

Caution required for handling genome editing technology

Motoko Araki¹, Kumie Nojima², and Tetsuya Ishii¹

¹ Office of Health and Safety, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0808, Japan

² Molecular Imaging Center, National Institute of Radiological Sciences, Chiba 263-8555, Japan

Genome-editing technology, although a robust tool for genetic engineering, is creating indistinct regulatory boundaries between naturally occurring and modified organisms. However, researchers must act with caution in research and development to avoid misleading society. Furthermore, appropriate regulations should be proactively discussed and established for handling genome-editing technology.

Current conditions

Precise genetic engineering can be achieved in higher organisms through genome editing with nucleases such as zinc finger nucleases (ZFNs), transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs), and the clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeat (CRISPR)/Cas system [1]. Although genome editing has received significant attention owing to its potential applications in plant and/or animal breeding, it has also raised regulatory issues. The artificial nucleases may generate novel organisms that are extremely similar or identical to naturally occurring organisms. Currently, some countries have attempted to establish regulations for handling ZFNs and TALENs, but not yet the CRISPR/Cas system. By contrast, some researchers advocate that organisms modified using genome editing do not fall under the genetically modified organism (GMO) regulations. Yet caution is needed because inappropriate use of genome editing may cause societal problems and loss of opportunities for agricultural and environmental applications. Here we briefly review regulatory responses, scrutinize societal implications, and propose a future direction for the biotechnology of genome editing.

Technical aspects

The genetic material in an organism can be modified using various mutagenesis techniques. Older techniques, such as chemical mutagenesis, produce entirely random mutations, whereas newer techniques, such as those of genetic engineering, can produce site-specific mutations. A GMO is an organism modified using such genetic engineering techniques. The most common type of genetic engineering begins with extracellular DNA manipulation to construct a vector harboring a specific DNA sequence or gene that is intended for transfer. The vector is transduced into cells or directly into an organ-

ism using physical, chemical, or biological methods. The modified cells, such as protoplasts, callus cells, or embryonic stem cells, are used to generate a GMO that harbors the exogenous DNA sequence. When the sequence is derived from an unrelated organism, the process is referred to as transgenesis. When DNA sequences are transferred between closely related organisms, the process is called cisgenesis, particularly in the genetic engineering of plants. Both transgenesis and cisgenesis can be labor intensive and require time-consuming screens to identify GMOs, especially when dealing with higher organisms. Building on the concept of transgenesis and cisgenesis, genome editing is an advanced genetic engineering technology that can directly modify a gene within a genome. This modification is achieved by enzymes that cause double-stranded breaks (DSBs) in target sequences and induce DNA repair through non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ) or homology-directed repair (HDR) (Box 1). The repair systems can subsequently facilitate the efficient creation of the desired mutation even in the genomes of higher organisms. Genome editing causes genetic modifications in which one or a few bases are removed, an amino acid substitution of a protein occurs, or a mutation is completely repaired in the resultant organism genome without leaving marked genetic vestiges following the modifications.

Despite the advantages of genome editing, there are still some technical issues. Obtaining a GMO that has an intentional mutation from among arising variants, albeit less laborious than conventional transgenesis or cisgenesis, continues to require screening. The technology may also cause off-target mutagenesis after attaining the desired modification in a target sequence [1]. The nucleases may fail to induce a biallelic modification in diploid organisms, thereby resulting in an organism with a monoallelic modification [2]. Furthermore, the microinjection of the nuclease mRNAs into zygotes may induce not only germline modifications but also mosaic modifications in which wild-type cells, including germline cells, and genetically modified (GM) cells coexist in the resultant organisms [3]. Therefore, the research done using genome editing must be well controlled, and the resultant organisms require meticulous screening and characterization.

Responses by regulatory agencies

In the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, a 'living modified organism' (the technical legal term that is close to GMO) is stipulated as 'any living organism that possesses a novel combination of genetic material obtained through the use of modern biotechnology' [4]. The use of nucleases such as ZFNs may be outside the scope of current GMO

Corresponding authors: Ishii, T. (tishii@general.hokudai.ac.jp, tetsuya.ishii0302@gmail.com).

0167-7799/\$ – see front matter

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2014.03.005>

Box 1. Genome editing technology and GMO regulations*DNA repair pathways used in genome editing [1]*

- Non-homologous end-joining (NHEJ) is a DNA double-strand break (DSB) repair pathway that ligates or joins two broken ends together without a homologous template for repair, thus leading to the introduction of small insertions and deletions at the site of the DSB.
- Homology-directed repair (HDR) is a template-dependent pathway for DSB repair, using a homology-containing donor template along with a site-specific nuclease, enabling the insertion of single or multiple transgenes in addition to single-nucleotide substitutions.

Zinc finger nuclease (ZFN) technologies used in plant breeding techniques [11]

- ZFN-1: NHEJ is used to introduce site-specific random mutations (substitutions, deletions and insertions) involving one or a few base pairs.
- ZFN-2: HDR with a short repair template is used to generate site-specific desired mutations and the copying of the repair template.
- ZFN-3: HDR with a large stretch of DNA is used to cause site-specific transgenesis (targeted gene addition or replacement).

Legislation and guidelines relevant to the section 'Responses by regulatory agencies'

- Argentina: the National Biosafety Framework (Developed under the United Nations Environment Program – Global Environment Facility Biosafety Project).
- Australia: the Gene Technology Act 2000.
- EU: the Regulation (EC) 1829/2003 on Genetically Modified Food and Feed.
- New Zealand: the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1998.
- USA: 7 CFR Part 340 – Introduction of organisms and products altered or produced through genetic engineering which are plant pests or which there is reason to believe are plant pests.

regulations, including the Cartagena Protocol, because these regulations largely depend on the existence of an exogenous DNA sequence in the resultant organisms. At present, some countries have attempted to establish regulations for the agricultural use of three types of ZFN (Box 1) and TALEN. The major issue is whether plants modified using genome editing fall under existing GMO regulations. However, there are two types of GMO regulations: product-based and process-based approaches [5]. For instance, the USA has adopted product-based regulations under which health and environmental risks associated with a GMO are assessed according to the final product. By contrast, in the EU, GMOs are subject to process-based regulations involving a detailed procedure based on a scientific assessment of the risks to human health and the environment. The differences in these GMO regulatory approaches may be reflected in the regulations of genome editing technology.

Argentina

In 2011, a preliminary view of the regulatory criteria for new plant technologies, including genome editing, was expressed in a regulatory workshop [6]. Although plants developed using ZFN-3 would fall under their product and process-based regulations, ZFN-1 might not be regulated under the Argentinian regulatory framework (Box 1). Moreover, it was stated that ZFN-2 would be regulated on a case-by-case basis if its use entails the introduction of coding sequences.

Australia and New Zealand

In 2012, the Food Standards Australia New Zealand GMO workshop concluded that plants generated using ZFN-3

should be regulated as GMOs [7]. By contrast, they concluded that ZFN-1 and ZFN-2 should not be regulated owing to their similarity to traditional mutagenic techniques. Against this backdrop, the Australian Office of the Gene Technology Regulator stated in a 2011 review of the current act that the product-based regulatory oversight of new organisms generated using tools such as ZFNs requires improvement [8] (Box 1). In 2013, the New Zealand and Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) committee declared that plants modified with ZFN-1 and TALENs are not GMOs under the act (Box 1), despite repeated statements from New Zealand EPA staff that the resultant organisms are GMOs [9]. The Sustainability Council, an independent council that undertakes research into genetic engineering issues, believes that the New Zealand EPA misinterpreted the act and is currently appealing the decision in the High Court [10].

EU

In 2010, the EU carried out a study of the new plant breeding techniques (NBTs), in which genetic and epigenetic changes in the plant genome as well as the possibility of detection of these changes were evaluated [11] (Box 1). In 2012, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) GMO panel issued a scientific report concluding that 'breeding' with ZFN-3 might minimize the hazards from food and feed products derived from plants with the induced disruption of a gene because ZFN-3 facilitates DNA insertion into a predefined region of the genome, unlike traditional transgenesis or cisgenesis [12]. Additionally, they stated that ZFN-3 may be assessed under the European Community regulations (Box 1). At present, the EFSA expresses no opinions regarding regulations on ZFN-1 and ZFN-2.

USA

In 2012, the US Department of Agriculture informed a private enterprise that a GM plant developed using ZFNs with no exogenous DNA insertion would fall outside the regulations [APHIS responded to an inquiry from Dow AgroSciences regarding the regulatory status of organisms modified using their zinc finger technology (EXZACT). March 8, 2012. http://www.aphis.usda.gov/biotechnology/downloads/reg_loi/APHIS_response_DOW_ZFN_IPK1_030812.pdf] (Box 1). This seems to indicate a possible exemption for ZFN-1 in the product-based regulations.

Blurring of regulatory boundaries

ZFN-1 and ZFN-2 seem to blur the current boundaries of product- and process-based regulations (Figure 1). However, on closer examination, the positions of ZFN-1 and ZFN-2 differ significantly in the product-based versus the process-based regulations. ZFN-1 is outside the scope of product-based regulations but partly within the scope of process-based regulations. This implies that the regulatory position of ZFN-1 depends on whether a country adopts product-based or process-based regulations. By contrast, ZFN-2 has both regulated and unregulated positions, although the existence or use of a short repair template varies its classification by different countries (Figure 1).

Although the regulatory response to genome editing is complicated, the current regulatory landscape suggests

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/37103>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/37103>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)