

Technology Report

Successful production of offspring derived from mouse zygotes vitrified with carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine and polyvinyl alcohol without serum

Midori ISHII^{1)*}, Maki KAMOSHITA^{2, 3)*}, Yoshihiro KURIHARA¹⁾, Kazuaki MATSUMURA⁴⁾, Suong-Hyu HYON⁵⁾, Junya ITO^{1, 2, 6)} and Naomi KASHIWAZAKI^{1, 2)}

¹⁾School of Veterinary Medicine, Azabu University, Sagamihara 252-5201, Japan

²⁾Graduate School of Veterinary Sciences, Azabu University, Sagamihara 252-5201, Japan

³⁾Research Institute for Microbial Diseases, Osaka University, Suita 565-0871, Japan

⁴⁾School of Materials Science, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Nomi 923-1291, Japan

⁵⁾BMG Incorporated, Higashikujo 601-8023, Japan

⁶⁾Center for Human and Animal Symbiosis Science, Azabu University, Sagamihara 252-5201, Japan

Abstract. The vitrification of zygotes is important for their use as donors for generating genome-edited mice. We previously reported the successful vitrification of mouse zygotes using carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine (COOH-PLL). However, this vitrification solution contains fetal calf serum (FCS), which contains unknown factors and presents risks of pathogenic viral and microbial contamination. In this study, we examined whether polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) can be used as an alternative to FCS in vitrification solutions for mouse zygotes. When COOH-PLL was added to the vitrification solutions, zygotes vitrified with solutions containing 0.01% PVA (PV0.01) and those vitrified in a control solution containing FCS (75.6%) developed into blastocysts (78.4%). In addition, there were no significant differences in the ability to develop to term between the control solution (46.6%) and PV0.01 (44.1%) groups. In conclusion, we clearly demonstrated that PVA can replace FCS in our vitrification solution supplemented with COOH-PLL for mouse zygotes.

Key words: Carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine, COOH-PLL, Mouse, Vitrification, Zygote

(J. Reprod. Dev. 69: 53–55, 2023)

Cryopreservation of mammalian zygotes is valuable for generating and maintaining genetically modified and genome-edited animals. Vitrification using a minimal volume cooling method is an efficient cryopreservation method for assisted reproductive technology (ART) and experimental purposes [1]. In this method, ethylene glycol (EG) and dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) were used as cryoprotective agents (CPAs) (ED solution). In a previous study, we improved the developmental ability of vitrified zygotes using a novel CPA, carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine (COOH-PLL), in mice [2] and pigs [3]. In our modified protocol, EG and COOH-PLL were used as CPAs in the cryopreservation (EP) solution. However, the solutions used for cryopreservation (wash, equilibration, vitrification, and warming solutions) contained fetal calf serum (FCS), which is widely used for cryopreservation [4]. FCS contains unknown factors and presents risks of pathogenic viral and microbial contamination [5], thus there is a wide demand for their replacement with non-animal alternatives [6]. Polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) has been employed as a substitute for FCS in vitrification/warming solutions for bovine embryos [7] and oocytes [8], porcine embryos [9], and ovine embryos [6]. PVA can effectively inhibit ice formation and growth in solution during vitrification and warming procedures [10], and is therefore a good substitute for serum in vitrification. In this study, we further examined

the effect of using PVA instead of FCS in ED and EP solutions to improve the vitrification protocol for mouse zygotes.

As shown in Table 2, there were no significant differences in rates of survival (Control: $80.2 \pm 7.4\%$; PV0.01: $84.2 \pm 5.8\%$; PV0.1: $78.6 \pm 8.1\%$; PV1: $77.9 \pm 12.7\%$), development to 2-cells (Control: $63.4 \pm 4.4\%$; PV0.01: $74.2 \pm 5.0\%$; PV0.1: $69.1 \pm 6.3\%$; PV1: $61.2 \pm 12.6\%$), or development to the blastocyst (Control: $50.9 \pm 6.7\%$; PV0.01: $63.3 \pm 3.4\%$; PV0.1: $53.7 \pm 10.7\%$; PV1: $53.2 \pm 12.3\%$) among the PVA groups ($P > 0.05$). Next, we examined whether PVA was also effective for vitrification using the EP solution (Table 2). We used 0.01 and 0.1% PVA because the survival and developmental rates were not significantly different, whereas PV1 was slightly lower in the results for the ED solution. When PV0 (EP solution without FCS and PVA) was used for vitrification, the survival ($71.8 \pm 6.9\%$) and developmental rates (2-cell: $53.2 \pm 7.7\%$; blastocyst: $26.6 \pm 6.1\%$) were lower than that of the other groups (Table 2). In EP solution, PV0.01 showed higher rates of development to the blastocyst stage ($78.4 \pm 4.2\%$) than those of PV0.1 ($51.9 \pm 10.6\%$) ($P < 0.01$), and this rate was similar to that of the control group ($75.6 \pm 6.5\%$) ($P > 0.05$) (Table 2). Although PVA can inhibit ice formation and growth in vitrification/warming solutions [10], it also has a negative effect on protein synthesis after vitrification [6]. For ovine blastocyst vitrification, 0.1% PVA was used instead of 20% FCS [6]. In contrast, the concentration of PVA (0–1%) did not affect the survival or developmental ability of *in vivo*-derived porcine morulae and blastocysts [9]. In the present study, the addition of 0.01% PVA to the EP solution yielded higher developmental rates than did the addition of 0.1% PVA (Table 2). Even though there were no statistically significant differences, PV0.01 in the ED solution also showed higher survival and developmental rates than the other PVA concentrations (Table 2). Therefore, we believe that 0.01%

Received: November 1, 2022

Accepted: November 21, 2022

Advanced Epub: December 12, 2022

©2023 by the Society for Reproduction and Development

Correspondence: J Ito (e-mail: itoj@azabu-u.ac.jp)

* M Ishii and M Kamoshita are equally contributed.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd) License. (CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

PVA is effective not only in EP solutions but also in ED solutions. Taken together, these results strongly suggest that optimization of the PVA concentration in the vitrification solution is essential and is dependent on the species and probably the developmental stage. Similar to PVA, COOH-PLL has been found to reduce the risk of damage due to ice recrystallization during freezing and thawing. An experiment conducted by Matsumura and Hyon showed that there were high survival rates in various cell lines after cryopreservation using a solution without serum but supplemented with COOH-PLL [11, 12]. More recently, they discovered the mechanism of COOH-PLL as a CPA [12]. During the cooling process, the signals of water, sodium ions, and polymer chains in the COOH-PLL solution spread, resulting in an increasingly restricted mobility and increased solution viscosity. Furthermore, strong intermolecular interactions promote the glass transition of COOH-PLL, trapping water and salt in the gaps of the reversible matrix and preventing intracellular ice formation and osmotic shock during freezing, which leads to reduced cellular stress by cryopreservation [12]. In addition, macromolecules such as bovine serum albumin (BSA; a component of FCS) and PVA can prevent the attachment of embryos onto glass pipettes, plastic dishes, and plastic sheets of Cryotop during vitrification and warming procedures. We attempted zygote vitrification with 0% PVA in the ED solution; however, most zygotes were lost due to their attachment onto glass pipettes, and we could not use 0% PVA in the ED solution (data not shown). COOH-PLL is also a macromolecule; therefore, we evaluated 0% PVA in an EP solution (PV0 in Table 2) to investigate whether COOH-PLL could complement FCS or PVA in mouse zygotes. However, our results showed the lowest survival and developmental rates in the PV0 group (Table 2), suggesting that COOH-PLL may require other macromolecules or serum with at least 15% COOH-PLL solution for the vitrification of mouse zygotes. We evaluated the developmental ability to term by transferring

2-cell embryos delivered from vitrified zygotes using control (20% FCS) and PV0.01 in EP solutions, which showed higher rates of blastocyst formation. Our results showed no significant differences between the control (46.6%) and PV0.01 (44.1%) groups in the EP solution (Table 3).

In conclusion, our results indicate that PVA can replace FCS in vitrification solutions supplemented with COOH-PLL in the vitrification of mouse zygotes. Our current protocol can be widely used for vitrification of mouse zygotes as donors for generating genome-edited mice.

Methods

All chemicals and reagents were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA) unless stated otherwise. All procedures for handling and treatment of animals were conducted according to the guidelines established by the Ethical Committee for Vertebrate Experiments at Azabu University (ID#170324-9). All the mice were purchased from Charles River Laboratories (Yokohama, Japan). Crlj:C57BL/6J females (4–5 weeks old) were used for metaphase II (MII) oocyte collection and Crlj:C57BL/6J males (12–24 weeks old) were used for sperm collection. Mature female Crlj:ICR mice (12–14 weeks old) were used as recipients of the embryo transfer. Vasectomized male Crlj:ICR mice (20–30 weeks old) were used to induce pseudo-pregnancy. The mice were housed in an environmentally controlled room with a 12 h dark/12 h light cycle at a temperature of $23 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ and a humidity of $55 \pm 5\%$ with free access to a laboratory diet and filtered water. Following the protocols of previous studies [2, 13], zygotes were obtained via *in vitro* fertilization (IVF) using frozen or thawed sperm. Zygotes were vitrified 6 h after insemination as previously described, [2] with some modifications. In brief, 5–20 zygotes were placed in an equilibrium solution composed of 7.5% (v/v) EG (Kanto Chemical, Tokyo, Japan) + 7.5% (v/v) DMSO + 20% FCS (Life Technologies, CA, USA) or PVA (0.01, 0.1, 1%) in modified Dulbecco's phosphate buffered medium (mPB1) [14] without bovine serum albumin (BSA) (Table 1) (ED solution) for 3 min at 25°C . The zygotes were then transferred into vitrification solution composed of 15% (v/v) EG + 15% (v/v) DMSO + 0.5 M sucrose + 20% FCS or PVA (0.01, 0.1, 1%) in mPB1 (ED solution) for 1 min at 25°C and vitrified using Cryotop [1]. To prepare equilibrium and vitrification solutions using COOH-PLL, 7.5% (w/v) and 15% (w/v) COOH-PLL were added, respectively, instead of DMSO (EP solution). The zygotes were warmed by immersing the Cryotop into a warming solution composed of 0.5 M sucrose + 20% FCS or PVA (0.01, 0.1, 1%) in mPB1 at 37°C for 3 min, and then placed

Table 1. Components of the modified PB1 as a base solution of vitrification solution

Compound	M.W.	mM	mg/100 ml
CaCl ₂ ·2H ₂ O	147	0.9	13.2
MgCl ₂ ·6H ₂ O	203.3	0.49	10.0
Dulbecco's PBS (-) *	–	–	960
Glucose	178.6	5.56	100
Sodium pyruvate	110	0.33	3.6
Penicillin G	–	–	6.3

* Dulbecco's PBS (-) "Nissui" (Nissui Pharmaceutical, Tokyo, Japan).

Table 2. Rates of survival and *in vitro* development of zygotes vitrified using indicated solutions

Solution	No. of zygotes	No. of survival (%) *	No. of 2-cells (%) *	No. of blastocysts (%) *	
Control	112	87 (80.2 ± 7.4)	71 (63.4 ± 4.4)	57 (50.9 ± 6.7)	
PV0.01	120	99 (84.2 ± 5.8)	89 (74.2 ± 5.0)	76 (63.3 ± 3.4)	
ED	PV0.1	136	107 (78.6 ± 8.1)	94 (69.1 ± 6.3)	73 (53.7 ± 10.7)
	PV1	139	108 (77.9 ± 12.7)	85 (61.2 ± 12.6)	74 (53.2 ± 12.3)
	Control	164	150 (92.3 ± 4.9) ^a	144 (87.8 ± 5.5) ^c	124 (75.6 ± 6.5) ^e
	PV0	124	84 (71.8 ± 6.9) ^b	66 (53.2 ± 7.7) ^d	33 (26.6 ± 6.1) ^f
EP	PV0.01	104	102 (95.7 ± 2.3) ^a	96 (89.7 ± 3.7) ^c	54 (78.4 ± 4.2) ^e
	PV0.1	116	112 (98.4 ± 1.1) ^a	104 (92.3 ± 3.0) ^c	91 (51.9 ± 10.6) ^{ef}

ED, 15% ethylene glycol + 15% dimethyl sulfoxide; EP, 15% ethylene glycol + 15% carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine; Control, 20% fetal calf serum; PV, polyvinyl alcohol. All percentages are expressed as mean ± standard error of the mean (SEMs). Different superscripts denote significant differences (a vs. b, c vs. d, e vs. f; $P < 0.01$).

Table 3. *In vivo* development of mouse 2-cells derived from zygotes vitrified using ethylene glycol and carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine-supplemented (EP) solutions

FCS or PVA	No. of 2-cells transferred	Pregnant/Recipients	No. of pups (%)
FCS 20%	88	6/6	41 (46.6%)
PVA 0.01%	102	6/6	45 (44.1%)

FCS, fetal calf serum; PVA, polyvinyl alcohol.

in mPB1 with 20% FCS or PVA (0.01, 0.1, 1%) at 37°C for 5 min. After washing three times with potassium simplex optimization medium containing amino acids (KSOMaa)[15], the zygotes were cultured in a 100- μ L drop of KSOMaa covered in paraffin oil, and their survival was evaluated. Development to the 2-cell and blastocyst stages was examined at 24 and 96 h, respectively. To evaluate the *in vivo* development of vitrified zygotes, 2-cell embryos derived from vitrified/warmed zygotes were transferred into the oviducts of recipient mice, as previously reported [2]. Each experiment had at least three replicates. More than 100 zygotes were used for each treatment group to evaluate the survival and developmental rates (Table 2). All percentage data were subjected to arcsine transformation before statistical analysis. The data were analysed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey's test to quantify survival and developmental rates (Table 2) and by a two-tailed Student's *t*-test to quantify development rates *in vivo*. A value of $P < 0.05$ (Table 3) was considered significant. Percentages are expressed as the mean \pm standard error of the mean (SEMs).

Conflict of interests: The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships that may be considered potential competing interests: Kazuaki MATSUMURA, Suong-Hyu HYON has patent #JP WO2009/157209 A1 2009.12.30 issued to Bioverde Inc.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the JSPS (KAKENHI, 20H04532 to KM, 21H02384 to JI, and 21K05977 to NK) and by the Center for Human and Animal Symbiosis Science, Azabu University and a research project grant awarded by the Azabu University Research Services Division. This study was supported by the MEXT*-Supported Program for the Private University Research Branding

Project (2016–2019) (*Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology) and by the NIBB Collaborative Research Program (18–908 and 19–903) awarded to JI.

References

1. Kuwayama M. Highly efficient vitrification for cryopreservation of human oocytes and embryos: the Cryotop method. *Theriogenology* 2007; **67**: 73–80. [Medline] [CrossRef]
2. Shibao Y, Fujiwara K, Kawasaki Y, Matsumura K, Hyon SH, Ito J, Kashiwazaki N. The effect of a novel cryoprotective agent, carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine, on the developmental ability of re-vitrified mouse embryos at the pronuclear stage. *Cryobiology* 2014; **68**: 200–204. [Medline] [CrossRef]
3. Kamoshita M, Kato T, Fujiwara K, Namiki T, Matsumura K, Hyon SH, Ito J, Kashiwazaki N. Successful vitrification of pronuclear-stage pig embryos with a novel cryoprotective agent, carboxylated ϵ -poly-L-lysine. *PLoS One* 2017; **12**: e0176711. [Medline] [CrossRef]
4. Bruyère P, Baudot A, Guyader-Joly C, Guérin P, Louis G, Buff S. Improved cryopreservation of in vitro-produced bovine embryos using a chemically defined freezing medium. *Theriogenology* 2012; **78**: 1294–1302. [Medline] [CrossRef]
5. Checura CM, Seidel GEJ Jr. Effect of macromolecules in solutions for vitrification of mature bovine oocytes. *Theriogenology* 2007; **67**: 919–930. [Medline] [CrossRef]
6. Leoni G, Bogliolo L, Berlinguer F, Rosati I, Pintus PP, Ledda S, Naitana S. Defined media for vitrification, warming, and rehydration: effects on post-thaw protein synthesis and viability of in vitro derived ovine embryos. *Cryobiology* 2002; **45**: 204–212. [Medline] [CrossRef]
7. Vajta G, Rindom N, Peura TT, Holm P, Greve T, Callesen H. The effect of media, serum and temperature on in vitro survival of bovine blastocysts after Open Pulled Straw (OPS) vitrification. *Theriogenology* 1999; **52**: 939–948. [Medline] [CrossRef]
8. Asada M, Ishibashi S, Ikumi S, Fukui Y. Effect of polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) concentration during vitrification of in vitro matured bovine oocytes. *Theriogenology* 2002; **58**: 1199–1208. [Medline] [CrossRef]
9. Sanchez-Osorio J, Cuello C, Gil MA, Parrilla I, Maside C, Almiñana C, Lucas X, Roca J, Vazquez JM, Martinez EA. Vitrification and warming of in vivo-derived porcine embryos in a chemically defined medium. *Theriogenology* 2010; **73**: 300–308. [Medline] [CrossRef]
10. Wang HY, Inada T, Funakoshi K, Lu SS. Inhibition of nucleation and growth of ice by poly(vinyl alcohol) in vitrification solution. *Cryobiology* 2009; **59**: 83–89. [Medline] [CrossRef]
11. Matsumura K, Hyon SH. Polyampholytes as low toxic efficient cryoprotective agents with antifreeze protein properties. *Biomaterials* 2009; **30**: 4842–4849. [Medline] [CrossRef]
12. Matsumura K, Hayashi F, Nagashima T, Rajan R, Hyon S. Molecular mechanisms of cell cryopreservation with polyampholytes studied by solid-state NMR. *Communications Materials* 2021; **2**: 15. [CrossRef]
13. Takeo T, Nakagata N. Reduced glutathione enhances fertility of frozen/thawed C57BL/6 mouse sperm after exposure to methyl-beta-cyclodextrin. *Biol Reprod* 2011; **85**: 1066–1072. [Medline] [CrossRef]
14. Whittingham DG, Wales RG. Storage of two-cell mouse embryos in vitro. *Aust J Biol Sci* 1969; **22**: 1065–1068. [Medline] [CrossRef]
15. Ho Y, Wigglesworth K, Eppig JJ, Schultz RM. Preimplantation development of mouse embryos in KSOM: augmentation by amino acids and analysis of gene expression. *Mol Reprod Dev* 1995; **41**: 232–238. [Medline] [CrossRef]