WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.074
Volume 8, Issue 3, 89-99. Review Article ISSN 2277– 7105

METHODS USED FOR HUMAN iPSC DERIVATION: A REVIEW

Davaakhuu Tergel and Chen Ding Ding*

Student, China Pharmaceutical University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China.

Article Received on
25 Dec. 2018,

Revised on 16 Jan. 2019,
Accepted on 07 Feb. 2019

DOI: 10.20959/wjpr20193-14275

***Corresponding Author**
Chen Ding Ding
Professor, China Pharmaceutical University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China.

ABSTRACT

The capability of somatic cells to be recombinant with induce pluripotent stem cells (iPSC) provides a chance to produce multi-energy patients special cell lines that aid to simulate human ailments. These iPSC series can be a powerful tool for drug discovery and cell transplant therapy development as well. There are many ways to generate iPSC lines, but the most suitable method for knowing more about human diseases and evolving treatments needs to be sufficiently efficient to produce iPSC from a limited number of samples that can reprogram the cells in these two skin fibers with chest blood and blood, with a footprints free of charge. Numerous reprogramming procedures fulfill these conditions and may be used to develop iPSC in projects with elementary scientific objectives and treatment objectives. Integrating such reprogramming techniques with the small molecular regulator of the signaling pathway, even the somatic cells produced by the most stubborn patients can successfully generate iPSC.

KEYWORDS: Reprogramming; human somatic cells; Induced pluripotent stem cells.

1. INTRODUCTION

The finding of somatic cells reprogramming to make pluripotent states has dramatically changed the prospects in the field of stem cell exploration. Meanwhile the creative proof of human and mouse fibroblasts might be further reprogrammed into induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) through viral over-expression of definite transcription factors; many techniques have been developed to produce iPSCs.[1,29] All of these methods have increased the effectiveness of reprogrammed cells and also the production of iPSC lines lacking footprint, which lacks the incorporation of some vector of viral sequences into its genome. In this review, a detail of current state of the iPSC reprogramming approach, mainly focusing on

reprogramming of particularly human cells, with occasional reference reprogramming of mouse cell has been reported.

Takahashi[2] proposed a method for reprogramming of mouse fibroblasts using Sox2, Oct4, Klf4 and cMyc retroviruses transduced into the mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) or from small expression of β-galactosidase tail tip fibroblasts (TTF) of the mouse. In this study the neomycin fusion of protein on the locus Fbx15 that was precisely expressed into stem-cells of pluripotent that serve as an exceptional indicator for pluripotency. The incorporation/selection of drug with G418 right after transduction of these four factors expressed in reprogramming of 0.02% MEF or TTF 14 to 21 days after transduction. Similarly Amlani et al.[3] also précised that MEF proved successfully reprogrammed by the same approach of drug specification markers resulted into the Oct4 locus. While in this method the reprogramming with 0.05 to 0.08% MEF was occurred 20 days after transduction than Yamanaka reprogramming approach.

The Takahashi group first reported reprogramming of adult dermal fibroblasts (HDF), with ~0.02% efficiency occurring approximately after 30 days of transduction of all reprogramming factors. The second set attained reprogramming of approximately 0.1% fetal fibroblasts after 15 days of infection in the four factors, while the reprogramming mixture could not be used to reprogram adult fibroblasts. Similarly, after the addition of hTERT and SV40 large T antigens into the reprogrammed cocktail, approximately 0.25% of the mature fibroblasts were reprogrammed. Lin28, Nanog Sox2, and Oct4 were delivered to the lung of fetal MRC5 fibroblasts and neonatal BJ-1 foreskin fibroblasts using a lentiviral expression system.[5] In addition to this, it was found that the neural stem cells (NSCs) taken from the ectoderm and small intestinal epithelial cells (IECs) taken from the endoderm could be chemically reprogrammed into pluripotent stem cells.[30] The iPSC colonies were observed 20 days after transduction, the efficiency of fetal fibroblasts was 0.03-0.05%, and the efficiency of newly-generated fibroblasts was 0.01%.[4] After the initial detection phase of the reprogramming studies, alterations are made to reshape the expression of reprogramming factor vector and novel delivery modes are endeavored to increase the effectiveness and minimalize or eliminate the vector sequences combined with the reprogrammed.

2. Existing Reprogramming Methods

2.1. The Single Cassette Reprogramming: Vectors having Cre-Lox Mediated Transgene Excision are of great importance. Unlike reverse transcriptase viruses, slow viruses can infect

cells that do not divide and proliferate, and it becomes the preferred transmission vector for the expression of reprogramming factors in somatic cells. The secondary optimization measurement implemented using this method is one of the problems of reprogramming four or more single vectors.[6] There are also some others concerns about the inclusion of slow virus sequences of vector in iPSC genome. The main concern is to develop a single cassette reprogramming vector, where each reprogramming factor is detached by a self-cutting signal of polypeptide (a). Some of the vectors are premeditated as well with loxp sites to remove any comprehensive sequence through cre-re at this time by the excessive expression of recombinant enzymes.[7] The first recorded cre-mediated mediated iPSC comprehensive sequence resection was achieved through the representation of Cre-puromycin plasmid in iPSC, which produced 4 loxp, including a chronic viral reprogramming vector disease in the patients of Parkinson's disease.[8] Subsequently, performing recombination and elimination of transgenic sequences, patient's iPSC retains the multi-energy, which can differentiate into dopaminergic neurons. Later on it was found that Adenovirus CRE was capable of integrating the resection of transgenic sequences into a single cassette carrier mediated.[1] A humanized version of one of the carriers is constructed, which has high reprogramming efficiency (0.5%) in mouse cells. The carrier, known as Stemcca, is currently being used and the carrier is reported to have been reprogrammed for 0.1 to 1.6%.[9]

2.2. Reprogramming by Non-integrating Viruses

2.2.1. Sendai Virus: The use of Sendai virus offers the advantage of being a RNA virus which does not involve the nucleus, so it is less concentrated from the cell to 10 channels after infection. The second ideal feature of the Sendai virus is to produce a large amount of polypeptide. Once Sendai-based reprogramming vectors were produced and utilized to produce iPSC, it was reported that Sendai could reprogram the endometrial blood cells and blood cells in newborns and adults.[1] The cells were reprogrammed within ~25 days, the blood cells of the blood cells were 0.1%, and the response rate of the implosion was 1%. Sendai is a complex task than a slow virus; nonetheless commercially viral extracts are available for mountain factors that can be used without further modification.[12] Sendai-based reprogramming has some drawbacks such it takes about 10 channels, the virus completely loses from newly reprogrammed iPSC and high temperature (39 °C is required to remove the virus completely) is required to culture the cells.[2]

2.2.2. Adenovirus: As Adenovirus is an unconformity virus, so it seems to be a beneficial expression vector to produce of iPSC. However, the reprogramming effectiveness of this method was merely 0.001 to 0.001% for mice[11] and only 0.002% in human cells.[10] In the case of adenovirus to have some suitable application for reprogramming, a great deal of work must be done to optimize the expression and improve the efficiency of reprogramming.[2]

2.2.3. Protein: The protein expression and other reprogramming factors will be a suitable procedure to produce iPSC of free floor space. Unluckily, it is technically difficult to form bioactive proteins which can span the plasmid membrane. Both groups were talented to do sufficient in E's bioactive protein expression system.[14] Escherichia coli (E.coli.) plan 0.006% of mice with chest meat[13] and 0.001% of people with membranes.[15] Low energy end effects, practical challenges and deficiency of research available on non-spray cell types propose that copious more requirements to be performed before reprogramming proteins is a feasible approach.

2.3. Non-viral Reprogramming Approaches: The ability to represent a re-programming factor as an mRNA provides another way to make an iPSC without footprints. Warren and others were able to overcome several obstacles to transcription mRNA, effectively expressing the re-programming factor.[1] They were able to reorganize 1.4% of human fibroblasts in 20 days. Addition of Lin28 to the mountain re-programming feature protocol, cultured with approximately 4.9% O_2 method, and adding valproic acid into the culture medium of cells, the effectiveness can be augmented to 4.5%.[16] While the re-programming factor mRNA is available in market, this technique is subject to the statement that it is labor-requiring and needs the accumulation of mRNA 7 days a day, and is not validated by fibroblasts outside the cell.[17]

2.3.1. PiggyBac: Piggybac is a moving transposon (genetic element) that, under the presence of transposon enzymes, can be combined into the TTAA chromosome loci and removed from the genome without footprints after the transposon enzyme is re-expressed. When cloned to the PIGGYBAC carrier and transfected to MEF together, the mountain factor can be redesigned to 0.02-0.05% cells after 14 to 25 days of transfection.[21] When the transposition enzyme is re-expressed, carrying a BAC carrier can be removed cleanly from the iPSC. At a concentration of 0.02%, human mesenchymal stem cells (MSCS) were re-programmed along with Piggybac and sodium butyrate. Though, this is 50 times times lower than the reverse transcriptase mediated MSC re-programming.[15] Piggybac seems to be a promising way to re-

program mouse iPSC, but unpublished studies have shown that human iPSC can be removed from vector, or that cell types other than MSC can be fully re-programmed.

2.3.2. The mRNA Transfection: Numerous miRNA clusters are intensely articulated in ESC. When artificial simulations of developed mir-30b and mir-372 add MRC5 and bj-1 foaming factors, is increased reprogramming efficiency increases by 10 to 15 times compared to four slow virus factors.[18] The study found that some miRNA can reorganize cells at an efficient rate without the presence of mountain factors. The seed sequence of the mirr3022667 sequence was expressed as an iPSC of slow-viral particles in bj-1 fibroblasts after 12 to 14 days of infection. Another miRNA reprogramming paper found that the transfection of certain miRNA can reprogram human cells.[19] Over a period of 6 days, mir-2000 C, mir-302 and mir-200c were incorporated to HDF and stromal cells of fats four times, and 0.002% of cells were reprogrammed after the first transfection 20 days.[20] No report has been published to report the results of replication with any three changes of miRNA reprogramming, that's why it is the hard to regulate whether this is a powerful reprogramming technique. If you can improve the effectiveness of miRNA transfection and determine a set of canonical reprogramming miRNA, this might be an auspicious instrument for reprogramming of iPSC.

2.3.3. Minicircle Vectors: The Micronucleus vector is the smallest vector that contains cDNA and eukaryotic promoter which will be expressed. Nanog, GFP, Lin28, Sox2 and Oct4 tiny carriers articulated in human fat stromal cells were able to regenerate 0.005% of cells within ~28 days.[22] This mechanism is less effective in the neonatal thermal thoracic reactions reprogramming, and there is no successful reports on programming of somatic cells. Consequently, more authentications are required before the application of this method.

2.3.4. Episomal Plasmids: The transient expression of the re-programming factor, which will be the body of the physique, will allow the production of iPSC without footprints. But, transient transfections using standard plasmid vectors do not produce expression to re-program cells for a long duration, unless repeated transfection on a daily basis, even if so, the re-programming efficiency is unacceptably low.[1] Compared to standard plasmids, ORIP/EBNA-based plasmids are consistently expressed for long duration of time and have thus been used to denote the re-programming factors that produce iPSC. One transfection of three Orip/ebna plasmid comprising eight degrees 4, Sox2, Nanog, transfection; October 4, Sox2, SV40 large T antigen; cMyc and ling28 into human circumcision, causing 0.03 to

0.0006% cells to turn After dyeing about 20 days was re-programmed.[23] Among the original two iPSC lines, only one-third of the sub-clones lost the transposition plasmid. Similarly, another research concluded that umbilical cord blood cells were also reprogrammed at a lower level, although adding thiazide could increase the process by 10 times. But, 0.036 of umbilical cord blood mononuclear cells were reprogrammed on the 12th Day. Unlike studies by Diecke et al.[24], the findings of that research described that all iPSC lines lost plasmid through the 15th paragraph. The co-expression of EBNA mRNA and complex programming carrier and the reprogramming of de enned E8 medium under hypoxia condition can significantly improve the reprogramming efficiency of fibroblasts, make it reach 0.006-0.1%, and change due to its characteristics. The parent fibroblasts System is a new and reprogrammed one. A novel Orip/ebna carrier was built by using mountain factor plus a cassette tape and additional ORIP/EBNA carrier encompassing SV40 huge turn. All of these vectors were articulated in cd34+ umbilical peripheral blood cord blood, and bone mononuclear in a sodium butyrate supplemented medium, and iPSC colonies were formed within 14 to 15 days in cells of 0.02, 0.009 and 0.005%, respectively. The transfected plasmid was lost through the 12th segment, and subsequent genome-wide sequencing confirmed the loss of plasmid in the iPSC isolated from bone marrow.[25] The overall iterative programming seems to be an efficient approach to produce no footprint of iPSC with the only undesirable fact that it is the unable to re-program fibroblasts in a way that does not alter cell culture to acceptable efficiency.

3. Oocyte Reprogramming as a Substitute Technology: Reprogramming of cellular genome by transferring it to the removed oocytes has been observed to happen quickly in several species, including mice, with an efficiency of close to 100%. However, moral contemplations and technical defies have revealed the progression of human cell nuclear metastasis.[1,15] A topical report has yielded positive outcomes in re-programming patients with fibroblasts by transferring fibroblast nuclei to oocytes, which have not been removed, and thus in the redesign of fibroblast cells.[2] The resulting re-programming cells have expressive and epigenetic characteristics, which are very alike to pluripotent stem cell lines. Since the programmed cell type is three times, significant improvements to the technology are still required.[17] Upcoming developments in this technique are likely to further extend the way conventional somatic cells are re-programmed.

4. Enhancing Reprogramming Effectiveness for Recalcitrant Cells: Even with the similar approach, iPSC efficiency can vary greatly, particularly in patient-specific diseases. This inconsistency is probably due to paternal lines that will be redesigned, or to mutations in specific diseases, or to problems regarding the collection source of tissues, prolonged and stored over a long period of time.[1] Different small molecules have been found to improve the re-programming efficiency (Table 1). Various available mechanisms permit these molecules to enable ease of re-programming, such as the reticence of histone deacetylation[26], blocking of TGF beta and MEK signaling paths[4], improvement of the function of epigenetic modifiers[11], and embarrassment of induction of the Rock Pathway as well as the glycolysis.[27] Among these minor molecules, sodium butyrate and histone deacetylase inhibitors valproic acid are the most studied re-programming protocols. It is also worth mentioning that in the process of re-programming, the cultivation of cells in 5% of oxygen can also improve the iPSC derivative efficiency ~5 times, in human cells increased 3 times.[16] For samples that are particularly difficult to redesign, adding a culture and small molecule under hypoxia situations may result in sufficient developments to produce iPSC clones. A large number of datasets studied by the entire transcription group of a multi-energy network may also produce new transcription features that can be supplemented to the combination presently in use or applied in new combinations to enhance the efficiency of re-programming.[21]

The medium (ESCM) of the condition induces the expression of endogenous reprogramming features. The approach was applied to reprogram the corneal limbal progenitor cells of rats to iPSC, with an efficiency of 0.002%, without any reprogramming factor[28] of exogenous expression. After adding valproic acid, the efficiency is increased to 0.008%. The free limbal progenitor cells had the endogenous expression of Klf4, Sox2 and cMyc, further raised their culture level in ESCM, and induced the cultivation of October 4 after a period of 10 months of ESCM culture. This approach might not be operative in extra distinguished cell types, however the application of conditional media and tiny molecules can improve the capability of the re-programmed factors of exogenous expression to improve the efficacy of reprogramming, especially in cells, which would then be problematic to reprogram.

5. Selecting a Reprogramming Technique: When deciding on a reprogramming method for producing iPSC, the main factors to be considered are the ability to reprogram the unit, the reprogramming technique to fully reprogram the unit kind, and the integration sequence in

IPSC that will hinder downstream applications. The weight of these factors will depend on the objectives of the project. Depending on the effectiveness, footprint, and many different somatic cell categories are famous to be reprogrammed by this process, the reprogramming method can grouped into six classes (Figure 1).

If iPSC does not have a long-term conversion target, then a viral infection using STEMCCA is sufficient, as this particular method applies to various cell types and provides the selection to use Cre-reatalater point in time to remove the sequence. Schemes with translation objectives should use a totally footprint-free approach, taking into account either blood cells or fibroblasts will be re-programmed. Sendai virus is suitable for all cell categories, but there is no footnote for iPSC that requires ~10 channel generation. The use of the surrogate method for re-programming is very good for blood cells; nonetheless the standard culture environments/conditions for fibroblasts need to be modified. The alterations are likewise there in the extent of time that is required to diminish the footprint in-between Sendai and Episomal centered approaches.

There is no need to concern about traces of the remaining footprints in mRNA's reprogrammed iPSC, but this method is cumbersome and seems to apply only to fibroblasts so far. Piggybac can be a striking option, but available research on human cells is incomplete and there is no reported piglet BAC inserted into the human ISC. The remaining methods discussed are either severely limited or not validated, and the ability of these methods is necessary to express full control. While there is no common way to handle each condition, at least one of the approaches described in this review must be capable to meet almost each requirement that researchers are trying to produce IPSC.

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATION

Since iPSC may be obtained unswervingly from adult organizations, they cannot avoid the need of embryos, however can also be finished in a way that matches patients, which implies that everybody can have their own pluripotent stem cell lines. This infinite source of autologous cells might be used to perform transplants without the peril of immune/cell rejection. Although iPSC expertise has not yet established into a phase in which therapeutic transplants are considered harmless, iPSC is being used at any time for tailored drug discovery and developing an understanding of a patient's specific disease. There is a need of research and development to optimize these methods in therapeutic events so that human being could be benefited.

REFERENCES

1. Shi, Y., Inoue, H., Wu, J. C., & Yamanaka, S. Induced pluripotent stem cell technology: a decade of progress. Nature reviews Drug discovery, 2017; 16(2): 115.
2. Takahashi, K., & Yamanaka, S. Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined factors. cell, 2006; 126(4): 663-676.
3. Amlani, B., Liu, Y., Chen, T., Ee, L. S., Lopez, P., Heguy, A., & Stadtfeld, M. Nascent Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells Efficiently Generate Entirely iPSC-Derived Mice while Expressing Differentiation-Associated Genes. Cell reports, 2018; 22(4): 876-884.
4. Nakagawa, M., Takizawa, N., Narita, M., Ichisaka, T., & Yamanaka, S. Promotion of direct reprogramming by transformation-deficient Myc. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2010; 201009374.
5. Park, I. H., Zhao, R., West, J. A., Yabuuchi, A., Huo, H., Ince, T. A., ... & Daley, G. Q. Reprogramming of human somatic cells to pluripotency with defined factors. Nature, 2008; 451(7175): 141.
6. Lim, K. L., Teoh, H. K., Choong, P. F., Teh, H. X., Cheong, S. K., & Kamarul, T. Reprogramming cancer cells: overview & current progress. Expert opinion on biological therapy, 2016; 16(7): 941-951.
7. Yu, J. Z., & Rasenick, M. M. Basic Principles of Molecular Biology and Genomics. The American Psychiatric Association Publishing Textbook of Psychopharmacology, 2017; 1.
8. Rao, M. S., & Malik, N. Assessing iPSC reprogramming methods for their suitability in translational medicine. Journal of cellular biochemistry, 2012; 113(10): 3061-3068.
9. Sommer, A. G., Rozelle, S. S., Sullivan, S., Mills, J. A., Park, S. M., Smith, B. W., ... & Murphy, G. J. Generation of human induced pluripotent stem cells from peripheral blood using the STEMCCA lentiviral vector. Journal of visualized experiments: JoVE, 2012; (68).
10. di Val Cervo, P. R., Romanov, R. A., Spigolon, G., Masini, D., Martín-Montañez, E., Toledo, E. M., ... & Sánchez, S. P. Induction of functional dopamine neurons from human astrocytes in vitro and mouse astrocytes in a Parkinson's disease model. Nature biotechnology, 2017; 35(5): 444.
11. Hao, Z., Mumphrey, M. B., Townsend, R. L., Morrison, C. D., Münzberg, H., Ye, J., & Berthoud, H. R. Reprogramming of defended body weight after R oux-En-Y gastric bypass surgery in diet-induced obese mice. Obesity, 2016; 24(3): 654-660.

12. Tropea, F., Troiano, L., Monti, D., Lovato, E., Malorni, W., Rainaldi, G., ... & Cermelli, C. Sendai virus and herpes virus type 1 induce apoptosis in human peripheral blood mononuclear cells. Experimental cell research, 1995; 218(1): 63-70.
13. Bernal, J. A. RNA-based tools for nuclear reprogramming and lineage-conversion: towards clinical applications. Journal of cardiovascular translational research, 2013; 6(6): 956-968.
14. Jia, F., Wilson, K. D., Sun, N., Gupta, D. M., Huang, M., Li, Z., & Longaker, M. T. A nonviral minicircle vector for deriving human iPS cells. Nature methods, 2010; 7(3): 197.
15. Muramatsu, T., Kozaki, K. I., Imoto, S., Yamaguchi, R., Tsuda, H., Kawano, T., & Inazawa, J. The hypusine cascade promotes cancer progression and metastasis through the regulation of RhoA in squamous cell carcinoma. Oncogene, 2016; 35(40): 5304.
16. Plews, J. R., Li, J., Jones, M., Moore, H. D., Mason, C., Andrews, P. W., & Na, J. Activation of pluripotency genes in human fibroblast cells by a novel mRNA based approach. PloS one, 2010; 5(12): e14397.
17. Cho, H. J., Lee, C. S., Kwon, Y. W., Paek, J. S., Lee, S. H., Hur, J., ... & Kim, Y. (2010). Induction of pluripotent stem cells from adult somatic cells by protein-based reprogramming without genetic manipulation. Blood, blood-2010.
18. Warren, L., Manos, P. D., Ahfeldt, T., Loh, Y. H., Li, H., Lau, F., ... & Daley, G. Q. Highly efficient reprogramming to pluripotency and directed differentiation of human cells with synthetic modified mRNA. Cell stem cell, 2010; 7(5): 618-630.
19. Li, Z., Yang, C. S., Nakashima, K., & Rana, T. M. Small RNA-mediated regulation of iPS cell generation. The EMBO journal, 2011; 30(5): 823-834.
20. Miyoshi, N., Ishii, H., Nagano, H., Haraguchi, N., Dewi, D. L., Kano, Y., ... & Saito, T. Reprogramming of mouse and human cells to pluripotency using mature microRNAs. Cell stem cell, 2011; 8(6): 633-638.
21. Wang, G., Yang, L., Grishin, D., Rios, X., Lillian, Y. Y., Hu, Y., ... & Pu, W. T. Efficient, footprint-free human iPSC genome editing by consolidation of Cas9/CRISPR and piggyBac technologies. Nature protocols, 2017; 12(1): 88.
22. Jia, Fangjun, Kitchener D. Wilson, Ning Sun, Deepak M. Gupta, Mei Huang, Zongjin Li, Nicholas J. Panetta et al. "A nonviral minicircle vector for deriving human iPS cells." Nature methods, 2010; 7(3): 197.
23. Hu, K., & Slukvin, I. (2013). Generation of transgene-free iPSC lines from human normal and neoplastic blood cells using episomal vectors. In Pluripotent Stem Cells (pp. 163-176). Humana Press, Totowa, NJ.

24. Diecke, S., Lu, J., Lee, J., Termglinchan, V., Kooreman, N. G., Burridge, P. W., ... & Wu, J. C. Novel codon-optimized mini-intronic plasmid for efficient, inexpensive, and xeno-free induction of pluripotency. Scientific reports, 2015; 5: 8081.
25. Shan, L., Wang, L., Yin, J., Zhong, P., & Zhong, J. An OriP/EBNA-1-based baculovirus vector with prolonged and enhanced transgene expression. The Journal of Gene Medicine: A cross-disciplinary journal for research on the science of gene transfer and its clinical applications, 2006; 8(12): 1400-1406.
26. Iaconelli, J., Huang, J. H., Berkovitch, S. S., Chattopadhyay, S., Mazitschek, R., Schreiber, S. L., ... & Karmacharya, R. HDAC6 inhibitors modulate Lys49 acetylation and membrane localization of β-catenin in human iPSC-derived neuronal cells. ACS chemical biology, 2015; 10(3): 883-890.
27. La Rosa, P., Bielli, P., Compagnucci, C., Cesari, E., Volpe, E., Vecchioli, S. F., & Sette, C. (2016). Sam68 promotes self-renewal and glycolytic metabolism in mouse neural progenitor cells by modulating Aldh1a3 pre-mRNA 3'-end processing. Elife, 5: e20750.
28. Snider, E. J. (2018). Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapies for the Trabecular Meshwork in Glaucoma (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology).
29. Thier, M. C., Hommerding, O., Panten, J., Pinna, R., García-González, D., Berger, T., ... & Kaschutnig, P. Identification of Embryonic Neural Plate Border Stem Cells and Their Generation by Direct Reprogramming from Adult Human Blood Cells. Cell stem cell, 2019; 24(1): 166-182.
30. Ye, J., Ge, J., Zhang, X., Cheng, L., Zhang, Z., He, S., ... & Zhao, Y. Pluripotent stem cells induced from mouse neural stem cells and small intestinal epithelial cells by small molecule compounds. Cell research, 2016; 26(1): 34.