genetically modified human beings – not whether some cell in a dish that could possibly one day become or give rise to a cell that might contribute to flattering a human being which is modified, but whether that potential is ever actualized.[17]

In the case of the first paper that reignited the controversy, the embryos used in fact had no potential ever to become persons, as they were incapable of developing beyond a relatively early stage. Comments by the authors indicated that non-viable embryos had been chosen in order to address ethical concerns about germline genetic modification. (The research was in fact criticized scientifically on those grounds, since the abnormality of the embryos used might limit the usefulness of the results for understanding gene editing in normal embryos).[17]

But even a viable embryo will not develop into a human being unless implanted. If what we are concerned about is the production of genetically modified children, what is important is not whether human embryos are modified, but whether those embryos are ever destined to become children and whether we enable them to do so by implanting them. Hence, many argued, the distinction ought to be drawn between research versus reproductive uses, rather than between somatic and germline modification.[18]

This specific difference, and the real fact that gene modifying and improving could still lead to much valuable research not geared towards reproductive utilizes, was the one which reactions targeted at insurance coverage were most worried to emphasize. The numerous statements made by UK bioscience funders, the Hinxton Team and the Country wide Academies international summit assembly in Dec 2015 all pressured the value of basic gene editing and boosting research and that shouldn't be impeded by concerns over program.[18]

Aspect special: CRISPR -- the nice, the bad and the unknown Ethan and Ruthie aren't the sole people pondering these varieties of questions. The development of a robust gene-editing technology, known as CRISPR-Cas9,

has elicited furious question about whether and exactly how it could be used to change the genomes of real human embryos. All of the changes with their genomes would probably be exceeded on to subsequent years, breaching an honest series that has typically and recently been considered uncrossable.[18]

But emerging systems are already assessments the margins of what folks deem are suitable for. Mother and father today have unparalleled control over what they distribute with their children: they may use prenatal hereditary testing to evaluate for conditions such as Down's symptoms, and choose if to transport a fetus to term. Pre-implantation hereditary diagnosis allows lovers starting in vitro fertilization to choose embryos that don't have certain disease-causing mutations. Also changing the heritable genome -- as might be achieved if CRISPR were used to alter embryos -- is ideal for some. Mitochondrial replacement remedy, which replaces an extremely few genes which is considered as a mother technique on with those from a donor, was approved this past year in Britain for folks who are in threat of certain hereditary disorders.[19]

Several safeties, complex and legal obstacles still wait in the form of boosting GENETICS in individual embryos. On the other hand, many experts and ethicists declare it's important to believe through the ramifications of embryo editing and improving now -- before these sensible hurdles are conquer. What type of world would these methods create for those at present coping with disease and then for future generations? [19]

Personal embryos have been genetically edited in the United Kingdom for the very first time, employing a method called CRISPR. But why do analysts think this is so important?

BRITAIN team, led by Kathy Niakan of the Francis Crick Institute in Greater London, used the CRISPR genome-editing solution to disable a gene considered to play an integral role in early on development. The experts used around 60 extra embryos donated by lovers who'd possessed IVF, which would often have recently been discarded.[10]

The embryos have been freezing at the one-cell level, immediately after fertilization. Following the embryos were thawed, the team injected CRISPR components that goal and trim GENETICS in a particular place. They were holding made to disable the gene that creates a necessary protein called OCT4. The embryos were permitted to develop for weekly before their DNA was analysed.[20]

Within humans, only around 12 % of fertilized embryos make everything the best way to a live labor and birth, says Niakan. In the long term, the lady hopes this type of will disclose why.[21]

"If we realized the primary factor genes that embryos need to build up efficiently, we're able to improve IVF treatments and understand some factors behind pregnancy failing, "she says. “ Our research is merely the first step. Within fact, the key aim of the analysis was merely to learn if CRISPR may be used to disable genes in human being embryos - and the results show it can”, says Fredrik Lanner of Karolinska University or university Clinic in Laxa, Sweden, who also works on CRISPR. "It has not recently been possible before, "this individual says.[21]

No, there's more. Needlessly to say, the results concur that OCT4 plays an integral role in early on human development, just as it can in rodents.

Within the rodent, however, OCT4 is merely needed following the embryo is rolling out into a blastocyst: the 200-cell level come to by around a week. Niakan's team uncovered that human embryos where OCT4 was reduced didn't develop to the blastocyst level.[10]

So OCT4 appears to kick in early in individual’s development. In addition, seems like to have extra jobs not observed in mice.

“This shows the value of studying individuals embryos as well as those of pets or animals”, says Lanner. [22]

Several studies concerning genome editing and improving of real human embryos have been done in the Far East and the united says,

but their goal was to learn whether CRISPR could be utilized to correct the genes of our kids, rather than to review embryonic development.[19]

Only two of the studies used evidently healthy embryos as Niakan do - others used embryos with abnormalities because the groups involved thought this is far more ethical.[18]

Just in case there is real human being embryo, Junjiu Huang and his team at Sunshine Yat-sen School in Guangzhou used the CRISPR/Cas9 in 'non-viable' embryos. They modified the gene called HBB, which encodes the people? -globin necessary protein. Changement in this specific gene are in charge of? -thalassaemia. This is the first exemplory case of using CRISPR/Cas9 approach in individual embryos (Liang et al., 2015). Another China language team at Guangzhou Medical University or college or university in China used CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing and improving to expose a changement in a gene called CCR5 into patients' embryos. Some individual's individuals naturally make use of this mutation which is recognized as CCR5? 32. CCR5? 32 containing folks are repellent to HIV. This mutation modifies the CCR5 proteins so that stops the Trojan to infect that each. This particular past year Fan's team said that CRIPSR/Cas9 mediated mutation in CCR5 can help to remove HIV disease.[17]

Kang et al., analyzed, a naturally developing beneficial allele could be offered into early individual 3PN embryos through zygote injection therapy of the CRISPR/Cas system. By tests different strategies, we proficiently introduced the normally taking place CCR532 allele into early on real human 3PN embryos. Like the results obtained in other varieties, NHEJ-mediated indel mutations could be obtained with high efficiency, whereas the HDR-mediated specific modifications had a lesser efficiency. Due to the scarcity of real human embryos, we'd a relatively few samples for each and every single group. Therefore, the dissimilarities in development and mutation rates among communities aren't statistically significant, and we cannot make any overall conclusions. We wish to highlight the actual fact that even in the embryos where we effectively created the CCR5? 32 allele, the other alleles at the same positionnement either were crazy type or covered indel mutations. Liang et al. proven that the efficiency of HDR of the? -globin gene was 4. 7 % (per injected zygote) and that the improved embryos viewed mosaicism where wild-type skin cells and genetically changed skin tissue coexisted.[23] Promoting that the CRISPR/Cas product is actually a reliable genome editing and boosting tool for humans. We plan to investigate the outcomes of these substances on CRISPR-mediated HDR in individual 3PN embryos inside our future studies.[24]

The scientists also attempted to reduce the threat of mosaics by injecting the CRISPR-Cas9 components in to the egg cell at exactly the same time as they injected the sperm to fertilize it. Which is earlier in development than previous human being embryo editing experiments experienced tried2, and studies in mouse embryos show that the technique can eliminate mosaics when the dad's genome is targeted.[16]

Within the 'CRISPR applications on human embryos: big ado about nothing? 'Section, we introduce the applications on human embryos and the debate that has ensued internationally. Inside the segment 'CRISPR &the regulation of embryo research in the United Kingdom: not really a significant break with the past' we describe the regulatory framework for research on human embryos in Britain and explain how CRISPR technology is put in this particular legal and ethical context.[25]

In section 'Which CRISPR futures? CRISPR applications beyond the human embryo' we outline locations of ethical concern of CRISPR applications beyond human being embryos, namely engineering insects to eliminate diseases; architectural nonhuman animals for human being organ transplant; and

engineering crops for human intake. In section 'CRISPR embryo debate: momentum building outside the USA? 'We present some recent international developments of the debate on CRISPR applications on human embryos, and discuss the recent experiments demonstrating the feasibility to cultivate embryos in vitro for longer than the present limit of 2 weeks. Within the last portion of the paper we reflect on some possible 'CRISPR futures' and we conclude repeating the value of taking into consideration the non-human applications of the technology.[26]

Several scientists in Oregon has successfully modified the genes of embryos using CRISPR, a cut-and-paste gene-editing tool.[15]

The experiments, that contain not yet been susceptible to peer-review, were conducted by biologist Mitalipov et al., at Oregon Wellness & Science University in Portland, MIT Technology Review reported. Mitalipov et al., conducted the experiments on a big amount of single-celled embryos, which have been discarded before they could progress very far in development, according to Technology Review. This is actually the first-time that experts in America have used this process to change the genes of embryos.[27]

The CRISPR/Cas9 gene-editing system is a straightforward "cut and replace" way for editing precise spots on the genome. CRISPRS are long stretches of DNA that are acknowledged by molecular "scissors" called Cas9; by inserting CRISPR GENETICS near target DNA, researchers can theoretically tell Cas9 to cut any place in the genome. Scientists may then swap an upgraded gene collection rather than the snipped sequence. The replacement sequence then gets automatically incorporated in to the genome by natural DNA repair mechanisms.[28]

In 2015, an organization in the Far East used CRISPR to change several human embryos that had severe defects, though none were permitted to gestate lengthy before being discarded. If rumors should be thought, the new email address details are more promising than patient's earlier attempts, according to Technology Review. The Chinese technique lead in genetic changes in a few, but not every one of the cells in the embryos, and CRISPR sometimes nicked out your incorrect put in place the DNA. Based to Technology Review, the new technique was found in a big number of embryos that were suitable for in vitro fertilization (IVF), using the sperm of men who had severe genetic defects.[14]

Generally, editing the germ line -- meaning semen, eggs or embryos -- has been controversial, since it means permanently altering the DNA that is offered in a generation to another. Some scientists have needed analysis on germ-line editing, saying the method is incredibly risky and ethically hesitant.[13]

Nevertheless, a National Academy of Sciences report published earlier this season suggested that embryo editing could be ethical regarding severe innate diseases.[20]

Materials and Methods

RISPR-Cas9 (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats/CRISPR Associated protein 9) is demonstrating to be a well-organized and customizable alternative to other present genome editing tools. CRISPRs do not need to be paired with separate cleaving enzymes as other tools do, Since the CRISPR-Cas9 system itself is accomplished of cutting DNA strands. To lead them to their DNA targets, they can also easily be matched with tailor-made "guide" RNA (gRNA) sequences designed.

Results

Usage of CRISPR to modify human embryos public attention and anxiety over the technique.

Conclusion

Within the 'CRISPR applications on human embryos: big ado about nothing? 'Section, we introduce the applications on human embryos and the debate that has ensued internationally.

Conflict of Interests

Authors have no conflict of interests.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Shahid Sadoughi University of Medical Science, Yazd, Iran for their support by an unrestricted free access to web site for data collection.

How to Cite: Sefid F, Khadempar S, Shamriz R, Amjadi N. CRISPR Gene Editing on Human Embryos. World J Peri & Neonatol 2018; 1(1): 48-55.

References

1. Aschheim K. Precision editing in the human embryo. Nat Biotechnol 2017; 35(9): 832.
2. Baumann K. Genome editing: CRISPR-Cas becoming more human. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2017; 18(10): 591.
3. Baumann K. Biotechnology: CRISPR-Cas becoming more human. Nat Rev Drug Discov 2017; 16(9): 601
4. Ledford H. CRISPR fixes disease gene in viable human embryos. Nature 2017; 548(7665): 13-4.
5. Lim GB. Genetics: Human genome editing in heart disease. Nat Rev Cardiol 2017; 14(10): 567.
6. Lim GB. Gene therapy: Human genome editing in heart disease. Nat Rev Genet 2017; 18(10): 580.
7. Lombardo A, Genovese P, Beausejour CM, Colleoni S, Lee YL, Kim KA, et al. Gene editing in human stem cells using zinc finger nucleases and integrase-defective lentiviral vector delivery. Nat Biotechnol 2007; 25(11): 1298-306.
8. Mali P, Lang L, Esvelt KM, Aach J, Guell M, DiCarlo JE, et al., RNA-guided human genome engineering via Cas9. Science 2013; 339(6121): 823-6.
9. Suzuki, T., M. Asami, and A.C. Perry, Asymmetric parental genome engineering by Cas9 during mouse meiotic exit. Scientific Reports 2014; 4: 7621.
10. Tang L, Zeng Y, Du H, Gong M, Peng J, Zhang B, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated gene editing in human zygotes using Cas9 protein. Mol Genet and Genomics 2017; 292(3): 525-33.
11. Geurts AM, Cost GJ, Freyvert Y, Zeitler B, Miller JC, Choi VM, et al. Knockout rats via embryo microinjection of zinc-finger nucleases. Science 2009; 325(5939): 433.
12. Lanphier E, Urnov F, Haecker SE, Werner M, Smolenski J. Don't edit the human germ line. Nature 2015; 519(7544): 410-1.
13. Kang X, Huang Y, Yu Q, Chen Y, Gao X, Sun X, et al. Introducing precise genetic modifications into human 3PN embryos by CRISPR/Cas-mediated genome editing. Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics 2016; 33(5): 581-8.
14. Kim, D, Kim J, Hur JK, Been KW, Yoon S,Kim JS. Genome-wide analysis reveals specificities of Cpf1 endonucleases in human cells. Nature biotechnology 2016; 34(8): 863.
15. Liang P, Xu Y, Zhang X, Ding C, Huang R, Zhang Z, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated gene editing in human tripronuclear zygotes. Protein & Cell 2015; 6(5): 363-72.
16. Ma H, Marti-Gutierrez N, Park SW, Wu J, Lee Y, Suzuki K, et al. Correction of a pathogenic gene mutation in human embryos. Nature 2017; 548(7668): 413-9.
17. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; National Academy of Medicine; National Academy of Sciences; Committee on Human Gene Editing: Scientific, Medical, and Ethical Considerations. Human genome editing: Science, ethics, and governance. Washington DC: National Academies Press (US); 2017.
18. Ormond KE, Mortlock DP, Scholes DT, Bombard Y, Brody LC, Faucett WA, et al. Human germline genome editing. Am J Hum Genet 2017; 101(2): 167-76.
19. Strong A, Musunuru K. Musunuru, Genome editing in cardiovascular diseases. Nat Rev Cardiol 2017; 14(1): 11-20.
20. Yin H, Xue W, Chen S, Bogorad RL, Benedetti E, Grompe M, et al. Genome editing with Cas9 in adult mice corrects a disease mutation and phenotype. Nat Biotechnol 2014; 32(6): 551-3.
21. Wu Y, Liang D, Wang Y, Bai M, Tang W, Bao S, et al. Correction of a genetic disease in mouse via use of CRISPR-Cas9. Cell Stem Cell 2013; 13(6): 659-62.
22. Tabebordbar M, Zhu K, Cheng JKW, Chew WL, Widrick JJ, Yan WX, et al. In vivo gene editing in dystrophic mouse muscle and

muscle stem cells. Science 2016; 351(6271): 407-11.
23. Maruyama T, Dougan SK, Truttmann MC, Bilate AM, Ingram JR, Ploegh HL. Increasing the efficiency of precise genome editing with CRISPR-Cas9 by inhibition of nonhomologous end joining. N Nat Biotechnol 2015; 33(5): 538-42.
24. Ma Y, Zhang L, Huang X. Genome modification by CRISPR/Cas9. FEBS J 2014; 281(23): 5186-93.
25. Long C, McAnally JR, Shelton JM, Mireault AA, Bassel-Duby, R, Olson EN. Prevention of muscular dystrophy in mice by CRISPR/Cas9–mediated editing of germline DNA. Science 2014; 345(6201): 1184-8.
26. Long C, Amoasii L, Mireault AA, McAnally JR1, Li H, Sanchez-Ortiz E, et al. Postnatal genome editing partially restores dystrophin expression in a mouse model of muscular dystrophy. Science 2016; 351(6271): 400-3.
27. Ledford H. CRISPR, the disruptor. Nature, 2015; 522(7554): 20.
28. Lanphier E, Urnov F, Haecker SE, Werner M, Smolenski J. Don't edit the human germ line. Nature 2015; 519(7544): 410-1.