OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Advancements in Genetic Engineering

Review Article

Manipulating the Mouse Genome Using Recombineering

Fatemah Riaz

Islamic Azad University, Iran

Abstract

Hereditarily built mouse models are imperative for understanding the organic capacity of qualities, understanding the hereditary premise of human maladies, and for preclinical testing of novel treatments. Age of such mouse models has been conceivable in light of our capacity to control the mouse genome. Recombineering is a profoundly proficient, recombination-based technique for hereditary building that has altered our capacity to create mouse models. Since recombineering innovation isn't reliant on the accessibility of limitation catalyst acknowledgment locales, it permits us to adjust the genome with extraordinary accuracy. It requires homology arms as short as 40 bases for recombination, which makes it moderately simple to create focusing on develops to embed, change, or erase either a solitary nucleotide or on the other hand a DNA piece a few kb in size; embed selectable markers or correspondent qualities; or add epitope labels to any quality of intrigue. In this survey, we center around the improvement of recombineering innovation and its application to the age of hereditarily built mouse models. High-throughput age of quality focusing on vectors, used to develop knockout alleles in mouse early stage undifferentiated cells, is currently practical on account of this innovation. The test currently is to utilize these "planner" mice to create novel treatments to forestall, fix, or adequately deal with some the most incapacitating human illnesses.

Keywords: Mouse models; Embryonic stem (ES) cell; Knockoutmice; Gene targeting; Recombineering; Bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC); Transgenic mice

Introduction

Creature models are routinely used to comprehend the etiology of human hereditary issues, just as to create preclinical models to test the adequacy of novel treatments. In spite of the fact that there are speciesspecific varieties dependent on quality capacity contemplates, the mouse is the generally dependable and ordinarily utilized model framework, primarily in light of the fact that of its hereditary and physiological comparability to people. Furthermore, headways in genome control and early stage stem (ES) cell advancements in the course of recent decades have made it conceivable to create modern hereditarily built mouse models. It is presently possible to produce freak mice in which inactivation, erasure, or on the other hand ectopic articulation of any quality of intrigue can be spatially and transiently managed.

Historical landmarks in the development of genetically engineered mouse models

Advancement of techniques to produce mice with a focused on change in a quality of intrigue required the arrangement of two fundamental issues: how to focus on the ideal change in mammalian cells what's more, how to move the controlled cells into the mouse germline. The answer for the main issue came in 1985, when Smithies et al. indicated homologous recombination between an endogenous quality what's more, a fake focusing on vector in mammalian cells [1]. Segregation of pluripotent ES cells from mouse blastocysts, which are capable and their ability to colonize the germ line of illusory mice when infused into blastocysts, tackled the second issue [2-4]. These milestone accomplishments prompted the age of the first hereditarily altered mouse, in which the hypoxanthine phosphoribosyl transferase (HPRT) locus was disturbed [5,6]. Be that as it may, disconnection of accurately directed ES cells was encouraged for this situation by the way that solitary a solitary duplicate of this quality is available in a XY-ES cell and that HPRT-lacking cells can be emphatically chosen in

Correspondence to: R Fatemah, Islamic Azad University, Iran;

media containing 6-thioguanine. Ensuing utilization of a negative choice marker, alongside a positive determination marker in the focusing on builds, permitted improvement of cells experiencing homologous recombination, which caused it conceivable to target even to non selectable qualities [7,8]. This methodology has since been used to produce focused on transformations in several qualities.

A significant restriction to the age of mouse models with wanted transformations in their genomes was a reliance on the utilization of ordinary hereditary building strategies to produce complex focusing on develops. Regularly, appropriate limitation chemical acknowledgment locales are missing or control of enormous DNA pieces is required to produce fitting focusing on builds, the two of which limit the utilization of standard sub-atomic science procedures. Control of the mouse genome has been extraordinarily best in class by the accessibility of Escherichia coli-based cloning frameworks that permit development of genomic libraries with enormous DNA embeds [9]. These builds, called bacterial fake chromosomes (BACs), are equipped for keeping up embeds as extensive as 300 kb in size. Moreover, the improvement of recombineering innovation, a recombination-based strategy for hereditary designing, has offered energizing new chances to control the genome. Here, we will talk about a portion of the ongoing progressions in recombineering innovation and portray its application in the age of inventive mouse models of human ailments and novel models to contemplate quality capacity.

Genetic engineering using homologous recombination in yeast and bacteria

Homologous recombination-based genome control was first showed in yeast by Baudin et al. [10]. The yeast homologous recombination-based strategy has in this way been utilized to produce focusing on vectors for mouse knockouts [11-13]. Albeit homologous recombination in yeast is exceptionally effective, utilization of yeast-based methodologies for control of mouse DNA has been negligible, for the most part due to age of undesired genomic revisions.

In contrast to yeast, E. coli debases remote direct DNA with its RecBCD exonuclease [14]. Thus, any hereditary control by homologous recombination utilizing a straight focusing on develops isn't plausible in E. coli. In any case, advancement of a RecBCD exonuclease deficient E. coli strain conquered this obstacle and was utilized as one of the first in vivo cloning frameworks [15]. This framework has been utilized to clone PCR sections into plasmid vectors with homologous finishes, bringing drug-selectable markers into the E. coli chromosome, and for different applications [15-19]. The significant constraints of this framework are that it relies upon constitutively communicated recombination apparatus, requires long homology arms, and creates a low recurrence of recombinants [20].

Use of phage recombination machinery and development of recombineering

A progressively managed phage-encoded recombination framework has been created in E. coli that permits direct control of the bacterial chromosome, just as any DNA embed cloned into a plasmid or BAC vector [19,21]. This innovation is called recombineering and it utilizes the homologous recombination frameworks from bacteriophage in E. coli to control DNA parts in vivo. It doesn't require the utilization of limitation catalysts and DNA ligase. This incredible framework can be utilized to subclone a part as extensive as 80 kb from BACs into standard plasmid vectors [22]. This innovation has points of interest over all different past recombination-based quality control frameworks, as talked about underneath.

Recombineering started in 1998, when Dr. Francis Stewart's research facility utilized a phage-encoded recombination framework for in vivo hereditary control, utilizing PCR-enhanced, direct, twofold abandoned DNA flanked by short (42 bp) homology arms [23]. This strategy, known as ET cloning, depends on the elements of the recE and recT proteins of the Rac prophage in an E. coli recBC silencer freak. The recE protein gives 5' to 3' exonuclease movement, and the recT protein ties to single-abandoned (ss) DNA and advances strand strengthening [23]. Further, this strategy was additionally utilized in recBC+ E. coli strains by using the gam protein of) bacteriophagetosuppress lambda (recBCD work. To permit the utilization of the ET cloning framework in any bacterial strain, a plasmid-based portable framework that communicates gam alongside recE and recT (called pBAD-ET) was created, with recE articulation heavily influenced by an inducible advertiser and articulation of the recT and gam qualities heavily influenced by constitutive advertisers [23].

Another, comparative, framework, which uses the Red phage homologous recombination hardware, was first announced by Kenan Murphy and associates [24]. The Red recombination phage framework of incorporates two qualities: exo (red) and wager (red), in which exo is like recE and wager is comparable to recT. The Red framework fills in as proficiently as the ET framework [25]. In this way, a replication-damaged prophage-based framework was created in which the declaration of exo, wager, and gam is the heavily influenced by their local administrative components [26]. In the phage genome, these qualities are situated straightaway to one another in an operon (pL), and their demeanor is coordinately constrained by a repressor (CI) and interpretation end. Effective articulation of these qualities from the pL advertiser requires the evacuation of the CI repressor just as the capacity of the counter translation eliminator N protein. The N protein, likewise communicated from the pL operon, forestalls RNA polymerase end of pL transcripts .

In the prophage-based framework, the Red recombination qualities are present in single duplicates in the bacterial genome, and their demeanor is firmly constrained by the temperature-delicate CI857 repressor. This repressor is inactivated at 42°C, which turns on the advertiser, permitting facilitated articulation of every one of the three qualities [26]. To encourage BAC building, this prophage-based framework has been presented into a BAC have E. coli strain (DH10B) and has been proficiently used to engineer BACs [22,27].

Because of incongruence between some BACs and the deficient

 prophage framework, increasingly adaptable phage-based frameworks (scaled down and pSIM vectors) are presently accessible that can be brought into any E. coli strain [28,29]. These versatile frameworks utilize endogenous Red recombination qualities and administrative components. Scaled down can incorporate into the host genome, however can be effortlessly extracted through - connection locales. Likewise, the extracted smaller than expected can shape round DNA that can be handily filtered utilizing standard plasmid filtration conventions. The pSIM vectors are accessible with an assortment of opposition markers and require medicate determination to be kept up in the host strains. They depend on low-duplicate number plasmids, and their replicons are temperature touchy, which permits simple restoring of the plasmids after recombineering is finished.

A one of a kind cross breed recombineering framework utilizes both RecA and Red-intervened recombination. This methodology uses the Red framework to incorporate a DNA succession ("fly in") utilizing a selectable marker. In the subsequent stage, RecA, which is embedded alongside the selectable marker in the initial step, is utilized for the evacuation of the vector DNA grouping ("jump out") [30].

Another high-throughput recombineering framework has been built up that can be done in a 96-well plate and can be applied to adjust a whole BAC library. This high-throughput recombineering depends on effectively conveying the recombination hardware into a whole BAC library utilizing a high-titer lysate of a recombination-inadequate phage that conveys a selectable marker to select the transduced clones. When the phage is coordinated into the genome, it tends to be steadily kept up in the host strain [31].

Applications of recombineering in mouse genome manipulation

Throughout the years, as recombineering innovation has gotten more productive and easy to use, it has become an important device for hereditary control. Recombineering-based techniques are by and large routinely utilized for mutagenesis and subcloning of genomic parts cloned in BACs. Together, BACs and recombineering have given novel ways to deal with study quality capacity and create devices for hereditary control. BAC-based transgenic mouse models have become a helpful and incredible transgenic model framework. In 1997, King et al. [32] were the first to utilize a BAC transgenic mouse to show the hereditary complementation of the mouse Clock change. From that point forward, BAC transgenic mice have been utilized in a few investigations to supplement mouse transformations [33-35]. This framework functions admirably because of the way that the enormous addition size contains a large portion of the administrative components required to summarize the endogenous quality articulation. What's more, the huge addition size dispenses with the position impacts that ordinarily result in the transgene articulation fluctuation saw in most cDNA-based transgene builds.

By utilizing recombineering, any selectable marker can be without any problem embedded into a BAC clone basically by producing a focusing on build containing the selectable quality flanked by the homology arms (40-80 bases each) containing groupings from the area where the marker should be focused on. Such focusing on develops can be quickly produced by PCR utilizing illusory preliminaries that have 20 bases corresponding to the selectable quality and 40-80 bases comparing to the district of homology. Within the sight of the recombineering proteins, the selectable quality can be embedded at the objective site and recombinant clones can be chosen for the nearness of the selectable creator. The equivalent approach can likewise be utilized to embed any non-selectable DNA piece. In such cases a selectable marker, similar to any anti-toxin opposition quality is included close to the non-selectable quality in the focusing on develop. The selectable marker can be thusly expelled from the BAC by flanking it with two loxP or FRT locales. The selectable marker can be extracted within the sight of Cre or Flp recombinase. For consistent inclusion of a non-selectable marker, a two-advance methodology of choice/ counter-determination can be utilized as portrayed underneath in subsection 7 (Age of hypomorphic alleles for useful dismemberment). These approaches have excessively improved age of BAC transgene develops that can be utilized for age of columnist lines, articulation of epitope-labeled proteins, age of refined mouse model to examine distinctive human sicknesses or articulation of site-explicit recombinases to produce restrictive knockout mouse models. These applications are depicted in detail beneath.

Generation of Reporter Lines

The likelihood that most cis-administrative components of any quality are available inside a BAC clone has made it a helpful instrument to produce correspondent mouse lines that precisely reflect endogenous quality articulation [36]. Correspondent qualities, for example, LacZ (-galactosidase) and GFP (green fluorescent protein) can be effectively embedded in the BAC by recombineering [37-41]. As of late, recombineering innovation has been utilized to truly connect together different qualities, alongside their particular correspondent qualities [42]. The age of a multi-journalist BAC develop depends on recombineering-interceded BAC connecting technique Connecting of BACs is reliant on the utilization of areas of homology, one of which is available in the vector spine and the other regular to both genomic embeds. These homology locales flank the selectable marker that permits the determination of an ideal connected clone subsequent to connecting [43]. To create a multi-correspondent BAC develop, Maye et al. [42] first subcloned qualities of enthusiasm into BAC connecting vectors, embedded the ideal columnist qualities into separate qualities, and afterward connected the distinctive BACs containing the columnist qualities. Utilizing this technique, they effectively connected three qualities and produced a multireporter mouse line[44].

Expression of Epitope-Tagged Proteins

Finding a decent counter acting agent against a protein of decision is regularly a significant obstacle in any proteomic research. This can be evaded by the utilization of a labeled (FLAG, HA, c-myc, and so on) rendition of the protein. To communicate the labeled protein at physiological levels in mice, knockin mouse

models have been created in which the tag is focused to the endogenous quality by homologous recombination in ES cells. This process, in any case, is very arduous and tedious. Labeling the qualities in a BAC clone with any ideal tag can bypass these issues. These BACs can be utilized to create transgenic mice that express the labeled quality at physiological levels in tissues where it is typically communicated. Utilizing recombineering, qualities present in a BAC clone can be productively labeled with any epitope [45]. In 2008, Poser et al. [46] built up a proficient, conventional, and high-throughput approach for protein labeling and BAC transgenesis in mammalian cells. This methodology can be utilized to examine the confinement, protein-protein, and/ or then again protein-DNA associations of any protein.

Generation of Knockout Mouse

A knockout mouse is a freak mouse strain in which the quality of intrigue is taken out by erasure or by supplanting with an exogenous DNA part, rendering the quality nonfunctional. Knockout mice have demonstrated to be an important apparatus for comprehension the natural elements of mouse qualities. Knockout mice have too been utilized to display different human infections, for example, malignant growth, heftiness, coronary illness, diabetes, joint pain, substance misuse, nervousness, maturing, and Parkinson's ailment (PD) [44,47-54]. These models are additionally utilized for creating and testing new medications [55-57].

Age of knockout mice includes development of a focusing on vector that can be utilized to disturb the quality of enthusiasm for ES cells. A average focusing on vector comprises of two homology arms flanking a positive determination marker and a negative choice marker [e.g. thymidine kinase (TK) or diphtheria poison (DT)] close to one of the homology arms. The positive choice marker is embedded with the end goal that it replaces a portion of the key exons, rendering the quality nonfunctional. Next, the focusing on vector is electroporated into ES cells and, by homologous recombination, one allele of the objective quality is supplanted by the successions cloned into the focusing on vector. Accurately focused on ES cells are separated by sedate determination, affirmed by Southern investigation or on the other hand PCR-based strategies, and afterward microinjected into blastocysts what's more, embedded into pseudo-pregnant females to create delusions. Fabrications with the ES cell commitment in their germline will transmit the freak allele when reared to wild-type mice. Posterity acquiring the freak allele are heterozygous for the transformation and when these are intercrossed homozygous posterity coming up short on any practical duplicate of the quality are gotten. In the event that the quality is basic for feasibility, such amazing embryogenesis. Phenotypic portrayal of homozygous mice or incipient organisms gives signs to the natural capacity of the focused on quality.

Construction of targeting vectors

A significant and tedious advance in the age of a knockout mouse model is the development of quality focusing on vectors that are utilized to erase or change qualities by homologous recombination in mouse ES cells. Advances in recombineering innovation and expanded accessibility of BAC clones have enormously improved the process, particularly two key advances: a) recovery, or subcloning a huge part of DNA (utilized as homology arms) from a BAC clone into a plasmid vector, and b) inclusion of a selectable marker into the recovered part.

Retrieval of genomic DNA from a BAC clone:

Recovery, or subcloning of a DNA section from a BAC clone into a plasmid DNA by recombineering, requires a recovery vector. The fundamental components of a recovery vector are a plasmid spine grouping that incorporates an cause of replication and a selectable marker, for example, an ampicillin or kanamycin obstruction quality, flanked by 50 bases homologous to the 5'and 3'ends of the DNA to be subcloned. The recovery vector can be quickly blended by PCR utilizing two illusory preliminaries (at the 5' end, 50 nucleotides of every groundwork are homologous to the two closures of the DNA to be subcloned and, at the 3' end, 20 nucleotides are homologous to the plasmid DNA) and the straight plasmid DNA as a layout (Figure 2). Once electroporated into bacterial cells communicating the recombineering proteins, the direct vector experiences homologous recombination with the BAC DNA and, by the procedure of hole fix, circularizes the direct plasmid DNA, permitting it to duplicate in E. coli The nearness of an anti-toxin opposition quality chooses for the round plasmid. The plasmid used to create a recovery vector moreover contains a negative determination marker (a DT or TK quality) [58].

Insertion of selectable markers:

After the recovery of the genomic DNA, the following stage is the evacuation of practically significant exons and addition of a selectable marker (qualities that permit opposition to anti-toxins, for example, blasticidin, neomycin, or hygromycin, and work in both eukaryotic and prokaryotic cells). The selectable creators are heavily influenced by a prokaryotic (for example Tn5, EM7) and a eukaryotic (for example PGK) advertiser. Such double advertisers permit the utilization of the equivalent selectable producer in both bacterial (for recombineering) what's more, mammalian cells (for quality focusing in ES cells). These selectable markers can be embedded into the plasmid utilizing a focusing on develop containing a selectable marker flanked by areas homologous to the target site. These develops can be set up by PCR utilizing illusory groundworks, as portrayed previously.

Construction of Conditional Knockout Vectors

A significant confinement of the knockout mouse innovation is that a lossof-work change in most practically significant qualities results in undeveloped lethality. This makes it hard to dissect the capacity of the quality in grown-up mice, which is pertinent to most human malady qualities. This issue is dodged by the advancement of the restrictive knockout methodology, in which the cancellation of the quality can be managed spatially, just as transiently. Tissue-or cell-explicit cancellation of any quality assumes a significant job in uncovering the elements of qualities basic for advancement and for contemplating the connection

between quality changes and malady improvement in grown-up mice. Restrictive quality erasures have been accomplished by presenting bacteriophageand yeast-inferred, site-explicit recombination (SSR) frameworks into the mouse. Bacteriophage P1-determined, site-explicit recombinase Cre (causes recombination) and yeast-determined recombinase Flp (flippase) perceive the 34-base-pair DNA groupings for loxP (locus of hybrid in phage P1) and FRT (flippase acknowledgment target), individually [59].

Contingent upon the direction of the objective destinations as for one another, recombinases can extract, incorporate, or reverse DNA successions. Contingent erasure of any quality is accomplished by flanking the basic exons of the quality with two loxP or FRT destinations (making a contingent allele). Ensuing articulation of the recombinases in a cell containing the restrictive allele of a quality permits either the whole quality or the basic exons to be erased, rendering the quality nonfunctional [60,61]. Until recombineering innovation opened up, age of restrictive knockout vectors was viewed as a protracted assignment. Utilizing recombineering, restrictive knockout focusing on vectors can be quickly produced by presenting loxP or FRT (or both) destinations, along with a positive determination marker, into the BAC DNA [58].

Transgenic Mice Expressing Cre or Flp Recombinase

Contingent cancellation of any quality depends on the focused on articulation of Cre or FLP recombinase in the cell or tissue of intrigue. In most cases, the administrative components, including the enhancer groupings that drive tissue-explicit articulation of a quality, are not all around described. Without such data, it is increasingly helpful to utilize BACbased transgenic mice to communicate Cre or Flp recombinase. This is advantageously accomplished by utilizing recombineering to embed the Cre or Flp cDNA after the beginning codon of a quality cloned in a BAC vector. This guarantees that the recombinase is communicated heavily influenced by the administrative components of this quality, which is communicated in the tissue or cell type(s) where the contingent allele must be erased. The Cre or Flp containing BAC clones would then be able to be utilized to produce transgenic mice. This methodology has significantly encouraged the age of tissuespecific Cre transgenic mouse lines. A few Cre lines for restrictive articulation of recombinases have been created, and some of them are recorded in Table 1. Data on extra transgenic mouse lines that express Cre can be gotten from The Jackson Laboratory (http:// www.jax.org/search/Main.jsp?qt=cre+mice&x=0&y=0), just as from the CREATE (coordination of assets for contingent articulation of changed mouse alleles) consortium (http://www.creline.org/ eucommtools). To transiently manage the statement of Cre protein in cells, a tamoxifen-inducible Cre-estrogen receptor (ER) combination protein can be utilized [62]. This Cre-ER protein is practical just in the nearness of tamoxifen, which can be infused into mice at the ideal time.

References

1. Smithies O, Gregg RG, Boggs SS, Koralewski MA, Kucherlapati RS (1985)Insertion of DNA sequences into the human chromosomal beta-globin locusby homologous recombination. Nature 317: 230-234.

2. Evans MJ, Kaufman MH (1981) Establishment in culture of pluripotential cells from mouse embryos. Nature 292: 154-156.

3. Martin GR (1981) Isolation of a pluripotent cell line from early mouse embryoscultured in medium conditioned by teratocarcinoma stem cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 78: 7634-7638.

4. Bradley A, Evans M, Kaufman MH, Robertson E (1984) Formation of germline chimaeras from embryo-derived teratocarcinoma cell lines. Nature 309:255-256.

5. Doetschman T, Gregg RG, Maeda N, Hooper ML, Melton DW, et al. (1987)Targetted correction of a mutant HPRT gene in mouse embryonic stem cells.Nature 330: 576-578.

6. Thomas KR, Capecchi MR (1987) Site-directed mutagenesis by genetargeting in mouse embryo-derived stem cells. Cell 51: 503-512.

7. Mansour SL, Thomas KR, Capecchi MR (1988) Disruption of the protooncogene int-2 in mouse embryo-derived stem cells: a general strategy for targeting mutations to non-selectable genes. Nature 336: 348-352.

8. Schwartzberg PL, Goff SP, Robertson EJ (1989) Germ-line transmission ofa c-abl mutation produced by targeted gene disruption in ES cells. Science 246: 799-803.

9. Shizuya H, Birren B, Kim UJ, Mancino V, Slepak T, et al. (1992) Cloningand stable maintenance of 300-kilobase-pair fragments of human DNA inEscherichia coli using an F-factor-based vector. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A89: 8794-8797.

10. Baudin A, Ozier-Kalogeropoulos O, Denouel A, Lacroute F, Cullin C (1993)A simple and efficient method for direct gene deletion in Saccharomycescerevisiae. Nucleic Acids Res 21: 3329-3330.

11. Storck T, Krüth U, Kolhekar R, Sprengel R, Seeburg PH (1996) Rapidconstruction in yeast of complex targeting vectors for gene manipulation inthe mouse. Nucleic Acids Res 24: 4594-4596.

12. Wilson SM, Toth PT, Oh SB, Gillard SE, Volsen S, et al. (2000) The status ofvoltage-dependent calcium channels in alpha 1E knock-out mice. J Neurosci20: 8566-8571.

13. Wattler S, Kelly M, Nehls M (1999) Construction of gene targeting vectorsfrom lambda KOS genomic libraries. Biotechniques 26: 1150-1156, 1158,1160.

14. Wackernagel W (1973) Genetic transformation in E. coli: the

inhibitory role othe recBC DNase. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 51: 306-311.

15. Jasin M, Schimmel P (1984) Deletion of an essential gene in Escherichia coli

by site-specific recombination with linear DNA fragments. J Bacteriol 159783-786.

16. Winans SC, Elledge SJ, Krueger JH, Walker GC (1985) Site-directedinsertion and deletion mutagenesis with cloned fragments in Escherichia coli.J Bacteriol 161: 1219-1221.

17. Bubeck P, Winkler M, Bautsch W (1993) Rapid cloning by homologousrecombination in vivo. Nucleic Acids Res 21: 3601-3602.

18. Oliner JD, Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B (1993) In vivo cloning of PCR products inE. coli. Nucleic Acids Res 21: 5192-5197.

19. Copeland NG, Jenkins NA, Court DL (2001) Recombineering: a powerful newtool for mouse functional genomics. Nat Rev Genet 2: 769-779.

20. Court DL, Sawitzke JA, Thomason LC (2002) Genetic engineering usinghomologous recombination. Annu Rev Genet 36: 361-388.

21. Muyrers JP, Zhang Y, Stewart AF (2001) Techniques: Recombinogenicengineering–new options for cloning and manipulating DNA. Trends BiochemSci 26: 325-331.

22. Lee EC, Yu D, Martinez de Velasco J, Tessarollo L, Swing DA, et al.(2001) A highly efficient Escherichia coli-based chromosome engineeringsystem adapted for recombinogenic targeting and subcloning of BAC DNA.Genomics 73: 56-65.

23. Zhang Y, Buchholz F, Muyrers JP, Stewart AF (1998) A new logic for DNAengineering using recombination in Escherichia coli. Nat Genet 20: 123-128.

24. Murphy KC (1998) Use of bacteriophage lambda recombination functions topromote gene replacement in Escherichia coli. J Bacteriol 180: 2063-2071.

25. Muyrers JP, Zhang Y, Testa G, Stewart AF (1999) Rapid modification ofbacterial artificial chromosomes by ET-recombination. Nucleic Acids Res 27:1555-1557.

26. Yu D, Ellis HM, Lee EC, Jenkins NA, Copeland NG, et al. (2000) An efficientrecombination system for chromosome engineering in Escherichia coli. ProcNatl Acad Sci U S A 97: 5978-5983.

27. Warming S, Costantino N, Court DL, Jenkins NA, Copeland NG (2005)Simple and highly efficient BAC recombineering using galK selection. NucleicAcids Res 33: e36.

28. Court DL, Swaminathan S, Yu D, Wilson H, Baker T, et al. (2003) Mini-lambda:a tractable system for chromosome and BAC engineering. Gene 315: 63-69.

29. Datta S, Costantino N, Court DL (2006) A set of recombineering plasmids forgram-negative bacteria. Gene 379: 109-115.

30. Sopher BL, La Spada AR (2006) Efficient recombination-based methods forbacterial artificial chromosome fusion and mutagenesis. Gene 371: 136-143.

31. Chan W, Costantino N, Li R, Lee SC, Su Q, et al. (2007) A recombineeringbased approach for high-throughput conditional knockout targeting vectorconstruction. Nucleic Acids Res 35: e64.

32. King DP, Zhao Y, Sangoram AM, Wilsbacher LD, Tanaka M, et al. (1997)Positional cloning of the mouse circadian clock gene. Cell 89: 641-653.

33. Matesic LE, Yip R, Reuss AE, Swing DA, O'Sullivan TN, et al. (2001)Mutations in Mlph, encoding a member of the Rab effector family, cause themelanosome transport defects observed in leaden mice. Proc Natl Acad SciU S A 98: 10238-10243.

34. Means GD, Boyd Y, Willis CR, Derry JM (2001) Transgenic rescue of thetattered phenotype by using a BAC encoding Ebp. Mamm Genome 12: 323-325.

35. Wilson SM, Yip R, Swing DA, O'Sullivan TN, Zhang Y, et al. (2000) A mutationin Rab27a causes the vesicle transport defects observed in ashen mice. ProcNatl Acad Sci U S A 97: 7933-7938.

36. Gong S, Zheng C, Doughty ML, Losos K, Didkovsky N, et al. (2003) A geneexpression atlas of the central nervous system based on bacterial artificialchromosomes. Nature 425: 917-925.

37. Mortlock DP, Guenther C, Kingsley DM (2003) A general approach foridentifying distant regulatory elements applied to the Gdf6 gene. GenomeRes 13: 2069-2081.

38. Sutherland MJ, Wang S, Quinn ME, Haaning A, Ware SM (2013) Zic3 isrequired in the migrating primitive streak for node morphogenesis and leftright patterning.Hum Mol Genet 22: 1913-1923.

39. Liao S, Bentley K, Lebrun M, Lesslauer W, Ruddle FH, et al. (2007)Transgenic LacZunder control of Hec-6st regulatory sequences recapitulatesendogenous gene expression onhigh endothelial venules. Proc Natl AcadSci U S A 104: 4577-4582.

40. Hansen C, Björklund T, Petit GH, Lundblad M, Murmu RP, et al. (2013) A novelÎ±-synuclein-GFP mouse model displays progressive motor impairment,olfactory dysfunction and accumulation of Î±-synuclein-GFP. Neurobiol Dis56: 145-155.

41. Ishitobi H, Matsumoto K, Azami T, Itoh F, Itoh S, et al. (2010) Flk1-GFP BACTg mice: an animal model for the

study of blood vessel development. ExpAnim 59: 615-622.

42. Maye P, Stover ML, Liu Y, Rowe DW, Gong S, et al. (2009) A BAC-bacterialrecombination method to generate physically linked multiple gene reporterDNA constructs. BMC Biotechnol 9: 20.

43. Kotzamanis G, Huxley C (2004) Recombining overlapping BACs into a singlelarger BAC. BMC Biotechnol 4: 1.

44. Parks CL, Robinson PS, Sibille E, Shenk T, Toth M (1998) Increased anxietyof mice lacking the serotonin1A receptor. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 95: 10734-10739.

45. Ciotta G, Hofemeister H, Maresca M, Fu J, Sarov M, et al. (2011)Recombineering BAC transgenes for protein tagging. Methods 53: 113-119.

46. Poser I, Sarov M, Hutchins JR, Hériché JK, Toyoda Y, et al. (2008) BACTransgeneOmics: a high-throughput method for exploration of proteinfunction in mammals. Nat Methods 5: 409-415.

47. Wang IT, Allen M, Goffin D, Zhu X, Fairless AH, et al. (2012) Loss of CDKL5disrupts kinome profile and event-related potentials leading to autistic-likephenotypes in mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 109: 21516-21521.

48. Hua G, Kolesnick R (2013) Using ASMase Knockout Mice to Model HumanDiseases. Handb Exp Pharmacol 216: 29-54.

49. Lee Y, Dawson VL, Dawson TM (2012) Animal models of Parkinson's disease:vertebrate genetics. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med 2.

50. McMurray F, Moir L, Cox RD (2012) From mice to humans. Curr Diab Rep12: 651-658.

51. Fowler CD, Kenny PJ (2012) Utility of genetically modified mice forunderstanding the neurobiology of substance use disorders. Hum Genet 131:941-957.

52. Chen Q (2008) Mouse models and new therapeutic targets for OA. JMusculoskelet Neuronal Interact 8: 311-312.

53. Diaz-Cruz ES, Cabrera MC, Nakles R, Rutstein BH, Furth PA (2010) BRCA1deficient mouse models to study pathogenesis and therapy of triple negativebreast cancer. Breast Dis 32: 85-97.

54. Ding Y, Cravero JD, Adrian K, Grippo P (2010) Modeling pancreatic cancerin vivo: from xenograft and carcinogen-induced systems to geneticallyengineered mice. Pancreas 39: 283-292.

55. Davis HR Jr, Lowe RS, Neff DR (2011) Effects of ezetimibe on atherosclerosisin preclinical models. Atherosclerosis 215: 266-278.

56. Gopinathan A, Tuveson DA (2008) The use of GEM models for experimentalcancer therapeutics. Dis Model Mech 1: 83-86.

57. Glasson SS (2007) In vivo osteoarthritis target validation utilizing geneticallymodified mice. Curr Drug Targets 8: 367-376.

58. Liu P, Jenkins NA, Copeland NG (2003) A highly efficient recombineeringbased methodfor generating conditional knockout mutations. Genome Res13: 476-484.

59. Turan S, Galla M, Ernst E, Qiao J, Voelkel C, et al. (2011) Recombinasemediatedcassette exchange (RMCE): traditional concepts and currentchallenges. J Mol Biol 407: 193-221.

60. Gu H, Marth JD, Orban PC, Mossmann H, Rajewsky K (1994) Deletion of aDNA polymerase beta gene segment in T cells using cell type-specific genetargeting. Science 265: 103-106.

61. Lewandoski M (2001) Conditional control of gene expression in the mouse.Nat Rev Genet 2: 743-755.

62. Schwenk F, Kuhn R, Angrand PO, Rajewsky K, Stewart AF (1998) Temporallyand spatially regulated somatic mutagenesis in mice. Nucleic Acids Res 26:1427-1432.

63. Valenzuela DM, Murphy AJ, Frendewey D, Gale NW, Economides AN, et al.(2003) High-throughput engineering of the mouse genome coupled with highresolutionexpression analysis. Nat Biotechnol 21: 652-659.

64. Skarnes WC, Rosen B, West AP, Koutsourakis M, Bushell W, et al. (2011)A conditional knockout resource for the genome-wide study of mouse gene

unction. Nature 474: 337-342.

65. Bradley A, Anastassiadis K, Ayadi A, Battey JF, Bell C, et al. (2012) Themammalian gene function resource: the International Knockout MouseConsortium. Mamm Genome 23: 580-586.

66. Chen Y, Yee D, Dains K, Chatterjee A, Cavalcoli J, et al. (2000) Genotypebased screen for ENU-induced mutations in mouse embryonic stem cells.Nat Genet 24: 314-317.

67. Vivian JL, Chen Y, Yee D, Schneider E, Magnuson T (2002) An allelic seriesof mutations in Smad2 and Smad4 identified in a genotype-based screen ofN-ethyl-N- nitrosourea-mutagenized mouse embryonic stem cells. Proc NatlAcad Sci U S A 99: 15542-15547.

68. Rajaraman S, Davis WS, Mahakali-Zama A, Evans HK, Russell LB, etal. (2002) An allelic series of mutations in the kit ligand gene of mice. I.Identification of point mutations in seven ethylnitrosourea-induced Kitl(Steel)alleles. Genetics 162: 331-340.

69. Muyrers JP, Zhang Y, Benes V, Testa G, Ansorge W, et al. (2000) Pointmutation ofbacterial artificial chromosomes by ET recombination. EMBORep 1: 239-243.

70. Westenberg M, Soedling HM, Mann DA, Nicholson LJ, Dolphin CT (2010)Counter-selection recombineering of the baculovirus genome: a strategy forseamless modification of repeat-containing BACs. Nucleic Acids Res 38:e166.

71. Bird AW, Erler A, Fu J, Hériché JK, Maresca M, et al. (2011) High-efficiencycounterselection recombineering for site-directed mutagenesis in bacterialartificial chromosomes. Nat Methods 9: 103-109.

72. Ellis HM, Yu D, DiTizio T, Court DL (2001) High efficiency mutagenesis,repair, and engineering of chromosomal DNA using single-strandedoligonucleotides. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 98: 6742-6746.

73. Swaminathan S, Ellis HM, Waters LS, Yu D, Lee EC, et al. (2001) Rapidengineering of bacterial artificial chromosomes using oligonucleotides.Genesis 29: 14-21.

74. Cha RS, Zarbl H, Keohavong P, Thilly WG (1992) Mismatch amplificationmutation assay (MAMA): application to the c-H-ras gene. PCR Methods Appl2: 14-20.

75. Yang Y, Sharan SK (2003) A simple two-step, 'hit and fix' method to generatesubtle mutations in BACs using short denatured PCR fragments. NucleicAcids Res 31: e80.

76. Kuznetsov SG, Liu P, Sharan SK (2008) Mouse embryonic stem cell-basedfunctional assay to evaluate mutations in BRCA2. Nat Med 14: 875-881.

77. Chang S, Biswas K, Martin BK, Stauffer S, Sharan SK (2009) Expressionof human BRCA1 variants in mouse ES cells allows functional analysis ofBRCA1 mutations. J Clin Invest 119: 3160-3171.

78. Testa G, Zhang Y, Vintersten K, Benes V, Pijnappel WW, et al. (2003)Engineering the mouse genome with bacterial artificial chromosomes tocreate multipurpose alleles. Nat Biotechnol 21: 443-447.

79. Mouse Genome Sequencing Consortium, Waterston RH, Lindblad-Toh K,Birney E, Rogers J, et al. (2002) Initial sequencing and comparative analysisof the mouse genome. Nature 420: 520-562.

80. Yang Y, Swaminathan S, Martin BK, Sharan SK (2003) Aberrant splicinginduced by missense mutations in BRCA1: clues from a humanized mousemodel. Hum Mol Genet 12: 2121-2131.

81. Senatorov V, Malyukova I, Fariss R, Wawrousek EF, Swaminathan S, et al.(2006) Expression of mutated mouse myocilin induces open-angle glaucomain transgenic mice. J Neurosci 26: 11903-11914.

82. Difilippantonio S, Celeste A, Fernandez-Capetillo O, Chen HT, Reina SanMartin B, et al. (2005) Role of Nbs1 in the activation of the Atm kinaserevealed in humanized mouse models. Nat Cell Biol 7: 675-685.

83. Li Y, Liu W, Oo TF, Wang L, Tang Y, et al. (2009) Mutant LRRK2(R1441G)BAC transgenic mice recapitulate cardinal features of Parkinson's disease.Nat Neurosci 12: 826-828.

84. Schmouth JF, Bonaguro RJ, Corso-Diaz X, Simpson EM (2012) Modellinghuman regulatory variation in mouse: finding the function in genomewide association studiesand whole-genome sequencing. PLoS Genet 8:e1002544.

85. Wallace HA, Marques-Kranc F, Richardson M, Luna-Crespo F, Sharpe JA,et al. (2007) Manipulating the mouse genome to engineer precise functionalsyntenic replacements with human sequence. Cell 128: 197-209.

86. Lu XH, Fleming SM, Meurers B, Ackerson LC, Mortazavi F, et al. (2009)Bacterial artificial chromosome transgenic mice expressing a truncatedmutant parkin exhibit age-dependent hypokinetic motor deficits, dopaminergicneuron degeneration, and accumulation of proteinase K-resistant alphasynuclein. J Neurosci29: 1962-1976.

87. Yamakado H, Moriwaki Y, Yamasaki N, Miyakawa T, Kurisu J, et al. (2012)

88. Gray M, Shirasaki DI, Cepeda C, André VM, Wilburn B, et al. (2008) Fulllength human mutant huntingtin with a stable polyglutamine repeat can elicitprogressive and selective neuropathogenesis in BACHD mice. J Neurosci28: 6182-6195.

89. Zhou Y, Grinchuk O, Tomarev SI (2008) Transgenic mice expressing theTyr437His mutant of human myocilin protein develop glaucoma. InvestOphthalmol Vis Sci 49: 1932-1939.

90. Gu A, Zhang Z, Zhang N, Tsark W, Shively JE (2010) Generation of humanCEACAM1 transgenic mice and binding of Neisseria Opa protein to theirneutrophils. PLoS One 5: e10067.

91. Michailidou K, Hall P, Gonzalez-Neira A, Ghoussaini M, Dennis J, et al.(2013) Large-scale genotyping identifies 41 new loci associated with breastcancer risk. Nat Genet 45: 353-361.

92. Pharoah PD, Tsai YY, Ramus SJ, Phelan CM, Goode EL, et al. (2013) GWASmeta-analysis and replication identifies three new susceptibility loci forovarian cancer. Nat Genet 45: 362-370.

93. Burton H, Chowdhury S, Dent T, Hall A, Pashayan N, et al. (2013) Publichealth implications from COGS and potential for risk stratification andscreening. Nat Genet 45: 349-351.

94. Sakoda LC, Jorgenson E, Witte JS (2013) Turning of COGS moves forward findings for hormonally mediated cancers. Nat Genet 45: 345-348.

95. Eeles RA, Olama AA, Benlloch S, Saunders EJ, Leongamornlert DA, et al.(2013) Identification of 23 new prostate cancer susceptibility loci using theiCOGS custom genotyping array. Nat Genet 45: 385-391, 391e1-2.

96. Garcia-Closas M, Couch FJ, Lindstrom S, Michailidou K, Schmidt MK, et al.(2013) Genome-wide association studies

identify four ER negative-specificbreast cancer risk loci. Nat Genet 45: 392-398, 398e1-2.

97. Bojesen SE, Pooley KA, Johnatty SE, Beesley J, Michailidou K, et al. (2013)Multiple independent variants at the TERT locus are associated with telomerelength and risks of breast and ovarian cancer. Nat Genet 45: 371-384, 384e1-2.

98. Schonhoff SE, Giel-Moloney M, Leiter AB (2004) Neurogenin 3-expressingprogenitor cells in the gastrointestinal tract differentiate into both endocrineand non-endocrine cell types. Dev Biol 270: 443-454.

99. Zhang XM, Ng AH, Tanner JA, Wu WT, Copeland NG, et al. (2004) Highlyrestricted expression of Cre recombinase in cerebellar Purkinje cells.Genesis 40: 45-51.

100. Ohyama T, Groves AK (2004) Generation of Pax2-Cre mice by modificationof a Pax2 bacterial artificial chromosome. Genesis 38: 195-199.

101. Tian Y, Li M, Fritzsch B, Zuo J (2004) Creation of a transgenic mouse forhair-cell gene targeting by using a modified bacterial artificial chromosomecontaining Prestin. Dev Dyn 231: 199-203.

102. Mukherjee A, Soyal SM, Wheeler DA, Fernandez-Valdivia R, Nguyen J, etal. (2006) Targeting iCre expression to murine progesterone receptor celllineages using bacterial artificial chromosome transgenesis. Genesis 44:601-610.

103. Bingham NC, Verma-Kurvari S, Parada LF, Parker KL (2006) Developmentof a steroidogenic factor 1/Cre transgenic mouse line. Genesis 44: 419-424.

104. Sackett SD, Fulmer JT, Friedman JR, Kaestner KH (2007) Foxl1-CreBAC transgenic mice: a new tool for gene ablation in the gastrointestinalmesenchyme. Genesis 45: 518-522.

105. Sato S, Inoue T, Terada K, Matsuo I, Aizawa S, et al. (2007) Dkk3-Cre BACtransgenic mouse line: a tool for highly efficient gene deletion in retinalprogenitor cells. Genesis 45: 502-507.

106. Sahly I, Fabre V, Vyas S, Milet A, Rouzeau JD, et al. (2007) 5-HT1A-iCre, anew transgenic mouse line for genetic analyses of the serotonergic pathway.Mol Cell Neurosci 36: 27-35.

107. Tiedt R, Schomber T, Hao-Shen H, Skoda RC (2007) Pf4-Cre transgenicmice allow the generation of lineage-restricted gene knockouts for studyingmegakaryocyte and platelet function in vivo. Blood 109: 1503-1506.

108. Gebhard S, Hattori T, Bauer E, Schlund B, Bösl MR, et al. (2008) Specificexpression of Cre recombinase in hypertrophic cartilage under the control ofa BAC-Col10a1 promoter. Matrix Biol 27: 693-699.109.Ji B, Song J, Tsou L, Bi Y, Gaiser S, et al. (2008) Robust acinar cell transgeneexpression of CreErT via BAC recombineering. Genesis 46: 390-395.

109. Ji B, Song J, Tsou L, Bi Y, Gaiser S, et al. (2008) Robust acinar cell transgene expression of CreErT via BAC recombineering. Genesis 46: 390-395.

110. Qiu HY, Guo C, Cheng XW, Huang Y, Xiong ZQ, et al. (2008) Pitx3-CreERmice showing restricted Cre expression in developing ocular lens andskeletal muscles. Genesis 46: 324-328.

111. Alizadeh A, Fitch KR, Niswender CM, McKnight GS, Barsh GS (2008)Melanocyte-lineage expression of Cre recombinase using Mitf regulatoryelements. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res 21: 63-69.

112. Boyle S, Misfeldt A, Chandler KJ, Deal KK, Southard-Smith EM, et al.(2008) Fate mapping using Cited1-CreERT2 mice demonstrates that thecap mesenchyme contains self-renewing progenitor cells and gives riseexclusively to nephronic epithelia. Dev Biol 313: 234-245.

113. Xu Q, Tam M, Anderson SA (2008) Fate mapping Nkx2.1-lineage cells in themouse telencephalon. J Comp Neurol 506: 16-29.

114. Scholten J, Hartmann K, Gerbaulet A, Krieg T, Müller W, et al. (2008) Mastcell-specific Cre/loxP-mediated recombination in vivo. Transgenic Res 17:307-315.

115. Kawashima H, Hirakawa J, Tobisawa Y, Fukuda M, Saga Y (2009)Conditional gene targeting in mouse high endothelial venules. J Immunol182: 5461-5468.

116. Birbach A, Casanova E, Schmid JA (2009) A Probasin-MerCreMer BACallows inducible recombination in the mouse prostate. Genesis 47: 757-764.

117. Boross P, Breukel C, van Loo PF, van der Kaa J, Claassens JW, et al. (2009)Highly B lymphocyte-specific tamoxifen inducible transgene expression ofCreER T2 by using the LC-1 locus BAC vector. Genesis 47: 729-735.

118. Wang Y, Tripathi P, Guo Q, Coussens M, Ma L, et al. (2009) Cre/loxrecombination in the lower urinary tract. Genesis 47: 409-413.119. Repass JF, Laurent MN, Carter C, Reizis B, Bedford MT, et al. (2009) IL7-hCD25 and IL7-Cre BAC transgenic mouse lines: new tools for analysis ofIL-7 expressing cells. Genesis 47: 281-287.120.Wendling O, Bornert JM, Chambon P, Metzger D (2009) Efficient temporallycontrolledtargeted mutagenesis in smooth muscle cells of the adult mouse.Genesis 47: 14-18.

119. Repass JF, Laurent MN, Carter C, Reizis B, Bedford MT, et al. (2009) IL7-hCD25 and IL7-Cre BAC transgenic mouse lines: new tools for analysis ofIL-7 expressingcells. Genesis 47: 281-287.

120. Wendling O, Bornert JM, Chambon P, Metzger D (2009) Efficient temporallycontrolled targeted mutagenesis in smooth muscle cells of the adult mouse.Genesis 47: 14-18.

121. Sassmann A, Offermanns S, Wettschureck N (2010) Tamoxifen-inducibleCre-mediated recombination in adipocytes.

Genesis 48: 618-625.122.Li S, Misra K, Xiang M (2010) A Cre transgenic line for studying V2 neuronallineages and functions in the spinal cord. Genesis 48: 667-672.

123.Grabner B, Blaas L, Musteanu M, Hoffmann T, Birbach A, et al. (2010) Amouse tool for conditional mutagenesis in ovarian granulosa cells. Genesis48: 612-617.

124.Quante M, Marrache F, Goldenring JR, Wang TC (2010) TFF2 mRNAtranscript expression marks a gland progenitor cell of the gastric oxynticmucosa. Gastroenterology 139: 2018-2027.

125.Borgius L, Restrepo CE, Leao RN, Saleh N, Kiehn O (2010) A transgenicmouse line for molecular genetic analysis of excitatory glutamatergicneurons. Mol Cell Neurosci 45: 245-257.126.Ishihara N, Armsen W, Papadopoulos T, Betz H, Eulenburg V (2010)Generation of a mouse line expressing Cre recombinase in glycinergicinterneurons. Genesis 48: 437-445.

127. Lang MF, Salinin S, Ridder DA, Kleesiek J, Hroudova J, et al. (2011) Atransgenic approach to identify thyroxine transporter-expressing structuresin brain development. J Neuroendocrinol 23: 1194-1203.

128.Lau J, Minett MS, Zhao J, Dennehy U, Wang F, et al. (2011) Temporal controlof gene deletion in sensory ganglia using a tamoxifen-inducible Advillin-CreERT2recombinase mouse. Mol Pain 7: 100.

129.Pellegrini M, Claps G, Orlova VV, Barrios F, Dolci S, et al. (2011) TargetedJAM-C deletion in germ cells by Spo11-controlled Cre recombinase. J CellSci 124: 91-99.

130.Arnolds DE, Moskowitz IP (2011) Inducible recombination in the cardiacconduction system of minK: CreERT^2 BAC transgenic mice. Genesis 49:878-884.

131.Kim EJ, Hori K, Wyckoff A, Dickel LK, Koundakjian EJ, et al. (2011)Spatiotemporal fate map of neurogenin1 (Neurog1) lineages in the mousecentral nervous system. J Comp Neurol 519: 1355-1370.

132.Aydin IT, Beermann F (2011) A mart-1::Cre transgenic line inducesrecombination in melanocytes and retinal pigment epithelium. Genesis 49:403-409.

133.Cheng X, Li Y, Huang Y, Feng X, Feng G, et al. (2011) Pulse labeling andlong-term tracing of newborn neurons in the adult subgranular zone. CellRes 21: 338-349.

134.Shen TH, Gladoun N, Castillo-Martin M, Bonal D, Domingo-DomenechJ, et al. (2012) A BAC-based transgenic mouse specifically expresses aninducible Cre in the urothelium. PLoS One 7: e35243.

135.Kang W, Hébert JM (2012) A Sox2 BAC transgenic approach for targetingadult neural stem cells. PLoS One 7: e49038.

136.Tarchini B, Jolicoeur C, Cayouette M (2012) In vivo evidence for unbiasedIkaros retinal lineages using an Ikaros-Cre mouse line driving clona recombination. Dev Dyn 241: 1973-1985.

137. Zhou X, Jeker LT, Fife BT, Zhu S, Anderson MS, et al. (2008) SelectivemiRNA disruption in T reg cells leads to uncontrolled autoimmunity. J ExpMed 205: 1983-1991.

138.Wang Y, Guo Q, Casey A, Lin C, Chen F (2012) A new tool for conditionalgene manipulation in a subset of keratin-expressing epithelia. Genesis 50899-907.

139.Hu ZL, Huang Y, Tao XR, Qi ZH, Chen JY, et al. (2012) Inducible Prrxl1-CreER(T2) recombination activity in the somatosensory afferent pathway.Genesis 50: 552-560.

140.Simon C, Lickert H, Götz M, Dimou L (2012) Sox10-iCreERT2 : a mouseline to inducibly trace the neural crest and oligodendrocyte lineage. Genesi 50: 506-515.

141. Wong QN, Ng VC, Lin MC, Kung HF, Chan D, et al. (2005) Efficient andseamless DNA recombineering using a thymidylate synthase A selectionsystem in Escherichia coli. Nucleic Acids Res 33: e59.

142.Wang S, Zhao Y, Leiby M, Zhu J (2009) A new positive/negative selectionscheme for precise BAC recombineering. Mol Biotechnol 42: 110-11