Università degli Studi di Padova

Padua Research Archive - Institutional Repository

Genome editing technologies to fight infectious diseases

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available at: 11577/3252147 since: 2017-12-11T09:59:15Z

Publisher:

Taylor and Francis Ltd

Published version:

DOI: 10.1080/14787210.2017.1400379

Terms of use:

Open Access

This article is made available under terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Guidelines, as described at <http://www.unipd.it/download/file/fid/55401> (Italian only)

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Genome editing technologies to fight infectious diseases**

2

3 Marta Trevisan, Giorgio Palù and Luisa Barzon

4 Department of Molecular Medicine, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

5

6 Correspondence:

7 Prof. Luisa Barzon, M.D., Department of Molecular Medicine, University of Padova, Via A. Gabelli 63, I-
8 35121, Padova, Italy. Tel. +39-0498218946; Fax +39-0498272355; email luisa.barzon@unipd.it

9

10

11

12

13

1 **Abstract**

2 **Introduction:** Genome editing by programmable nucleases represents a promising tool that could be exploited
3 to develop new therapeutic strategies to fight infectious diseases. These nucleases, such as zinc-finger
4 nucleases, transcription activator-like effector nucleases, clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic
5 repeat (CRISPR)-CRISPR-associated protein 9 (Cas9) and homing endonucleases, are molecular scissors that
6 can be targeted at predetermined loci in order to modify the genome sequence of an organism.

7 **Areas covered:** By perturbing genomic DNA at predetermined loci, programmable nucleases can be used as
8 antiviral and antimicrobial treatment. This approach includes targeting of essential viral genes or viral
9 sequences able, once mutated, to inhibit viral replication; repurposing of CRISPR-Cas9 system for lethal self-
10 targeting of bacteria; targeting antibiotic-resistance and virulence genes in bacteria, fungi, and parasites;
11 engineering arthropod vectors to prevent vector-borne infections.

12 **Expert commentary:** While progress has been done in demonstrating the feasibility of using genome editing
13 as antimicrobial strategy, there are still many hurdles to overcome, such as the risk of off-target mutations, the
14 raising of escape mutants, and the inefficiency of delivery methods, before translating results from preclinical
15 studies into clinical applications.

16

17 **Keywords**

18 Zinc-finger nuclease; transcription activator-like effector nuclease; CRISPR-Cas9; homing endonucleases;
19 viral infections; bacterial infections; fungal infections; parasite infections; vector-borne infections.

20

1. Introduction

Advancements in basic research have allowed dissecting pathogen structure, replication mechanisms, and virulence factors at molecular level, leading to the discovery of several new antimicrobial agents. However, notwithstanding these advances, infectious diseases still represent the third cause of mortality worldwide and the increasing emergence of multi-drug resistant pathogens is a matter of concern. Next generation technologies are now helping moving forward scientific knowledge and its translational applications at an unprecedented speed. Among these technologies, genome editing by programmable nucleases represents a promising tool that could be exploited to develop new therapeutic strategies to fight infectious diseases. These nucleases, such as zinc-finger nucleases (ZFNs), transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs), clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeat (CRISPR)-CRISPR-associated protein 9 (Cas9) and homing endonucleases (HEs), are molecular scissors that can be targeted at predetermined loci in order to modify the genome sequence of an organism. In this review, we will discuss the main applications of these gene editing tools with particular focus on their use as antiviral and antimicrobial agents and on the critical issues that need to be faced in order to translate promising results from basic research into new treatment modalities for evaluation in clinical trials.

2. Genome editing tools

Despite their architectural and origin differences, all four classes of engineered nucleases mostly used so far, ZNFs, TALENs, CRISPR-Cas, and HEs have one common final aim: to exert DNA double strand breaks (DSBs) into preselected loci of a genome. The first three are composed of two basic units: one is responsible for DNA sequence recognition and bond and the other one, represented by the molecular scissors, for the DNA DSB. Once a DNA DSB occurs, the physiological cell machinery works in order to repair this rupture throughout two types of mechanisms: non-homologous end joining pathways (NHEJ) or homologous recombination (HR) [1]. NHEJ is an error prone mechanism that can introduce insertions or deletions (the so called indels) in the process of reuniting the DNA ends. These indels may be advantageous when they cause frameshifts resulting in gene knock-out due to mRNA degradation or production of non-functional proteins [2]. When a high copy number of an homologous sequence is introduced exogenously into a cells in the form of plasmids or single stranded oligonucleotides, HR can instead take place, allowing the new sequence to be introduced into the cell genome [3,4]. ZNFs are the first class of chimeric programmable nucleases that was applied for genome editing. Their first use dates back to 2001, when ZNFs were shown to promote HR at specific genomic sequences in *Xenopus* embryos [5]. Few years later, ZNFs were shown to allow the genetic correction of the SCID mutation in human cells by HR at high efficiency [6] and brought to the production of the first knockout rats via embryo microinjections [7]. Then, TALENs were applied as genome editing tools in human cells [8]. In 2013, two independent groups demonstrated that bacterial CRISPR-Cas9 system could be adapted to become programmable nuclease for genome editing very efficiently [9,10]. The DNA binding

1 domain of ZFNs is composed by a tandem array of C₂H₂ zinc fingers with each one recognizing a 3-bp DNA
2 sequence [11] and usually 3–6 zinc-fingers are used to generate a single ZFN subunit that binds to DNA
3 sequences of 9–18 bp. The element responsible for DSBs of ZFNs is represented by the cleavage domain of
4 bacterial restriction enzyme *FokI* that must dimerize in order to cleave DNA [12]. Consequently, binding of
5 two ZFN monomers to two specific sites is required for effective double-strand DNA cleavage [13]. TALENs
6 are similar to ZFNs as they rely on the same cleavage unit, the restriction enzyme *FokI*, and are so fore required
7 to bind the DNA grove as dimers [8]. The DNA binding domain of TALENs is composed by TALE proteins,
8 derived from the plant pathogenic *Xanthomonas spp.* bacteria [14], that comprise tandem arrays of 33–35
9 amino acid repeats, each recognizing a single base-pair of the major groove [15]. Two amino acids at positions
10 12 and 13 of each repeat domain [16], called repeat variable diresidues (RVDs), are responsible for the
11 nucleotide specificity and four different RVDs are most widely used to recognize the four bases of the DNA.
12 While both ZFNs and TALENs rely on a protein/DNA based interaction, CRISPR-Cas9 system is based on
13 RNA/DNA interaction. In bacteria and archaea, the CRISPR-Cas system naturally provides adaptive immunity
14 against invading phages or plasmids [17]. Briefly, CRISPR regions are incorporated into the bacterial genome,
15 upon capture of a ~20 bp DNA fragments (called protospacer), from the foreign DNA of invading phages or
16 plasmids. In type II CRISPR systems, the CRISPR regions together with an invariable target-independent
17 trans-activating crRNA (tracrRNA) region are transcribed as pre-CRISPR RNA (pre-crRNA) and processed
18 to give rise to target-specific crRNA [18]. Both crRNA and tracrRNA are complexed with the Cas9 protein to
19 form an active DNA endonuclease, able to cleave a target DNA sequence composed of the 20-bp guide
20 sequence, represented by the protospacer and the 5'-NGG-3' sequence known as PAM (protospacer adjacent
21 motif) [19]. Unlike the other classes of nucleases, in HEs the same domain mediates both DNA recognition
22 and cleavage functions. In microbial organisms, phages, and viruses, HEs are small proteins naturally encoded
23 by elements found within introns of the genome. HEs function by introducing DSBs within homologous alleles
24 that lack the corresponding intron, which are subsequently repaired via HR using the allele containing the HN
25 gene. HEs have been adapted for gene editing purposes by engineering the protein structure to facilitate DNA
26 binding without modifying the cleavage activity [20].

27

28

29 **3. Viral infections**

30 When considering genome editing as strategies for antiviral therapy, error-prone NHEJ is the main mechanism
31 by which programmable nucleases operate, by leading to the formation of indels able to perturb the DNA
32 sequence of a virus present in infected cells or by targeting cellular key factors that are essential for virus entry,
33 replication, or reactivation from latency. Since the target of programmable nucleases is a DNA sequence, this
34 constrains the possibility to use these tools only against viruses that have a DNA-based genome or that passes
35 through a viral-DNA intermediate easily accessible by the programmable nucleases, such as in the case of

1 human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). The CRISPR-Cas9 system has been recently modified to generate
2 gRNAs that were complementary to the genome of hepatitis C virus (HCV), thus demonstrating the feasibility
3 of targeting viruses with a RNA genome [21]. Finally, antiviral strategies that employ programmable nucleases
4 seem to be more suited for chronic or persistent infections, characterized by the persistence of the viral genome
5 as an episome in the nucleus or integrated into host chromosomes, than for acute infections, for which most of
6 antiviral interventions are inefficacious after the onset of symptoms. Genome editing-based antiviral strategies
7 are illustrated in Figure 1.

8 **3.1. Targeting the viral genome**

9 HIV has been a focus for the application of genome editing as antiviral therapy. HIV is a lentivirus that
10 randomly integrates into the host cell genome and persists in CD4+ T cells. The integrated proviral genome
11 serves both as template for gene transcription in the infected cells and for the latency of the virus [22]. By
12 eliminating the integrated provirus, HIV infection could be eradicated. One of the first attempts to disrupt an
13 integrated lentiviral provirus exploited HEs targeting a green-fluorescent protein (GFP) open reading frame,
14 in which the wild-type recognition site for the HE, Y2 I-AniI, was inserted resulting in loss of GFP signal [23].
15 The two long terminal repeats (LTR) of HIV-1 and in particular the extremely conserved U3 and the
16 transactivation response element (TAR) regions, which are critical for viral replication, have been targeted
17 with engineered ZFNs [24] and TALENs [25], respectively. The ZFNs-U3 system could target and excise the
18 full-length HIV-1 proviral DNA in infected human cell lines with an efficiency of about 30% without affecting
19 cell cycle progression and cell proliferation [24], while TALENs demonstrated an editing efficiency of 55–
20 60% and could eliminate the production of viral particles in HIV-infected in cells [25]. Ebina *et al.* were the
21 first to demonstrate the potential of the CRISPR-Cas9 system to edit the HIV-1 genome by blocking its
22 expression via targeting the LTR promoter region and by showing disruption and excision of the latent provirus
23 from human cells [26]. Then, several other studies showed that CRISPR-Cas9 targeting viral LTR or essential
24 viral genes in the integrated provirus or in its pre-integration form (when the cDNA of the virus is free and
25 readily targetable by nucleases) resulted in profound suppression of HIV-1 production and infection in CD4+
26 T cells [27-32]. Recently, Kaminski *et al.* [33], in their proof of concept work, demonstrated the feasibility of
27 HIV genome editing *in vivo* by using a recombinant adeno-associated virus 9 (rAAV9) vector injected through
28 the tail-vein in transgenic mice to deliver the gRNAs/Cas9. Treatment led to the excision of a 978 bp DNA
29 fragment spanning between the LTR and Gag gene of integrated HIV-1 DNA in multiple organs such the
30 spleen, liver, heart, lung and kidney as well as in the circulating lymphocytes [33]. In other studies, ZFNs were
31 able to act as repressors of HIV [34,35] and to interfere with integration [36,37].

32 An alternative genome editing strategy to interfere with HIV infection is the so-called “shock and kill”
33 approach, based on the reactivation of latent virus in infected cells, which, so far, has been attempted with
34 chemical agents, such as a histone deacetylase inhibitors [38]. A particular, a mutant form of Cas9 that has lost
35 its DNA cleavage activity, named CRISPR activation (CRISPRa), can be directed to induce HIV reactivation
36 in latently infected cells, resulting in their recognition by host immune surveillance mechanisms [39].

1 CRISPRa has been also fused to transcriptional activator domains directed to LTR sequences to drive virus
2 replication and to induce HIV-1 reactivation [40-43].

3 Hepatitis B virus (HBV) is a hepadnavirus whose genome is composed by a partially double-stranded circular
4 DNA that, upon infection of hepatocytes, is transported to the nucleus and converted to a covalently closed,
5 circular, double-stranded DNA (cccDNA), which remains episomal. The cccDNA is the template for
6 transcription of the three main subgenomic RNAs and of the pregenomic RNA that is reverse transcribed into
7 the negative-strand DNA, converted into partially dsDNAs, and used in part for the packaging of new viral
8 particles and in part shipped to the nucleus where it becomes cccDNA [44]. The first examples of gene editing
9 strategies applied as antiviral therapy for HBV infection include the use of ZNFs designed to bind HBV viral
10 sequences to inactivate the episomal viral genome [45] and the use of self-complementary AAV (sc-AAV)
11 vectors to deliver HBV-specific ZFNs to infected hepatocytes, resulting in decreased HBV DNA synthesis to
12 near-baseline levels without significant toxicity [46]. The efficacy of anti-HBV TALENs was demonstrated
13 by Bloom *et al.*, who designed anti-HBV TALENs to target three HBV open reading frames (S, P and C) [47].
14 The S and C TALENs were able to cause intended mutations in the viral cccDNA, with an editing rate of 35%
15 and 12%, respectively [47]. Hydrodynamic injection (HDI) of plasmids encoding HBV-targeted TALENs was
16 used for *in vivo* delivery, which led to reduction of HBsAg levels by 90% and circulating viral particle
17 equivalents by 70%, without relevant toxicity in treated mice [47]. The HBV model of HDI was also employed
18 to suppress HBsAg expression by CRISPR-Cas9 system [48] and efficient targeting of the cccDNA and
19 inhibition of HBV replication was also demonstrated in *in vitro* [49, 50] and *in vivo* models [51]. These *in vivo*
20 experiments were performed in HBV-transgenic mice and other limited models of HBV infection, rather than
21 in HBV infection in humanized mice or other physiologically relevant models, so further studies are needed
22 before generalization of these results to human infection.

23 Human papillomavirus (HPV), a DNA virus belonging to the *Papillomaviridae* family, is the leading cause of
24 infection-related cancer in humans. The virus infects the cells in the basal epithelial layer of the skin and
25 mucosa, where its genome persists in the nucleus as an episome, without active replication. When these basal
26 cells undergo differentiation into keratinocytes, migrating towards the surface of the epidermis, virus
27 replication cycle is triggered, leading to the release of infectious viral particles [52]. The genome of oncogenic
28 HPV types may integrate into cellular chromosomes and this causes overexpression of viral E6 and E7
29 oncoproteins, which are responsible for cell transformation, mainly through inactivation of p53 and Rb,
30 respectively [53]. Persistent overexpression of HPV E6/E7 is necessary for cell transformation and E6/E7
31 inactivation leads to tumor regression [53]. The key role of E6 and E7 in HPV-driven tumors supports the use
32 of genome editing tools targeting E6/E7 as anticancer therapy. Studies demonstrated that ZFNs, TALENs, and
33 CRISPR-Cas9 directed against E6 and E7 efficiently cleaved both episomal and in integrated forms of the
34 HPV genome, resulting in the disruption of target oncogenes [54-60]. In particular, ZFNs directed against E7
35 of oncogenic HPV16 and HPV18 specifically inhibited growth, induced apoptosis and repressed xenograft
36 formation *in vivo* of corresponding HPV16- and HPV18-positive cervical cancer cell lines [54]. Targeting

1 E6/E7 with TALENs induced apoptosis, inhibited growth, reduced tumorigenicity in nude mice and restored
2 p53 and Rb in HPV-positive cell lines [60]. In a HPV16 transgenic mouse model of HPV-driven cancer, direct
3 cervical application of polymer-complexed plasmids carrying HPV16-E7-targeted TALENs effectively
4 mutated the E7 oncogene, reduced viral DNA load, and reversed the malignant phenotype [60]. Efficient
5 cleavage of the HPV genome with the introduction inactivating mutations of the E6 and E7 genes was also
6 achieved by using CRISPR-Cas9 with sgRNAs specific for HPV18 E6 or E7 [57]. Treatment resulted in the
7 induction of p53 or Rb, respectively, cell cycle arrest and cell death [57]. These studies paved the way to the
8 initiation of phase I clinical trials with the main objective to evaluate the safety of ZFNs (NCT02800369),
9 TALENs, and CRISPR-Cas9 (NCT03057912) systems. In the NCT02800369 study, patients were treated with
10 suppositories containing 500 µg of ZFN-603 or ZFN-758, which target the HPV16 E7 or HPV18 E7 oncogene,
11 respectively. The primary outcome was the evaluation of safety by reporting treatment-related adverse events
12 of ZFN-603 and ZFN-758 in HPV16-positive and HPV18-positive subjects, respectively. The secondary
13 outcome was the evaluation of efficacy in a time frame of 6 months, by detection of HPV16 and HPV18
14 persistence, changes in the number of dysplastic cells as measured by Pap test, and the number of patients
15 without disease progression [61]. The primary objective of the NCT03057912 study was to evaluate the safety
16 of therapeutic doses and the dosing regimen of TALENs and CRISPR/Cas9 plasmids targeting E6/E7 of
17 HPV16 or HPV18. Both TALENs and CRISPR-Cas9 were formulated as plasmids in gel. The secondary
18 objective of this study was to evaluate efficacy by measurement of HPV DNA load and cytological and
19 histological regression at 3 and 6 months [62]. No results from these studies have been published so far.

20 Several studies on other clinically relevant DNA viruses demonstrated the feasibility of viral genome targeting
21 by programmable nucleases. Among these, Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) episomes have been disrupted by specific
22 Cas9/sgRNAs combinations in a latent EBV infection model [63]; a three gRNAs- CRISPR-Cas9 system could
23 suppress JCV T-antigen expression and inhibit viral replication in JCV transformed and in permissive cell
24 lines [64]; delivery of HEs or CRISPR-Cas9 system targeting essential herpes simplex virus type 1 (HSV-1)
25 genes could disrupt latent HSV genome or inhibit viral lytic replication *in vitro* [65-67].

26 **3.2. Targeting host factors required for viral infection and replication**

27 Host factors required for virus entry, replication, and pathogenesis are potential targets for genome editing
28 interventions. This is the case for HIV-1 entry, which is mediated through interaction of gp120 and host CD4
29 with the help of a coreceptor that, for nearly almost all primary isolates of HIV-1, is represented by chemokine
30 receptor 5 (*CCR5*) [68]. The idea that this coreceptor could be used as a target for HIV-1-entry inhibition
31 comes from the observation that individuals who carry a deletion of 32bp in the *CCR5* gene, known as *CCR5*-
32 $\Delta 32$, are protected against R5 strains of HIV-1 [69]. Several preclinical studies showed that ZFNs directed to
33 *CCR5* were able to disrupt the gene in human CD4+ T cells and in CD34+ hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs),
34 able to give rise to multi-lineage progeny with stably disrupted *CCR5*. The efficiency of gene disruption ranged
35 from 17% to 25% when engrafted in immune-deficient or humanized mice, thus reducing HIV-1 levels and
36 conferring resistance to HIV-1 infection [70-74]. Moving from bench to bedside, so far a few clinical trials

1 involving ZFN-mediated *CCR5* disruption have been completed, with promising results. In these trials, CD4+
2 T cells or HSCs from HIV-1 infected patients were treated *ex-vivo* and then the corrected cells were reinfused
3 into patients (NCT00842634, NCT01044654, NCT01252641 and NCT02500849). Safety of this protocol was
4 evaluated in an open-label, nonrandomized, uncontrolled study of a single dose of ZFN-modified autologous
5 CD4 T cells, in which the *CCR5* gene was inactivated (NCT00842634) [75]. The study enrolled 12 HIV-
6 positive aviremic patients who were receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. In six patients, antiretroviral
7 treatment was interrupted 4 weeks after infusion of CD4 T cells, 11%- 28% of which were genetically
8 modified. Treatment was well tolerated and only one serious adverse event occurred, attributed to a transfusion
9 reaction. The count CD4 T-cells significantly increased after transfusion and, in patients who interrupted
10 antiretroviral therapy, the decline in circulating *CCR5*-modified cells was significantly lower than the decline
11 in unmodified cells, suggesting engrafting of the cells and resistance to HIV infection [75].

12 The aforementioned CRISPRa system can also be exploited to influence the expression of key cellular host
13 factors representing anti-viral defense in human cells, such as antiviral restriction factors. This approach was
14 applied in an HIV-1 model of infection of human CD4+ T cells to enhance the expression of the antiviral genes
15 *APOBEC3G* and *APOBEC3B*, members of the cytidine deaminase gene family that can edit newly synthesized
16 HIV provirus intermediates. As *APOBEC3G* is susceptible to degradation by the HIV-1 Vif protein, whereas
17 *APOBEC3B* is resistant, only the induced *APOBEC3B* inhibited wild-type HIV-1 infectivity whereas
18 *APOBEC3G* inhibited replication of a Vif-deficient (Δ Vif) HIV-1 provirus [76]. Such strategy could also be
19 applied to other viruses such as HBV, in which stimulation of IFN by *APOBEC3A* and *3B* [77] or Toll-like
20 receptor 7 [78] has been reported to induce degradation of HBV cccDNA.

21 From a virological perspective, targeting host factors required for viral infection and replication with
22 programmable nucleases will open up a number of possibilities for basic research. Genome-scale CRISPR-
23 Cas9 screens are already employed to globally investigate the effects of individual human gene products on
24 the biological cycle of clinically relevant viruses, including HCV, HIV, dengue virus, Zika virus, and West
25 Nile virus, leading to new insights into viral molecular biology and giving the opportunity to provide new
26 potential targets for antiviral drug development [79].

27

28 **4. Bacterial infections**

29 The CRISPR-Cas9 system has evolved in bacteria and archaea as an acquired immune system to protect against
30 invading phages and plasmids. These systems can be repurposed for lethal self-targeting, leading to selective
31 bacterial elimination. Due to the lack of efficient DNA repair pathways, bacteria are particularly susceptible
32 to genomic DNA damage and cell death as compared to eukaryotic cells. Furthermore, nuclease-deactivated
33 Cas9 can be used to control bacterial gene expression, rather than to cleave DNA sequences [80]. Genome
34 editing-based antimicrobial strategies are illustrated in Figure 2.

1 **4.1. Lethal self-targeting of bacterial genomes**

2 As mentioned above, an obvious application of CRISPR–Cas systems is their repurposing for self-targeting
3 and damaging bacterial genomes, leading to cell death [81-83]. The proof-of-principle of this approach was
4 demonstrated in the *Escherichia coli* model by engineering potent type I CRISPR–Cas systems, which cleave
5 and degrade DNA through the action of the 3'-to-5' exonuclease Cas3 [84]. In this model, genome targeting
6 was highly sequence-specific and allowed the selective elimination of targeted bacterial strains within mixed
7 cultures. Cell killing was the result of chromosomal injury, since it was similarly potent regardless of the
8 targeted locus, its genomic location, and transcriptional activity. Similar results were achieved by engineering
9 type II CRISPR–Cas systems, in which the Cas9 endonuclease causes double-strand cleavage of target DNA
10 sequences [85,86]. The type I CRISPR–Cas system is expected to be more efficient in inducing DNA damage
11 and cell killing than type II systems, because its exonuclease activity results in large-scale genomic alterations
12 [86,87], thus enabling more potent eradication of a bacterial population. In addition, the type I CRISPR–Cas
13 systems is widespread in many pathogenic bacteria, such as *E. coli* or *Clostridium difficile* [88], and could be
14 repurposed to their self-targeting.

15 Treatment with CRISPR-Cas-based antimicrobials may lead to uncomplete killing of bacteria populations,
16 mainly due to inefficient delivery of the CRISPR-Cas system and to the emergence of defective CRISPR-Cas
17 [84,85,89]. However, when applied to a mixed bacterial population, sequence-specific antimicrobials allow
18 non-targeted cells to keep growing, which may in turn compete with the small proportion of targeted cells that
19 survive the treatment.

20 **4.2. Targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance and virulence genes.**

21 Antibiotic-resistance and virulence genes represent elective targets for sequence-based antimicrobial
22 strategies. These genes often reside in mobile elements, such as conjugative plasmids, phages, and transposons,
23 and may be horizontally transferred and disseminated. Targeting antibiotic-resistance and virulence genes is
24 feasible because the number of relevant pathogens responsible for the majority of antibiotic-resistant infections
25 in humans is relatively small (e.g., *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Enterococcus faecium*,
26 *Acinetobacter baumannii*, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*), thus requiring the development of only a limited
27 number of tools. Actually, the emergence and worldwide spread of these multidrug-resistant bacteria is a
28 serious threat to public health, leading to significant morbidity, mortality, and increase of healthcare costs.

29 Targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance and virulence genes was pursued by Citorik *et al.* [85] and Bikard *et*
30 *al.* [89], who also addressed the difficult task of developing efficient methods to deliver genome editing tools
31 into target bacterial cells. Citorik *et al.* [85] exploited two different horizontal genetic transfer systems of
32 bacteria to deliver molecular constructs to bacterial cells, i.e. plasmid conjugation and viral transduction. The
33 first approach, based on a broad-host-range conjugative plasmid carried by an *E. coli* strain, was hampered by
34 low conjugation efficiency. The second delivery system was based on a M13-phagemid vector, i.e., a plasmid
35 encoding specific genes packaged into a phage capsid. Phagemids were engineered to carry CRISPR-Cas9-

1 based RNA-guided nucleases targeting the *bla*_{SHV-18} or *bla*_{NDM-1} genes, which confer extended-spectrum and
2 pan-resistance to β -lactam antibiotics, respectively. Treatment with phagemids of *E. coli* strains carrying the
3 resistance genes resulted in a significant reduction of viable cells, while no toxicity was observed in wild-type
4 *E. coli* strains. Interestingly, the mechanisms of cell killing after targeted cleavage of endogenous plasmids
5 were shown to result from the activation of plasmid-borne toxin-antitoxin systems. The specificity of the
6 CRISPR-Cas system was challenged by targeting a single-nucleotide mutation in the chromosomal DNA
7 gyrase gene (*gyrA*_{D87G}), which confers resistance to quinolone antibiotics. Experiments showed that a targeted
8 phagemid vector selectively killed only *E. coli* cells harboring the *gyrA*_{D87G} mutation, but not other *E. coli*
9 strains with the wild-type *gyrA* gene [85]. To demonstrate the versatility of the CRISPR-Cas system to combat
10 pathogens, this was engineered to target the chromosomal *eae* gene, which encodes intimin, a cell-surface
11 adhesin in enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* O157:H7 (EHEC) that is necessary for intestinal colonization and tissue
12 damage. However, *eae* targeting led to only a 20-fold reduction of EHEC cell viability, probably because of
13 inefficient phagemid delivery to this bacterial strain. Anyway, treatment significantly increased the survival of
14 EHEC-infected *G. mellonella* larvae, an *in vivo* infection model to assess the efficacy of antimicrobials [85].

15 Bikard *et al.* [89] used a similar CRISPR-Cas9-based approach to target antibiotic resistance and virulence
16 genes in bacteria, but exploited the Φ NM1 phage for phagemid encapsidation and *S. aureus* as the model
17 pathogen. A CRISPR-Cas9 antimicrobial that targeted the methicillin resistance gene *mecA* led to a marked
18 decrease of *mecA*-carrying *S. aureus* in mixed cultures, while CRISPR-Cas9 that targeted a plasmid conferring
19 tetracycline resistance in *S. aureus* did not result in cell death, but in selective degradation and loss of the
20 plasmid in a bacterial population. In addition, this CRISPR-Cas9 antimicrobial could immunize nonpathogenic
21 *S. aureus* strains against the transfer of antibiotic-resistant plasmids. *In vivo* tests in a mouse model of skin
22 colonization showed that CRISPR-Cas9 phagemids selectively reduced the proportion targeted *S. aureus*
23 strains, more efficiently than standard treatment with the topical antibiotic mupirocin [89].

24 An improvement to CRISPR-Cas9 antimicrobial strategies was achieved by combining spacers targeting
25 antibiotic resistance with spacers conferring a selective advantage to antibiotic-sensitive bacteria by protection
26 from a lytic phage [90]. The engineered CRISPR-Cas system was introduced into a λ prophage, and thus made
27 transferable to bacteria by lysogenization. When treated with lytic phages, lysogenized bacterial were
28 protected, enabling the positive selection of a population of antibiotic-sensitized bacteria [90].

29 **4.3. Driving bacterial gene expression**

30 Nuclease-deactivated Cas9, termed dCas9, in which the RuvC and HNH nickase domains have been mutated,
31 is unable to cleave DNA but retains its ability to bind specific DNA sequences when guided by a sgRNA
32 [80,91,92]. Regulation of gene expression by dCas9 was first demonstrated in *E. coli*, where delivery of dCas9
33 with a sequence-specific sgRNA led to inhibition of gene expression (CRISPR interference, CRISPRi) [93].
34 The dCas9-sgRNA complex interferes with gene expression probably by blocking RNA polymerase or by
35 hindering the binding of transcription activators [93]. Like the CRISPR-Cas9 nuclease, CRISPRi is highly

1 efficient, has minimal off-target effects, and is multiplexable, allowing the simultaneous repression of multiple
2 genes. However, in bacteria, CRISPRi is polar, since any operon gene downstream or upstream of the dCas9
3 binding site is silenced in addition to the targeted gene [94,95]. As mentioned above, mutant dCas9 can be also
4 used as a fusion protein to activate gene expression (CRISPRa). For example, dCas9 fused with the ω -subunit
5 of *E. coli* RNA polymerase enhanced gene expression by facilitating assembly of the enzyme to the targeted
6 promoter [96]. Applications of the CRISPRi and CRISPRa technology to regulate gene expression in bacteria
7 are still limited [93, 95-98]. In *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, CRISPRi mediated by dCas9 from *Streptococcus*
8 *thermophilus* could efficiently and specifically knockdown gene expression and inhibit cell growth after
9 targeting essential genes [94]. In addition, CRISPRi proved its usefulness in dissecting the mycobacterial folate
10 biosynthesis pathway, with potential utility in drug target discovery [94].

11

12 **5. Fungal infections**

13 Antimicrobial strategies based on targeting drug-resistance and virulence genes, which have been developed
14 against bacteria, could potentially be applied to eukaryotic pathogens, such as yeast, protozoa, and nematodes.
15 However, these organisms have a larger size and diploid genome and more efficient DNA repair mechanisms
16 than prokaryotes, making them less susceptible to the lethal effects of gene targeting. At variance, their genome
17 may be easily modified by genome editing technologies, which are providing powerful research tools to dissect
18 the basic mechanisms of infection and pathogenesis. Despite these advances, efficient intracellular delivery of
19 exogenous biomolecules remains a major challenge for genome editing applications.

20 The CRISPR/Cas9 system has been optimized and adapted to fungi by using fungal constitutive or inducible
21 promoters to drive Cas9 and sgRNA expression and codon-optimized Cas9 [99-104]. In addition, methods to
22 achieve transient expression of Cas9 have been developed, in order to limit its cytotoxic effects [103]. The
23 CRISPR-Cas9 complex has been delivered to fungi through transformation mediated by polyethylene glycol,
24 agrobacterium, and blastospores [102]. CRISPR-Cas9 has been successfully applied in the genetic
25 manipulation of several fungi, including model organisms, such as *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* [105] and
26 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* [106-108], and fungal pathogens, such as *Aspergillus fumigatus* [99,109], *Candida*
27 *albicans* [110,111], other *Candida* species [112-114], and *Cryptococcus neoformans* [115,116], paving the
28 way for applications in pathogenesis studies, characterization of mechanisms of drug resistance, and drug
29 discovery.

30

31 **6. Parasite infections**

32 Studies that used genome editing technologies to target the genome of protozoa and nematodes aimed mainly
33 at developing easy and efficient methods for gene knock out and genome engineering, with applications in

reverse genomics for the identification of virulence genes, new drug targets, and drug resistance mechanisms, while direct genome targeting has not been exploited so far for therapeutic purposes.

For example, ZFNs have been used to generate deletions, allelic replacement, and specific point mutations in endogenous genes of *Plasmodium falciparum*, including point mutations in the chloroquine resistance transporter gene [117]. CRISPR-Cas9 has been used to rapidly generate specific gene knockouts and single-nucleotide substitutions in *P. falciparum* [118-121], leading to the characterization of mutations associated with drug-resistance. Gene editing strategies to attenuate or kill malaria parasites for vaccine development and therapy have been proposed [122]. CRISPR-Cas9 allowed characterizing drug-resistance mutations and new potential therapeutic targets in *Toxoplasma gondii* [123-125]. In *Trypanosoma cruzi*, knock down of multiple genes was performed for functional genomics studies [126,127]. Proof of concept of CRISPR-Cas9-mediated genome editing was demonstrated for *Leishmania major* [128] and *Leishmania donovani* [129], with the introduction of loss-of-function insertion and deletion mutations.

The CRISPR-Cas9 technology has been also applied to the model organism *Caenorhabditis elegans* [130,131], a nematode that is widely used for the study of metazoan biology and for parasitology research. In multicellular parasite organisms, efficient *in vivo* delivery of genome editing constructs is even a more critical issue, in order to allow biallelic targeting of multiple cells in different tissues. Enrichment of genome editing events, which has been achieved in arthropods by using gene drivers [132] and mutagenic chain reaction [133], could be potentially applied to expand modified genetic traits in parasite populations.

7. Vector-borne infections

Vector-borne infectious diseases, which include infections caused by viruses, bacteria, and parasites, represent a relevant burden of disability and death, especially in developing countries. The most effective strategies to combat vector-borne infectious diseases are based on the control of arthropod vectors, which is hindered by increasing insecticide resistance. Novel approaches to control vector populations, especially mosquitoes, used genetic engineering technologies to generate genetically modified and sterile strains [134,135]. In particular, gene drive systems are exploited to rapidly spread these genetic modifications throughout vector populations, in order to promote their crash or to propagate alleles that make vectors less competent to pathogen transmission. Gene drives are selfish genetic elements that are transmitted to progeny more frequently than expected from Mendelian genetics. Example of gene drive systems found in nature are represented by transposable elements and homing endonuclease genes, and they have been already applied to generate transgenic mosquitoes [135,136]. The advent of CRISPR-Cas9 tools has allowed overcoming technical hurdles and to speed up the development of artificial gene drives, with relevant results already achieved [134-136], such as the introduction of anti-*P. falciparum* effector genes [137] and the inactivation of female fertility genes [132] in *Anopheles* mosquitoes to combat malaria. The risks related to potential off-target effects, the emergence of resistant strains of vectors, the ecological impact of suppression of mosquitoes and other vector

1 populations, and the spread in the environment of genetically modified organisms should be carefully evaluated
2 before field implementation of these new technologies in vector control programs [135,138].

3

4 **8. Expert commentary**

5 **8.1. Safety concerns**

6 An important feature to keep in mind when designing a strategy with programmable nucleases is the risk of
7 off-target effects, namely the possibility that other undesired loci of the human genome, homologous to the
8 one to target, might be cleaved, giving rise to perturbations in the DNA that can lead to disease or tumor
9 formation. Notwithstanding, in the human genome the recognition of a DNA sequences of 17 or more bp
10 should minimize this event [139], actually, all the above mentioned nucleases can cause off-target mutations
11 [20, 140-142]. The off-target activity of ZFNs, TALENs and CRISPR-Cas9 depends exclusively on the
12 specificity of their DNA-binding domains, as their cleavage domain is not DNA-specific. ZFN-induced off-
13 target effects are likely determined by the complex context dependence of the ability of ZF domains to bind
14 DNA as well as the frequency and location of sites in the genome actually bound by ZFNs [141,143], thus
15 being highly dependent on the ZFN being tested. As TALE domains are less tolerant of target sequence
16 mismatches than ZFs, TALENs are likely to have higher specificity for target-binding site and cleavage [144].
17 Although several studies have shown that the CRISPR-Cas9 system can exert off-target activity *in vitro*, recent
18 *in vivo* studies showed how this system is highly specific and rarely exert off-target effects [145,146]. In
19 contrast, whole genome sequencing analysis indicated that sgRNAs might exert mutations *in vivo* in noncoding
20 RNAs or other regulatory intragenic regions that are independent of the target loci and that could be harmful
21 to key cellular processes [147]. The results raise important safety issue for clinical applications of CRISPR-
22 Cas9, but need to be further investigated and confirmed. There are several strategies that can be applied in
23 order to reduce the off-target effect of programmable nucleases. HEs usually show very high specificity for
24 their DNA targets and exert less off-target cleavage, as demonstrated by low toxicity *in vitro*, even if expressed
25 at high levels [23].

26 Significant reduction of off-target cleavage has been achieved by choosing unique target sites without highly
27 homologous sequences within the human genome [148,149]. A further reduction was accomplished by
28 approaches focused on the cleavage domain such as forcing *FokI* subunits to interact as obligate heterodimers
29 [150], by replacing it with a DNA-specific nuclease (such as HE) [151] or by using chimeric enzymes [149].
30 For example, HPV18 was successfully targeted by fusing the staphylococcal nuclease, cleaving DNA as a
31 monomer, to a ZF protein thus not requiring dimerization [55]. Moreover, the avoidance of unwanted indels
32 was achieved by converting *FokI* or Cas9 into nickases exerting SSBs [148,153,154]. Such system proved to
33 be successful in targeting HBV by designing two pairs of guides to introduce a DSB at target DNA with no
34 apparent off-target mutations detected [155,156]. Furthermore, the use of truncated sgRNAs [157] or larger
35 PAM sequences, demonstrated reduction of off-target cleavage with efficient on-target editing [158]. Finally,

the delivery of nucleases in form of mRNAs or proteins can lead to faster expression and lower toxicity compared to plasmids due to the rapid degradation into the host cells [159,160]. Despite the optimistic low rate of off-target events reported for all classes of nucleases, post editing verification such as next generation sequencing methods will be necessary in order to add confidence to results by increasing numbers and quality of reads of off- target sites.

Since all the four classes of nucleases originate in part from non-human organisms, they are potential immunogens that can redirect the immune-responses and trigger the clearance of the transfected cell. To date, few data are available on the *in vivo* toxicity or immunogenicity of programmable nucleases. Clinical trials with ZFNs showed no toxicity or immunogenicity, but the delivery of ZFNs to CD4+ T cells was done *ex vivo*, allowing for expansion of corrected cells before transplantation into patients [75]. In therapeutic mouse models of HBV and HPV infection, no *in vivo* toxicity was observed with TALENs [64,161].

Other important safety problems are represented by either the potential occurrence of multiple DNA DSBs in the same genome that might lead to genomic rearrangements or by the risk that cleavage of episomal genomes of viruses, such as HBV and HPV, with subsequent linearization, could promote their random integration into the target cells and hence the risk of tumor development. As the long-term effects of exposure to programmable nucleases *in vivo* remains unknown, safety procedures such as the use of tissue-specific, drug-inducible, or non-constitutive viral promoters, together with evaluation of the possible off-target effects and multiplexed targeting within the virus genome, should be taken into consideration to ensure the safety of the procedure.

8.2. Delivery challenges

When designing a therapeutic strategy with programmable nucleases, the delivery method is one of the most important hurdles to face. In fact, to obtain a therapeutic effect, nucleases must be delivered efficiently to infected cells and expressed at high levels. Several factors must be taken into consideration: the type of pathogen, the type of infected cell that need to be targeted, the accessibility of the anatomical site of infection, the dosing necessary to exert the desired effect, and the type of delivery system. Pathogens that are primarily found in a restricted anatomic site will be more suitable for the targeted delivery of programmable nucleases, whereas pathogens capable to infect blood cells or multi organs may be more challenging to treat *in vivo*, since they require systemic delivery. *Ex vivo* delivery is considered safer than *in vivo* delivery, but it has been applied so far only to treat disorders of the hematopoietic system. Several delivery approaches, based on virus-free system (such as electroporation, liposomes) and viral vectors (such as lentiviral vectors, adenoviral vectors, AAV vectors, phagemid vectors), have been developed and applied in clinical trials for delivery of therapeutic genes [162]. Methods based on non-viral delivery systems are less immunogenic and have a lower risk of chromosomal integration than viral vector-based approaches, but transfection efficiency is usually lower and not cell-type specific. For example, the liver is a good target for infection by AAV vectors, especially AAV8, which can be used to transduce HBV-infected hepatocyte *in vivo*. Viral vector have limitations in their capacity to accommodate foreign sequences, including those encoding programmable nucleases. Specifically, HEs are

1 the smallest class of programmable nucleases (about 250 amino acids) and this facilitates their insertion into
2 any delivery vector. ZFNs, in turn, are smaller than TALENs and, unlike the latter, can be incorporated into
3 small-capacity AAV vectors [46] or integrase deficient lentiviral vectors [163]. In addition, the highly repetitive
4 nature of the coding sequences for ZFNs and TALENs represent a challenges in viral packaging, due to
5 undesired recombination during the production process [164]. Since the enzyme Cas9 has a large size, smaller
6 Cas molecules that can be efficiently packaged into small capacity viral vectors have been engineered, such as
7 Cas from *S. aureus* [165-167].

8 Phages are ideal vectors for gene transfer in bacterial cells, since they have evolved to infect and introduce
9 their genetic material into bacteria. However, their potential clinical use in humans is limited to the treatment
10 of bacterial infections in external sites, such as external ear infections or burn wound-associated infections. In
11 fact, after systemic injection in mice, most phages are rapidly sequestered by the liver and the spleen [168]; in
12 addition, the narrow host range of phages limits their application to different pathogens, while the relatively
13 large size hinders efficient diffusion into infected tissues; finally, induction of neutralizing antibodies prevents
14 the possibility of repeated administrations of phages [169].

15 The use of non-viral delivery methods for bacterial cells is hampered by the cell wall. A recent study [170]
16 developed a novel non-viral delivery method, called Cr-Nanocomplex, which was based on a nanocomplex of
17 polymer-derivatized Cas9 protein and sgRNA targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance. In particular, in the
18 nanocomplex, recombinant Cas9 was covalently modified with branched polyethylenimine, a cationic
19 polymer, as the carrier for packaging sgRNA. At variance with approaches used for mammalian cells, based
20 on the noncovalent encapsulation of Cas protein and sgRNA into nanoparticles and characterized by low
21 loading and packaging efficiencies, the direct covalent modification of the protein allowed to minimize the
22 amount of carrier material and hence its toxicity. *In vitro* experiments showed that a Cr-Nanocomplex targeting
23 *mecA* could be successfully delivered into methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*, resulting in reduced growth of
24 bacteria [170].

25 **8.3. Emergence of resistant pathogens**

26 Another concern about the use of programmable nucleases for the treatment of infectious diseases is the
27 emergence of escape mutants that develop resistance to treatment. These mutants could be the result of the
28 acquisition of genetic changes in target sites acquired during replication or may be induced by the nucleases
29 themselves. This scenario is more likely to occur in error-prone RNA viruses than DNA viruses [171]. The
30 emergence of endonuclease resistance can be prevented by multiple targeting of different regions of pathogen
31 genome [175]. Replication-competent HIV-1 with mutation in nuclease target sites emerged after exposure to
32 ZFNs targeting reverse transcriptase [172] or to CRISPR-Cas9 targeting HIV proviral DNA [173].

33 Anti-bacterial and anti-parasitic therapies based on programmable nucleases may also induce the emergence
34 of escape mutants, characterized for example by a defective CRISPR-Cas, with loss of spacer sequences or
35 deletion of the *cas9* gene [84,85,89]. Importantly, the occurrence of escape mutations in the targeted sequence

was not observed in experimental studies, indicating a low risk for the emergence of resistant bacterial strains [89].

9. Five-year view

Despite the great advances that have been made in the past few years with proof-of-concept studies demonstrating the feasibility of harnessing programmable nucleases for the treatment of antimicrobial diseases, many more are needed to concretely translate them into clinical and field applications. Obstacles that still should be overcome are mainly related to the safety issue. Thus, in a five-year view, advances are expected in the generation of nucleases lacking off-target effects and with higher cleavage efficiency, and in the development of sensitive diagnostic methods to detect the presence of off-target mutations. The applicability of genome editing-based antiviral therapy has been proven in clinical trials of ZFN-based inactivation of the *CCR5* gene to block HIV-1 infection [75], but further clinical studies are warranted in the next years to test safety and effectiveness of genome editing-based therapies. Another problem to be solved is the improvement in the efficiency and safety of delivery systems for programmable nucleases, especially if directing them for *in vivo* administration is the goal. Viral vectors have been widely used for genome editing in the research field, but it is expected that non-viral vectors will have more chances to be approved for clinical applications. Topical treatment of infections involving external sites, such as skin, mucosa, burn wounds and the eye, will probably have more chances of success than treatment of systemic infections. Development of strategies based on fine dosing and transient intracellular expression of the gene editing machinery is also preferable, since continuous expression of high-levels nucleases in the long run may increase the risk of off-target effects and the emergence of escape mutants. Definitely, before moving to the bedside, studies in suitable *in vivo* animal models will be necessary, but with the important limitation that animal models are not available for all infectious diseases.

Key issues

- Programmable nucleases, such as ZFNs, TALENs, CRISPR-Cas9 and HEs, are molecular scissors that can be targeted at predetermined loci in order to modify the genome sequence of an organism. The main mechanisms by which programmable nucleases can be employed for the treatment of infectious diseases is the introduction of mutations into the genome by the error-prone NHEJ mechanism.
- Programmable nucleases can be exploited as antiviral treatment by targeting essential viral genes or host factors that are required for viral infection and replication. Efficiency of these strategies has already been proven *in vitro* and *in vivo* models of HIV, HBV, HSV, and HPV infection. Phase I clinical trials have been initiated to test safety and efficacy of targeted nucleases in patients with HIV infection and with HPV-related cervical lesions.

- As bacteria are particularly susceptible to genomic DNA damage and cell death compared to eukaryotic cells, the CRISPR-Cas9 systems has been redirected for lethal self-targeting, allowing selective elimination of targeted bacterial strains. In addition, CRISPR-Cas9 has been employed to target antibiotic-resistance genes and virulence genes. Furthermore, nuclease-deactivated Cas9 has been used to interfere with bacterial gene expression by blocking RNA polymerase or by hindering the binding of transcription activators.
- Feasibility of using programmable nucleases to modify the genome of parasites and fungi and to manipulate the genome of arthropod vectors has been demonstrated, opening perspective for therapeutic and vector-control applications.
- In the past few years, many progresses have been made in demonstrating the feasibility of programmable nucleases as therapeutic strategy for the treatment of infectious diseases. However, there are still many hurdles to overcome such as the safety issues, mostly dictated by the risk of off-target mutations, the raising of escape mutants, and the inefficiency of delivery methods, before translating results from preclinical studies into clinical and field applications.

Declaration of interest

The authors have no relevant affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity with a financial interest in or financial conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. This includes employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties.

References

* = of interest, ** = of considerable interest

1. Rouet P, Smih F, Jasin M. Introduction of double strand breaks into the genome of mouse cells by expression of a rare-cutting endonuclease. *Mol Cell Biol.* 1994;14:8096–8106.
2. Isken O, Maquat LE. Quality control of eukaryotic mRNA: safeguarding cells from abnormal mRNA function. *Genes Dev.* 2007;21:1833–1856.
3. Smithies O, Koralewski MA, Song KY, et al. Homologous recombination with DNA introduced into mammalian cells. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol.* 1984;49:161–170.
4. Kucherlapati RS, Eves EM, Song KY, et al. Homologous recombination between plasmids in mammalian cells can be enhanced by treatment of input DNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 1984;81:3153–3157.
5. Bibikova M, Carroll D, Segal DJ, et al. Stimulation of homologous recombination through targeted cleavage by chimeric nucleases. *Mol Cell Biol.* 2001;21:289–297.

- 1 6. Urnov FD, Miller JC, Lee YL, et al. Highly efficient endogenous human gene correction using designed
2 zinc-finger nucleases. *Nature*. 2005;435:646–651.
- 3 7. Geurts AM, Cost GJ, Freyvert Y, et al. Knockout rats via embryo microinjection of zinc-finger nucleases.
4 *Science*. 2009;325:433.
- 5 8. Miller JC, Tan S, Qiao G, et al. A TALE nuclease architecture for efficient genome editing. *Nature*
6 *Biotech*. 2011;29:143–148.
- 7 9. Cho SW, Kim S, Kim JM, et al. Targeted genome engineering in human cells with the Cas9 RNA-guided
8 endonuclease. *Nature Biotech*. 2013;31:230–232.
- 9 10. Cong, L, Ran FA, Cox D, et al. Multiplex genome engineering using CRISPR/Cas systems. *Science*.
10 2013;339:819–823.
- 11 11. Wolfe SA, Nekludova L, Pabo C O. DNA recognition by Cys2His2 zinc finger proteins. *Annu Rev*
12 *Biophys Biomol Struct*. 2000;29:183–212.
- 13 12. Vanamee ES, Santagata, S, Aggarwal AK. FokI requires two specific DNA sites for cleavage. *J Mol Biol*.
14 2001;309:69–78.
- 15 13. Mani M, Smith J, Kandavelou K, et al. Binding of two zinc finger nuclease monomers to two specific
16 sites is required for effective double-strand DNA cleavage. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun*.
17 2005;334(4):1191–1197.
- 18 14. Mussolino C, Cathomen T. TALE nucleases: tailored genome engineering made easy. *Curr Opin*
19 *Biotechnol*. 2012;23:644–650.
- 20 15. Deng D, Yan C, Pan X, et al. Structural basis for sequence-specific recognition of DNA by TAL effectors.
21 *Science*. 2012;335:720–723.
- 22 16. Boch J, Scholze H, Schornack S, et al. Breaking the code of DNA binding specificity of TAL-type III
23 effectors. *Science*. 2009;326:1509–1512.
- 24 17. Barrangou R, Fremaux C, Deveau H, et al. CRISPR provides acquired resistance against viruses in
25 prokaryotes. *Science*. 2007;315:1709–1712.
- 26 18. Deltcheva E, Chylinski K, Sharma CM, et al. CRISPR RNA maturation by transencoded small RNA and
27 host factor RNase III. *Nature*. 2011;471:602–607.
- 28 19. Hsu PD, Scott DA, Weinstein JA, et al. DNA targeting specificity of RNA-guided Cas9 nucleases. *Nature*
29 *Biotech*. 2013;31:827–832.
- 30 20. Stoddard BL. Homing endonucleases: from microbial genetic invaders to reagents for targeted DNA
31 modification. *Structure*. 2011;19:7–15.
- 32 21. Price AA, Sampson TR, Ratner HK, et al. Cas9-mediated targeting of viral RNA in eukaryotic cells. *Proc*
33 *Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015;112(19):6164–6169.
- 34 22. Trono D, Van Lint C, Rouzioux C, et al. HIV persistence and the prospect of long-term drug-free
35 remissions for HIV-infected individuals. *Science*. 2010;329:174–80.

- 1 23. Aubert M1, Ryu BY, Banks L, Rawlings DJ, Scharenberg AM, Jerome KR. Successful targeting and
2 disruption of an integrated reporter lentivirus using the engineered homing endonuclease Y2 I-AniI. *PLoS*
3 *One*. 2011;6:e16825.
- 4 24. Qu X, Wang P, Ding D, et al. Zinc finger nuclease: a new approach for excising HIV-1 proviral DNA
5 from infected human T cells. *Mol Biol Rep*. 2014;41:5819–27.
- 6 25. Strong CL, Guerra HP, Mathew KR, et al. Damaging the Integrated HIV Proviral DNA with TALENs.
7 *PLoS One*. 2015;10(5):e0125652.
- 8 26. Ebina H, Misawa N, Kanemura Y, et al. Harnessing the CRISPR/Cas9 system to disrupt latent HIV-1
9 provirus. *Sci Rep*. 2013;3:2510.
- 10 27. Hu W, Kaminski R, Yang F, et al. RNA-directed gene editing specifically eradicates latent and prevents
11 new HIV-1infection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2014;111:11461–11466.
- 12 28. Liao HK, Gu Y, Diaz A, et al. Use of the CRISPR/Cas9 system as an intracellular defense against HIV-1
13 infection in human cells. *Nat Commun*. 2015;6:6413.
- 14 29. Kaminski R, Chen Y, Fischer T, et al. Elimination of HIV-1 genomes from human T-lymphoid cells by
15 CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6:22555.
- 16 30. Kaminski R, Chen Y, Salkind J, et al. Negative feedback regulation of HIV-1by gene editing strategy. *Sci*
17 *Rep*. 2016;6:31527.
- 18 31. Zhu W, Lei R, Le Duff Y, et al. The CRISPR/Cas9 system inactivates latent HIV-1 proviral DNA.
19 *Retrovirology*. 2015;12:22.
- 20 32. Yin C, Zhang T, Li F, et al. Functional screening of guide RNA targeting the regulatory and structural
21 HIV-1 viral genome for a cure of AIDS. *AIDS*. 2016;30:1163–1174.
- 22 33. Kaminski R, Bella R2, Yin C, et al. Excision of HIV-1 DNA by gene editing: a proof-of-concept in vivo
23 study. *Gene Ther*. 2016;23:690–695.
- 24 34. Segal DJ, Gonçalves J, Eberhardy S, et al. Attenuation of HIV-1 replication in primary human cells with
25 a designed zinc finger transcription factor. *J Biol Chem*. 2004; 279:14509–14519.
- 26 35. Eberhardy SR, Gonçalves J, Coelho S, et al. Inhibition of human immunodeficiency virus type 1
27 replication with artificial transcription factors targeting the highly conserved primer-binding site. *J Virol*.
28 2006;80:2873–2883.
- 29 36. Sakkhachornphop S, Jiranusornkul S, Kodchakorn K, et al. Designed zinc finger protein interacting with
30 the HIV-1 integrase recognition sequence at 2-LTR-circle junctions. *Protein Sci*. 2009;18: 2219–2230.
- 31 37. Sakkhachornphop S, Barbas CF, Keawvichit R, et al. Zinc finger protein designed to target 2-long
32 terminal repeat junctions interferes with human immunodeficiency virus integration. *Hum Gene Ther*.
33 2012;23:932–942.
- 34 38. Shan L, Deng K, Shroff NS, et al. Stimulation of HIV-1-specific cytolytic T lymphocytes facilitates
35 eliminationof latent viral reservoir after virus reactivation. *Immunity*. 2012;36:491–501.
- 36 39. Martin AR, Siliciano RF. Progress toward HIV eradication: case reports, current efforts, and the
37 challenges associated with cure. *Annu RevMed*. 2016;67:215–228.

- 1 40. Bialek JK, Dunay GA, Voges M, et al. Targeted HIV-1 latency reversal using CRISPR/Cas9 derived
2 transcriptional activator systems. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0158294.
- 3 41. Limsirichai P, Gaj T, Schaffer DV. CRISPR-mediated activation of latent HIV-1 expression. Mol Ther.
4 2016;24:499–507.
- 5 42. Saayman SM, Lazar DC, Scott TA, et al. Potent and targeted activation of latent HIV-1 using the
6 CRISPR/dCas9 activator complex. Mol Ther. 2016;24:488–498.
- 7 43. Ji H, Jiang Z, Lu P, et al. Specific reactivation of latent HIV-1 by dCas9-SunTag-VP64-mediated guide
8 RNA targeting the HIV-1 promoter. Mol Ther. 2016;24:508–521.
- 9 44. Muzyczka N, Berns, KI. Fields Virology. Philadelphia (PA): Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2001.
- 10 45. Cradick TJ, Keck K, Bradshaw S, et al. Zinc-finger nucleases as a novel therapeutic strategy for targeting
11 hepatitis B virus DNAs. Mol Ther. 2010;18(5):947–54.
- 12 46. Weber ND, Stone D, Sedlak RH, et al. AAV-mediated delivery of zinc finger nucleases targeting hepatitis
13 B virus inhibits active replication. PLoS One. 2014;9(5):e97579.
- 14 47. Bloom K, Ely A, Mussolino C, et al. Inactivation of hepatitis B virus replication in cultured cells and in
15 vivo with engineered transcription activator-like effector nucleases. Mol Ther. 2013;21: 1889–1897.
- 16 48. Lin SR, Yang HC, Kuo YT, et al. The CRISPR/Cas9 system facilitates clearance of the HBV templates
17 *in vivo*. Mol Ther Nucleic Acids. 2014;3:e186.
- 18 49. Ramanan V, Shlomai A, Cox DB, et al. CRISPR/Cas9 cleavage of viral DNA efficiently suppresses
19 hepatitis B virus. Sci Rep. 2015;5:10833.
- 20 50. Kennedy EM, Bassit LC, Mueller H, et al. Suppression of hepatitis B virus DNA accumulation in
21 chronically infected cells using a bacterial CRISPR/Cas RNA-guided DNA endonuclease. Virology.
22 2014;476C:196–205.
- 23 51. Dong C, Qu L, Wang H, et al. Targeting hepatitis B virus cccDNA by CRISPR/Cas9 nuclease efficiently
24 inhibits viral replication. Antiviral Res. 2015;118:110–117.
- 25 52. Johansson C, Schwartz S. Regulation of human papillomavirus gene expression by splicing and
26 polyadenylation. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2013; 11:239-251.
- 27 53. Mighty KK, Laimins LA. The role of human papillomaviruses in oncogenesis. Recent Results Cancer
28 Res. 2014;193:135–148.
- 29 54. Ding W, Hu Z, Zhu D, et al. Zinc finger nucleases targeting the human papillomavirus E7 oncogene
30 induce E7 disruption and a transformed phenotype in HPV16/18-positive cervical cancer cells. Clin
31 Cancer Res. 2014;20:6495–6503.
- 32 55. Mino T, Mori T, Aoyama Y, et al. Gene- and protein-delivered zinc finger-staphylococcal nuclease hybrid
33 for inhibition of DNA replication of human papillomavirus. PLoS One. 2013;8:e56633.
- 34 56. Mori T, Aoyama Y, Sera T. Inhibition of DNA replication of human papillomavirus by using zinc finger-
35 single- chain FokI dimer hybrid. Mol Biotechnol. 2014;56(8):731–737.

- 1 57. Kennedy EM, Kornepati AV, Goldstein M, et al. Inactivation of the human papillomavirus E6 or E7 gene
2 in cervical carcinoma cells by using a bacterial CRISPR/Cas RNA-guided endonuclease. *J Virol.*
3 2014;88:11965–11972.
- 4 58. Zhen S, Hua L, Takahashi Y, et al. *In vitro* and *in vivo* growth suppression of human papillomavirus 16
5 positive cervical cancer cells by CRISPR/Cas9. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2014;450:1422–1426.
- 6 59. Hu Z, Yu L, Zhu D, et al. Disruption of HPV16-E7 by CRISPR/Cas system induces apoptosis and growth
7 inhibition in HPV16 positive human cervical cancer cells. *Biomed Res Int.* 204;2014:612823.
- 8 60. Hu Z, Ding W, Zhu D, et al. TALEN-mediated targeting of HPV oncogenes ameliorates HPV-related
9 cervical malignancy. *J Clin Investig.* 2014;125:425–436.
- 10 61. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/record/NCT02800369> [last accessed on October 28, 2017].
- 11 62. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/record/NCT03057912> [last accessed on October 28, 2017].
- 12 63. Wang J, Quake SR. RNA-guided endonuclease provides a therapeutic strategy to cure latent herpesviridae
13 infection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2014;111:13157–13162.
- 14 64. Wollebo HS, Bellizzi A, Kaminski R, et al. CRISPR/Cas9 system as an agent for eliminating
15 polyomavirus JC infection. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(9):e0136046.
- 16 65. Grosse S, Huot N, Mahiet C, et al. Meganuclease-mediated inhibition of HSV1 infection in cultured cells.
17 *Mol Ther.* 2011;19:694-702.
- 18 66. Aubert M, Boyle NM, Stone D, et al. In vitro inactivation of latent HSV by targeted mutagenesis using
19 an HSV-specific homing endonuclease. *Mol Ther Nucleic Acids.* 2014;3:e146.
- 20 67. van Diemen FR, Kruse EM, Hooykaas MJ, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genome editing of herpes
21 viruses limits productive and latent infections. *PLoS Pathog.* 2016;12:e1005701.
- 22 68. Coakley E, Petropoulos CJ, Whitcomb JM. Assessing chemokine co-receptor usage in HIV. *Curr Opin*
23 *Infect Dis.* 2005;18:9–15.
- 24 69. Mummidi S, Ahuja SS, Gonzalez E, et al. Genealogy of the CCR5 locus and chemokine system gene
25 variants associated with altered rates of HIV-1 disease progression. *Nat Med.* 1998;4:786–793.
- 26 70. Holt N, Wang J, Kim K. Human hematopoietic stem/progenitor cells modified by zinc-finger nucleases
27 targeted to CCR5 control HIV-1 *in vivo*. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2010;28:839–847.
- 28 71. Maier DA, Brennan AL, Jiang S. Efficient clinical scale gene modification via zinc finger nuclease-
29 targeted disruption of the HIV co-receptor CCR5. *Hum Gene Ther.* 2013;24:245–258.
- 30 72. Li L, Krymskaya L, Wang J. Genomic editing of the HIV-1 coreceptor CCR5 in adult hematopoietic stem
31 and progenitor cells using zinc finger nucleases. *Mol Ther.* 2013;21:1259–1269.
- 32 73. Hofer U, Henley JE, Exline CM, et al. Pre-clinical modeling of CCR5 knockout in human hematopoietic
33 stem cells by zinc finger nucleases using humanized mice. *J Infect Dis.* 2013;208:S160–S164.
- 34 74. Yi G, Choi JG, Bharaj P. CCR5 gene editing of resting CD4(+) T Cells by transient ZFN expression from
35 HIV envelope pseudotyped nonintegrating lentivirus confers HIV-1 resistance in humanized mice. *Mol*
36 *Ther Nucleic Acids.* 2014;3:e198.

- 1 75. Tebas P, Stein D, Tang WW, et al. Gene editing of CCR5 in autologous CD4 T cells of persons infected
2 with HIV. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;370(10):901–10.
- 3 **** Clinical trial in 12 HIV patients showing that infusion of autologous CD4 T-cell in which**
4 **the CCR5 was inactivated by ZFNs is safe.**
- 5 76. Bogerd HP, Kornepati AV, Marshall JB, et al. Specific induction of endogenous viral restriction factors
6 using CRISPR/Cas-derived transcriptional activators. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2015;112:7249–7256.
- 7 77. Lucifora J, Xia Y, Reisinger F, et al. Specific and nonhepatotoxic degradation of nuclear hepatitis B virus
8 cccDNA. *Science*. 2014;343:1221–1228.
- 9 78. Lanford RE, Guerra B, Chavez D, et al. GS-9620, an oral agonist of Toll-like receptor-7, induces
10 prolonged suppression of hepatitis B virus in chronically infected chimpanzees. *Gastroenterology*.
11 2013;144:1508–1517.
- 12 79. Puschnik AS, Majzoub K, Ooi YS, et al. A CRISPR toolbox to study virus-host interactions. *Nat Rev*
13 *Microbiol*. 2017;15:351–364.
- 14 80. Dominguez AA, Lim WA, Qi LS. Beyond editing: repurposing CRISPR-Cas9 for precision genome
15 regulation and interrogation. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*. 2016;17:5–15.
- 16 81. Vercoe RB, Chang JT, Dy RL, et al. Cytotoxic chromosomal targeting by CRISPR/Cas systems can
17 reshape bacterial genomes and expel or remodel pathogenicity islands. *PLoS Genet*. 2013;9:e1003454.
- 18 82. Edgar R, Qimron U. The *Escherichia coli* CRISPR system protects from λ lysogenization, lysogens, and
19 prophage induction. *J Bacteriol*. 2010;192:6291–6294.
- 20 83. Jiang W, Bikard D, Cox D, et al. RNA-guided editing of bacterial genomes using CRISPR-Cas systems.
21 *Nat. Biotechnol*. 2013;31:233–239.
- 22 84. Gomaa AA, Klumpe HE, Luo ML, et al. Programmable removal of bacterial strains by use of genome-
23 targeting CRISPR-Cas systems. *mBio*. 2014;5:e00928-13.
- 24 *** Proof-of-principle of lethal self targeting of a bacterial genome.**
- 25 85. Citorik RJ, Mimee M, Lu TK. Sequence-specific antimicrobials using efficiently delivered RNA-guided
26 nucleases. *Nat. Biotechnol*. 2014;32:1141–1145.
- 27 *** Use of phagemids and CRISPR/Cas to targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance and virulence genes.**
- 28 86. Sinkunas T, Gasiunas G, Fremaux C, et al. Cas3 is a single-stranded DNA nuclease and ATP-dependent
29 helicase in the CRISPR/Cas immune system. *EMBO J*. 2011;30:1335–1342.
- 30 87. Huo Y, Nam KH, Ding F, et al. Structures of CRISPR Cas3 offer mechanistic insights into Cascade-
31 activated DNA unwinding and degradation. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2014;21:771–777.
- 32 88. Grissa I, Vergnaud G, Pourcel C. The CRISPRdb database and tools to display CRISPRs and to generate
33 dictionaries of spacers and repeats. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2007;8:172.
- 34 89. Bikard D, Euler CW, Jiang W, et al. Exploiting CRISPR-Cas nucleases to produce sequence-specific
35 antimicrobials. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2014;32:1146–1150.
- 36 *** Use of phagemids and CRISPR/Cas to targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance and virulence genes.**

1 90. Yosef I, Manor M, Kiro R, et al. Temperate and lytic bacteriophages programmed to sensitize and kill
2 antibiotic-resistant bacteria. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2015;112:7267–7272.

3 *** Use of CRISPR-Cas9 for combined targeting antibiotic resistance and introduction of selective**
4 **advantage to targeted bacterial cells.**

5 91. Luo ML, Mullis AS, Leenay RT et al. Repurposing endogenous type I CRISPR-Cas systems for
6 programmable gene repression. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2015;43:674–681.

7 92. Gilbert LA, Horlbeck MA, Adamson B, et al. Genome-Scale CRISPR-mediated control of gene repression
8 and activation. *Cell*. 2014;159:647–661.

9 93. Qi LS, Larson MH, Gilbert LA, et al. Repurposing CRISPR as an RNA-guided platform for sequence-
10 specific control of gene expression. *Cell*. 2013;152:1173–1183.

11 94. Rock JM, Hopkins FF, Chavez A, et al. Programmable transcriptional repression in mycobacteria using
12 an orthogonal CRISPR interference platform. *Nat Microbiol*. 2017;2:16274.

13 *** Application of CRISPR interference to knockdown gene expression and inhibit cell growth in**
14 **mycobacteria.**

15 95. Peters JM, Colavin A, Shi H, et al. A comprehensive, CRISPR-based functional analysis of essential
16 genes in bacteria. *Cell*. 2016;165:1493–1506.

17 96. Bikard D, Jiang W, Samai P, et al. Programmable repression and activation of bacterial gene expression
18 using an engineered CRISPR-Cas system. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2013;41:7429–7437.

19 97. Choudhary E, Thakur P, Pareek M, et al. Gene silencing by CRISPR interference in mycobacteria. *Nat*
20 *Commun*. 2015;6:6267.

21 98. Singh AK, Carette X, Potluri LP, et al. Investigating essential gene function in *Mycobacterium*
22 *tuberculosis* using an efficient CRISPR interference system. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2016;44:e143.

23 99. Fuller KK, Chen S, Loros JJ. et al. Development of the CRISPR/Cas9 system for targeted gene disruption
24 in *Aspergillus fumigatus*. *Eukaryot Cell*. 2015;14:1073–1080.

25 100. Nødvig CS, Nielsen JB, Kogle ME, et al. A CRISPR-Cas9 system for genetic engineering of filamentous
26 fungi. *PloS one*. 2015;10:e0133085.

27 101. Ng H, Dean N. Dramatic Improvement of CRISPR/Cas9 editing in *Candida albicans* by increased single
28 guide RNA Expression. *mSphere*. 2017;2(2):e00385-16.

29 102. Deng H, Gao R, Liao X, et al. CRISPR system in filamentous fungi: Current achievements and future
30 directions. *Gene*. 2017;627:212–221.

31 103. Mitchell AP. Location, location, location: Use of CRISPR-Cas9 for genome editing in human pathogenic
32 fungi. *PLoS Pathog*. 2017;13(3):e1006209.

33 104. Stovicek V, Holkenbrink C, Borodina I. CRISPR/Cas system for yeast genome engineering: advances
34 and applications. *FEMS Yeast Res*. 2017;doi10.1093/femsyr/fox030.

35 105. Jacobs JZ, Ciccaglione KM, Tournier V, et al. Implementation of the CRISPR-Cas9 system in fission
36 yeast. *Nat Commun*. 2014;5:5344.

- 1 106. DiCarlo JE, Norville JE, Mali P, et al. Genome engineering in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* using CRISPR-
2 Cas systems. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2013;41(7):4336–43.
- 3 107. Zalatan JG, Lee ME, Almeida R, et al. Engineering complex synthetic transcriptional programs with
4 CRISPR RNA scaffolds. *Cell.* 2015;160:339–50.
- 5 108. Si T, Chao R, Min Y, et al. Automated multiplex genome-scale engineering in yeast. *Nat Commun.*
6 2017;8:15187.
- 7 109. Zhang C, Meng X, Wei X, et al. Highly efficient CRISPR mutagenesis by microhomology-mediated end
8 joining in *Aspergillus fumigatus*. *Fungal Genet Biol.* 2016;86:47–57.
- 9 110. Min K, Ichikawa Y, Woolford CA, et al. *Candida albicans* gene deletion with a transient CRISPR-Cas9
10 System. *mSphere.* 2016;1(3):e00130–16.
- 11 111. Nguyen N, Quail MMF, Hernday AD. An Efficient, Rapid, and recyclable system for CRISPR-mediated
12 genome editing in *Candida albicans*. *mSphere.* 2017;2(2)pii:e00149–17.
- 13 112. Grahl N, Demers EG, Crocker AW, et al. Use of RNA-protein complexes for genome editing in non-
14 *albicans Candida* species. *mSphere.* 2017;2(3)pii:e00218–17.
- 15 113. Norton EL, Sherwood RK, Bennett RJ. Development of a CRISPR-Cas9 system for efficient genome
16 editing of *Candida lusitanae*. *mSphere.* 2017;2(3)pii:e00217–17.
- 17 114. Enkler L, Richer D, Marchand AL, et al. Genome engineering in the yeast pathogen *Candida glabrata*
18 using the CRISPR-Cas9 system. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:35766.
- 19 115. Arras SD, Chua SM, Wizrah MS, et al. Targeted genome editing via CRISPR in the pathogen
20 *Cryptococcus neoformans*. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(10):e0164322.
- 21 116. Wang Y, Wei D, Zhu X, et al. A 'suicide' CRISPR-Cas9 system to promote gene deletion and restoration
22 by electroporation in *Cryptococcus neoformans*. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:31145.
- 23 117. Strairmer J, Lee MC, Lee AH, et al. Site-specific genome editing in *Plasmodium falciparum* using
24 engineered zinc-finger nucleases. *Nat Methods.* 2012;9(10):993–998.
- 25 *** Use of zinc-finger nucleases for genome editing in *Plasmodium falciparum*.**
- 26 118. Ghorbal M, Gorman M, Macpherson CR, et al. Genome editing in the human malaria parasite *Plasmodium*
27 *falciparum* using the CRISPR-Cas9 system. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2014;32:819–821.
- 28 *** Use of the CRISPR-Cas9 system for genome editing in *Plasmodium falciparum*.**
- 29 119. Wagner JC, Platt RJ, Goldfless SJ, et al. Efficient CRISPR-Cas9-mediated genome editing in *Plasmodium*
30 *falciparum*. *Nat Methods.* 2014;11:915–918.
- 31 120. Lim M, LaMonte G, Lee MC, et al. UDP-galactose and acetyl-CoA transporters as *Plasmodium* multidrug
32 resistance genes. *Nat Microbiol.* 2016;16166. doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.166.
- 33 121. Ng CL, Siciliano G, Lee MC, et al. CRISPR-Cas9-modified *pfmdr1* protects *Plasmodium falciparum*
34 asexual blood stages and gametocytes against a class of piperazine-containing compounds but potentiates
35 artemisinin-based combination therapy partner drugs. *Mol Microbiol.* 2016;101(3):381–93.
- 36 122. Singer M, Frischknecht F. Time for genome editing: next-generation attenuated malaria parasites. *Trends*
37 *Parasitol.* 2016;33(3):202–213.

1 123. Shen B, Brown KM, Lee TD, et al. Efficient gene disruption in diverse strains of *Toxoplasma gondii* using
2 CRISPR/CAS9. *mBio*. 2014;5(3):e01114–14.

3 124. Sidik SM, Huet D, Ganesan SM, et al. A Genome-wide CRISPR screen in *Toxoplasma* identifies essential
4 apicomplexan genes. *Cell*. 2016;166(6):1423–1435.

5 125. Palencia A, Bougdour A, Brenier-Pinchart MP, et al. Targeting *Toxoplasma gondii* CPSF3 as a new
6 approach to control toxoplasmosis. *EMBO Mol Med*. 2017;9(3):385–394.

7 126. Peng D, Kurup SP, Yao PY, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated single-gene and gene family disruption in
8 *Trypanosoma cruzi*. *mBio*. 2015;6(1):e02097–14.

9 127. Lander N, Li ZH, Niyogi S, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-induced disruption of paraflagellar rod protein 1 and 2
10 genes in *Trypanosoma cruzi* reveals their role in flagellar attachment. *MBio*. 2015;6:e01012.

11 128. Sollelis L, Ghorbal M, MacPherson CR, et al. First efficient CRISPR-Cas9-mediated genome editing in
12 *Leishmania* parasites. *Cell Microbiol*. 2015;17(10):1405–12.

13 129. Zhang WW, Matlashewski G. CRISPR-Cas9-mediated genome editing in *Leishmania donovani*. *mBio*
14 2015; 6(4):e00861.

15 130. Friedland AE, Tzur YB, Esvelt KM, et al. Heritable genome editing in *C. elegans* via a CRISPR-Cas9
16 system. *Nat Methods*. 2013;10:741–743.

17 131. Zamanian M, Andersen EC. Prospects and challenges of CRISPR/Cas genome editing for the study and
18 control of neglected vector-borne nematode diseases. *FEBS J*. 2016;283(17):3204–21.

19 132. Hammond A, Galizi R, Kyrou K, et al. A CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive system targeting female reproduction
20 in the malaria mosquito vector *Anopheles gambiae*. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2016;34:78–83.

21 **** Application of a CRISPR-Cas9 gene drive to inactivate female fertility genes in *Anopheles***
22 **mosquitoes.**

23 133. Gantz VM, Bier E. The mutagenic chain reaction: A method for converting heterozygous to homozygous
24 mutations. *Science*. 2015;348:442–444.

25 134. Reegan AD, Ceasar SA, Paulraj MG, et al. Current status of genome editing in vector mosquitoes: A
26 review. *Biosci Trends*. 2017;10(6):424–432.

27 135. Adelman ZN, Tu Z. Control of mosquito-borne infectious diseases: Sex and gene drive. *Trends Parasitol*.
28 2016;32(3):219–229.

29 136. Champer J, Buchman A, Akbari OS. Cheating evolution: engineering gene drives to manipulate the fate
30 of wild populations. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2016;17:146–159.

31 137. Gantz VM, Jasinskiene N, Tatarenkova O, et al. Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population
32 modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*.
33 2015;112(49):6736–6743.

34 138. Callaway E. Gene drives thwarted by emergence of resistant organisms. *Nature*. 2017;542(7639):15.

35 139. Schiffer JT, Aubert M, Weber ND, et al. Targeted DNA mutagenesis for the cure of chronic viral
36 infections. *J Virol*. 2012;86(17):8920–8936.

- 1 140. Mussolino C, Morbitzer R, Lütge F, et al. A novel TALE nuclease scaffold enables high genome editing
2 activity in combination with low toxicity. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2011;39:9283–9293.
- 3 141. Gabriel R, Lombardo A, Arens A, et al. An unbiased genome-wide analysis of zinc-finger nuclease
4 specificity. *Nature Biotech.* 2011;29:816–823.
- 5 142. Fu Y, Foden JA, Khayter C, et al. High-frequency off-target mutagenesis induced by CRISPR–Cas
6 nucleases in human cells. *Nature Biotech.* 2013;31:822–826.
- 7 143. Cornu TI, Thibodeau-Beganny S, Guhl E, et al. DNA-binding specificity is a major determinant of the
8 activity and toxicity of zinc finger nucleases. *Mol Ther J Am Soc Gene Ther.* 2008;16:352–358.
- 9 144. Mussolino C, Alzubi J, Fine EJ, et al. TALENs facilitate targeted genome editing in human cells with
10 high specificity and low cytotoxicity. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2014;42:6762–6773.
- 11 145. Long C, Amoasii L, Mireault AA, et al. Post-natal genome editing partially restores dystrophin expression
12 in a mouse model of muscular dystrophy. *Science.* 2016;351:400–403.
- 13 146. Nelson CE, Hakim CH, Ousterout DG, et al. *In vivo* genome editing improves muscle function in a mouse
14 model of Duchenne muscular dystrophy. *Science.* 2016;351:403–407.
- 15 147. Schaefer KA, Wu WH, Colgan DF, et al. Unexpected mutations after CRISPR-Cas9 editing in vivo. *Nat*
16 *Methods.* 2017;14:547–548.
- 17 148. Cho SW, Kim S, Kim Y, et al. Analysis of off-target effects of CRISPR/Cas-derived RNA-guided
18 endonucleases and nickases. *Genome Res.* 2014;24(1):132–141.
- 19 149. Li T, Huang S, Zhao X, et al. Modularly assembled designer TAL effector nucleases for targeted gene
20 knockout and gene replacement in eukaryotes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2011;39(14):6315–6325.
- 21 150. Szczepek M, Brondani V, Büchel J, et al. Structure-based redesign of the dimerization interface reduces
22 the toxicity of zinc-finger nucleases. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2007;25(7):786–793.
- 23 151. Fonfara I, Curth U, Pingoud A, et al. Creating highly specific nucleases by fusion of active restriction
24 endonucleases and catalytically inactive homing endonucleases. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2012;40(2):847–860.
- 25 152. Miller JC, Holmes MC, Wang J, et al. An improved zinc-finger nuclease architecture for highly specific
26 genome editing. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 2007;25(7):778–785.
- 27 153. Ran FA, Hsu PD, Lin CY, et al. Double nicking by RNA-guided CRISPR Cas9 for enhanced genome
28 editing specificity. *Cell.* 2013;154:1380–1389.
- 29 154. McConnell Smith A, Takeuchi R, Pellenz S, et al. Generation of a nicking enzyme that stimulates site-
30 specific gene conversion from the I-AniI LAGLIDADG homing endonuclease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.*
31 2009;106(13):5099–104.
- 32 155. Karimova M, Beschorner N, Dammermann W, et al. CRISPR/Cas9 nickase-mediated disruption of
33 hepatitis B virus open reading frame S and X. *Sci Rep.* 2015;5:13734.
- 34 156. Sakuma T, Masaki K, Abe-Chayama H, et al. Highly multiplexed CRISPR-Cas9-nuclease and Cas9-
35 nickase vectors for inactivation of hepatitis B virus. *Genes Cells.* 2016;21(11):1253–1262.
- 36 157. Fu Y, Sander JD, Reyon D, et al. Improving CRISPR-Cas nuclease specificity using truncated guide
37 RNAs. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2014;32(3):279–284.

- 1 158. Esvelt KM, Mali P, Braff JL, et al. Orthogonal Cas9 proteins for RNA-guided gene regulation and editing.
2 Nat Methods. 2013;10(11):1116–21.
- 3 159. Genovese P, Schirotti G, Escobar G, et al. Targeted genome editing in human repopulating haematopoietic
4 stem cells. Nature. 2014;510(7504):235–240.
- 5 160. Gaj T, Guo J, Kato Y, et al. Targeted gene knockout by direct delivery of zinc finger nuclease proteins.
6 Nat Methods. 2012;9:805–807.
- 7 161. Chen J, Zhang W, Lin J, et al. An efficient antiviral strategy for targeting hepatitis B virus genome using
8 transcription activator-like effector nucleases. Mol Ther J Am Soc Gene Ther. 2014;22:303–311.
- 9 162. Naldini L. Gene therapy returns to centre stage. Nature. 2015;526(7573):351–60.
- 10 163. Lombardo A, Genovese P, Beausejour CM, et al. Gene editing in human stem cells using zinc finger
11 nucleases and integrase-defective lentiviral vector delivery. Nat Biotechnol. 2007;25(11):1298–306.
- 12 164. Holkers M, Maggio I, Liu J, et al. Differential integrity of TALE nuclease genes following adenoviral and
13 lentiviral vector gene transfer into human cells. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013;41:e63.
- 14 165. Ran FA, Cong L, Yan WX, et al. In vivo genome editing using Staphylococcus aureus Cas9. Nature.
15 2015;520(7546):186–91.
- 16 166. Bengtsson NE, Hall JK, Odom GL, et al. Muscle-specific CRISPR/Cas9 dystrophin gene editing
17 ameliorates pathophysiology in a mouse model for Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Nat Commun.
18 2017;8:14454.
- 19 167. Zetsche B, Heidenreich M, Mohanraju P, et al. Multiplex gene editing by CRISPR-Cpf1 using a single
20 crRNA array. Nat Biotechnol. 2017;35(1):31–34.
- 21 168. Kotterman MA, Schaffer DV. Engineering adeno-associated viruses for clinical gene therapy. Nat Rev
22 Genet. 2014;15(7):445–51.
- 23 169. Merrill CR, Biswas B, Carlton R, et al. Long-circulating bacteriophage as antibacterial agents. Proc Natl
24 Acad Sci USA. 1996;93:3188–3192.
- 25 170. Goren M, Yosef I, Qimron U. Sensitizing pathogens to antibiotics using the CRISPR-Cas system. Drug
26 Resist Updat. 2017;30:1–6.
- 27 171. Kang YK, Kwon K, Ryu JS, et al. Nonviral genome editing based on a polymer-derivatized CRISPR
28 nanocomplex for targeting bacterial pathogens and antibiotic resistance. Bioconjug Chem. 2017;28:957–
29 967.
- 30 172. Schiffer JT, Swan DA, Stone D, et al. Predictors of hepatitis B cure using gene therapy to deliver DNA
31 cleavage enzymes: a mathematical modeling approach. PLoS Comput Biol 2013;9:e1003131.
- 32 173. De Silva Felix HS, Stone D, Pietz HL, et al. Detection of treatment-resistant infectious HIV after
33 genome-directed antiviral endonuclease therapy. Antiviral Res. 2016;126:90–98.
- 34 174. Wang Z, Pan Q, Gendron P, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-derived mutations both inhibit HIV-1 replication and
35 accelerate viral escape. Cell Rep. 2016;15:481–489.
- 36 175. Lebbink RJ, de Jong DC, Wolters F, et al. A combinational CRISPR/Cas9 gene-editing approach can
37 halt HIV replication and prevent viral escape. Sci Rep. 2017;7:41968.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Genome editing strategies for antiviral therapy. **Targeting viral genome:** programmable nucleases can be exploited for the direct targeting of virus genome leading to disruption of essential viral genes. **Targeting of integrated viral genome:** integrated viruses such as HIV can be targeted at both LTRs leading the excision of the provirus. Alternatively, programmable nucleases can act throughout NHEJ to disrupt essential viral sequences. **Targeting key host factors:** programmable nucleases can target viruses key host factors essential for virus entry/replication. **Activating viruses/restriction factors:** nucleases activation can be directed to induce virus reactivation in latently infected cells, triggering the immune system to recognize infected cells; the same system can be applied to activate host restriction factors that can block the virus at different biological levels.

Figure 2: CRISPR-based strategy as antimicrobials. **Lethal self-targeting of bacterial genomes:** by delivering, via engineered phages, self-targeting spacers, endogenous Cas3 exonuclease can be redirected, leading to chromosome targeting and degradation. **Targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance genes:** chromosome targeting and degradation can be achieved also by gRNA/Cas9 system to generate DNA DSBs, which can be edited using the endogenous DNA repair pathways. Alternatively the same approach can be adopted by using **nanosized CRISPR complexes** (Cr-Nanocomplex), polymer-derivatized Cas9 complexed with sgRNA targeting antibiotic resistance. **Blocking virulence gene transcription:** The block of transcription can be obtained by using a deactivated Cas9 (dCas9), able to bind but not cleave the target sequence.

Targeting viral genome

Targeting integrated viral genome

Targeting key host factors

Activating viruses/restriction factors

1

2 Figure 1

3

4

Lethal self-targeting of bacterial genomes

Targeting bacterial antibiotic resistance genes

Blocking virulence gene transcription

Using nanosized CRISPR complexes

1

2 Figure 2