Comparing In-Vivo and Ex-Vivo Base-Editing Therapies for Sickle Cell Disease

Sickle cell disease (SCD) has become a focal point for advanced gene editing therapies, with base editing emerging as a promising approach that offers precision without the drawbacks of conventional CRISPR-Cas9 techniques. Base editing enables the modification of individual DNA nucleotides without creating double-strand breaks, potentially addressing the underlying genetic mutation of SCD while minimizing unwanted genomic alterations. The two primary delivery approaches-ex-vivo and in-vivo-represent distinct paradigms for treating this devastating disease. Each approach offers unique advantages and faces distinct challenges in clinical development, efficacy, safety, and accessibility. This comprehensive comparison examines how these approaches differ in their mechanisms, clinical progress, and potential to revolutionize SCD treatment.

Ex-Vivo Base Editing Approaches

Mechanism and Implementation

Ex-vivo base editing for sickle cell disease involves harvesting a patient's hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells (HSPCs), genetically modifying them outside the body, and reinfusing them following myeloablative conditioning. This approach utilizes various base editing technologies to target specific genetic elements involved in hemoglobin production. The most advanced ex-vivo therapy, BEAM-101, employs adenine base editors to modify the promoter regions of HBG1/2 genes, inhibiting BCL11A (a fetal hemoglobin repressor) from binding without disrupting BCL11A expression itself[15]. This precision editing mimics naturally occurring variants seen in individuals with hereditary persistence of fetal hemoglobin[4].

Alternative ex-vivo strategies include prime editing, which can directly correct the SCD mutation (HBBS) to wild-type hemoglobin (HBBA) at frequencies of 15%-41% in patient-derived HSPCs[2]. Another approach uses adenine base editors to convert the sickle mutation into Makassar β-globin (HBBG), a non-pathogenic variant, achieving 80% conversion in HSPCs from SCD patients[16]. Multiplex base editing of BCL11A erythroid-

specific enhancers has also demonstrated substantial HbF reactivation without generating significant double-strand breaks or genomic rearrangements[5].

Clinical Progress and Efficacy

Ex-vivo base editing therapies have progressed into clinical development, with BEAM-101 leading the way. Initial clinical data from Beam Therapeutics' BEACON trial shows promising results in the first cohort of SCD patients. All four patients in the efficacy cohort achieved fetal hemoglobin levels above 60% at 1-6 months follow-up, exceeding the company's target threshold[11][17]. These patients demonstrated red blood cells with less sickling, reduced cell adhesion, and improved flow properties, with no reported vaso-occlusive crises during the follow-up period[11].

Preclinical studies have similarly demonstrated robust efficacy. When prime-edited SCD HSPCs were transplanted into immunodeficient mice, they maintained HBBA levels for at least 17 weeks, with approximately 42% of human erythroblasts and reticulocytes expressing the corrected gene[2]. Similarly, HSPCs edited with ABE8e-NRCH to convert HBBS to HBBG showed 68% editing frequency 16 weeks after transplantation, with a fivefold decrease in hypoxia-induced sickling of bone marrow reticulocytes[16]. These results underscore the potential durability of ex-vivo base editing approaches.

Safety Profile and Limitations

Base editing offers improved safety compared to conventional CRISPR-Cas9 nuclease-based approaches by avoiding double-strand breaks that can lead to unwanted genomic rearrangements. Studies of prime editing showed minimal off-target editing across over 100 sites analyzed via unbiased genome-wide assessment[2]. Similarly, base editing of human HSPCs avoided the p53 activation and larger deletions typically observed with Cas9 nuclease treatment[16].

However, the ex-vivo approach still faces significant safety challenges, primarily related to the conditioning regimen required for engraftment. Current protocols typically involve

myeloablative conditioning with agents like busulfan, which carry substantial toxicity. In the BEAM-101 trial, one patient died from respiratory failure attributed to the conditioning agent rather than the therapeutic itself[19]. This highlights one of the major limitations of ex-vivo approaches-the requirement for intensive conditioning that introduces significant treatment-associated risks.

In-Vivo Base Editing Approaches

Delivery Systems and Mechanisms

In-vivo base editing represents a fundamentally different approach, delivering editing machinery directly to cells within the patient's body, primarily targeting hematopoietic stem cells in the bone marrow. Several delivery systems are under development, with bone-marrow-homing lipid nanoparticles (LNPs) emerging as a promising vehicle. These specialized LNPs can deliver mRNA encoding base editors to multiple cell types in the bone marrow, including HSCs, enabling editing without cell extraction[9][13].

Another delivery approach utilizes adeno-associated viruses (AAVs) with size-optimized genomes incorporating compact adenine base editors. Single-AAV-encoded ABEs have demonstrated efficient editing in mice at similar or lower doses compared to dual-AAV systems[7]. In-vivo prime editing has also been explored using vectorized prime editors for HSC transduction, achieving correction of the sickle cell mutation without requiring HSC transplantation or myeloablation[6].

The editing strategies for in-vivo approaches parallel those used ex-vivo, including reactivation of fetal hemoglobin through modification of BCL11A regulatory elements or direct correction of the sickle mutation. However, the in-vivo context presents unique challenges for delivery specificity and editing efficiency that researchers are actively addressing through targeted delivery technologies[13].

Preclinical Evidence and Potential

While in-vivo base editing for SCD remains in preclinical development, studies have demonstrated promising results in animal models. In a humanized SCD mouse model, in-vivo HSC prime editing achieved correction of approximately 40% of βS alleles in HSCs, resulting in 43% replacement of sickle hemoglobin with adult hemoglobin and significant mitigation of SCD phenotypes[6]. Single-AAV-encoded ABEs have achieved editing efficiencies of up to 66% in mouse liver tissues, though efficiency in hematopoietic tissues requires further optimization[7].

Recent advances in LNP technology show particular promise. Antibody-free targeted LNPs have achieved efficient base editing of the HBG target in human HSCs engrafted in immunodeficient mice, demonstrating restored globin chain balance in erythroid cells[13]. Furthermore, these edited HSCs maintained their ability to support secondary transplantation with multilineage human hematopoietic engraftment, suggesting preservation of stem cell functionality[13].

Accessibility and Practical Advantages

The in-vivo approach offers several potential advantages that could dramatically improve treatment accessibility, particularly in regions where sophisticated ex-vivo processing facilities are unavailable. By eliminating the need for cell harvesting, laboratory manipulation, and subsequent transplantation, in-vivo base editing could significantly simplify the treatment process for SCD patients[4][6]. This simplicity and portability make it particularly attractive for application in resource-limited settings where SCD prevalence is high[6].

In addition to logistical advantages, in-vivo approaches could potentially avoid the need for myeloablative conditioning, which represents one of the most significant barriers to current gene therapy approaches. While some conditioning may still be required to create space for edited cells, researchers are exploring less toxic alternatives that could further improve the safety profile and accessibility of in-vivo therapies[4].

Comparative Analysis of Approaches

Efficacy Profiles

Current evidence suggests that both approaches can achieve clinically meaningful editing efficiencies, though they are at different stages of development. Ex-vivo base editing has demonstrated efficacy in early clinical trials, with BEAM-101 achieving fetal hemoglobin levels exceeding 60% in treated patients[11][17]. This is comparable to or better than the 40% threshold predicted necessary for therapeutic benefit[2].

In-vivo approaches have shown promising results in preclinical models, with editing efficiencies ranging from 40% in HSCs using prime editing[6] to higher percentages in specific tissues using AAV delivery[7]. However, these approaches have yet to demonstrate efficacy in human trials, and questions remain about whether they can achieve the consistent editing levels observed with ex-vivo approaches across diverse patient populations.

Both approaches appear capable of durably modifying long-term repopulating HSCs, which is essential for sustained therapeutic benefit. However, ex-vivo approaches currently have more robust evidence for long-term efficacy through secondary transplantation studies and longer follow-up periods[2][16].

Safety Considerations and Risk-Benefit Balance

Base editing generally offers improved safety compared to nuclease-based gene editing by reducing double-strand breaks and associated genomic alterations. Both ex-vivo and in-vivo approaches benefit from this fundamental advantage. However, they differ substantially in treatment-associated risks beyond the editing process itself.

Ex-vivo approaches require myeloablative conditioning, which introduces significant risks including infection, infertility, and secondary malignancies. The recent death in the BEAM-101 trial attributed to conditioning complications underscores this concern[19]. In contrast, in-vivo approaches may potentially reduce or eliminate the need for intensive

conditioning, though some conditioning may still be required for optimal engraftment of edited cells[4].

Regarding off-target effects, both approaches have demonstrated relatively clean editing profiles in preclinical studies[2][6], though the controlled environment of ex-vivo editing may offer advantages for quality control and safety assessment before cell reinfusion. In-vivo delivery systems face additional challenges in targeting specificity that could potentially affect their safety profile.

Accessibility and Implementation Challenges

The starkest contrast between these approaches lies in their accessibility and implementation requirements. Ex-vivo therapies require sophisticated infrastructure for cell processing, quality control, and patient management during conditioning and transplantation. These requirements create significant barriers to widespread implementation, particularly in resource-limited settings where SCD prevalence is highest[6].

In-vivo approaches promise dramatically improved accessibility by potentially eliminating the need for specialized cell processing facilities and reducing the intensity of patient preparation[4][13]. However, they face substantial technical challenges in delivery optimization, editing efficiency, and manufacturing of complex delivery vehicles like LNPs or AAVs.

Future Directions and Emerging Innovations

Hybrid Approaches and Conditioning Alternatives

The future may see convergence between these approaches, with innovations addressing the limitations of each. Beam Therapeutics is developing their ESCAPE platform, which uses base editing to enable non-genotoxic conditioning options for patients with SCD[4].

This could substantially improve the safety profile of ex-vivo therapies while retaining their proven efficacy.

Simultaneously, improvements in in-vivo delivery specificity and efficiency could bridge the gap to ex-vivo performance levels. Next-generation LNPs with enhanced bone marrow targeting are showing promise in preclinical models, with potential for clinical translation in coming years[13].

Regulatory Pathway and Clinical Implementation

Ex-vivo base editing therapies are following a regulatory pathway already established by approved gene therapies like Casgevy (exagamglogene autotemcel)[12]. BEAM-101 has entered phase 1/2 clinical trials[18], benefiting from the precedent set by earlier therapies. In contrast, in-vivo base editing approaches will likely face additional regulatory scrutiny given their novelty and systemic delivery, potentially extending their development timeline.

Clinical implementation will require consideration of both efficacy and accessibility. While ex-vivo approaches may reach approval sooner, their impact may be limited by implementation barriers. In-vivo approaches, if successful, could eventually reach far more patients globally, though their development timeline appears longer.

Conclusion

Both in-vivo and ex-vivo base editing approaches represent significant advances in the treatment landscape for sickle cell disease, each with distinct advantages and challenges. Ex-vivo approaches have progressed further in clinical development, demonstrating impressive efficacy and an improved safety profile compared to earlier gene editing technologies. However, they remain limited by the complexity and risks of cell harvesting, ex-vivo manipulation, and myeloablative conditioning.

In-vivo base editing offers a compelling vision of simplified treatment delivery that could dramatically improve accessibility, particularly in regions with limited healthcare infrastructure. While still in preclinical development, this approach has shown promising results in animal models and continues to benefit from rapid advances in delivery technology.

The optimal approach may ultimately depend on specific patient factors and healthcare setting constraints. In well-resourced settings with established infrastructure for cellular therapies, ex-vivo approaches may provide the most immediate and proven benefit. For global implementation, particularly in regions with high SCD prevalence but limited healthcare resources, in-vivo approaches may eventually offer the most realistic path to widespread treatment access. Continued development of both strategies, along with innovations that address their respective limitations, will be essential to realizing the full potential of base editing for sickle cell disease.

Sources

[1] CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing for curing sickle cell disease - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8049447/

[2] Ex vivo prime editing of patient haematopoietic stem cells rescues ...
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41551-023-01026-0

[3] Base Editing Beats Other Genome Editing Strategies for Treating ...
https://www.genengnews.com/topics/genome-editing/base-editing-beats-other-genome-editing-strategies-for-treating-sickle-cell-disease/

[4] Pipeline | Beam Therapeutics https://beamtx.com/pipeline/

[5] Multiplex base editing of BCL11A regulatory elements to treat sickle ...
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.12.13.628398v1.full-text

[6] In vivo HSC prime editing rescues sickle cell disease in a mouse ...
https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/141/17/2085/494601/In-vivo-HSC-prime-editing-rescues-sickle-cell

[7] Efficient in vivo base editing via single adeno-associated viruses ...
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41551-022-00911-4

[8] Exagamglogene Autotemcel for Severe Sickle Cell Disease - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38661449/

[9] Bone-marrow-homing lipid nanoparticles for genome editing in ...
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38783058/

[10] CRISPR/Cas9 in the treatment of sickle cell disease (SCD) and its ...
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11444630/

[11] Base editing boosts hemoglobin in sickle cell disease - Nature
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-024-02517-4

[12] Exagamglogene autotemcel - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exagamglogene_autotemcel

[13] [PDF] In vivo genome editing of human hematopoietic stem cells ... - bioRxiv
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.10.28.620445v1.full.pdf

[14] CRISPR Sickle Cell Gene Therapy - Synthego https://www.synthego.com/crispr-sickle-cell-disease

[15] Press Release - Beam Therapeutics https://investors.beamtx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/beam-therapeutics-announces-new-data-beacon-phase-12-clinical

[16] Base editing of haematopoietic stem cells rescues sickle ... - Nature
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03609-w

[17] Beam hits hemoglobin goal in first base editing clinical data
https://www.fiercebiotech.com/biotech/beam-hits-hemoglobin-goal-first-base-editing-clinical-data-reports-death-tied-conditioning

[18] CRISPR Clinical Trials: A 2024 Update - Innovative Genomics Institute
https://innovativegenomics.org/news/crispr-clinical-trials-2024/

[19] Beam Therapeutics Sickle Cell Base Editing Works, Not Cause of ...
https://www.insideprecisionmedicine.com/topics/precision-medicine/beam-therapeutics-sickle-cell-base-editing-works-not-cause-of-patient-death/

[20] Therapeutic Promise of CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing in Sickle Cell ...
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2452318625000224

[21] Ex Vivo CRISPR-Based Sickle Cell Modeling | Blood
https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/140/Supplement%201/12984/488174/Ex-Vivo-CRISPR-Based-Sickle-Cell-Modeling

[22] Adenine base editor–mediated correction of the common and ...
https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/141/10/1169/493713/Adenine-base-editor-mediated-correction-of-the

[23] Base editing of hematopoietic stem cells rescues sickle cell disease ...
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8266759/

[24] Adenine Base Editors Could Offer Alternative Approach in Beta ...
https://ashpublications.org/ashclinicalnews/news/7964/Adenine-Base-Editors-Could-Offer-Alternative

[25] Editing outside the body: Ex vivo gene-modification for β ...
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8571174/

[26] Genome editing for sickle cell disease: still time to correct? - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10652763/

[27] Base editing boosts hemoglobin in sickle cell disease - Nature
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-024-02517-4

[28] Therapeutic adenine base editing of human hematopoietic stem cells
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-022-35508-7

[29] Exploring the potential of base editing for sickle cell disease - Revvity
https://www.revvity.com/blog/exploring-potential-base-editing-sickle-cell-disease

[30] Revolutionising healing: Gene Editing's breakthrough against sickle ...
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0268960X24000183

[31] FDA Approves First Gene Therapies to Treat Patients with Sickle ...
https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-gene-therapies-treat-patients-sickle-cell-disease

[32] Genetic base editing treats sickle cell disease in mice - Broad Institute
https://www.broadinstitute.org/news/genetic-base-editing-treats-sickle-cell-disease-mice

[33] Patient Death Taints Otherwise Positive Data for Beam's Sickle Cell ...
https://www.biospace.com/business/patient-death-taints-otherwise-positive-data-for-beams-sickle-cell-gene-therapy

[34] WO2021067233A1 - Bcl11a guide and base editor delivery
https://patents.google.com/patent/WO2021067233A1/en

[35] Introducing a hemoglobin G-Makassar variant in HSCs by in vivo ...
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39489920/

[36] Adenine Base Editing In Vivo with a Single Adeno-Associated Virus ... https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35811581/

[37] Press Release - Beam Therapeutics https://investors.beamtx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/beam-therapeutics-present-data-across-hematology-franchise

[38] Base editing of key residues in the BCL11A-XL-specific zinc finger ... https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38273654/

[39] In vivo HSC prime editing rescues sickle cell disease in a mouse ... https://ashpublications.org/blood/article-abstract/141/17/2085/494601

[40] A split and inducible adenine base editor for precise in vivo ... - Nature https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-023-41331-5

[41] A sickle cell first: Base editing - Boston Children's Answers https://answers.childrenshospital.org/sickle-cell-base-editing/

[42] In vivo base editing by a single i.v. vector injection for treatment of ... https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9675455/

[43] Explainer: What Are Base Editors and How Do They Work? https://crisprmedicinenews.com/news/explainer-what-are-base-editors-and-how-do-they-work/

[44] An evaluation of exagamglogene autotemcel for the treatment of ... https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39222044/

[45] Safer and efficient base editing and prime editing via ... - Nature https://www.nature.com/articles/s41551-024-01296-2

[46] CASGEVY (Exagamglogene Autotemcel) | Boston Children's Hospital https://www.childrenshospital.org/treatments/casgevy

[47] Non-viral DNA delivery and TALEN editing correct the sickle cell ... https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-024-49353-3

[48] Exagamglogene autotemcel: a beacon of hope for severe sickle cell ... https://journals.lww.com/ijsopen/fulltext/2024/08000/exagamglogene_autotemcel__a_beacon_of_hope_for.52.aspx

[49] CRISPR-dependent base editing as a therapeutic strategy for rare ... https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/genome-editing/articles/10.3389/fgeed.2025.1553590/full

[50] Beam Therapeutics Outlines Long-term Strategy for Base Editing ...
https://investors.beamtx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/beam-therapeutics-outlines-long-term-strategy-base-editing

[51] [PDF] In vivo genome editing of human hematopoietic stem cells ... - bioRxiv
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.10.28.620445v1.full.pdf

[52] A base editing strategy using mRNA-LNPs for in vivo correction of ...
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666247723000854

[53] In vivo hematopoietic stem cell modification by mRNA delivery
https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.ade6967

[54] A step closer to in vivo editing of haematopoietic stem cells - Nature
https://www.nature.com/articles/d41573-023-00147-0

[55] mRNA-loaded nanoparticles edit genes | C&EN Global Enterprise
https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/cen-10126-scicon5

[56] In vivo base editing of Angptl3 via lipid nanoparticles to treat ...
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S216225312500040X

[57] New nanoparticle delivery method targets sickle cell mutations in ...
https://phys.org/news/2024-07-nanoparticle-delivery-method-sickle-cell.html

[58] CASGEVY® (exagamglogene autotemcel) | Patient Website https://www.casgevy.com

[59] Exagamglogene autotemcel: Uses, Interactions, Mechanism of Action
https://go.drugbank.com/drugs/DB15572

[60] In vivo HSC prime editing rescues sickle cell disease in a mouse ...
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10163316/

[61] Durable Clinical Benefits with Exagamglogene Autotemcel for ...
https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/144/Supplement%201/4954/533973/Durable-Clinical-Benefits-with-Exagamglogene

[62] In vivo hematopoietic stem cell modification by mRNA delivery
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37499029/

[63] In Vivo RNA Delivery to Hematopoietic Stem and Progenitor Cells ...
https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.nanolett.3c00304

[64] Lipid nanoparticles allow efficient and harmless ex vivo gene editing ... https://ashpublications.org/blood/article/142/9/812/496264/Lipid-nanoparticles-allow-efficient-and-harmless

[65] How mRNA Could Cure Sickle Cell Gene Mutations https://accessh.org/from-chairs-desk/how-mrna-could-cure-sickle-cell-gene-mutations/

[66] Lipid nanoparticles: The game-changer in CRISPR-Cas9 genome ... https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10823087/