

SaCas9 and AsCas12a (AsCpf1) are as potent and more specific than SpCas9

Gregory Gotta, Jenna Zappetti, Tim Fennell, Eugenio Marco, Tongyao Wang, Terence Ta, Christopher J .Wilson*

Editas Medicine, Inc. 11 Hurley Street, Cambridge, MA 02141

Introduction

- This is an off-target study comparing SpCas9, SaCas9, and AsCas12a (AsCpf1).
- Digenome-Seq¹ was used to assess specificity because it is highly sensitive and uses a completely reconstituted system enabling assessment of on- and off-target cutting relative to ribonucleoprotein (RNP) concentration in a straightforward fashion.

Results	
SpCas9 has 10x–100x more off-target cut sites than AsCas12a and SaCas9 at 1 µM RNP	On-target activity and potency are similar between the three enzymes in Digenome-Seq

- 25 'matched sites'² in the human genome were used in the study. Matched sites are sequences in the genome which have protospacer adjacent motif (PAM) sequences for multiple enzymes. Thus the same target site can be interrogated for all the enzymes, reducing bias due to the target and guide sequences.
- A subset of 10 sites were analyzed in a concentration-response using Digenome-Seq and T cell editing, via RNP nucleofection, to determine whether and how on- and offtarget cutting was related to RNP concentration.
- This rigorous methodology can be used generically for comparative specificity assessments.







10 guide RNAs for each enzyme were sub-selected (30 RNPs total) and assayed using multiplex Digenome-Seq² in a second experiment. As before, RNPs were incubated with human genomic DNA at concentrations from 1000 nM to 0.1 nM each, for 16 hours at 37°C.

On-target cutting percent is defined as the percent of read starts divided by the total number of reads.

Each color point/line refers to a distinct target site.





Concentration-response in primary human T cells shows editing is enzyme- and target site-specific



25 target sites for each enzyme (75 RNPs total) were assayed using multiplex Digenome-Seq³ (5 RNPs / reaction). RNPs were incubated with human genomic DNA at 1,000 nM concentration each for 16 hours at 37°C. WGS data was aligned to hg38 and cut sites identified using the algorithm⁴ with a template score >= 15. To deconvolute the multiplexed RNPs, cut sites were assigned to target sites after alignment, having 6 or less mismatches plus gaps.





Nine target sites were assessed for on-target editing in primary human T cells by RNP nucleofection. RNP concentration at the time of nucleofection is on the x-axis and percent editing (indels at expected cut site) measured by targeted PCR-NGS, on the y-axis. Each trellis panel represents a different target site.

Conclusions

- SpCas9 had 10x-100x more cut sites than SaCas9 and AsCas12a assayed with Digenome-Seq at saturating RNP concentrations (1000 nM). The average SpCas9 had 78 off-target cut sites, while the SaCas9 had 0.9 and AsCas12a had 1.2.
- On-target cutting was found to be concentration-dependent.

References

¹ Kim, D. et al. Nat. Methods 12, 237–243 (2015).
 ² Kleinstiver, B. P. et al. Nat. Biotechnol. 34, 869–874 (2016).
 ³ Kim, D., Kim, S., Kim, S., Park, J. & Kim, J.-S. Genome Res. 26, 406–415 (2016).
 ⁴ Maeder, M. L. et al. Nat. Med. 25, 229–233 (2019).

No common variants >0.1% in guide or PAM

 Target sites are at least 10kb apart
 Inspection of target region from previous WGS runs to ensure >15x coverage and no SNPs / indels / other variants
 Successfully design PCR primers to amplify target region

25 sites chosen

Half-maximal biochemical potency was similar for all 3 enzymes at ~3 to 30 nM.

Half-maximal cellular potency was ~300 nM to 3,000 nM, although more variable with some target sites showing striking differences between enzymes.

Off-target cutting was also concentration-dependent with the "off-to-on" target ratio often reaching 100-1000x for SaCas9 and AsCas12a but not exceeding 10 for SpCas9.

This study points towards the use of SaCas9 and AsCas12a for potential therapeutic interventions where large specificity windows are more attainable.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Aaron Wilson, William Pierce, Jen DaSilva, Meltem Isik, the sequencing team, and Mrudula Donepudi for scientific contributions and editing of this poster; as well as Genewiz for WGS Services.



All authors are employees and shareholders of Editas Medicine, Inc, except Tim Fennel, Fulcrum Genomics, who is a paid consultant.

Presented at the 5th Meeting on Genome Engineering: Frontiers of CRISPR-Cas at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, October 10-13, 2019.





