THE EVOLVING PICTURE IN OBTAINING GENETICALLY MODIFIED LIVESTOCK
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Abstract: Genetically modified livestock are farm animals that were subject to modification of an endogenous DNA sequence or introduction of exogenous DNA into their genome. Genetically modified livestock have great potential as models for studies of human diseases, for more efficient meat and dairy production, for xenotransplantation, and for production of highly-demanded products for human health. Different methods have been defined for obtention of genetically modified livestock, with varying efficiencies, limitations and advantages. The review aims to describe a brief history on obtention of genetically modified livestock, its major hurdles, current approaches for their obtention, and future perspectives on the technology.
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UMA VISÃO EM EVOLUÇÃO DA OBTENÇÃO DE ANIMAIS DE PRODUÇÃO GENETICAMENTE MODIFICADOS

Resumo: Animais de produção geneticamente modificados são aqueles que tiveram uma sequência de DNA endógena modificada ou um DNA exógeno introduzido em seu genoma. Animais de produção geneticamente modificados apresentam grande potencial como modelo para estudo de doenças humanas, para produção mais eficiente de carne e derivados do leite, para xenotransplante e para produção de produtos sob grande demanda para saúde humana. Diferentes abordagens têm sido descritas para obtenção de animais de produção geneticamente modificados, as quais apresentam eficiências, vantagens e limitações variáveis. O objetivo da revisão é descrever o histórico da obtenção de animais de produção geneticamente modificados, os principais obstáculos, abordagens atuais e perspectiva futuras sobre a tecnologia.

INTRODUCTION

The first influence of humankind on livestock genomes was by the process of domestication over the past 10,000 years (BRUFORD et al., 2003; WIENER; WILKINSON, 2011; LARSON; BURGER, 2013). Another significant event that hugely affected the genetic composition of livestock populations was the advent of breed formation (WIENER; WILKINSON, 2011; WANG et al., 2014). From the twentieth century onward, multiple developments on animal breeding methodologies led to significant progress on livestock quantitative genetic selection (LUSH, 1951; HENDERSON, 1975; GIANOLA; ROSA, 2015), despite limited understanding of the genetic basis of such traits (HAYES et al., 2013; GIANOLA; ROSA, 2015). More importantly, these processes rely on selective breeding to obtain more favorable livestock genotypes, and genetic merit is mostly based on phenotypes alone, genotyping for major genes, or genomic selection based on association between DNA variation and phenotypic data (MEUWISSEN et al., 2001; HAYES et al., 2013; GIANOLA; ROSA, 2015).

The first genetically modified mammalian cell was obtained by co-incubation of naked DNA and rabbit sperm cells (BRACKETT et al., 1971). These sperm cells carrying exogenous DNA were capable of fertilizing eggs and stably transmitting it to the embryo genome (BRACKETT et al., 1971). The production of the first transgenic animal was performed by introduction of simian virus 40 sequences in mouse early embryos, to recapitulate viral-induced oncogenesis in newborn mice (JAENISCH; MINTZ, 1974). Curiously, these retroviral sequences were epigenetically silenced by DNA methylation, and pups were protected from the disease (JAENISCH; MINTZ, 1974; JähNER et al., 1982). However, these reports did not envision the potential of genetic modification of the mammalian germ-line, as described below.

Later efforts demonstrated the feasibility of genetically modifying the genome by introduction exogenous DNA (transgene) into mouse early embryos (GORDON et al., 1980; BRINSTER et al., 1985; HAMMER et al., 1985; WALL, 1996, 2001). Under similar experimental conditions, genetically modified livestock embryos were produced (BREM et al., 1985; HAMMER...
et al., 1985), but live animals were obtained years later (Figure 1). At this stage, cattle had been considered the most difficult livestock species to modify its genome (CLARK, 2002).

Figure 1. Timeline of developments to obtain live-born genetically modified livestock.
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After these original reports, extensive work has been devoted to improving the generation of genetically modified laboratory and livestock species (EYESTONE, 1994; CAPECCHI, 1989, 2005; FREITAS et al., 2012; POLEJAEVA, 2016; ROGERS, 2016; LOTTI et al., 2017). Several routes were taken to improve the efficiency and type of genetic modification in livestock genomes over almost three decades of intense investigation (NIEMANN; KUES, 2003; POLEJAEVA, 2016; ROGERS, 2016). A careful analysis of the literature suggested that three arbitrary periods can be envisioned during the development of genetically modified livestock (Figure 2). The review aimed to describe these three periods by providing a brief history on genetically modified livestock production (cattle, pigs, sheep, and goats), its
significant hurdles, current approaches for their production, and future perspectives.

Figure 2. The three periods of the development of genetically-modified livestock.


**THE FIRST PERIOD: INITIAL REPORTS OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED LIVESTOCK**

The introduction of exogenous DNA into zygotes was the first approach developed that led to the small-scale production of genetically modified livestock (EYESTONE, 1994; WALL, 1996, 2001; CLARK, 2002). This procedure, also known as the pronuclear injection (Figure 3A), consists of the introduction of transgene copies into zygote pronuclei by ultra-thin needles using micromanipulators (GORDON et al., 1980; BREM et al., 1985; HAMMER et al., 1985). Embryos can be cultured after injection, to
identify surviving structures, or transferred immediately to recipient females (GORDON et al., 1980; EYESTONE, 1994). Newborn transgenic offspring obtained by pronuclear injection are genotyped for transgene integration and the number of copies (COUSENS et al., 1994; EYESTONE, 1994, 1999). Genetically modified livestock are then raised until puberty and tested for germ-line transmission (EYESTONE, 1994, 1999). Founder germ-line genetically modified animals can then be propagated by natural mating or assisted reproductive technologies (ART) to increase their numbers (EYESTONE et al., 1999; CLARK, 2002; BALDASSARRE et al., 2004).

Although its simplicity and several proof-of-principle reports, pronuclear injection holds several limitations: requires many embryos (e.g., ~150-1,000 injected zygotes per transgenic animal), embryo survival after injection is relatively low, may generate mosaic animals, and requires germ-line transmission testing (EYESTONE, 1994, 1999; CLARK, 2002). Moreover, transgenes form tandem head-to-tail sequences upon injection, may hold variable copy number integration, and its expression may vary due to position effect (PARK, 2007).

Despite the surmountable number of challenges posed to the obtention of genetically modified livestock, such conditions allowed the establishment of initial animal models and set the stage for some relevant applications (Table 1), particularly of pharmaceutical proteins in the milk of goats and cattle (MELO et al., 2007). Under the perspective proposed here, these developments characterize the first period of obtention of genetically modified livestock (Figure 2).

**THE SECOND PERIOD: ASSISTED REPRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES AND GENE TARGETING**

The second period is characterized by the substantial development of ART (Figure 2), particularly in cattle (HASLER, 2014; LONERGAN; FAIR, 2016), and less intensively in small ruminants and pigs (PARAMIO; IZQUIERDO, 2014). The *in vitro* production (IVP) of preimplantation embryos became a large-scale tool for commercial operations in cattle, where hundreds of thousands of offspring are born each year (LONERGAN; FAIR, 2016). It offered an attractive approach to generate zygotes for pronuclear injection (EYESTONE, 1999; BALDASSARRE et al., 2003), despite the lower developmental
Table 1. — A survey of key applications of genetically modified livestock.

| Major Fields               | Key Applications (Period
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type of Genetic Modification</th>
<th>Method to Obtain GM Animals</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Models</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Gene Targeting</td>
<td>IVP; SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Gain-of-Function or Gene Targeting</td>
<td>PI; SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased Meat Production</td>
<td>Myostatin Knockout</td>
<td>IVP; PI; SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Production</td>
<td>Enriched Milk Composition</td>
<td>Gain-of-Function</td>
<td>PI; SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pollness</td>
<td>Gene Targeting</td>
<td>SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disease Resistance</td>
<td>Gain-of-Function or Gene Targeting</td>
<td>SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metabolic Traits</td>
<td>Gain-of-Function</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopharming</td>
<td>Human Antibodies</td>
<td>Artificial Chromosome</td>
<td>SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Recombinant</td>
<td>Gain-of-Function</td>
<td>PI; SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proteins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenotransplantation</td>
<td>Organ Xenografts</td>
<td>Gain-of-Function or Gene Targeting</td>
<td>SCNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Gene Targeting</td>
<td>BI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

potential of IVP embryos (CLARK, 2002).

Another major distinction of the second period was the initial efforts on gene knockouts by homologous recombination in sheep (MCCREATH et al., 2000; DENNING et al., 2001), pigs (LAI et al., 2002; DAI et al., 2002; PHELPS et al., 2003), and cattle (KUROIWA et al., 2004) (Figure 1). This later development was technically-based on pioneered work in the mouse (CAPECCHI, 1989, 2005). Several ART-based methods have been described as alternative routes to pronuclear injection, to obtain of genetically modified livestock (Figure 3), as described below.

Genetically-modified livestock using sperm-mediated methods

The observation that sperm cells uptake nucleic acid made it as a new method for introduction of foreign DNA into mammalian genomes (BRACKETT et al., 1971) (Figure 3A). However, this first report did not receive much attention, and sperm-mediated method gained broader attention when revisited almost two decades later (LAVITRANO et al., 1989; GANDOLFI, 2000). Proof-of-principle work in several species demonstrated that this approach could be used for obtaining of transgenic livestock, even using artificial insemination alone (GANDOLFI, 2000; LAVITRANO et al., 2006).

The process of transgene uptake by sperm cells occurs in two steps (NIU; LIANG, 2008). Firstly, it initiates with exogenous DNA binding to sperm cells and its internalization. Secondly, transgene copies are integrated into the sperm genome in a permanent fashion (NIU; LIANG, 2008). However, the application of this method remains limited by growing skepticism due to its low reproducibility (GANDOLFI, 2000; EGHBALSAIED et al., 2013). A better understanding of the mechanism by which sperm cells uptake DNA molecules and the identification of factors that affect this process should receive more significant attention.

An alternative approach to use sperm cells for transgenesis is through intracytoplasmatic sperm injection (ICSI) into eggs (Figure 3A), as described in the mouse (PERRY et al., 1999; MOISYADI et al., 2009). Physical damage compromises sperm motility but facilitates transgene uptake by sperm cells (PERRY et al., 2001). Although efficient in mice and primates (KIMURA; YANAGIMACHI, 1995; PERRY et al., 1999), ICSI is inefficient and not
The evolving picture in...

Figure 3. Application of assisted reproduction technologies (ART) to obtain genetically modified livestock. Efficiencies are outlined for most-widely used ARTs.


replicable in livestock, since eggs are not readily activated by the process and ICSI embryos have low in vivo developmental potential (GARCÍA-ROSELLó et al., 2009; LóPEZ-SAUCEDO et al., 2012). Future developments on ICSI technology in livestock may motivate to revisit it on the future for germ-line modification.

Genetically modified livestock using egg-mediated methods

Another approach is the delivery of transgenes directly into oocytes or eggs (Figure 3A), as described in mouse and cattle systems (CHAN et al., 1998; PERRY et al., 2001; HOFMANN et al., 2004). Initially, retroviral vectors
were used to transfer transgenes to bovine oocytes at high efficiency (CHAN et al., 1998). Infection by retroviruses requires replicative cells, mainly using cells in metaphase, due to the absence of a nuclear envelope. This fact poses metaphase II (MII)-arrested eggs as an attractive cell type (CHAN et al., 1998; HOFMANN et al., 2004). In cattle, oocyte-mediated transgenesis using retrieval vectors was more efficient than pronuclear injection and perivitelline injection in zygotes (CHAN et al., 1998). However, transgene silencing was observed in newborn transgenic calves (CHAN et al., 1998).

The use of lentivirus allows more efficient transgene integration and stable activity in embryonic cells, thus circumventing silencing (HOFMANN et al., 2004). Oocyte-mediated transgenesis in mice permitted the introduction of larger transgenes (10-170 kilobases) or artificial chromosomes into resulting preimplantation embryos and offspring (PERRY et al., 2001). Due to construct size, larger transgenes were co-incubated with sperm heads and delivered into oocytes during ICSI (PERRY et al., 2001). For livestock, this method could now be revisited with the new molecular tools available, as described below.

**Genetically modified livestock using somatic cell nuclear transfer**

Animal cloning by somatic cell nuclear transfer (SCNT) gave another perspective on the production of genetically modified livestock (Figure 3B). Shortly after these initial reports on cloned mammals (WILMUT et al., 1997; WAKAYAMA et al., 1998; KATO et al., 1998; MOURA, 2012; KEEFER, 2015), several species were cloned using transgenic somatic cells (SCHNIEKE et al., 1997; CIBELLI et al., 1998; BONDIOLI et al., 2001). The exception to this rule was the first report on goat cloning, which already used transgenic donor cells (BAGUISI et al., 1999). A significant advantage of this approach was the possibility to modify primary cells genetically and select for transgenic cell clones before its use for SCNT (HOFMAN et al., 2004; LISAUSKAS et al., 2007). Therefore, cloned transgenic cattle are assured for transgene germ-line transmission (BORDIGNON et al., 2003).

There are two limiting factors on production of transgenic cattle using SCNT. Firstly, primary cultures of somatic cells have a limited replicative capacity (TOMINAGA et al., 2002), thus limiting their expansion and clonal selection (MCCREATH et al., 2000; DENNING et al., 2001). This limitation is often reduced by usage of fetal cells, but multiples rounds of genetic
modification would require recovery of cloned fetuses for SCNT (Figure 3B), in a process often called re-cloning (KUROIWA et al., 2004). Another limiting factor is the low efficiency of SCNT to produce viable offspring (WILMUT et al., 2002; KEEFER, 2015). Although some protocol modifications have increased its efficiency (LOI et al., 2016), more impactful improvements are still in demand to increase SCNT efficiency.

One alternative to increase SCNT efficiency would be to use less differentiated cells as donors, which are more amenable for cellular reprogramming (CIBELLI et al., 1998a; HOCHEDLINGER; JAENISCH, 2002). However, progenitor cells or adult stem cells are difficult to establish primary cultures (CHEN et al., 2015b) and pluripotent stem cells have not been described in livestock (EZASHI et al., 2016; SOTO; ROSS, 2016). Thus, the growing understanding of cellular reprogramming may lead to attractive strategies to improve SCNT efficiency (YAMANAKA; BLAU, 2010; JULLIEN et al., 2011; TAKAHASHI; YAMANAKA, 2015; KRAUSE et al., 2016).

Genetically modified livestock using pluripotent stem cells

The challenge that is presented by the low nuclear reprogramming efficiency during SCNT could be circumvented by methods using pluripotent cells (Figure 3C). The advent of embryonic stem (ES) cells revolutionized mouse genetics due to their feasibility to introduce exogenous DNA and ease targeted edition of the genome (GOSSLER et al., 1986; CAPECCHI, 1989, 2005). The ES-cell phenotype holds two hallmark biological features: the potential to form any cell type in the body and an unlimited proliferative capacity (EVANS; KAUFFMAN, 1981; MARTIN, 1981; WOBUS; BOHELER, 2005; BUEHR et al., 2008). The ES cell is functionally equivalent to inner cell mass cells of the blastocyst (NAGY et al., 1990), since their introduction into preimplantation embryos leads to ES-derived contribution to all mouse tissues, including the germ-line (BRADLEY et al., 1984; NAGY et al., 1990; SMITH, 2001).

These cellular features allow ES cells to be genetically modified by simples means, such as electroporation or lipofection when found in single cell suspensions (GOSSLER et al., 1986). Transgenic ES cell clones can be isolated and readily expanded by negative and-or positive selection (CAPECCHI
Injection of transgenic ES cells into mouse blastocysts generates chimeric pups carrying transgenic and non-transgenic cells (GOSSLER et al., 1986; KOLLER et al., 1989). The mating of chimeric transgenic mice with their wild-type counterparts generate transgenic and non-transgenic progeny (GOSSLER et al., 1986). Moreover, injection of transgenic mouse ES cells into tetraploid preimplantation embryos leads to newborn mice fully-derived from ES cells, since tetraploid embryos contribute exclusively to the placenta (NAGY et al., 1990, 1993; EGGAN et al., 2002).

The mating of chimeric transgenic mice with their wild-type counterparts generate transgenic and non-transgenic progeny (GOSSLER et al., 1986). The establishment of livestock ES cells has not been described (EZASHI et al., 2016; SOTO; ROSS, 2016). Livestock ES-like cells are readily obtained (WHEELER, 1994; BEHBOODI et al., 2013). They show morphology of undifferentiated cells and are prone to spontaneous differentiation in embryos bodies or teratoma assays (WHEELER, 1994; CIBELLI et al., 1998b; SAITO et al., 2003; BEHBOODI et al., 2013). However, limited ES-derived tissue contribution in vivo has been described and no germ-line transmission for livestock species (WHEELER, 1994; CIBELLI et al., 1998b; SOTO; ROSS, 2016). Culture conditions used for human and mouse ES cells do not maintain livestock ES pluripotency. Thus identification of signaling pathways that contribute to their ES self-renewal is paramount (VERMA et al., 2013; EZASHI et al., 2016; SILVA et al., 2017).

Future research on the more efficient production of livestock tetraploid embryos is also advisable (HE et al., 2013; RAZZA et al., 2016), since raising ES-derived chimeric livestock for germ-line transmission is expected to be expensive, due to high maintenance costs and extended generation intervals required for germ-line transmission testing.

An possible attractive alternative to ES technology in livestock was the development of induced pluripotent stem (iPS) cells (Takahashi; Yamanaka, 2006; OKITA et al., 2007; WERNIG et al., 2007; OGOREVC et al., 2016; SOTO; ROSS, 2016; SILVA et al., 2017). The combined ectopic expression of different sets of pluripotency-associated genes triggers cellular reprogramming that coverts somatic cells into pluripotent counterparts (Takahashi; Yamanaka, 2006, 2015; KRAUSE et al., 2016). In cattle and other livestock, iPS cells show morphology, growth traits and in vitro differentiation potential resembling pluripotent cells (OGOREVC et al., 2016). However, these iPS cells are dependent on ectopic expression of
reprogramming factors, thus are unlikely to be fully pluripotent, are also expected to rely on yet unidentified self-renewal conditions, and their germ-line contribution also needs to be demonstrated (SOTO; ROSS, 2016; SILVA et al., 2017). Under such circumstances, ES-like can only be destined for SCNT (CIBELLI et al., 1998b), albeit at a not very encouraging efficiency.

THE THIRD PERIOD: NOVEL MOLECULAR TOOLS FOR GENOME EDITING

The third period is marked by some progress on construct delivery systems and the availability of highly efficient molecular tools for genome editing (Figure 2). Although the combination of the targeted locus by homologous recombination in somatic cells and its use for SCNT proved to be reliable (MCCREATH et al., 2000; DENNING et al., 2001), its low efficiency and labor-intensiveness limited its adoption. Therefore, the production of genetically-modified livestock, using gene-targeting remained as a costly technology. At this stage of its development, the two major limiting factors for efficient production of genetically modified livestock remained, namely construct delivery and its integration into the genome. Several efforts were devoted to meet such demands (WALL, 2002), and are described below (Table 2).

The first attempt to genetically increase construct delivery was made using retroviral vectors by co-incubation with cleavage-stage embryos and blastocysts (SQUIRE et al., 1989; KIM et al., 1993; HASKELL; BOWEN, 1995). This approach led to transgenic embryos and fetuses with multiple proviral integrations, suggestive of negligible mosaicism and possible germ-line contribution (HASKELL; BOWEN, 1995). However, retroviral vectors infect only mitotic cells and are subject to silencing in pluripotency cells (CHAN et al., 1998). The advent of lentiviral vectors improved transduction efficiency, including non-dividing cells and are functional in pluripotent cells (HOFMANN et al., 2003, 2004; PARK, 2007). The main disadvantages of such vectors are their limited construct size, an inability for genome editing and its high transduction efficiency is limited to zygotes (PARK, 2007).

The primary shift brought in the third period came from the availability of designer nucleases (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015; WANG, 2015). Three nuclease-based systems are now routinely used for livestock genome editing, namely zinc finger nucleases (ZFN), transcription activator-like effector
Table 2. — Association of construct delivery strategies and gene editing tools to obtain genetically modified livestock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Construct Delivery</th>
<th>Gene Editing Tool</th>
<th>Production of Mosaics</th>
<th>Germ-line Transmission</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sperm</td>
<td>AI, IVP</td>
<td>CI, VV</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Gandolfi, 2000; Lavitrano et al., 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oocyte or Egg</td>
<td>IVP</td>
<td>VV</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Hofmann et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zygote</td>
<td>IVV, IVP</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Eyestone, 1994; Wall, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IVV, IVP</td>
<td>PI, EP, VV</td>
<td>ZFN, CRISPR, TALEN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Petersen and Niemann, 2015 Sato et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic Cells*</td>
<td>SCNT</td>
<td>VV, MI, EP, LP</td>
<td>HR, ZFN, CRISPR, TALEN</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Cibelli et al., 1998; Dai et al., 2002; Kuroiwa et al., 2002; Hofmann et al., 2004; Petersen and Niemann, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nucleases (TALEN), and clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats/CRISPR-associated protein 9 (CRISPR/Cas9) (WANG, 2015). These nucleases create a double-strand break (DSB) at the desired site in the genome, due to its DNA-binding and cleavage domains (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015). Gene targeting by HR applies relatively long targeting vectors homologous to the gene to be targeted, while the cellular machinery performs the HR event (CAPECCHI, 1989, 2005; PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015). The HR approach allows both the generation of gene knock-outs and knock-ins, albeit at low efficiency (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015).

The ZFN technology consists of DNA binding domain formed by at least two zinc finger motifs and a cleavage domain of the FokI endonuclease (WANG, 2015). The ZFN forms a DSB in the targeted site and the cleavage site is repaired by non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) or HR (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015). All dominant livestock species have been subject to genome editing by ZFN (Figure 1), while more reports are expected to be described in the near future.

The transcription activator-like effector (TALE) consists of 33–35 amino-acid repeats with two polymorphisms at positions 12 and 13, which are coined as the repeat variable di-residue (RVD) (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015). Each RVD binds specifically to one nucleotide of genomic DNA, conferring a code for protein-DNA interaction at a single base resolution. Different combinations of TALEs allow the targeted recognition of a single genomic site (WANG, 2015). A TALE can be linked to a FokI endonuclease to form a TALEN, thus allowing targeted edition of the genome (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015; WANG, 2015). TALEN DSB sites are repairs by NHEJ or HR (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015). Gene-edited livestock animals became available shortly after their ZFN-targeted counterparts (Figure 1).

The most recently developed designer nucleases was the clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats / CRISPR-associated protein 9 (CRISPR/Cas9) system (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015; WANG, 2015). This system has a single-guided RNA molecule for targeted sequence recognition and the CAS9 nuclease for DNA cleavage (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015). Although it holds a similar efficiency to ZFN and TALEN systems, it is easier to design, requires less labor and is more cost-effective than previous methods (PETERSEN; RIEMANN, 2015; WANG, 2015). By this fact, gene-edited
livestock has been described in recent years with CRISPR/Cas9 (Figure 1), far more than the other systems, particularly in pigs.

These three designer nucleases may be used in somatic cells destined for SCNT, but more recently in zygotes (Table 2). This advantage may now circumvent the requirement of ART technologies (Figure 1) since in vivo-produced zygotes can be transformed by electroporation or possibly other relatively simple delivery systems (SATO et al., 2016). The production of genetically modified livestock now offers several unprecedented opportunities for basic research, and both agricultural and biomedical industries (Table 1). Several animal models (PERTERSEN; NIEMANN, 2015; SATO et al., 2016), particularly in pigs, became available in the recent years and more are expected to be designed in the foreseeable future. This experimental setup seems robust, but may be challenging for more sophisticated modifications of the genome and for several rounds of gene editing. These may be attractive research topics for the next few years.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

A historical outlook of the obtention of genetically modified livestock was provided by an arbitrary division into three distinct periods. Initial efforts to produce these animals were met with labor-intensive procedures to retrieve eggs or zygotes and to introduce transgenes into them. The development of ARTs, particularly IVP and SCNT, increased the availability of injectable zygotes or allowed more sophisticated editions of the genome, but their low efficiency somewhat counterbalanced their potential. The arrival of new molecular tools made genome edition in livestock a reality. Thus, their usage may circumvent the dependency on ARTs, which have not reached maturity for most livestock species, particularly in pigs. If this trend will stand the test of time, it’s a question that will be answered in the years to come.
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