Introduction

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) can lead to necrosis, apoptosis and autophagic cell death of neurons following by multiple events such as opening of the blood-brain or blood-spinal cord barrier (BBB and BSCB), inflammation, edema, ecotoxicity, increase in free-radicals, altered cell signaling and gene expression The microenvironment of the injured brain, includes different cell types such as normal and dysfunctional neurons (surviving bodies and dead axons or synapses), denervated intact neurons, senescent cells, glial scars, neuroinflammatory and neurotrophic factors. Thus, repair and reconstruction of the brain tissue are the ultimate goals for treatment of brain injury. It has been observed that, after injury, the brain may be attempting to repair itself, endogenous neural stem cells (NSCs) can migrate from the subventricular zone (SVZ), dentate gyrus (DG), and striatum to the injury site where they differentiate into neurons, oligodendrocytes, and astrocytes. Axon formation is a critical step to neural connection and synaptogenesis. Axon can grow and sprout from new neurons derived from NSCs. However, the spontaneous regenerative process is not sufficient for complete reconstruction and full recovery of the neuronal function, and in general in adult brain, regeneration and migration of new neurons are limited [1][2].

Also, as part of the acute injury response, glial cells (astrocytes and microglia) migrate to the injury site where they form the reactive glial scars to repair BBB, BSCB and isolate the site of injury and help in the healing process. However, the same cells start producing inhibiting growth factors limiting axonal regeneration.

Thus, a design of neural injury response strategy needs to promote favorable factors and simultaneously inhibit adverse factors [3].

Cell transplantation therapy has great potential and, following cell delivery using intravenous and intraarterial injections after TBI, significant neurological improvements are observed. However transplanting stem cells in-vivo is a complex and difficult operation: 1) these cells have low capacity of migration and tend to form clusters close to the targeted site and 2) they have to integrate into the host neuronal network and survive; overall this process of migration, differentiation and integration, has yet to be fully understood [4].

Direct cell reprogramming, or transdifferentiation, is the conversion, using typically defined transcription factors (TFs) [5], of a somatic cell into another without inducing pluripotency. For both techniques, the main concerns are risk of tumor formation, and spread of foreign new derived neurons in unintended sites, however cell transplantation is a more involved process with a risk of triggering an immune-rejection from the host and comes with a high-cost involved in clinical grade cell production for transplantation. Yet direct reprogramming in-vivo still faces difficulties which need to be addressed [6]:

1) Careful selection of the target cell for reprogramming to avoid depletion of the cells being reprogrammed: cells to be reprogrammed need to be carefully selected as not to impair their functional role.
2) Identify transcription factors (TFs) which promote conversion to identified neuronal cells.
3) Design of a precise and safe gene delivery system.

In the study we will address each of these points.

AIM: Design of gene targeted cell reprogramming strategy 1) to promote reprogramming of astrocytes into neurons in the adult brain after TBI with a low-risk gene delivery system and 2) to provide a methodology to monitor neuronal recovery.

Strategy

- Research from Nui et al.[7], identified SOX2 as a critical transcription factor in the induction of resident astrocytes to neuroblasts, in conjunction with the neurotrophic factor BNDF and NOG gene for induction of neuroblasts to mature neurons. In addition, Guo et Al. [8], showed that NeuroD1 expression reprograms reactive astrocytes and N2 cells directly into fully functional neurons (glutamatergic and GABAergic neurons) without them going through a neuroprogenitor stage. We express these genes using CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technique which is directed to a DNA sequence by a single guide RNA (sgRNA) [9]. To target each gene, we inject using AAV-sgRNA, an sgRNA per gene to express, with repeats if needed [1] . For our study, we use the improved dCas9-fused activator SunTag-p65-HSF1 (SPH) and the SPH; GFAP-Cre double-transgenic mice to induce SPH activator in astrocytes [10]. With this construct, the desired TFs are activated in primary SPH astrocytes after transfection of plasmids expressing Cre and sgRNAs.
- Non-viral mRNA delivery systems have recently show promising results with biodegradable ionizable lipid-based nanoparticles (LNPs) encapsulating mRNA [11]; however, since lentivirus and adeno-associated viruses (AAV)

---

[1] In past studies, expression of a single sgRNA is not sufficient to induce gene expression and co-transfection up to four sgRNAs per gene has led to synergistic effects with an increase of gene expression.

have repetitively successfully been used to deliver CRISPR/Cas9 to modify cells both in vitro and in-vivo, we choose them as primary delivery system [2].

- For brain trauma animal mode [13], we use controlled cortical impact injury (CCI) [14], which allows fine control of the impact (time, velocity, depth), and lateral fluid percussion injury animal (LFPI) models [15]. The reasons to use two TBI models, is to study cell reprograming in regard to the type of injury: rigid with light skull fracture (CCI), and mild-repetitive injuries simulating concussions (diffuse brain injury) like the ones observed in sports (LFPI)[3]. We also use mice of different age-groups (it has been established that brain injuries in young and older people are more fatal). For this purpose, we will have two experimental groups: CCI concussions (CCONC), mild concussion using LFPI (LCONC) and within each group: young, mid-age, and older mice. Since we also want to evaluate the impact of the transcription factors SOX2 and NeuroD1, we stratify our mice in 4 groups, LCONC-SOX2, LCONC-NeuroD1, CCONC -SOX2, CCONC -NeuroD1 and within each group, we have, as stated above, mice from 3 different age-groups.

- STEP [1] - Begin injection of retrovirus and AAVs, 24h after TBI, leaving enough time for astrocytes, and N2 cells to be activated and proliferate in the injury site. After CCI or LPI, first, as a control, we inject into the SPH;GFAP-Cre mouse cortex, a retrovirus expressing mCherry under GFAP promoter (AAV-GFAP-mCherry). Brain-stained sections should reveal GFAP-positive reactive astrocytes within the injury site (red). Whereas using doublecortin DCX marker, should not reveal any DCX+ cells infected by control retrovirus expressing GFP alone [8]. Then in some of the mice of the experiment groups CCONC-NeuroD1 and LCONC-NeuroD1 we inject AAV-sgRNAs targeting NeuroD1 using a stereotactic injection into the cerebral cortex and cerebellar cortex. To further confirm that induction of neurons is independent of migration of neuronal stem cells (NSCs) from endogenous neurogenic sites (SVZ, DG, striatum) we also inject on the contralateral side of the first injection: AAV-GFP-mCherry [10]. At 3 days after injection, 1 week, 2 weeks, 3 weeks, we sacrifice some mice and analyze brain sections close to the injection site and contralateral to it. After staining with the neuronal marker NeuN, immunofluorescent images from the different regions should show mCherry(red) and NeuN (green) expressions and in the injected site, these two expressions are co-localized. As time after injury increases, the number of induced neurons should also increase, and NeuroD1 infected cells, should show developing neurites.

- To further confirm, that the induced neurons are indeed newly generated, we also have isolated few mice from each group, LCONC-NeuroD1 and CCONC-NeuroD1, and for four weeks after injection of AAV-sgRNA (NeurD1), we continuously add BrdU to drinking water before immunostaining [7]. After four weeks, immunofluorescence analysis should show Brdu (red) cells co-localized with NeuN (green) cells.

- To further characterize the converted NeuroD1 neurons, we perform immunostaining with VGluT1 (glutamatergic neurons) and GAD67(GABAergic neurons) antibodies, and to analyze how deep these neurons are located, we also use superficial and deep layer cortical markers: Cux1, Lhx2 (superficial markers) and Ctip2, Otx1, Tbr1 (deep layer markers, staining is red) [8]. We expect to see NeurD1-converted neurons to be positive for the deep layer markers and be in majority glutamatergic neurons.

- 14 weeks after AAV injection, we perform whole-cell-patch-clamp recordings on mature neurons selected using morphology and mCherry expression in the injected region of live brain slices, to examine their electrophysiological properties. We expect to be able to generate action potentials in response to step injection of depolarizing current in current-clamp mode. In addition, the same cells should display spontaneous postsynaptic currents in voltage-clamp model indicating that these neurons have formed functional synapses and have functionally integrated into the local neuronal network.

- STEP [2] - We reiterate similar experiments starting at step STEP [1], this time using mice from LCONC-SOX2, and CCONC-SOX2 groups, and plasmids expressing Cre and sgRNAs targeting SOX2, BNDF and Nog genes.

Validation

- MRI is a non-evasive technique of repeated imaging measurements to detect structural and functional integrity of the brain allowing tracking the temporal trajectory of the brain injury. Before and immediately after the injury, mice are subject to different behavioral tests and the loss-of-righting-reflex (LRR) time is measured. 30 minutes after recovery, Neuro Severity Score (NSS) is measured for each group of mice. At day 2, day 7, day 14, day 30, day 60, NSS is measured again and the mice undergo the same initial tests and MRI scan [16][17].

- For behavioral tests, mice are tested for 1) anxiety-like behavior using an elevated-plus maze 2) spatial cognition with a water maze, 3) locomotor-social behaviors using a circular open area testing behavioral interactions 4) sensorimotor ability using a narrow wooden beam 5) depression-like behavior using the forced swim test.

---

[2] Sendai virus (Sev) is an RNA virus with no DNA intermediate and no nuclear phase, eliminating the risk of unwanted integration. However engineering Sev with our different vectors, does not seem straightforward and might be investigated in a follow-up research [12].

[3] For sake of simplicity, we may reduce the scope of the research to use only LFPI.

- For MRI measurements, we track diffusion tensor imaging metrics (DTI), neurite orientation dispersion and density imaging (NODDI) metrics, structural MRI changes in ventricle, cortex local tissue volumes, and post-concussion resting-state and stimulus-evoked fMRI activity. We keep track of various trends in the temporal profile of different MRI markers, DTI, NODDI, resting-state and stimulus-evoked fMRI scans between mice injected with transcription factors and the ones not treated [17]. We expect to observe on going significant changes and major differences of this data between: CCONC and LCONC, CCONC and CCONC-TF (CCONC-TF mice with astrocytes reprogrammed), LCONC and LCONC-TF (LCONC-TF: LCONC mice with astrocytes reprogrammed), CCONC-TF and LCONC-TF groups and we propose to create various statistical models to correlate these MRI changes with cell reprogramming activity until full recovery. We expect to see an inverse correlation between MRI signals expressing neuroinflammation response of the brain to the injury and increase of neurogenesis.

In conclusion, although there are inherent limitations to this research like brain differences between humans and rodents and its complexity due to the sheer number of parameters to keep track for a long period of time, we believe that this research will provide valuable insight about the direct impact of fully functional induced neurons on recovery after a mild and acute TBI.

References
Referenced Paper Summary[7]
Wenze Niu et al., in their study, selected astrocytes for cell reprogramming since they are one of the most abundant non-neuronal cells in the CNS. And following a TBI, they aggregate to form glial scars which physically and chemically obstruct axonal regeneration. Among the eight TFs (SCLA1, BRN2, KLF4, MYC, MYT1L, OCT4, SOX2 and ZFP521) and the four microRNAs (miR9, miR124, miR125 and miR128), they found that SOX2, by itself, induces the most significant number of DCX^+ cells, or adult neuroblast cells (iANBs). Next, they crossed various transgenic mice with reporter-line mice, and subsequently injected them with SOX2-expressing lentivirus. They showed that 1) iANBs were only localized in the injected striatal regions and were not the result of any migration of DCX^+ cells coming from areas surrounding the injection site like the lateral ventricle, 2) the iANBs originated from resident astrocytes, and 3) the iANBs originated from the cells transduced by lentivirus under hGFAP promoter and not from $IBA1^+$ microglia or N2-glia. Additionally, they also proved that SOX-2 induced iANBS did not originate from neurons going through dedifferentiation and becoming DCX^+ neuroblasts. Then they investigated iANBs characteristics demonstrating that the neuroblasts derived from non-dividing astrocytes and passed through a proliferating state. Finally, after co-injecting BNDF-Nog-expressing lentivirus with SOX2-lentivirus, the researchers performed a whole-cell patch-clamp which exhibited mature neurons with full electrophysiological function. In the course of the experiments, they did not observe any tumor formations confirming that the newly converted neurons have been successfully integrated into the local neuronal network without immediate side-effects.

[1] M. S. Shoichet, C. C. Tate, M. D. Baumann, and M. C. LaPlaca, "Strategies for Regeneration and Repair in the Injured Central Nervous System," in *Indwelling Neural Implants: Strategies for Contending with the In Vivo Environment*, W. M. Reichert, Ed. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press/Taylor & Francis, 2008. Accessed: Nov. 30, 2021. [Online]. Available: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK3941/

[2] P. Zhang, R. Ilagan, Y. Bai, X. Zhang, Y. Deng, and Y. Ding, "Editorial: Plasticity and Reconstruction of Neural Network in Brain Injury," *Front. Cell. Neurosci.*, vol. 15, p. 710499, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fncel.2021.710499.

[3] A. Ofenbauer and B. Tursun, "Strategies for in vivo reprogramming," *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.*, vol. 61, pp. 9–15, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ceb.2019.06.002.

[4] D. Henriques, R. Moreira, J. Schwamborn, L. Pereira de Almeida, and L. S. Mendonça, "Successes and Hurdles in Stem Cells Application and Production for Brain Transplantation," *Front. Neurosci.*, vol. 13, p. 1194, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.3389/fnins.2019.01194.

[5] K. Liu *et al.*, "Advances in transcription factors related to neuroglial cell reprogramming," *Transl. Neurosci.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 17–27, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1515/tnsci-2020-0004.

[6] L. Fang *et al.*, "Potentials of Cellular Reprogramming as a Novel Strategy for Neuroregeneration," *Front. Cell. Neurosci.*, vol. 12, p. 460, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.3389/fncel.2018.00460.

[7] W. Niu *et al.*, "In vivo reprogramming of astrocytes to neuroblasts in the adult brain," *Nat. Cell Biol.*, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 1164–1175, Oct. 2013, doi: 10.1038/ncb2843.

[8] Z. Guo, L. Zhang, Z. Wu, Y. Chen, F. Wang, and G. Chen, "In Vivo Direct Reprogramming of Reactive Glial Cells into Functional Neurons after Brain Injury and in an Alzheimer's Disease Model," *Cell Stem Cell*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 188–202, Feb. 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.stem.2013.12.001.

[9] W.-J. Dai, L.-Y. Zhu, Z.-Y. Yan, Y. Xu, Q.-L. Wang, and X.-J. Lu, "CRISPR-Cas9 for in vivo Gene Therapy: Promise and Hurdles," *Mol. Ther. Nucleic Acids*, vol. 5, no. 8, p. e349, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.1038/mtna.2016.58.

[10] H. Zhou *et al.*, "In vivo simultaneous transcriptional activation of multiple genes in the brain using CRISPR–dCas9-activator transgenic mice," *Nat. Neurosci.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 440–446, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1038/s41593-017-0060-6.

[11] H. Yin, R. L. Kanasty, A. A. Eltoukhy, A. J. Vegas, J. R. Dorkin, and D. G. Anderson, "Non-viral vectors for gene-based therapy," *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 541–555, Aug. 2014, doi: 10.1038/nrg3763.

[12] A. Park *et al.*, "Sendai virus, an RNA virus with no risk of genomic integration, delivers CRISPR/Cas9 for efficient gene editing," *Mol. Ther. - Methods Clin. Dev.*, vol. 3, p. 16057, 2016, doi: 10.1038/mtm.2016.57.

[13] Y. Xiong, A. Mahmood, and M. Chopp, "Animal models of traumatic brain injury," *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 128–142, Feb. 2013, doi: 10.1038/nrn3407.

[14] O. Furmanski, M. D. Nieves, and M. L. Doughty, "Controlled Cortical Impact Model of Mouse Brain Injury with Therapeutic Transplantation of Human Induced Pluripotent Stem Cell-Derived Neural Cells," *J. Vis. Exp.*, no. 149, p. 59561, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.3791/59561.

[15] J. Alder, W. Fujioka, J. Lifshitz, D. P. Crockett, and S. Thakker-Varia, "Lateral Fluid Percussion: Model of Traumatic Brain Injury in Mice," *J. Vis. Exp.*, no. 54, p. 3063, Aug. 2011, doi: 10.3791/3063.

[16] E. D. Hall, P. G. Sullivan, T. R. Gibson, K. M. Pavel, B. M. Thompson, and S. W. Scheff, "Spatial and Temporal Characteristics of Neurodegeneration after Controlled Cortical Impact in Mice: More than a Focal Brain Injury," *J. Neurotrauma*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 252–265, Feb. 2005, doi: 10.1089/neu.2005.22.252.

[17] X. V. To and F. A. Nasrallah, "A roadmap of brain recovery in a mouse model of concussion: insights from neuroimaging," *Acta Neuropathol. Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 2, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s40478-020-01098-y.