of choice for studying reprogramming at a functional level. less technically demanding approaches may be helpful for dissecting reprogramming at the cellular, molecular and biological levels (Hochedlinger and Jaenisch, 2006).

Cell fusion: a reprogramming system with the challenge of tetraploidy

Cell fusion is the mechanism by which reprogramming occurs naturally; a haploid oocyte fuses with a haploid spermatozoan. Artificially induced cell fusion generates tetraploid cells which, due to their lack of contribution to chimeras and their perceived susceptibility to turn aneuploid and abnormal, are of limited therapeutic use (Tada *et al.*, 1997; Sullivan and Eggan, 2007). However, cell fusion is the only system yet to show reprogramming in humans (Cowan *et al.*, 2005), and if it was possible to harness cell enucleation strategies either by naturally occurring (erythrocyte enucleation or selective genome ejection systems seen in insects species such as fire-ants) or artificial means (cytoplast/whole cell fusions, or manual chromatin removal), this problem could be surmounted (Sullivan and Eggan, 2007).

Cell fusion, apart from being a potential therapy, has provided a model system where aspects of how cell-specific phenotypes are initiated and maintained can be examined in fusion products of different cell types (intertypic synkaryons). Monoclonal antibodies and polymorphisms between fusion partners can be used to study gene expression at the single cell level or in mass cultures at a biochemical and molecular level. Regulatory mechanisms governing cell fate and differentiation have been partially elucidated by studying differences among cell types in the frequency, kinetics, and patterns of gene expression. The results of both strategies applied to heterokaryons and cell hybrids show that the expression of genes in the nuclei of differentiated cells is remarkably plastic and susceptible to modulation by the cytoplasm (Boshart *et al.*, 1993). Isolation of genetically stable cell hybrids can be achieved using selection for transgenes integrated in, or against mutations occurring in, only one of the parental cell types. Generation of cell hybrids has elucidated three principles of cell differentiation (Boshart *et al.*, 1993): (i) trans-acting gene regulators are involved in cell differentiation; (ii) such regulators repress as well as activate cell-specific gene expression; and (iii) maintenance of the differentiated state is dependent on such factors.

In intertypic somatic hybrids, genes associated with specialized function are often shut down. Such repression is termed 'extinction'. Extinction is a commonly observed feature of intertypic hybridization (Davidson, 1974). One interesting example of hybridization provided the first direct evidence that telomere length determines proliferative capacity in human cells (Wright *et al.*, 1996). In immortal cell lines, the ends of the chromosomes (telomeres) are constitutively replenished by the ribonucleoprotein enzyme telomerase (Counter *et al.*, 1992), while in somatic cell types, telomere length is found to shorten with age (Lindsey *et al.*, 1991; Vaziri, 1997). Hybrids of immortal and somatic cells are found to have limited life span, and this is due to the extinction of the telomerase gene (Wright, 1996). Treating these cell hybrids with specific oligonucleotides results in telomere elongation. It is thought that telomere elongation reduces the probability of DNases cutting into essential regulatory and expressed sequences in chromosomal DNA and so extends the life span of the hybrids (Wright *et al.*, 1996).

Gene repression is far more commonly observed than activation (Baron *et al.*, 1996). However, it has been observed that activation of cell-type specific gene expression can also occur when different cell types are fused (Baron *et al.*, 1996). An interesting example of activation involves fusing erythroid cells at different developmental stages (Broyles, 1999). The phenotype of hybrid cells involves the retention of specific chromosomes (Weiss and Chaplain, 1971), and is dependent on the number of copies of the individual chromosomes retained. For example in hepatoma × fibroblast hybrids possessing only one copy of hepatic chromosomes, the hepatic phenotype is not observed; if, however, the hybrid contains two sets of hepatic chromosomes, the hepatic phenotype is present. Clearly a delicate equilibrium between positive and negative trans-acting factors mediates hybrid phenotype (Peterson and Wess, 1972). It is interesting to juxtapose these data with similar findings from imprinting experiments injecting transgenes containing differentially methylated regions (Reik *et al.*, 1999). Introduction of such genes alters the methylation status of the chromosomal DNA, also indicating a trans-acting mechanism with a delicate equilibrium (Reik *et al.*, 1999).

In summary, cell hybridization experiments have shown that trans-acting gene regulators control the differentiated state of a cell. Somatic cells may be reprogrammed by fusion with pluripotent stem cells; however, in this case, the persistence of ES cell-derived chromatin causes applicative and interpretive complications, i.e. the resulting tetraploid cells are of limited therapeutic use and it is still unknown whether the ES cell chromatin remaining in the fusion product is playing an active role in the perpetuation of the resultant phenotype.

iPS cell transduction: a technique to study reprogramming at the molecular level

There is currently much interest in the reprogramming community surrounding 'induced pluripotent stem (iPS) cell transduction' (Takahashi and Yamanaka, 2006) (**Figure 1**), a novel approach that uses four transcription factors to restore an ES cell-like phenotype to murine fibroblasts (Rodolfa and Eggan, 2006). By simply transducing murine fibroblast cultures with Moloney virus coding for four stem cell factors (Oct3/4, Sox2, Klf4 and c-Myc), it appears that a pluripotent stem cell-like state can be restored. This is particularly exciting when one considers that the techniques involved (cell culture and viral transduction) are commonly used in many laboratories worldwide already. New work on iPS cells has recently been published from three different laboratories (Rodolfa *et al.* 2007). They showed iPS cells selected for Nanog expression can contribute to all tissue types including germ cells. Amazingly, the Nanog–iPS cells closely resemble ES cells in their epigenetic state as well as genetic activity (Okita *et al.*, 2007; Wernig *et al.*, 2007; Maherali *et al.*, 2007). Many laboratories worldwide can now use this method to elucidate

reprogramming mechanisms. Further published work with this technique is eagerly anticipated, as several questions have still to be answered: for example what cells are being transduced to generate these iPS cells? Can this be done with human cells? What is the molecular basis of reprogramming induced by the four factors? Is it the same process that happens during NT and cell fusion reprogramming? Can the implicated genes be activated and induce reprogramming without use of oncogenic virus (Surani, 2007)?

Screening for reprogramming factors

Reprogramming remains largely phenomenological, and efforts should now aim to dissect the mechanism at the molecular level (Hochedlinger and Jaenisch, 2006). Oocytes, preimplantation embryos, and pluripotent stem cells contain factors sufficient for reprogramming, and so constitute good material for identifying reprogramming factors (Hamatani *et al.*, 2004; Ko, 2006). Beyhan *et al.* (2007) reported global gene expression analysis of bovine NT, IVF embryos and donor somatic cells to characterize differences in their transcription profiles. They have found a small set of genes differentially expressed as well as genes of donor cells persistently expressed in NT embryos. Investigating gene expression changes that occur during or soon after reprogramming should elucidate the molecular mechanisms involved.

Another approach includes the use of mass spectrometry to identify reprogramming factors in cells and cell-derived extracts (Koziol *et al.*, 2007). Cell extracts have been shown to induce transient changes in gene expression and chromatin structure in differentiated cells (Dimitrov and Wolffe, 1996), which, if maintained, could possibly result in reprogramming. However, a caveat to these approaches is that the initial induction of reprogramming may only involve subtle changes in gene expression that then cumulatively elicit a pronounced effect. A more forceful approach would be to individually overexpress the four factors shown by Yamanaka and colleagues to reprogram differentiated cells (Takahashi and Yamanaka, 2006) and analyse the resulting genome-wide changes in gene expression. Alternatively, small molecule or RNAi screens could be performed to identify the important factors (Edwards, 2006).

Induction and maintenance of nuclear programmes has, for many years, been considered to be directed solely by proteins involved in gene regulation and morphogenic signalling. Many researchers have carried out reprogramming screens for proteins only to pull out generic chromatin remodeling factors. Additional candidates now need to be considered, including non-proteinaceous macromolecules. RNA, for example, has now emerged as a key player in a surprisingly large number of gene regulation studies. For example, the activity of X chromosomes in female mammals is controlled by non-coding RNAs such as *Xist* and *Tsix*. Furthermore, microRNAs (miRNAs), a large family of short non-coding RNAs (17–25 nucleotides) that mainly function to repress expression of their target genes, regulate blood development (Yekta *et al.* 2004). Tang *et al.* (2007) have recently showed a large proportion of the maternal genes are directly or indirectly under the control of miRNAs, which demonstrates that the maternal miRNAs are essential for the earliest stages of mouse embryonic development. It would not be surprising if non-coding RNA has further roles in specific and stable regulation of developmental programmes. miRNA may have an important role in nuclear reprogramming.

An alternative approach to studying artificial reprogramming, which could be expanded further, has been to study naturally induced reprogramming in lower vertebrates where it occurs successfully and more frequently and to look for common elements in more complex organisms. Unlike mammals, many fish and amphibia have the capacity to regenerate complex structures such as limbs after injury. Even mammals have this capacity in Msx1 expressing regions at the digit termini and more widely during early embryonic phases (Han *et al.*, 2003). This process involves cell migration and a change in cell phenotype in response to the injury. There are certain caveats here, however. It is hard to dissect process important for reprogramming from other processes such as the innate immune response, cell migration, and other consequences of injury. It is also unknown to what extent these processes are conserved in mammals. Still, dedifferentiation of cells to form proliferating progenitor cells is interesting, and systems such as skeletal muscle, limb and tail regeneration or dorsal iris epithelium during lens regeneration should be studied further with screens designed to find the key players involved.

The main challenge facing elucidation of nuclear reprogramming mechanisms using the conventional approaches, and potential solutions

The main problem with current studies investigating nuclear reprogramming mechanisms is the lack of material due to the low frequencies of reprogramming using artificial methods. Conventional approaches entail isolating and expanding reprogrammed cells in strongly selective culture conditions [e.g. in cell fusion experiments (Tada *et al.*, 1997; Cowan *et al.*, 2005) hybrid clones were isolated by antibiotic resistance and expanded]. Analysing such material, however, does not allow discrimination between the epigenetic changes necessary for the induction of reprogramming versus those that happen independently of such induction; i.e. it does not allow the study of reprogramming as it is happening.

How can the study of this process be facilitated? One strategy is to use easily reprogrammable cells, such as cells differentiated from ES cells in culture (Blelloch *et al.*, 2006; Silva *et al.*, 2006). Perhaps the initial focus should be on cultured cells instead of later primary cells, as these will still have strong epigenetic regulation, and thus would be harder to reprogram. Experiments with cultured cells should yield more reprogrammed material.

Additionally, it would be possible to use chromatin modifying drugs such as trichostatin A and 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine to make the chromatin less condensed and more accessible. Factors required for activating the *Oct-3/4* gene are unknown, but recently it has been shown that two chromatin modifying drugs can activate the *Oct-3/4* gene in cells (Hattori *et al.*, 2004). These two drugs, trichostatin A (TSA) and 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine

(5-aza-dC), which inhibit histone deacetylation and DNA methylation respectively, are thought to make the chromatin structure more open and consequently the *Oct-3/4* gene easier to activate. However, such drug treatment is quite toxic to the cells as well as being non-specific (these drugs reactivate many genes including those not associated with an ES cell phenotype (S Sullivan, unpublished data). Tsuji-Takayama *et al.* (2004) have recently shown that treatment of differentiated ES cells with a similar chemical to 5-aza-dC, called 5-azacytidine, causes the up-regulation of stem cell marker genes *Oct-3/4*, *Nanog* and *Sox2*. As with Hattori's work, the expression of genes associated with differentiated cells were not studied, and it is expected that these too will be up-regulated. It will be very interesting to screen for more specific drugs that increase the frequency of reprogramming.

Thirdly, although the reason is unknown, cell cycle synchronization by serum starvation makes murine embryonic fibroblasts (MEF) more easily reprogrammed both by NT (Campbell, 1996) or cell fusion (Sullivan *et al.*, 2006) This strategy could also facilitate reprogramming studies.

Can one learn about reprogramming and improve its efficiency by transposing conditions between the three reprogramming methods?

In order to learn from experiments using the three different methods to deduce the reprogramming mechanism(s) and improve their efficiencies, it is necessary to compare and contrast observations from them. At present, it is difficult to dissect the important events such as changes in gene regulation and chromatin structure during the reprogramming processes due to the inefficiency of all three methods, but some hints can be gathered from existing kinetic, gene expression, and cell cycle data. The kinetics of reprogramming appears to be very similar between NT and cell fusion. Somatic cell-derived transgenic Oct-3/4 is expressed within 24 h after NT and cell fusion (Sullivan and Egli, unpublished data). In contrast, reprogramming experiments using viral transduction have shown that stem cell genes *Alkaline Phosphatase*, *SSEA-1*, and *Nanog* are not highly expressed until 2–3 weeks post-infection (Blelloch *et al.*, 2007; Maherali *et al.* 2007; Meissner *et al.* 2007; Okita *et al.* 2007; Wernig *et al.* 2007), indicating that reprogramming proceeds at a slower pace with this method. The need to synthesize the four reprogramming genes *de novo* can only partially explain the slower kinetics of reprogramming using the viral transduction method. It is likely that other proteins that facilitate the induction of reprogramming during NT and cell fusion are missing, or that the entire transcriptional programme required for reprogramming, which is more completely expressed by the oocyte during NT or the ES cell during cell fusion, is vast and requires a substantial amount of time to execute. For example, demethylation of promoters of endogenous genes such as Oct-3/4 may occur very slowly during reprogramming by viral transduction if factors required for active demethylation are not produced as they are thought to be during NT (Yamazaki *et al.* 2006).

The two pluripotency genes used in the iPS cell viral transduction approach, *Oct-3/4* and *Sox2*, are expressed in oocytes (Avilion *et al.*, 2003; Monti *et al.*, 2006) and mouse ES cells (Yamanaka, 2007), suggesting that their roles in establishing and/or maintaining pluripotency are conserved in all three reprogramming approaches. Yamanaka posits that c-Myc may make the chromatin more accessible to transcription factors by binding to many sites in the genome and inducing histone deacetylation in addition to promoting self-renewal, as it does in murine ES cells (Cartwright *et al.* 2005; Yamanaka, 2007). c-Myc is expressed in oocytes (Naz *et al.* 1994) but is not highly expressed in mouse ES cells (Blelloch *et al.*, 2007). However, a functionally equivalent family member, n-Myc, is expressed and can substitute for c-Myc in iPS cell transduction (Blelloch *et al.*, 2007). Thus, Myc proteins may stimulate self-renewal in iPS cell transduction, cell fusion and NT. *Klf-4* is highly expressed in mouse ES cells (Yamanaka, 2007) and thus may play a role in reprogramming during cell fusion.

Cell cycle synchronization of the somatic cells into G_0/G_1 or G_2/M prior to NT or cell fusion increases the efficiency of reprogramming (Campbell *et al.*, 1996; Sullivan *et al.*, 2006). This effect is attributable to avoiding the aneuploidy or chromosomal damage risked by nuclear transfer or cell fusion during S phase. Yamanaka used unsynchronized cells in the iPS cell transduction experiments because active cell division is a requirement for infection by Moloney retrovirus. Egli and coworkers determined that a zygote arrested in mitosis can reprogram a somatic nucleus while an interphase zygote cannot (Egli *et al.*, 2007). A major difference between a mitotic zygote and an interphase zygote is that the nuclear membrane has broken down in the mitotic zygote. Therefore, it is possible that factors required for reprogramming are sequestered in the nucleus during interphase and released during mitosis. In cell fusion in mice, ES cells in G_2/M phase were the most effective at reprogramming, suggesting that key reprogramming activities at that stage of the cell cycle (Sullivan *et al.*, 2006).

Now there is the opportunity to use observations made in one method of reprogramming to try to improve the other methods. For example, will overexpressing some or all of the four Yamanaka factors in ES cells make reprogramming by cell fusion more efficient? The best evidence that this might be the case is given by Silva and coworkers. They reported elevated frequencies of reprogramming in a cell fusion system where *Nanog*, a pluripotency gene not necessary for iPS cell formation by viral transduction, was overexpressed in the ES cell fusion partner (Silva *et al.*, 2006). High Nanog levels may assist the induction of reprogramming indirectly as positive feedback circuits involving Nanog elevate Oct-3/4 and Sox2 levels (Loh *et al.*, 2006).

It will also be interesting to introduce *c-Myc* and *Klf-4* transgenically into cells to be reprogrammed by NT or cell fusion, to see if this increases the frequency of reprogramming; however, as these gene are both oncogenes, the resultant cells should be tested for epigenetic and genetic abnormalities. There is an additional caveat with this approach; what is learned from reprogramming genetically manipulated, cultured cells may not immediately inform the process of reprogramming normal primary somatic cells, which still have all epigenetic regulatory processes intact. It is, however, a first step towards reprogramming primary cells and should give enough material to untangle the various mechanisms.

Slow demethylation or chromatin re-structuring may be why Yamanaka's viral transduction method proceeds more slowly than NT or cell fusion. This seems likely, given that the other two methods have other factors that could potentially speed up these processes. For example, Yamazaki and coworkers found that even in NT, demethylation of the *Oct-4* promoter proceeds gradually and is probably a result of both active and passive mechanisms for demethylation (Yamazaki *et al.*, 2006). Yamanaka's four factors may not be sufficient to induce active demethylation, and may be dependent on the passive mechanism alone, causing slower reprogramming. Overexpression of de-novo methyl-transferase genes such as *Dnmt-1* or *Dnmt-3* might facilitate the process. Alternatively, if chromatin remodelling is the rate-limiting step, small molecule HDAC inhibitors could expedite reprogramming.

In the future, determining the list of genes that are up-regulated in ES cells during G_2/M phase or proteins that are localized in the nucleus during interphase in zygotes will significantly concentrate the search for genes necessary for reprogramming. Additionally, Yamanaka's work suggests that transcription factor libraries may be the most fruitful source of reprogramming factors.

Currently, it seems reasonable that all three reprogramming methods share a general mechanism involving chromatin remodelling to allow changes in gene expression as the first step, followed by changes to prevent cell death. The last step would be the induction of pluripotency. It also seems likely that the genes used to induce pluripotency are the same in all three methods, while there could be different molecular pathways to cell immortalization and altering DNA accessibility.

Conclusion

NT is the only reprogramming technique known not to require addition of foreign genes to induce restoration of developmental potential. Furthermore, it is still the only method can restore pluripotency without a high risk of oncogenesis. Thus, NT remains a very important system for studying reprogramming. Efficiency by this and the other two methods discussed is, however, still very low and the lack of material limits efforts to identify important factors for reprogramming induction. All three methods (NT, cell fusion, and iPS cell transduction) should be perused so that conditions optimal in one system can be implemented in the others to try to improve reprogramming frequencies. The four iPS cell factors can be introduced into cells that are to be used in NT and cell fusion experiments with the hope of increasing the frequency of reprogramming. It is hoped this will provide more material to study mechanisms and so help understanding of reprogramming. The scarcity of tissues and organs for transplantation, as well as the need for pluripotent stem cells to develop in-vitro models of human disease and development, compel further study of reprogramming mechanisms.

Acknowledgements

SS is funded by a fellowship from the Harvard Stem Cell Research Foundation. JI is funded by a fellowship from the New York Stem Cell Foundation. AU and HA are funded by Health and Labour Sciences Research Grants, Japan. The authors thank Esther Son, Kit Rodolfa, Katelyn Foley, and Gabriella Boulting for proofreading the manuscript.

References

Avilion AA, Nicolis SK, Pevny LH *et al.* 2003 Multipotent cell lineages in early mouse development depend on SOX2 function. *Genes and Development* **17**, 126–140.

Baron MD, Kamata Y, Barras V *et al.* 1996 The genome sequence of the virulent Kabete 'O' strain of rinderpest virus: comparison with the derived vaccine. *Journal of General Virology* **77**, 3041–3046.

Barton SC, Arney KL, Shi W *et al.* 2001 Genome-wide methylation patterns in normal and uniparental early mouse embryos. *Human Molecular Genetics* **10**, 2983–2987.

Beyhan Z, Ross PJ, Iager AE *et al.* 2007 Transcriptional reprogramming of somatic cell nuclei during preimplantation development of cloned bovine embryos. *Developmental Biology* **305**, 637–649.

Blelloch R, Venere M, Yen J, Ramalho-Santos M 2007 Generation of induced pluripotent stem cells in the absence of drug selection. *Cell Stem Cell* **1**, 245–247.

Blelloch R, Wang Z, Meissner A *et al.* 2006 Reprogramming efficiency following somatic cell nuclear transfer is influenced by the differentiation and methylation state of the donor nucleus. *Stem Cells* **24**, 2007–2013.

Boshart M, Nitsch D, Schutz G 1993 Extinction of gene expression in somatic cell hybrids – a reflection of important regulatory mechanisms? *Trends in Genetics* **9**, 240–245.

Brambrink T, Hochedlinger K, Bell G, Jaenisch R 2006 ES cells derived from cloned and fertilized blastocysts are transcriptionally and functionally indistinguishable. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **103**, 933–938.

Briggs R, King TJ 1952 Transplantation of living nuclei from blastula cells into enucleated frogs' eggs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **38**, 455–463.

Broyles RH 1999 Use of somatic cell fusion to reprogram globin genes. *Seminars in Cell and Developmental Biology* **10**, 259–265.

Campbell KH 1999 Nuclear equivalence, nuclear transfer, and the cell cycle. *Cloning* **1**, 3–15.

Campbell KH, Loi P, Otaegui PJ, Wilmut I 1996 Cell cycle co-ordination in embryo cloning by nuclear transfer. *Reviews of Reproduction* **1**, 40–46.

Cartwright P, McLean C, Sheppard A *et al.* 2005 LIF/STAT3 controls ES cell self-renewal and pluripotency by a Myc dependent mechanism. *Development* **132**, 885–896.

Cibelli JB, Stice SL, Golueke PJ *et al.* 1998 Cloned transgenic calves produced from nonquiescent fetal fibroblasts. *Science* **280**, 1256–1258.

Counter CM, Avilion AA, LeFeuvre CE *et al.* 1992 Telomere shortening associated with chromosome instability is arrested in immortal cells which express telomerase activity. *EMBO Journal* **11**, 1921–1929.

Cowan CA, Atienza J, Melton DA, Eggan K 2005 Nuclear reprogramming of somatic cells after fusion with human embryonic stem cells. *Science* **309**, 1369–1373.

Davidson RL 1974 Gene expression in somatic cell hybrids. *Annual Review of Genetics* **8**, 195–218.

Di Giorgio FP, Carrasco MA, Siao MC *et al.* 2007 Non-cell autonomous effect of glia on motor neurons in an embryonic stem cell-based ALS model. *Nature Neuroscience* **10**, 608–614.

Dimitrov S, Wolffe AP 1996 Remodeling somatic nuclei in *Xenopus laevis* egg extracts: molecular mechanisms for the selective release of histones H1 and H1(0) from chromatin and the acquisition of transcriptional competence. *EMBO Journal* **15**, 5897–5906.

Edwards RG 2006 Genetics, epigenetics and gene silencing in differentiating mammalian embryos. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* **13** 732–753.

Eggan K, Akutsu H, Loring J *et al.* 2001 Hybrid vigor, fetal overgrowth, and viability of mice derived by nuclear cloning and tetraploid embryo complementation. *Proceedings of the National*

Academy of Sciences of the USA **98**, 6209–6214.
Egli D, Rosains J, Birkhoff G, Eggan K. 2007 Developmental reprogramming after chromosome transfer into mitotic mouse zygotes. *Nature* **447**, 679–685.
Evans MJ, Kaufman MH 1981 Establishment in culture of pluripotential cells from mouse embryos. *Nature* **292**, 154–156.
Fulka J Jr, First NL, Moor RM 1996 Nuclear transplantation in mammals: remodelling of transplanted nuclei under the influence of maturation promoting factor. *Bioessays* **18**, 835–840.
Gridelli B, Remuzzi G 2000 Strategies for making more organs available for transplantation. *New England Journal of Medicine* **343**, 404–410.
Gurdon JB 1968 Nucleic acid synthesis in embryos and its bearing on cell differentiation. *Journal of Embryology and Experimental Morphology* **20**, 401–414.
Gurdon JB, ElsdaleTR, Fischberg M. 1958 Sexually mature individuals of *Xenopus laevis* from the transplantation of single somatic nuclei. *Nature* **182**, 64–65.
Hakelien AM, Landsverk HB, Robl JM *et al.* 2002 Reprogramming fibroblasts to express T-cell functions using cell extracts. *Nature Biotechnology* **20**, 460–466.
Hamatani T, Carter GM, Sharov AA *et al.* 2004 Dynamics of global gene expression changes during mouse preimplantation development. *Developmental Cell* **6**, 117–131.
Han M, Yang X, Farrington JE, Muneoka K 2003 Digit regeneration is regulated by Msx1 and BMP4 in fetal mice. *Development* **130**, 5123–5132.
Hattori N, Nishino K, Ko Y *et al.* 2004 Epigenetic control of mouse Oct-3/4 gene expression in embryonic stem cells and trophoblast stem cells. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **279**, 17063–17069.
Hochedlinger K, Jaenisch R 2006 Nuclear reprogramming and pluripotency. *Nature* **441**, 1061–1067.
Hochedlinger K, Jaenisch R 2002 Nuclear transplantation: lessons from frogs and mice. *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* **14**, 741–748.
Kass SU, Wolffe AP 1998 DNA methylation, nucleosomes and the inheritance of chromatin structure and function. *Novartis Foundation Symposium* **214**, 36–50.
Kato K, Gurdon JB 1993 Single-cell transplantation determines the time when *Xenopus* muscle precursor cells acquire a capacity for autonomous differentiation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **90**, 1310–1314.
Kato Y, Tani T, Sotomaru Y *et al.* 1998 Eight calves cloned from somatic cells of a single adult. *Science* **282**, 2095–2098.
Kelly SJ 1977 Studies of the developmental potential of 4- and 8-cell stage mouse blastomeres. *Journal of Experimental Zoology* **200**, 365–376.
Kikyo N, Wade PA, Guschin D *et al.* 2000 Active remodeling of somatic nuclei in egg cytoplasm by the nucleosomal ATPase ISWI. *Science* **289**, 2360–2362.
Ko SHM 2006 Expression profiling of the mouse early embryo: reflections and perspectives. *Developmental Dynamics* **235**, 2437–2448.
Koziol MJ, Garrett N, Gurdon JB 2007 Tpt1 activates transcription of Oct3/4 and nanog in transplanted somatic nuclei. *Current Biology* **17**, 801–807.
Lindsey J, McGill NI, Lindsey LA, Green *et al.* 1991 In-vivo loss of telomeric repeats with age in humans. *Mutation Research* **256**, 45–48.
Loh YH, Wu Q, Chew JL, *et al.* 2006 The Oct4 and Nanog transcription network regulates pluripotency in mouse embryonic stem cells. *Nature Genetics* **38**, 431–440.
Maherali N, Sridharan R, Xie W *et al.* 2007 Global epigenetic remodeling in directly reprogrammed fibroblasts. *Cell Stem Cell* **1**, 55–70.
Martinez-Balbas MA, Dey A, Rabindran SK *et al.* 1995 Displacement of sequence-specific transcription factors from mitotic chromatin. *Cell* **83**, 29–38.
Matsui YK, Zsebo K Hogan BL 1992 Derivation of pluripotential embryonic stem cells from murine primordial germ cells in culture. *Cell* **70**, 841–847.
McGrath J, Solter D 1984 Inability of mouse blastomere nuclei transferred to enucleated zygotes to support development in vitro. *Science* **226**, 1317–1319.
Meissner A, Jaenisch R 2006 Mammalian nuclear transfer. *Developmental Dynamics* **235**, 2460–2469.
Meissner A, Wernig M, Jaenisch R 2007 Direct reprogramming of genetically unmodified fibroblasts into pluripotent stem cells. *Nature Biotechnology* **25**, 1177–1181.
Monk M, Boubelik M, Lehnert S 1987 Temporal and regional changes in DNA methylation in the embryonic, extraembryonic and germ cell lineages during mouse embryo development. *Development* **99**, 371–382.
Monti M, Garagna S, Redi C, Zuccotti M 2006 Gonadotropins affect Oct-4 gene expression during mouse oocyte growth. *Molecular Reproduction and Development* **73**, 685–691.
Naz RK, Kumar G, Minhas BS 1994 Expression and role of c-myc protooncogene in murine preimplantation embryonic development. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics* **11**, 208–216.
Ogura A, Inoue K, Ogonuki N *et al.* 2000 Production male cloned mice fresh, cultured, and cryopreserved immature Sertoli cells. *Biology of Reproduction* **62**, 1579–1584.
Okita K, Ichisaka T, Yamanaka S 2007 Generation of germline-competent induced pluripotent stem cells. *Nature* **448**, 313–317.
Perreault SD 1992 Chromatin remodeling in mammalian zygotes. *Mutation Research* **296**, 43–55.
Peterson JA, Wess MC 1972 Expression of differentiated functions in hepatoma cell hybrids: induction of mouse albumin production in rat hepatoma-mouse fibroblast hybrids. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **69**, 571–575.
Reik W, Kelsey G, Walter J 1999 Dissecting de novo methylation. *Nature Genetics* **23**, 380–382.
Resnick JL, Bixler LS, Cheng L, Donovan PJ 1992 Long-term proliferation of mouse primordial germ cells in culture. *Nature* **359**, 550-551.
Ribbert H 1911 *Das Karzinom des Menschen/Human Cancer*. Friedrich Cohen, Bonn.
Ridcout WM 3rd, Eggan K, Jaenisch R 2001 Nuclear cloning and epigenetic reprogramming of the genome. *Science* **293**, 1093–1098.
Rodolfa KT, Eggan K 2006 A transcriptional logic for nuclear reprogramming. *Cell* **126**, 652–655.
Rodolfa K, Di Giorgio FP, Sullivan S 2007 Defined reprogramming: a vehicle for changing the differentiated state. *Differentiation* **75**, 577–579.
Schultz RM, Davis W Jr, Stein P *et al.* 1999 Reprogramming of gene expression during preimplantation development. *Journal of Experimental Zoology* **285**, 276–282.
Silva J, Chambers I, Pollard S, Smith A 2006 Nanog promotes transfer of pluripotency after cell fusion. *Nature* **441**, 997–1001.
Stojkovic M, Stojkovic P, Leary C *et al.* 2005 Derivation of a human blastocyst after heterologous nuclear transfer to donated oocytes. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* **11**, 226–231.
Sullivan S, Eggan K 2007 The potential of cell fusion for human therapy. *Stem Cell Reviews* **2**, 341–350.
Sullivan S, Pells S, Hooper M *et al.* 2006 Nuclear reprogramming of somatic cells by embryonic stem cells is affected by cell cycle stage. *Cloning Stem Cells* **8**, 174–188.
Surani MA 2007 Afterword. In: Sullivan S, Chad CA, Eggan K (eds) *Human Embryonic Stem Cells: The Practical Handbook*. John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK. 389–391.
Surani MA 1999 Reprogramming a somatic nucleus by trans-modification activity in germ cells. *Seminars in Cell and Developmental Biology* **10**, 273–277.
Tada M, Takahama Y, Abe K *et al.* 2001 Nuclear reprogramming of somatic cells by in vitro hybridization with ES cells. *Current Biology* **11**, 1553–1558.
Tada M, Tada T, Lefebvre L *et al.* 1997 Embryonic germ cells induce epigenetic reprogramming of somatic nucleus in hybrid cells. *EMBO Journal* **16**, 6510–6520.
Takahashi K, Yamanaka S 2006 Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined

factors. *Cell* **126**, 663–676.
Tang F, Kaneda M, OCarroll D *et al.* 2007 Maternal microRNAs are essential for mouse zygotic development. *Genes and Development* **21**, 644–648.
Tsuji-Takayama K, Inoue T, Ijiri Y *et al.* 2004 Demethylating agent, 5-azacytidine, reverses differentiation of embryonic stem cells. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* **323**, 86–90.
Vaziri H, West MD, Allsopp RC *et al.* 1997 ATM-dependent telomere loss in aging human diploid fibroblasts and DNA damage lead to the post-translational activation of p53 protein involving poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase. *EMBO Journal* **16**, 18–33.
Verlinsky Y, Strelchenko N, Kukharenko V *et al.* 2005 Human embryonic stem cell lines with genetic disorders. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* **10**, 105–110.
Wakayama T, Tabar V, Rodriguez I *et al.* 2001 Differentiation of embryonic stem cell lines generated from adult somatic cells by nuclear transfer. *Science* **292**, 740–743.
Wakayama T, Tateno H, Mombaerts P, Yanagimachi R 2000 Nuclear transfer into mouse zygotes. *Nature Genetics* **24**, 108–109.
Wakayama T, Perry AC, Zuccotti M *et al.* 1998 Full-term development of mice from enucleated oocytes injected with cumulus cell nuclei. *Nature* **394**, 369–374.
Weismann A 1893 The Germ-Plasm: A Theory of Heredity. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
Weiss MC, Chaplain M 1971 Expression of differentiated functions in hepatoma cell hybrids: reappearance of tyrosine aminotransferase inducibility after the loss of chromosomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **68**, 3026–3030.
Wernig M, Meissner A, Foreman R *et al.* 2007 In vitro reprogramming of fibroblasts into a pluripotent ES-cell-like state. *Nature* **448**, 318–324.
Willadsen SM 1986 Nuclear transplantation in sheep embryos. *Nature* **320**, 63–65.
Wilmut I, Schnieke AE, McWhir J *et al.* 1997 Viable offspring derived from fetal and adult mammalian cells. *Nature* **385**, 810–813.
Wobus AM, Boheler KR 2005 Embryonic stem cells: prospects for developmental biology and cell therapy. *Physiological Reviews* **85**, 635–678.
Wright WE, Brasiskyte D, Piatyszek MA, Shay JW 1996 Experimental elongation of telomeres extends the lifespan of immortal x normal cell hybrids. *EMBO Journal* **15**, 1734–1741.
Yamanaka S 2007 Strategies and new developments in the generation of patient-specific pluripotent stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell* **1**, 39–44.
Yamazaki Y, Fujita TC, Low EW *et al.* 2006 Gradual DNA demethylation of the Oct4 promoter in cloned mouse embryos. *Molecular Reproduction and Development* **73**, 180–188.
Yekta S, Shih IH, Bartel DP 2004 MicroRNA-directed cleavage of HOXB8 mRNA. *Science* **304**, 594–596.

Received 27 July 2007; refereed 12 September 2007; accepted 17 October 2007.