Comparative Analysis of In-Vivo and Ex-Vivo Base-Editing Therapies for Sickle-Cell Disease

Medical Researcher Specializing in Gene Therapy and Hematology

1. Introduction:

Sickle-cell disease (SCD) is a debilitating inherited blood disorder that affects millions of individuals worldwide.[1] Characterized by a single nucleotide mutation in the β-globin gene, this condition leads to the production of abnormal hemoglobin, causing red blood cells to adopt a rigid, sickle-like shape.[1] These misshapen cells impede blood flow, resulting in chronic anemia, excruciating vaso-occlusive crises, and progressive damage to vital organs, ultimately diminishing the quality of life and reducing the lifespan of affected individuals.[1] While current therapeutic interventions, such as regular blood transfusions and the administration of hydroxyurea, can help manage the symptoms and complications associated with SCD, they do not address the underlying genetic defect and thus do not offer a curative solution.[3]

The advent of gene editing technologies, particularly those based on the CRISPR-Cas system, has ushered in a new era of potential curative therapies for monogenic disorders like SCD.[1] Among these innovative tools, CRISPR base editing stands out as a highly precise method for correcting single-base mutations within the genome without the need to induce double-strand breaks (DSBs) in the DNA molecule.[5] This technology offers a promising avenue for targeting the specific genetic alteration responsible for SCD. The approval of Casgevy, the first CRISPR-based gene therapy for SCD, by regulatory agencies signifies the clinical translation of these advancements.[4] However, limitations in accessibility and the invasiveness of current approved therapies underscore the need for exploring alternative and potentially more refined approaches.

This report aims to provide a comprehensive comparison between two primary strategies that employ CRISPR base editing for the treatment of SCD: *ex-vivo* and *in-vivo* therapies. By examining their respective mechanisms of action, current stages of development, efficacy profiles, safety considerations, accessibility potentials, and future prospects, this analysis will offer a detailed perspective on these cutting-edge therapeutic modalities. The significant global health burden of SCD, affecting over 20 million people worldwide, including a substantial population in the United States, highlights the critical importance of developing effective and widely accessible curative treatments.[1] The recent regulatory approval of Casgevy, a CRISPR-based therapy, marks a crucial step forward, validating the potential of gene editing to address this challenging disease.[4] However, the complexities associated with Casgevy, particularly its requirement for bone marrow transplantation and access to specialized medical centers, along with its high cost, suggest a need for alternative strategies, such as base editing and *in-vivo* delivery, to broaden the therapeutic landscape for SCD patients.[1] This review underscores the promise of base editing as a key technology in the development of curative treatments for hemoglobinopathies, including SCD.[3]

2. CRISPR Base Editing: A Precise Gene Editing Tool:

CRISPR base editing is an advanced genome editing technology that builds upon the foundational CRISPR-Cas9 system, offering the capability to perform targeted modifications of individual nucleotide bases within the DNA sequence without the induction of double-strand breaks (DSBs).[5] This precision is achieved through the engineering of a Cas9 variant, typically a nickase (a Cas9 enzyme with one of its two cutting domains inactivated), which is fused to a deaminase enzyme. This deaminase is responsible for catalyzing the direct conversion of one

DNA base into another, such as the conversion of cytosine (C) to uracil (U), which is subsequently read as thymine (T) during DNA replication, or the conversion of adenine (A) to inosine (I), which is read as guanine (G) by the cellular machinery.[5] This targeted activity is directed to a specific genomic location by a single guide RNA (sgRNA) molecule, which guides the modified Cas9 enzyme to the complementary DNA sequence.[5]

Currently, the repertoire of available base editors primarily allows for three types of base conversions: C•G-to-T•A, A•T-to-G•C, and C•G-to-G•C.[5] In the context of sickle cell disease, a critical limitation arises from the fact that the primary disease-causing mutation (βS) is a T-to-A transversion at the sixth codon of the β-globin gene. Existing base editors are not capable of directly reverting this mutated thymine base back to the wild-type adenine base (A-to-T), which would be the ideal correction.[5] This technical constraint necessitates the exploration of alternative base editing strategies for SCD, such as converting the sickle mutation to a different, naturally occurring, and clinically benign variant like Hemoglobin G-Makassar.

Despite this limitation, CRISPR base editing offers several compelling advantages over traditional CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing, which relies on the generation of DSBs and the cellular homology-directed repair (HDR) pathway to introduce precise genetic corrections.[5] These advantages contribute to the potential of base editing as a therapeutic modality:

- **Enhanced Precision and Minimized Off-Target Effects:** A significant benefit of base editing is its ability to perform targeted single-base changes without creating DSBs. This avoidance of DSBs inherently reduces the risk of unintended genomic rearrangements, such as large deletions or translocations, as well as off-target mutations at sites other than the intended target, potentially leading to a more favorable safety profile for therapeutic applications.[5]
- **Efficacy in Non-Dividing Cells:** The HDR pathway, which is often utilized by traditional CRISPR-Cas9 for precise gene correction, is most active during specific phases of the cell cycle, particularly in dividing cells. Hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs), the primary target for long-term correction in SCD, are largely quiescent or non-dividing. Base editing, which does not depend on HDR, can efficiently modify the genome in these non-proliferating cells, making it particularly well-suited for therapeutic applications targeting HSCs.[6]
- **Improved On-Target Editing Efficiency:** In various preclinical studies, base editing has demonstrated higher frequencies of on-target editing compared to HDR-based CRISPR-Cas9 approaches. Achieving a high level of gene correction or modification in HSCs is often critical for attaining therapeutic efficacy in SCD, and the increased efficiency of base editing can be advantageous in this regard.[14]
- **Versatility and Expanding Toolset:** The field of base editing is rapidly evolving, with the development of new base editors that exhibit improved efficiency, enhanced specificity, the ability to target previously inaccessible genomic loci, and the potential for multiplexed editing. These advancements broaden the scope of therapeutic strategies that can be envisioned for complex diseases like SCD.[12]

The recognized precision of base editing within the scientific community underscores its potential as a reliable therapeutic tool.[11] The ongoing development and refinement of base editing technologies continue to enhance their applicability and safety for addressing the genetic underpinnings of SCD and other inherited disorders.

3. Ex-Vivo Base Editing Therapies for Sickle Cell Disease:

Ex-vivo CRISPR base editing for sickle cell disease involves a multi-step process that begins with the isolation of hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells (HSPCs) from the patient.[16] These cells, which are the precursors to all blood cell types, are typically obtained from the patient's bone marrow or mobilized peripheral blood. Once harvested, the HSPCs are transferred to a specialized laboratory where they undergo genetic modification using CRISPR base editing tools.[16] The specific base editing strategy employed depends on the therapeutic goal, such as

increasing fetal hemoglobin (HbF) production or correcting the sickle cell mutation indirectly. Following the base editing process, the modified HSPCs are carefully evaluated and prepared for transplantation back into the patient. This reinfusion is usually preceded by a conditioning regimen, which involves chemotherapy or radiation therapy, to deplete the patient's existing bone marrow cells. This step creates space within the bone marrow niche, allowing the transplanted, genetically modified cells to engraft and proliferate, ultimately replacing the diseased blood cells.[16]

A significant focus of *ex-vivo* base editing strategies for SCD is the induction of fetal hemoglobin (HbF) production.[1] HbF is a form of hemoglobin that is predominantly expressed during fetal development and shortly after birth. It has a higher affinity for oxygen than adult hemoglobin and, importantly, does not carry the sickle cell mutation. Elevated levels of HbF in adults with SCD can effectively compensate for the defective adult hemoglobin (HbS), mitigating the sickling of red blood cells and alleviating the associated symptoms.[1] Reactivation of HbF expression can be achieved by using base editors to target specific regulatory elements within or around the γ-globin genes (*HBG1* and *HBG2*), which encode the subunits of HbF, or by modifying the genes that repress their expression, such as *BCL11A*.[17]

Examples of Ex-Vivo Base Editing Strategies:

- **BEAM-101 (Beam Therapeutics):** BEAM-101 is an investigational *ex-vivo* cell therapy developed by Beam Therapeutics that utilizes an adenine base editor (ABE).[19] The therapeutic strategy involves introducing precise A-to-G base edits in the promoter regions of the *HBG1* and *HBG2* genes within the patient's HSPCs.[20] These targeted edits are designed to mimic naturally occurring genetic variants that are associated with hereditary persistence of fetal hemoglobin (HPFH). Individuals with HPFH continue to produce significant levels of HbF throughout their adult life, which protects them from the symptoms of SCD.[20] By mimicking these protective mutations, BEAM-101 aims to reactivate the expression of HbF in SCD patients, thereby compensating for the defective adult hemoglobin and alleviating the disease.[20] BEAM-101 is currently undergoing evaluation in the BEACON Phase 1/2 clinical trial, an open-label study designed to assess the safety and efficacy of this novel therapy in adult patients who have severe sickle cell disease.[21] Initial data from the BEACON trial, which is expected in the latter half of 2024, will provide critical insights into the potential of *ex-vivo* base editing for SCD treatment.[22] The successful engraftment of edited cells in the first patient dosed in the BEACON trial represents a positive early indicator for the feasibility of this approach.[22]
- **Correction to Makassar Variant:** Another innovative *ex-vivo* base editing approach focuses on directly modifying the sickle cell mutation in the β-globin gene. Given the current limitations of base editors in performing T-to-A conversions, researchers have explored an alternative strategy: using adenine base editors to convert the pathogenic sickle mutation to the sequence that encodes Hemoglobin G-Makassar (HBB^G).[5] Hemoglobin G-Makassar is a naturally occurring variant of β-globin that is non-pathogenic and does not cause sickling of red blood cells.[5] Preclinical studies conducted on HSPCs derived from patients with SCD have demonstrated that adenine base editors can achieve high levels of conversion from the sickle β-globin gene to the Makassar β-globin gene, with editing efficiencies reaching approximately 80%.[5] Furthermore, these studies have shown a significant reduction in the characteristic sickling of red blood cells in vitro and in mouse models engrafted with the edited human HSPCs.[5] This approach offers a compelling workaround to the technical limitations of current base editing tools, providing a pathway to potentially therapeutic levels of non-sickling hemoglobin production in SCD patients.

Efficacy and Safety of Ex-Vivo Base Editing:

Preclinical investigations into *ex-vivo* base editing strategies for SCD have yielded promising results, demonstrating the ability to effectively increase the levels of fetal hemoglobin or

generate non-sickling variants of adult hemoglobin.[5] The ongoing Phase 1/2 clinical trial of BEAM-101 is poised to provide crucial clinical data that will illuminate the therapeutic potential of *ex-vivo* base editing in human patients with SCD.[21] One of the inherent advantages of *ex-vivo* approaches is the ability to perform rigorous quality control assessments on the genetically modified cells prior to their reinfusion into the patient. This includes evaluating the efficiency of on-target editing and assessing for any potential off-target modifications, which can contribute to a more predictable and potentially safer therapeutic profile.[16] Moreover, the use of autologous cells, derived directly from the patient, in *ex-vivo* gene therapy minimizes the risk of immune rejection and the development of graft-versus-host disease, which are significant concerns in allogeneic transplantation settings.[6] The established *ex-vivo* process for gene therapy in blood disorders provides a robust and well-defined framework for the further development and clinical translation of base editing therapies for SCD.[16]

4. In-Vivo Base Editing Therapies for Sickle Cell Disease:

In-vivo CRISPR base editing represents a transformative approach that aims to deliver the gene editing machinery directly into the patient's body to modify the hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) within their native bone marrow environment.[16] This strategy holds the potential to circumvent several limitations inherent to *ex-vivo* therapies, most notably the requirement for bone marrow transplantation, the extensive manipulation of cells outside the body in specialized laboratory settings, and the need for potentially harsh conditioning regimens such as myeloablation.[23] The ability to edit HSCs directly within the patient could lead to less invasive, more accessible, and potentially more cost-effective treatments for SCD.[24]

The delivery of base editors *in vivo* typically relies on the use of vectors to transport the gene editing components (mRNA encoding the base editor enzyme and the single guide RNA) to the target HSCs.[16] These vectors can be broadly categorized as viral or non-viral. Viral vectors, such as adeno-associated viruses (AAVs), have been extensively studied for their gene delivery capabilities. Non-viral vectors, including lipid nanoparticles (LNPs), are also being explored due to their potential for reduced immunogenicity.[16] A critical aspect of *in-vivo* base editing is the development of effective targeting strategies to ensure that the editing activity is primarily directed to the HSCs within the bone marrow, thereby maximizing therapeutic efficacy and minimizing off-target editing in other cell types and tissues.

Examples of In-Vivo Base Editing Strategies:

- **Editas Medicine's LNP Approach:** Editas Medicine is actively pursuing an *in-vivo* gene-editing strategy for sickle cell disease that utilizes their proprietary targeted lipid nanoparticles (LNPs).[26] These LNPs are engineered to specifically deliver a CRISPR gene-editing machinery to blood progenitor cells residing in the bone marrow.[26] Preclinical studies conducted in mice have demonstrated that a single dose of this *in-vivo* approach resulted in a notable increase in fetal hemoglobin production, with approximately 20% of red blood cells showing the desired effect.[26] Furthermore, Editas Medicine has reported achieving effective delivery and meaningful levels of gene editing in HSCs of non-human primates following a single dose of their optimized LNP formulations.[27] These promising results pave the way for the company to potentially declare an *in-vivo* development candidate for both SCD and beta-thalassemia in 2025, marking a significant step towards clinical translation.[27]
- **UPenn Research using CD117 Targeting:** Researchers at the University of Pennsylvania have developed an innovative proof-of-concept model for *in-vivo* gene editing in blood disorders, including SCD, by employing lipid nanoparticles (LNPs) that are decorated with antibodies targeting CD117, a surface marker that is highly specific to hematopoietic stem cells.[23] In *in vitro* studies using cells obtained from donors with sickle cell disease, this targeted delivery system (CD117/LNP) facilitated efficient adenine base editing. The editing resulted in the conversion of the sickle cell mutation in the β-globin gene to the sequence encoding the non-pathogenic Makassar variant, leading to a

substantial increase in the levels of functional hemoglobin.[23] This research group also explored the potential of using LNPs for *in-vivo* conditioning, aiming to deplete diseased HSCs in the bone marrow without the need for traditional chemotherapy or radiation, which could significantly improve the safety profile of the therapy.[23]

- **In-Vivo Prime Editing:** An intriguing study conducted in mice has demonstrated the feasibility of directly correcting the sickle cell mutation within the body using an *in-vivo* prime editing approach.[28] This method involved a single intravenous injection of a nonintegrating viral vector that expressed the prime editor machinery. The treatment was combined with a low dose of drug selection in vivo to help expand the population of corrected HSCs.[28] The results of this study showed a significant reduction in the levels of sickle hemoglobin and a corresponding mitigation of the SCD phenotypes in the treated mice, all achieved without the need for HSC transplantation or myeloablative conditioning.[28] This approach offers a potentially safer and simpler route to gene correction for SCD.

Efficacy and Safety Considerations for In-Vivo Base Editing:

In-vivo base editing strategies have shown considerable promise in preclinical studies, particularly in animal models of SCD, where they have demonstrated the ability to achieve therapeutically relevant levels of gene editing and a subsequent correction of the disease-related phenotypes.[26] However, the translation of these findings to human therapies presents several significant challenges. One of the primary hurdles is achieving efficient and specific delivery of the base editing machinery to the target hematopoietic stem cells within the bone marrow. Off-target editing in other cell types and tissues remains a concern that needs to be carefully addressed to ensure the safety of *in-vivo* therapies. Additionally, the delivery vectors, whether viral or non-viral, and the editing enzymes themselves have the potential to elicit immunogenic responses in patients, which could limit the efficacy and safety of the treatment.[16] The long-term safety profile of *in-vivo* base editing therapies is an area of ongoing investigation, and comprehensive studies will be necessary to fully understand and mitigate any potential risks.[11] While *in-vivo* approaches aim to avoid the toxicities associated with the conditioning regimens used in *ex-vivo* therapies, the safety of the *in-vivo* delivery methods and the long-term consequences of direct genome modification within the body require thorough evaluation.

5. Comparative Analysis: In-Vivo vs. Ex-Vivo Base Editing for Sickle Cell Disease:

Feature	Ex Vivo CRISPR Base Editing	In Vivo CRISPR Base Editing
Process	HSC Isolation, Editing in Lab, Reinfusion	Direct Delivery of Editing Components to HSCs in Patient
Conditioning Regimen	Typically Milder than Allogeneic Transplant	Aims to Avoid Myeloablative Conditioning
Efficacy (Current Status)	Clinical Trials Underway (e.g., BEAM-101); Promising Preclinical Data (Makassar Conversion)	Preclinical Studies Showing Promise (Editas LNP, UPenn Targeting, Prime Editing); Early Clinical Trial (BEAM-102 for Hypercholesterolemia)
Safety Concerns	Potential Off-Target Edits; Risks Associated with Transplantation and Conditioning Regimen	Immunogenicity of Delivery Vectors and Editing Components; Potential Off-Target Edits in Various Tissues; Systemic Toxicity
Accessibility	Requires Specialized Medical Centers and Expertise; High Treatment Costs	Potential for Broader Accessibility and Administration in More Clinical Settings; Possibility of Lower Treatment Costs in the Future

Advantages	Higher Control Over Editing Process and Quality Control of Edited Cells; Established Framework for Clinical Translation	Less Invasive Procedure; Avoids the Need for Transplantation; Potential for Greater Scalability and Reduced Costs
Disadvantages	Invasive Procedure Requiring Transplantation; High Costs and Limited Accessibility; Need for Specialized Infrastructure	Challenges in Achieving Efficient and Specific Delivery to HSCs; Potential for Off-Target Effects and Immunogenicity; Long-Term Durability and Safety Still Under Investigation
Snippet IDs	[16]	[16]

Both *in-vivo* and *ex-vivo* base editing strategies have demonstrated the capacity to induce therapeutically relevant modifications in hematopoietic stem cells, leading to either an increase in the production of fetal hemoglobin or the generation of hemoglobin variants that do not cause sickling.[5] Currently, *ex-vivo* approaches tend to achieve higher levels of on-target editing and allow for a more direct selection of the modified cells before they are transplanted back into the patient, offering a greater degree of control over the final product.[5] In contrast, *in-vivo* editing is still in the process of optimizing its efficiency to reach comparable levels of consistent and durable editing across a broader range of patients.[16]

In terms of safety, *ex-vivo* base editing benefits from the ability to thoroughly assess and characterize the edited cell product in the laboratory before it is administered to the patient, which can help in mitigating certain safety concerns, such as the presence of off-target modifications.[16] However, the conditioning regimens, often involving chemotherapy, that are typically required to prepare the patient for the transplantation of the modified cells can have significant toxic side effects.[9] *In-vivo* editing aims to circumvent these toxicities by delivering the gene editing tools directly to the patient, but it introduces its own set of safety challenges related to the delivery vectors (such as viral or lipid nanoparticles), the potential for off-target editing in various tissues throughout the body, and the possibility of the patient's immune system reacting to the delivery components or the editing enzymes.[16] Base editing, as a nuclease-free genome editing method, is generally considered to have a more favorable safety profile compared to traditional CRISPR-Cas9 systems that rely on double-strand DNA breaks.[5]

Regarding accessibility and scalability, *ex-vivo* gene therapies necessitate highly specialized infrastructure, including state-of-the-art cell processing facilities and a team of experts skilled in hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. These requirements limit the availability of such treatments to a select number of medical centers and contribute to the very high costs associated with these therapies.[7] *In-vivo* base editing, if it can be successfully developed and implemented, has the potential to offer a more scalable and widely accessible treatment option for SCD. By simplifying the treatment process and potentially reducing the need for extensive infrastructure and prolonged hospital stays, *in-vivo* approaches could significantly lower the overall costs and make gene therapy available to a larger number of patients in diverse clinical settings.[24]

The high costs associated with current *ex-vivo* gene therapies represent a substantial barrier to their widespread adoption, particularly in resource-limited settings.[7] *In-vivo* approaches hold the promise of being more cost-effective in the long term by streamlining the treatment procedure and minimizing the need for complex manufacturing and administration protocols.[24] However, the initial development and large-scale manufacturing of the *in-vivo* delivery systems and the base editing components themselves will also have associated costs that need to be taken into account.

Both *in-vivo* and *ex-vivo* base editing strategies are ultimately aimed at providing a long-lasting or potentially permanent cure for SCD by modifying the patient's hematopoietic stem cells,

which have the unique ability to self-renew and give rise to all blood cell types throughout the individual's life.[5] Early clinical data emerging from *ex-vivo* CRISPR-based therapies for SCD suggest that they can indeed provide durable therapeutic benefits, with some patients experiencing a significant reduction or even complete cessation of vaso-occlusive crises.[9] The long-term efficacy and safety of *in-vivo* base editing for SCD are still being rigorously evaluated in preclinical studies and early-phase clinical trials.[11] The potential of *in-vivo* prime editing to correct the sickle cell mutation directly in hematopoietic stem cells, without the need for transplantation, suggests a promising avenue for long-term benefit.[32] While *ex-vivo* therapies have shown efficacy, *in-vivo* approaches hold the potential for broader accessibility, a crucial factor for a globally prevalent disease like SCD.[25] The use of autologous cells in *ex-vivo* therapy eliminates the risk of immune rejection, a significant advantage, and the shorter lifespan of sickle cells provides a natural selection mechanism for corrected cells, a principle that could also apply to cells edited *in vivo*.[6]

6. The Broader Landscape: Approved Gene Therapies and the Role of Base Editing:

The field of gene therapy for sickle cell disease has recently witnessed significant progress with the approval of two cell-based gene therapies by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA): Casgevy (exagamglogene autotemcel) and Lyfgenia (lovotibeglogene autotemcel).[7]

- **Casgevy:** Developed through a collaboration between CRISPR Therapeutics and Vertex Pharmaceuticals, Casgevy is an *ex-vivo* therapy that utilizes CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technology to modify the patient's own hematopoietic stem cells.[7] The specific target of this editing is the *BCL11A* gene, which plays a crucial role in suppressing the production of fetal hemoglobin (HbF).[4] By disrupting the activity of *BCL11A*, Casgevy enables the patient's edited stem cells to produce high levels of HbF. This increase in HbF effectively interferes with the aggregation of sickle hemoglobin, thereby preventing the red blood cells from sickling and reducing the occurrence of vaso-occlusive crises.[4] Clinical trials evaluating Casgevy have demonstrated remarkable efficacy, with a significant proportion of patients experiencing a substantial reduction or complete elimination of severe vaso-occlusive episodes.[7]
- **Lyfgenia:** Lyfgenia, developed by Bluebird Bio, is another *ex-vivo* gene therapy approved for the treatment of sickle cell disease.[1] This therapy employs a lentiviral vector, a type of gene delivery vehicle, to introduce a modified form of the β-globin gene, known as HbA^{T87Q}, into the patient's hematopoietic stem cells.[1] The HbA^{T87Q} protein is engineered to function similarly to normal adult hemoglobin (HbA) and has been shown to reduce the propensity of red blood cells to sickle.[8] Clinical data from studies on Lyfgenia have also indicated a significant decrease in the frequency of vaso-occlusive events in treated patients.[9]

Both Casgevy and Lyfgenia share a common approach: they are *ex-vivo* therapies that necessitate the collection of the patient's hematopoietic stem cells, their genetic modification in a specialized laboratory setting, and their subsequent reinfusion into the patient following a myeloablative conditioning process, which involves high-dose chemotherapy to prepare the bone marrow for the modified cells.[7] These procedures are inherently complex, invasive, and associated with substantial costs, which can significantly limit the accessibility of these groundbreaking treatments to a broader patient population.[1]

CRISPR base editing presents itself as a potentially safer and more precise alternative to traditional CRISPR-Cas9 in certain therapeutic contexts due to its ability to perform targeted single-base corrections without inducing double-strand breaks in the DNA.[5] While there are currently no base editing therapies that have received regulatory approval for sickle cell disease, the ongoing research efforts and clinical trials, such as the BEACON trial evaluating BEAM-101, strongly suggest that this technology is poised to play a pivotal role in the future treatment landscape for SCD.[24] Base editing strategies that focus on reactivating fetal hemoglobin production or on generating non-sickling variants of adult hemoglobin represent

promising avenues of investigation that could potentially offer advantages in terms of safety and, particularly with the development of *in-vivo* delivery methods, in terms of accessibility and cost for patients with sickle cell disease.[24] The recent approvals highlight the progress in the field but also underscore the need for less invasive and more affordable options.[1] The requirement for myeloablative conditioning in both approved therapies emphasizes the desirability of non-myeloablative approaches like *in-vivo* base editing.[9] The complexity and cost of *ex-vivo* manufacturing also serve as major drivers for the continued development of *in-vivo* gene editing strategies.[31]

7. Future Directions and Conclusion:

The field of base editing for sickle cell disease is characterized by rapid advancements in research and development, with ongoing efforts directed at enhancing the efficiency, specificity, and delivery methods for both *ex-vivo* and *in-vivo* therapeutic strategies.[1]

Significant attention is being paid to optimizing *in-vivo* delivery technologies, such as the engineering of targeted lipid nanoparticles and the development of viral vectors that exhibit enhanced tropism for hematopoietic stem cells. The goal of these efforts is to achieve higher rates of on-target gene editing while simultaneously minimizing off-target modifications in other cell types and tissues.[23] Furthermore, researchers are exploring the development of non-myeloablative conditioning regimens that could be used in conjunction with *ex-vivo* therapies, as well as the potential for *in-vivo* conditioning using targeted delivery systems, both of which could contribute to improved safety and accessibility of these treatments.[23]

Emerging gene editing technologies, such as prime editing, which offers the capability for more versatile and precise DNA modifications, also hold considerable promise for the treatment of SCD. Prime editing could potentially overcome some of the limitations of current base editing tools by allowing for the direct correction of the causative sickle cell mutation without relying on the generation of double-strand breaks or the homology-directed repair pathway.[1]

In conclusion, both *in-vivo* and *ex-vivo* base editing therapies represent highly promising avenues for the development of curative treatments for sickle cell disease. While *ex-vivo* approaches are currently further along in the trajectory of clinical development, with approved therapies now available to patients, *in-vivo* strategies hold the potential to address the significant limitations of accessibility, cost, and invasiveness that are associated with *ex-vivo* methods. Continued rigorous research and comprehensive clinical trials will be absolutely crucial in determining the long-term safety, efficacy, and optimal application of these innovative gene editing therapies, ultimately for the benefit of individuals living with SCD.[11] The potential safety advantages offered by nuclease-free editing technologies like base editing are a key driving force behind their development for SCD therapy.[35] Targeting *BCL11A* enhancers using multiplex base editing has shown significant promise in achieving therapeutic levels of fetal hemoglobin production in a potentially safe manner.[18] Comparative studies have suggested that base editing may offer superior efficacy in certain aspects when compared to traditional CRISPR-Cas9 for the treatment of hemoglobinopathies.[15] Adenine base editing, in particular, has demonstrated the potential for robust and consistent induction of fetal hemoglobin, a critical therapeutic strategy for SCD.[36] Further evidence supports the notion that base editing, especially ABE, holds significant promise as a therapeutic approach for SCD.[37] The successful *in-vivo* application of adenine base editors in animal models of beta-hemoglobinopathies, achieving clinically relevant levels of fetal hemoglobin without the need for myeloablation, represents a substantial step towards human application.[13] Finally, the potential of *in-vivo* gene therapy to address the accessibility challenges associated with *ex-vivo* approaches is particularly important for a globally prevalent disease such as SCD.[25]

Key Tables:

1. **Comparison of In-Vivo and Ex-Vivo Base Editing for Sickle Cell Disease:**

Feature	Ex Vivo	In Vivo
Process	HSC Isolation, Editing in Lab, Reinfusion	Direct Delivery of Editing Components to HSCs in Patient
Conditioning Regimen	Typically Milder than Allogeneic Transplant	Aims to Avoid Myeloablative Conditioning
Efficacy (Current Status)	Clinical Trials Underway (e.g., BEAM-101); Promising Preclinical Data (Makassar Conversion)	Preclinical Studies Showing Promise (Editas LNP, UPenn Targeting, Prime Editing); Early Clinical Trial (BEAM-102 for Hypercholesterolemia)
Safety Concerns	Potential Off-Target Edits; Risks Associated with Transplantation and Conditioning Regimen	Immunogenicity of Delivery Vectors and Editing Components; Potential Off-Target Edits in Various Tissues; Systemic Toxicity
Accessibility	Requires Specialized Medical Centers and Expertise; High Treatment Costs	Potential for Broader Accessibility and Administration in More Clinical Settings; Possibility of Lower Treatment Costs in the Future
Advantages	Higher Control Over Editing Process and Quality Control of Edited Cells; Established Framework for Clinical Translation	Less Invasive Procedure; Avoids the Need for Transplantation; Potential for Greater Scalability and Reduced Costs
Disadvantages	Invasive Procedure Requiring Transplantation; High Costs and Limited Accessibility; Need for Specialized Infrastructure	Challenges in Achieving Efficient and Specific Delivery to HSCs; Potential for Off-Target Effects and Immunogenicity; Long-Term Durability and Safety Still Under Investigation
Snippet IDs	[16]	[16]

2. **Examples of Base Editing Strategies for Sickle Cell Disease:**

Therapy/Study	Approach	Target	Editing Type	Stage	Snippet IDs
BEAM-101 (Ex-Vivo)	Base Editing of HSCs	*HBG1/2* Promoters	Adenine Base Editor (A-to-G)	Phase 1/2 Clinical Trial	[19]
Newby et al. (Ex-Vivo)	Base Editing of HSCs	*HBB* Gene (Sickle Mutation)	Adenine Base Editor (A-to-G to Makassar)	Preclinical (Mice)	[5]
Editas Medicine (In-Vivo)	LNP Delivery to HSCs	Increase Fetal Hemoglobin	CRISPR Gene Editing	Preclinical (Mice, Non-Human Primates)	[26]
UPenn Research (In-Vivo)	CD117-Targeted LNP Delivery to HSCs	*HBB* Gene (Sickle Mutation)	Adenine Base Editor (A-to-G to Makassar)	*In Vitro*, Preclinical (Mice)	[23]
Lieber Group (In-Vivo)	Viral Vector Delivery to HSCs	*HBB* Gene (Sickle Mutation)	Prime Editing	Preclinical (Mice)	[28]

Works cited

1. Sickle Cell Disease: A 2025 Update - Front Line Genomics, accessed May 10, 2025, https://frontlinegenomics.com/sickle-cell-disease-a-2024-update/
2. CRISPR-Cas9 and Sickle Cell Anemia - NSTA, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.nsta.org/ncss-case-study/crispr-cas9-and-sickle-cell-anemia
3. Gene therapy for sickle cell disease and thalassemia - PubMed, accessed May 10, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40013946/
4. Approval of the First CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing Therapy for Sickle Cell Disease, accessed May 10, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/clinchem/article-abstract/70/10/1298/7808729
5. Exploring the potential of base editing for sickle cell disease - Revvity, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.revvity.com/blog/exploring-potential-base-editing-sickle-cell-disease
6. CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing for curing sickle cell disease - PMC, accessed May 10, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8049447/
7. Creating the World's First CRISPR Medicine, for Sickle Cell Disease ..., accessed May 10, 2025, https://hms.harvard.edu/news/creating-worlds-first-crispr-medicine-sickle-cell-disease
8. FDA Approves U.S.-First CRISPR-edited Gene Therapy for Sickle Cell Disease - ASGCT, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.asgct.org/publications/news/december-2023/fda-approves-u-s-first-crispr-edited-gene-therapy
9. FDA Approves First Gene Therapies to Treat Patients with Sickle Cell Disease, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-gene-therapies-treat-patients-sickle-cell-disease
10. CRISPR Sickle Cell Gene Therapy: Approaches, Challenges, and Progress - Synthego, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.synthego.com/crispr-sickle-cell-disease
11. First in vivo base-editing trial shows promise - PMC, accessed May 10, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10787164/
12. Base and Prime Editing Technologies for Blood Disorders - Frontiers, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/genome-editing/articles/10.3389/fgeed.2021.618406/full
13. Adenine Base Editors Could Offer Alternative Approach in Beta Hemoglobinopathies Gene Therapies | ASH Clinical News | American Society of Hematology, accessed May 10, 2025, https://ashpublications.org/ashclinicalnews/news/7964/Adenine-Base-Editors-Could-Offer-Alternative
14. Base editing of hematopoietic stem cells rescues sickle cell disease in mice - PMC, accessed May 10, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8266759/
15. Base editing demonstrates favorable results over CRISPR-Cas9 for treating hemoglobinopathies - RegMedNet, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.regmednet.com/base-editing-demonstrates-favorable-results-over-crispr-cas9-for-treating-hemoglobinopathies/
16. The future of ex vivo hematopoietic stem cell gene editing: what's next - PMC, accessed May 10, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11951688/

17. Clinical genome editing to treat sickle cell disease—A brief update - Frontiers, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/medicine/articles/10.3389/fmed.2022.1065377/full
18. Multiplex base editing of BCL11A regulatory elements to treat sickle cell disease | bioRxiv, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.12.13.628398v2.full
19. CRISPR Clinical Trials: A 2024 Update - Innovative Genomics Institute (IGI), accessed May 10, 2025, https://innovativegenomics.org/news/crispr-clinical-trials-2024/
20. Pipeline | Beam Therapeutics, accessed May 10, 2025, https://beamtx.com/pipeline/
21. Disease Roundup: Four Gene-Editing Candidates in the Clinic for Sickle Cell Disease, accessed May 10, 2025, https://crisprmedicinenews.com/news/disease-roundup-four-gene-editing-candidates-in-the-clinic-for-sickle-cell-disease/
22. Beam Therapeutics Highlights Progress Across Base Editing Portfolio and Outlines 2024 Anticipated Milestones, accessed May 10, 2025, https://investors.beamtx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/beam-therapeutics-highlights-progress-across-base-editing/
23. Researchers Develop “In Vivo” Gene Editing Model for Blood Disorders, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.chop.edu/news/researchers-develop-vivo-gene-editing-model-blood-disorders
24. Editing Stem Cells In Vivo: A Major Stride in Gene Therapy for Blood Disorders, accessed May 10, 2025, https://crisprmedicinenews.com/news/editing-stem-cells-in-vivo-a-major-stride-in-gene-therapy-for-blood-disorders/
25. Recent advancements in gene therapy for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia - Frontiers, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/hematology/articles/10.3389/frhem.2024.1468952/full
26. Editas' new gene-editing strategy for SCD shows promise in mice, accessed May 10, 2025, https://sicklecellanemianews.com/news/editas-medicine-gene-editing-strategy-scd-shows-promise-mice/
27. Editas Medicine Highlights New In Vivo Preclinical Proof of Concept Data, Anticipated 2025 Key Milestones, and Three-year Strategic Priorities, accessed May 10, 2025, https://ir.editasmedicine.com/news-releases/news-release-details/editas-medicine-highlights-new-vivo-preclinical-proof-concept
28. In vivo HSC prime editing rescues sickle cell disease in a mouse model | Blood, accessed May 10, 2025, https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/141/17/2085/494601/In-vivo-HSC-prime-editing-rescues-sickle-cell
29. New approaches in gene therapy for sickle cell disease, moving in vivo - PMC, accessed May 10, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10928759/
30. In vivo base editing by a single i.v. vector injection for treatment of hemoglobinopathies, accessed May 10, 2025, https://insight.jci.org/articles/view/162939

31. Panorama of CRISPR Gene Editing Clinical Applications: 2024 Review - KACTUS, accessed May 10, 2025, https://kactusbio.com/blogs/news/panorama-of-crispr-gene-editing-clinical-applications-2024-review
32. The promise of in vivo HSC prime editing | Blood - American Society of Hematology, accessed May 10, 2025, https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/141/17/2039/495427/The-promise-of-in-vivo-HSC-prime-editing
33. FDA Approves Two Gene Therapies for Sickle Cell Disease, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.chop.edu/news/fda-approves-two-gene-therapies-sickle-cell-disease
34. Treating Sickle Cell Disease: Gene Therapy Approaches - Annual Reviews, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-pharmtox-022124-022000
35. Genome editing for sickle cell disease: still time to correct? - Frontiers, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/pediatrics/articles/10.3389/fped.2023.1249275/full
36. Base editing shows potential superiority for curing sickle cell disease, accessed May 10, 2025, https://www.stjude.org/media-resources/news-releases/2023-medicine-science-news/base-editing-shows-potential-superiority-for-curing-sickle-cell-disease.html
37. In SCD, base editing beats CRISPR-Cas9 at gene editing: Study | Sickle Cell Disease News, accessed May 10, 2025, https://sicklecellanemianews.com/news/scd-base-editing-beats-crispr-cas9-gene-editing-study/