



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Curr Opin Insect Sci. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2019 August 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Curr Opin Insect Sci. 2018 August ; 28: 66–72. doi:10.1016/j.cois.2018.05.006.

Gene Editing Technologies and Applications for Insects

Valentino M. Gantz^{1,2} and Omar S. Akbari^{1,2,†}

¹Division of Biological Sciences, Section of Cell and Developmental Biology, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California, 92092, United States of America

²Tata Institute for Genetics and Society, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, United States of America

Abstract

Initially discovered in bacteria, CRISPR-based genome editing endonucleases have proven remarkably amenable for adaptation to insects. To date, these endonucleases have been utilized in a plethora of both model and non-model insects including diverse flies, bees, beetles, butterflies, moths, and grasshoppers, to name a few, thereby revolutionizing functional genomics of insects. In addition to basic genome editing, they have also been invaluable for advanced genome engineering and synthetic biology applications. Here we explore the recent genome editing advancements in insects for generating site-specific genomic mutations, insertions, deletions, as well as more advanced applications such as Homology Assisted Genome Knock-in (HACK), potential to utilize DNA base editing, generating predictable reciprocal chromosomal translocations, and development gene drives to control the fate of wild populations.

Introduction

The increasingly refined ability to introduce altered traits into insects via genome editing offers scientists exciting opportunities for tackling public health and environmental issues in novel sustainable ways. Intentional spread of engineered traits through wild insect populations could be used to address numerous problems as varied as biocide resistance, ill effects associated with invasive species, and insect-borne diseases. For example, the replacement of herbicide- or pesticide-resistant alleles with sensitive ones may restore vulnerability to herbicides or pesticides, allowing for their continued use. Moreover, the introduction of genes that make an organism sensitive to a previously innocuous molecule may allow for that molecule to be utilized as a novel biocide. Additionally, the spread of certain genetic elements, for example ones that impede vector competence, or that cause deleterious recessive mutations, or that bias the sex ratio of a population, may be used to

[†]To whom all correspondence should be addressed: oakbari@ucsd.edu.

Conflict of Interest

V.M.G. is a founder of Synbal, Inc. and Agragene, Inc.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

block the spread of vector disease, or suppress invasive organisms in a species-specific eco-friendly manner, respectively [1].

Recent genome editing and engineering approaches in insects have evolved from the early random chemical and radiation mutagenesis strategies for genome modification [2], to transgenesis methods based on transposable elements, and more recently to site-directed mutagenesis and transgenesis approaches utilizing sequence-specific nucleases enabling the manipulation of the genome with surgical accuracy. These techniques have permitted researchers to generate random, or planned modifications, within the genomes of insects to investigate the function of genes and their regulatory sequences, and to engineer synthetic genetic elements with novel functions. Editing strategies in recent years have been developed to exploit different nucleases beginning from sequence-specific zinc finger nucleases [3], to modular TALENs (transcription activator-like effectors nuclease) [4], and now RNA-guided nucleases adapted from bacterial adaptive immune systems, known as CRISPR/Cas, (clustered regularly interspaced palindromic repeats/CRISPR associated systems). Together these tools have given birth to a new era of gene editing and genome engineering. In general, each of these technologies uses sequence-specific nucleases to generate double-stranded DNA breaks (or nicks) in regions of interest, this allows for targeted DNA modifications by taking advantage of endogenous mechanisms to repair broken DNA. Since cells are unable to divide further when harboring broken chromosomes, the nuclease generated cuts must be rapidly repaired by the cell to ensure survival. Two DNA repair pathways are usually employed for this purpose: (1) Non-homologous end-joining, which can lead to small insertion and deletions (indels) at the break site; (2) Homology-directed repair, which is designed to use the information on the intact chromosome to accurately repair the broken one. The latter can be turned to the researcher's advantage as the cell can be tricked into using a synthetic construct as a template, and therefore leading to user defined insertions or deletions (reviewed in [5]).

The CRISPR/Cas system has been particularly amenable to be used in insects and, thus far, it has been used in multiple species with minimal optimization steps (reviewed in [6]). These applications reduce the bacterial immunity complex to a simplified version composed of two components: (1) the Cas9 endonuclease, which performs DNA cleavage, and (2) a synthetic guide RNA (gRNA) which pilots the nuclease to the target genomic location, programmed within its RNA sequence [7]. In insects, these two elements can be delivered as RNA, plasmid DNA, or encoded in the genome to increase efficiency (reviewed in [8]). When combined they can lead to whooping rates of mutagenesis at the target site efficiently disrupting the function of the target DNA sequence. Alternatively, when combined with an exogenous DNA source (single-stranded DNA or double-stranded plasmid DNA) harboring homology to the genomic target sequence on each side of the intended cleavage site, the intervening DNA "cargo sequence" can be reliably and efficiently inserted at the cut site with efficiencies comparable to traditional transgenesis [9]. Here we discuss recent developments and focus on two broad aspects of utilizing gene editing in insects including functional genomics to elucidate gene function, and utilizing advanced gene editing for insect control.

1. Practical uses of the CRISPR/Cas9 to investigate the genome's function

Many applications of CRISPR/Cas9 for genome editing have been developed to modify the DNA sequence of an insect's genome. To utilize CRISPR, the Cas9 endonuclease, combined with one or more gRNAs, is delivered to the nucleus where the Cas9/gRNA complex is directed by base-complementarity of the guide RNA(s) with their user-specified genomic target to induce DNA cleavage (Figure 1A–B). Once a cut is generated on a chromosome, the cell senses the break and responds to it by via one of two main DNA-repair pathways: nonhomologous end joining (NHEJ) and homology-directed repair (HDR). While other repair pathways could be employed by the cell to repair the break (reviewed in [10,11]) NHEJ and HDR have been thus far co-opted successfully for efficient genome editing in several insects (reviewed in [12]), with extensive pioneer work and optimization in the fruit fly [13,14].

1.1 Targeted mutations and knock-outs (KOs) with NHEJ—NHEJ is an error-prone process that can be exploited to generate localized mutations, usually small indels, neighboring the cut site determined by the gRNA target sequence (Figure 1C). Additionally, if two (or more) gRNAs are used in concert, NHEJ can be used to obtain deletions of large DNA fragments by occasional loss of the sequence in between the two gRNAs (Figure 1D). This approach is extremely useful to investigate gene function by generating small mutations in the coding region of a gene, or its regulatory region when using one gRNA, and the generation of functional knockouts (KOs) by deleting entire genes or gene complexes using two gRNAs. For example, Gratz et al. achieved genomic deletions of up to 14.2kb in *Drosophila melanogaster* using a comparable strategy [13].

1.2 Targeted knock-ins (KIs) and knock-outs with HDR—By utilizing CRISPR to first generate a double stranded DNA break, foreign DNA sequences can be integrated with high efficiency into the genome at this break site by exploiting the HDR pathway. In general, this pathway uses the intact sister chromatid as a template to correct dsDNA breaks. However, when a DNA template (single or double stranded) with homology to the target DNA sequence abutting the CRISPR target cut site is provided, the HDR machinery can be exploited to “knock-in” the DNA in between the homologous sequences. Single-stranded oligodeoxynucleotides (ssODN's) of up to 200 nt can be readily ordered from commercial vendors and, by allowing 50nt of homology to each side of the dsDNA cut, these molecules can be used to efficiently insert small sequences up to ~100 nt (e.g., attP docking site) into the target location at high frequency [15] (Figure 1E–F). Double-stranded DNA (i.e., plasmid DNA) can also be used as a template, in this case, it has been shown that 500–1000 bp homology arms (HAs) to each side of the dsDNA break seem to promote efficient insertion of the cargo DNA contained in between the HAs [13]. Depending on the gRNAs used in the strategy (Figure 1G–I), researchers have used HDR to knock-in a 17.3 kb cargo DNA in mosquitoes as part of a gene drive strategy (using one gRNA)[16] a concerted knock-in/knock-out strategy in *Drosophila melanogaster* [13], or a trans-species regulatory sequence replacement to generate chimeric animals [9].

1.3 Complex genome editing & Synthetic genomics—Combining the use of CRISPR-based techniques with other genetic technologies has resulted in more powerful

novel methods of addressing a plethora of significant worldwide issues, including the spread of insect-borne diseases, ill effects of invasive species, and biocide resistance.

Several naturally occurring selfish genetic elements, including transposons, meiotic drive, B-chromosomes, homing endonuclease genes (HEGs), and *Medea* elements, have been proposed as potential gene drive mechanisms (reviewed in [31–35]), along with approaches relying on linking genes of interest to engineered chromosomes, such as translocations or compound chromosomes [25,36], or engineered underdominance [37,38] (Figure 2C). Some of these strategies, including *Medea* [39–41], engineered underdominance [42], and HEGs [43] have been shown to have some capacity to mediate gene introgression in laboratory populations of insects. However, these systems have been difficult to engineer in diverse species and therefore much of the recent excitement has been redirected toward using CRISPR systems to generate gene drives (Figure 2D). In fact, significant progress has already been made and CRISPR homing based drive systems have recently been demonstrated to bias mendelian inheritance in insects with incredible efficiency [16,44,45]. Given these exciting results, future efforts are now aimed toward utilizing gene editing approaches to further optimize drive systems, transfer working drive technologies to other insects that transmit pathogens to humans, and to engineer new drive systems inspired from naturally existing systems (reviewed in [32]).

Given the rapid scientific progress aimed at the development of gene drives articulated above, the discussion has now turned to the ethics and regulation of such systems. This is particularly complicated due to the fact that many of these systems are invasive and can spread beyond borders requiring international agreements to be made before any planned release. For example, *Medea*, HEGs, transposable elements, meiotic drive, and RNA-guided CRISPR homing based gene drives, are predicted to be invasive drive mechanisms with low release thresholds, capable of spreading to high frequency even when a small number of individuals are introduced into a population [46,47]. Invasive gene drive mechanisms are ideal when the goal is to spread genes over a large area, particularly when migration rates between the release site and surrounding areas of interest are low. However, because such systems have a low release thresholds, once introduced, the pre-transgenic state cannot easily be restored by diluting the replaced population with wild-type alleles such that the frequency of the gene drive alleles fall below the threshold frequency required for spread. Therefore, given their potency and difficulty of removal, establishing international agreements and developing countermeasures and safeguards, prior to any planned release, is a high priority issue for the entire gene drive field [30,32,48–50].

Conclusions

In summary, while still relatively new, CRISPR based gene editing technologies have already revolutionized functional genomics of insects. With CRISPR we now have the ability to rapidly modify, delete, and insert DNA nearly anywhere we desire in virtually any insect species. Additionally, with more advanced genome editing based technologies rapidly being developed such as HACK systems, DNA base-editors, site-specific chromosomal translocations, and gene drives, we may soon have the power to eradicate disease transmitting insects in the wild. Given this exciting potential, it is important to continue

optimizing gene editing technologies, to understand and overcome potential limitations and risks, and to engage with regulators, stakeholders and the general public to ensure the safe and timely application of these promising technologies to address the problems they are intended to solve.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by NIH grants 5K22AI113060, 1R21AI123937 and a Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) Safe Genes Program Grant HR0011-17-2-0047 to O.S.A; and NIH grant DP5 OD023098 awarded to V.M.G. We thank Ethan Bier (UCSD) and Anthony A. James (UCI) for their useful comments and edits.

References

Special interest (•) or outstanding interest (••). Annotated references MUST be from the past two years, and the annotation should provide a brief description of the major findings and the importance of the study. This is an essential part of each review and is very popular with our readers.” Description for each annotated reference provided in blue.

1. Burt A. Site-specific selfish genes as tools for the control and genetic engineering of natural populations. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2003; 270:921–928. [PubMed: 12803906]
2. Falk R. Mutagenesis as a Genetic Research Strategy. *Genetics.* 2010; 185:1135–1139. [PubMed: 20713742]
3. Bibikova M, Golic M, Golic KG, Carroll D. Targeted chromosomal cleavage and mutagenesis in *Drosophila* using zinc-finger nucleases. *Genetics.* 2002; 161:1169–1175. [PubMed: 12136019]
4. Bogdanove AJ, Voytas DF. TAL effectors: customizable proteins for DNA targeting. *Science.* 2011; 333:1843–1846. [PubMed: 21960622]
- 5•. Gantz VM, Bier E. The dawn of active genetics. *Bioessays.* 2016; 38:50–63. [PubMed: 26660392]
6. Sun D, Guo Z, Liu Y, Zhang Y. Progress and Prospects of CRISPR/Cas Systems in Insects and Other Arthropods. *Front Physiol.* 2017; 8:608. [PubMed: 28932198]
7. Cong L, Ran FA, Cox D, Lin S, Barretto R, Habib N, Hsu PD, Wu X, Jiang W, Marraffini LA, et al. Multiplex genome engineering using CRISPR/Cas systems. *Science.* 2013; 339:819–823. [PubMed: 23287718]
8. Taning CNT, Van Eynde B, Yu N, Ma S, Smaghe G. CRISPR/Cas9 in insects: Applications, best practices and biosafety concerns. *J Insect Physiol.* 2017; 98:245–257. [PubMed: 28108316]
- 9•. Xu X-RS, Gantz VM, Siomava N, Bier E. CRISPR/Cas9 and Active Genetics-based trans-species replacement of the endogenous *Drosophilakni-L2 CRM* reveals unexpected complexity. *Elife.* 2017:6.
10. Chapman JR, Taylor MRG, Boulton SJ. Playing the end game: DNA double-strand break repair pathway choice. *Mol Cell.* 2012; 47:497–510. [PubMed: 22920291]
11. Sekelsky J. DNA Repair in *Drosophila*: Mutagens, Models, and Missing Genes. *Genetics.* 2017; 205:471–490. [PubMed: 28154196]
12. Reid W, O’Brochta DA. Applications of genome editing in insects. *Curr Opin Insect Sci.* 2016; 13:43–54. [PubMed: 27436552]
13. Gratz SJ, Ukken FP, Rubinstein CD, Thiede G, Donohue LK, Cummings AM, O’Connor-Giles KM. Highly specific and efficient CRISPR/Cas9-catalyzed homology-directed repair in *Drosophila*. *Genetics.* 2014; 196:961–971. [PubMed: 24478335]
14. Gratz SJ, Dustin Rubinstein C, Harrison MM, Wildonger J, O’Connor-Giles KM. CRISPR-Cas9 Genome Editing in *Drosophila*. *Current Protocols in Molecular Biology.* 2015:31.2.1–31.2.20.
15. Gratz SJ, Cummings AM, Nguyen JN, Hamm DC, Donohue LK, Harrison MM, Wildonger J, O’Connor-Giles KM. Genome engineering of *Drosophila* with the CRISPR RNA-guided Cas9 nuclease. *Genetics.* 2013; 194:1029–1035. [PubMed: 23709638]

16. Gantz VM, Jasinskiene N, Tatarenkova O, Fazekas A, Macias VM, Bier E, James AA. Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015; 112:E6736–43. [PubMed: 26598698]
17. Lin C-C, Potter CJ. Editing Transgenic DNA Components by Inducible Gene Replacement in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*. 2016; 203:1613–1628. [PubMed: 27334272]
- 18••. Buchman AB, Ivy T, Marshall JM, Akbari O, Hay BA. Engineered reciprocal chromosome translocations drive high threshold, reversible population replacement in *Drosophila*. 2016; doi: 10.1101/088393
19. Komor AC, Kim YB, Packer MS, Zuris JA, Liu DR. Programmable editing of a target base in genomic DNA without double-stranded DNA cleavage. *Nature*. 2016; 533:420–424. [PubMed: 27096365]
20. Hess GT, Tycko J, Yao D, Bassik MC. Methods and Applications of CRISPR-Mediated Base Editing in Eukaryotic Genomes. *Mol Cell*. 2017; 68:26–43. [PubMed: 28985508]
21. Nicholson GM. Fighting the global pest problem: preface to the special *Toxicon* issue on insecticidal toxins and their potential for insect pest control. *Toxicon*. 2007; 49:413–422. [PubMed: 17223148]
22. de La Rocque S, Balenghien T, Halos L, Dietze K, Claes F, Ferrari G, Guberti V, Slingenbergh J. A review of trends in the distribution of vector-borne diseases: is international trade contributing to their spread? *Rev Sci Tech*. 2011; 30:119–130. [PubMed: 21809758]
23. Randolph SE, Rogers DJ. The arrival, establishment and spread of exotic diseases: patterns and predictions. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2010; 8:361–371. [PubMed: 20372156]
24. Tatem AJ, Rogers DJ, Hay SI. Global transport networks and infectious disease spread. *Adv Parasitol*. 2006; 62:293–343. [PubMed: 16647974]
25. Curtis CF. Possible use of translocations to fix desirable genes in insect pest populations. *Nature*. 1968; 218:368–369. [PubMed: 5649682]
26. Hay BA, Chen C-H, Ward CM, Huang H, Su JT, Guo M. Engineering the genomes of wild insect populations: challenges, and opportunities provided by synthetic *Medea* selfish genetic elements. *J Insect Physiol*. 2010; 56:1402–1413. [PubMed: 20570677]
27. Lambrechts L, Koella JC, Boëte C. Can transgenic mosquitoes afford the fitness cost? *Trends Parasitol*. 2008; 24:4–7. [PubMed: 18164248]
28. Schmid-Hempel P. Evolutionary ecology of insect immune defenses. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 2005; 50:529–551. [PubMed: 15471530]
29. Tripet F, Aboagye-Antwi F, Hurd H. Ecological immunology of mosquito-malaria interactions. *Trends Parasitol*. 2008; 24:219–227. [PubMed: 18424235]
30. Esvelt KM, Smidler AL, Catteruccia F, Church GM. Concerning RNA-guided gene drives for the alteration of wild populations. *Elife*. 2014:3.
31. Sinkins SP, Gould F. Gene drive systems for insect disease vectors. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2006; 7:427–435. [PubMed: 16682981]
- 32••. Champer J, Buchman A, Akbari OS. Cheating evolution: engineering gene drives to manipulate the fate of wild populations. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2016; 17:146–159. [PubMed: 26875679]
33. Marshall JM, Akbari OS. Gene Drive Strategies for Population Replacement. *Genetic Control of Malaria and Dengue*. 2016:169–200.
34. Papanthanos, PA, Windbichler, N, Akbari, OS. Transgenic insects: techniques and applications. Sex ratio manipulation for insect population control; 83–100. [date unknown]
35. Macias VM, Ohm JR, Rasgon JL. Gene Drive for Mosquito Control: Where Did It Come from and Where Are We Headed? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2017:14.
36. Gould F, Schliekelman P. Population genetics of autocidal control and strain replacement. *Annu Rev Entomol*. 2004; 49:193–217. [PubMed: 14651462]
37. Davis S, Bax N, Grewe P. Engineered underdominance allows efficient and economical introgression of traits into pest populations. *J Theor Biol*. 2001; 212:83–98. [PubMed: 11527447]
38. Magori K, Gould F. Genetically engineered underdominance for manipulation of pest populations: a deterministic model. *Genetics*. 2006; 172:2613–2620. [PubMed: 16415364]

39. Akbari OS, Chen C-H, Marshall JM, Huang H, Antoshechkin I, Hay BA. Novel synthetic Medea selfish genetic elements drive population replacement in *Drosophila*; a theoretical exploration of Medea-dependent population suppression. *ACS Synth Biol*. 2014; 3:915–928. [PubMed: 23654248]
40. Chen C-H, Huang H, Ward CM, Su JT, Schaeffer LV, Guo M, Hay BA. A synthetic maternal-effect selfish genetic element drives population replacement in *Drosophila*. *Science*. 2007; 316:597–600. [PubMed: 17395794]
- 41••. Buchman A, Marshall J, Ostrovski D, Yang T, Akbari OS. Synthetically Engineered Medea Gene Drive System in the Worldwide Crop Pest, *D. suzukii*. 2017; doi: 10.1101/162255
42. Akbari OS, Matzen KD, Marshall JM, Huang H, Ward CM, Hay BA. A synthetic gene drive system for local, reversible modification and suppression of insect populations. *Curr Biol*. 2013; 23:671–677. [PubMed: 23541732]
43. Windbichler N, Menichelli M, Papathanos PA, Thyme SB, Li H, Ulge UY, Hovde BT, Baker D, Monnat RJ Jr, Burt A, et al. A synthetic homing endonuclease-based gene drive system in the human malaria mosquito. *Nature*. 2011; 473:212–215. [PubMed: 21508956]
44. Gantz VM, Bier E. Genome editing. The mutagenic chain reaction: a method for converting heterozygous to homozygous mutations. *Science*. 2015; 348:442–444. [PubMed: 25908821]
- 45••. Hammond A, Galizi R, Kyrou K, Simoni A, Siniscalchi C, Katsanos D, Gribble M, Baker D, Marois E, Russell S, et al. A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive system targeting female reproduction in the malaria mosquito vector *Anopheles gambiae*. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2016; 34:78–83. [PubMed: 26641531]
46. Marshall JM, Buchman A, Sánchez CHM, Akbari OS. Overcoming evolved resistance to population-suppressing homing-based gene drives. *Sci Rep*. 2017; 7:3776. [PubMed: 28630470]
47. Marshall JM, Akbari OS. Can CRISPR-Based Gene Drive Be Confined in the Wild? A Question for Molecular and Population Biology. *ACS Chem Biol*. 2018; doi: 10.1021/acscchembio.7b00923
48. Adelman Z, Akbari O, Bauer J, Bier E, Bloss C, Carter SR, Callender C, Denis AC-S, Cowhey P, Dass B, et al. Rules of the road for insect gene drive research and testing. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2017; 35:716–718. [PubMed: 28787415]
49. Akbari OS, Bellen HJ, Bier E, Bullock SL, Burt A, Church GM, Cook KR, Duchek P, Edwards OR, Esvelt KM, et al. BIOSAFETY. Safeguarding gene drive experiments in the laboratory. *Science*. 2015; 349:927–929. [PubMed: 26229113]
50. Oye KA, Esvelt K, Appleton E, Catteruccia F, Church G, Kuiken T, B-Y, Lightfoot S, McNamara J, Smidler A, Collins JP. Regulating gene drives. *Science*. 2014; 345:626–628. [PubMed: 25035410]

Highlights

- CRISPR-based gene editing has revolutionized functional genomics of insects.
- Gene editing technologies are invaluable tools for advanced insect genome engineering and synthetic biology.
- CRISPR has enabled the development of powerful strategies for insect control such as gene drives.




Figure 1. Strategies for genome editing using CRISPR-based tools

Various gene editing strategies target the genome for dsDNA cleavage with one (panel **a**, **c**, **e**, **g**), two (panel **b**, **d**, **f**, **h–i**), or more (not shown) gRNAs. If a localized random mutation is wanted, the use of a single gRNA could lead to small indels (**c**) through the NHEJ pathway. To obtain large deletions, it is possible to use two gRNAs flanking the DNA fragment to be deleted; a deletion can be achieved without a repair template (**d**) or by providing a single- or double-stranded DNA that would help bridging the two ends to be fused by HDR (**f**, **h**) and obtain predictable sequence contiguity. When the goal is instead the insertion of exogenous cargo sequences, the use of DNA templates helps to do so with base-pair precision at predetermined locations (**e**, **g**). When using single-stranded oligodeoxynucleotides (ssODNs) (**e**) the inserted sequence, limited in size by the oligonucleotide synthesis, can range from few base pairs to ~120 bp (assuming a max oligo length of 200 nt, and homology arms of ~40 nt) (eg.: attP docking sites, FRT or LoxP sequences)[15]. (**g**) shows instead a strategy where a plasmid is used as a template, in this case, 500–1000 bp homology arms are used, and large DNA sequences can be inserted (10+ Kbp). Lastly, a strategy that combines the approaches in (**g**) and (**h**) is diagrammed in (**i**) where a plasmid is used to simultaneously delete an insert DNA sequences with remarkable accuracy [9,13].




Figure 2. Complex genome editing examples

In panel (a) an active genetic element with homology arms and a gRNA to a given genomic location is inserted randomly using a transposable element (represented by the black arrows) (a'); further crossing of such transgenic animal with one carrying a source of Cas9, results in the element copying onto the predetermined location by homology-directed repair (a'') [17]. (b) describes the use of an activation-induced cytidine deaminase (AID), fused to a dead form of Cas9, to target mutagenic DNA base-editing in the neighborhood of the gRNA target site (b'); the endogenous DNA-repair mechanisms repair these mismatches creating occasional mutations in the targeted locus (b'') [19]. (c) describes a strategy that takes advantage of inverted homologous sequences, separated by a gRNA target site, inserted into two separate transgenes (c'); in presence of Cas9 and the appropriate gRNA (in panel (c) they are supplied as transgenes), the gRNA cleaves both locations resulting in four chromosomal fragments with homologous sequences at their ends (c'') which trigger recombination and result in a predictable reciprocal translocation between the darker and the lighter chromosomes carrying the transgenes (c''') [18]. Lastly, panel (d) describes the use of a transgene containing both a Cas9 and a gRNA genes inserted at the location targeted by the gRNA (d'); this arrangement generates an active genetic element capable of cutting the opposing (wild-type) chromosome (d'') and converting it to the same condition (d'''); when this process happens in the germline of an animal it generated a strong gene drive effect which dramatically modifies the inheritance pattern of the genetic construct from Mendelian (d''') to Super-mendelian (d''''') and can be taken advantage of for population suppression or modification applications.