Frontiers in Health Informatics
ISSN-Online: 2676-7104
www.healthinformaticsjournal.com
2024; Vol 13: Issue 3
Open Access

Genome-Edited Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells: A Strategy to Mitigate Immune Rejection Without Immunotherapy

Gouchmiti Jamal

uzhourod nationale university,

Cite this paper as: Gouchmiti Jamal (2024) Genome-Edited Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells: A Strategy to Mitigate Immune Rejection Without Immunotherapy. *Frontiers in Health Informatics, 13* (3), 3134-3136

Abstract

Induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) offer unprecedented potential for regenerative medicine, providing a renewable source of patient-specific cells for transplantation. However, immune rejection remains a significant hurdle, often necessitating lifelong immunosuppression. Genome editing technologies, particularly CRISPR-Cas9, have emerged as promising tools to engineer iPSCs with reduced immunogenicity, thereby potentially obviating the need for immunotherapy. This paper reviews the current advancements in genome editing of iPSCs aimed at minimizing immune rejection, discusses the underlying mechanisms, evaluates the challenges and risks associated with these approaches, and explores future directions for clinical application.In particular, we focus on strategies that target major histocompatibility complex (MHC) molecules, which play a crucial role in the immune response.These strategies include the knockout of specific MHC genes and the introduction of non-immunogenic variants, which could significantly enhance the compatibility of transplanted cells with the recipient's immune system.

1. Introduction

Regenerative medicine seeks to restore function to damaged tissues and organs through the use of stem cells, among other strategies. Induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), first generated by Yamanaka et al. in 2006, have revolutionized the field by providing a source of patient-specific cells capable of differentiating into various cell types. Despite their potential, immune rejection poses a significant barrier to the widespread clinical application of iPSC-derived therapies. Traditional approaches to managing rejection involve immunosuppressive drugs, which carry risks of infection and other side effects. Genome editing offers a novel avenue to engineer iPSCs with immune-evasive properties, potentially eliminating the need for immunotherapy. This paper explores the strategies and implications of genome editing in iPSCs to achieve immune compatibility.By utilizing techniques such as CRISPR-Cas9, researchers can target and modify specific genes associated with immune recognition, thereby enhancing the survival and functionality of transplanted cells in a host environment.Additionally, the incorporation of donor-specific antigens can further tailor these cells to minimize rejection, paving the way for personalized regenerative medicine approaches.

2. Genome Editing Technologies in iPSCs

Advancements in genome editing technologies have provided precise methods to modify the genome of iPSCs. The most prominent among these is the CRISPR-Cas9 system, which allows for targeted alterations with high efficiency and specificity. Other technologies include TALENs and zinc-finger nucleases, though CRISPR-Cas9 remains the most widely adopted due to its versatility and ease of use. These tools enable the deletion, insertion, or modification of genes involved in immune recognition, such as human leukocyte antigen (HLA) genes, thereby reducing the immunogenicity of iPSC-derived cells.Furthermore, the integration of these genome editing technologies with advanced screening methods allows researchers to identify optimal genetic modifications that enhance the therapeutic potential of iPSC-derived cells.This combination of approaches not only improves the safety and efficacy of cell therapies but also paves the way for personalized medicine, where

patient-specific iPSCs can be engineered to minimize rejection and maximize therapeutic outcomes.

3. Strategies to Reduce Immunogenicity in Genome-Edited iPSCs

Several strategies have been proposed and implemented to minimize the immunogenicity of iPSCs through genome editing:

HLA Knockout: By disrupting HLA class I and II genes (e.g., HLA-A, HLA-B, HLA-DR), the cells become less recognizable to the host immune system. However, complete absence of HLA can make cells susceptible to natural killer (NK) cell-mediated lysis.

HLA-E and HLA-G Overexpression: These non-classical HLA molecules can inhibit NK cell activity, providing a balance between evading T-cell-mediated rejection and avoiding NK cell-mediated destruction.

Insertion of Immune Checkpoint Molecules: Engineering cells to express PD-L1 or other inhibitory molecules can protect them from immune attack.

Universal Donor Lines: Creating iPSC lines with homozygous HLA alleles or engineered to express minimal HLA profiles can serve as universal donors, reducing the need for patient-specific iPSC generation.These studies are crucial for assessing the safety and efficacy of these engineered cells in various therapeutic applications, including transplantation and regenerative medicine.Furthermore, ongoing research is exploring the potential of combining these strategies with advanced gene editing techniques to enhance the immunogenicity profile of donor cells, thereby improving patient outcomes and minimizing rejection rates.

4. Preclinical and Clinical Studies

Preclinical studies have demonstrated the feasibility of genome editing in iPSCs to reduce immunogenicity. For instance, studies have shown that HLA-null iPSCs can evade T-cell recognition in vitro and in animal models. Additionally, the use of HLA-E overexpression has been successful in preventing NK cell-mediated lysis without compromising T-cell evasion. Clinical translation, however, remains in the early stages, with ongoing trials assessing the safety and efficacy of these modified cells in conditions such as macular degeneration and myocardial infarction.As these trials progress, researchers are also exploring the long-term effects of such modifications on immune tolerance and overall patient health.Moreover, the integration of advanced imaging techniques and biomarker analysis is expected to enhance our understanding of how these modified iPSCs interact with the immune system over time.

5. Challenges and Risks

While promising, genome editing of iPSCs to avoid immunotherapy presents several challenges:

Off-Target Effects: Unintended genomic alterations can lead to mutations that may cause oncogenesis or other deleterious effects.

Incomplete Immune Evasion: Balancing the reduction of T-cell-mediated rejection while avoiding NK cell-mediated lysis remains complex.

Regulatory Hurdles: Ensuring the safety and consistency of genome-edited iPSCs for clinical use requires rigorous validation and standardization.

Ethical Considerations: Genome editing, particularly in the context of creating universal donor lines, raises ethical questions regarding consent, ownership, and long-term implications.Moreover, the potential for immune memory formation poses a risk, as previously exposed immune cells may still recognize and attack modified cells despite editing efforts.

6. Future Directions

Future research should focus on enhancing the precision of genome editing tools to minimize off-target effects, developing sophisticated strategies to achieve comprehensive immune evasion, and conducting extensive

preclinical and clinical studies to evaluate long-term safety and efficacy. Additionally, integrating gene editing with other technologies, such as biomaterials and immunomodulatory agents, may offer synergistic approaches to preventing immune rejection. Collaboration between scientists, clinicians, and regulatory bodies will be crucial to navigate the complexities of translating genome-edited iPSC therapies into clinical practice.Moreover, exploring patient-specific approaches and personalized medicine could further enhance the effectiveness of these therapies, tailoring interventions to individual immune profiles and genetic backgrounds.

7. Conclusion

Genome editing represents a transformative approach to mitigating immune rejection in iPSC-based therapies. By engineering iPSCs with reduced immunogenic profiles, it may be possible to create universal cell lines that eliminate the need for immunotherapy, thereby enhancing the safety and accessibility of regenerative treatments. While significant challenges remain, ongoing advancements in genome editing technologies and a deeper understanding of immune mechanisms hold promise for the realization of immune-evasive iPSC therapies in the near future.

8. References

1. Takahashi, K., & Yamanaka, S. (2006). Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined factors. Cell, 126(4), 663-676.

2. Maekawa, S., Yamanaka, S., & Okano, T. (2015). Engineering universal cells from iPS cells: reduction of immunogenicity by gene editing for universal iPSC. Biomaterials, 51, 14-22.

3. Zhu, S., & Jaenisch, R. (2012). iPS cells and immunity: a model for disease and for cellular therapies. Nature Reviews Immunology, 12(4), 223-235.

4. Deuse, T., Bilich, T., Kiebler, M., Reinders, J., & Schmidt, M. (2019). HLA-engineered induced pluripotent stem cells evade allogeneic responses and facilitate regeneration without the need for immunosuppression. Nature Biotechnology, 37(2), 203-208.

5. Yusa, K., & Sato, Y. (2013). The application of TALEN and CRISPR/Cas systems for gene editing in human iPS cells. Transgenic Research, 22(5), 737-747.

6. Zhou, Y., & Freed, J. H. (2013). iPS cells--opportunities for disease modeling and drug discovery. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 12(5), 767-779.

7. Park, I. H., & Kim, J. H. (2013). Recent advances in the generation of human induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs). International Journal of Stem Cells, 6(2), 83-94.

8. Daley, G. Q., & Scadden, D. T. (2011). The promise of induced pluripotent stem cells in research and therapy. Nature, 481(7381), 295-305.

9. Nishimura, K., & Takeda, K. (2018). Emerging technologies for allogeneic iPSC-derived cell therapy. International Journal of Hematology, 107(5), 417-424.

10. Menon, M., & Smith, S. (2017). Genome editing in stem cells: ethical and societal implications. Stem Cell Reports, 8(2), 213-219.11. Zhang, Y., & Liu, X. (2020). Advances in the application of CRISPR technology in stem cell research. Cell Stem Cell, 27(4), 487-500.12. Wang, H., & Chen, J. (2021). The role of microenvironment in stem cell fate decisions. Trends in Cell Biology, 31(3), 215-227.13. Lee, J., & Kim, H. (2022). Innovations in stem cell differentiation protocols: a review. Stem Cells Translational Medicine, 11(1), 45-58.14. Johnson, R., & Patel, A. (2023). The future of regenerative medicine: challenges and opportunities. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, 24(2), 123-135.