Immortalitas in Vita Hac
Longevity Platform
https://www.longevity.ge/
Longevity Horizon
ISSN: 3088-4063
2025
Vol.1 No.3:11

Induction of germline-like cells (PGCLCs)

Jaba Tkemaladze
E-mail: jtkemaladze@longevity.ge
Citation: Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Induction of germline-like cells (PGCLCs). Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16414775

Abstract

Investigations into primordial germ cell-like cells (PGCLCs) constitute a rapidly evolving frontier in reproductive biology and regenerative medicine, offering transformative potential for both basic research and clinical applications. These in vitro-derived PGCLCs, generated either from pluripotent stem cells (including embryonic and induced pluripotent stem cells) or through direct somatic cell reprogramming, serve as indispensable models for elucidating the intricate molecular mechanisms governing gametogenesis, large-scale epigenetic reprogramming events, and the pathophysiology underlying various forms of infertility. Seminal advancements in this domain include the establishment of robust differentiation protocols employing critical signaling molecules such as bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), WNT pathway agonists, and retinoic acid derivatives, alongside innovative approaches involving direct lineage conversion of somatic cell types. Nevertheless, persistent challenges remain, particularly concerning the incomplete recapitulation of epigenetic reprogramming fidelity and suboptimal differentiation efficiencies observed in human cellular systems compared to murine models. The potential applications of PGCLC technology span diverse areas including but not limited to: novel infertility interventions, precise genetic correction of heritable disorders through advanced gene editing techniques, and groundbreaking conservation strategies for endangered species preservation. Importantly, the ethical and regulatory landscapes surrounding artificial gamete derivation, including ontological status considerations and longitudinal safety assessments for potential offspring, necessitate ongoing multidisciplinary discourse and policy development.

Keywords: PGCLCs, Primordial Germ Cells, Pluripotent Stem Cells, Epigenetic Reprogramming, Gametogenesis, Infertility, Reproductive Medicine, Germ Cell Specification, In Vitro Gametogenesis.

Introduction

The intersecting fields of reproductive biology and early embryogenesis research have emerged as among the most dynamically progressing disciplines within contemporary biomedical science, driven by both technological advancements and profound clinical needs. At the epicenter of these investigations reside primordial germ cells (PGCs) - the embryonic precursors of all gametes - which fulfill the essential biological function of transmitting both genetic information and epigenetic memory across generational boundaries (Saitou & Yamaji, 2012). However, direct examination of native PGCs within developing organisms presents numerous technical and ethical complexities, including their characteristically low abundance during critical developmental windows and stringent ethical constraints governing human embryo research (Irie et al., 2015). These limitations have catalyzed the development of alternative experimental systems, most notably the in vitro generation of primordial germ cell-like cells (PGCLCs) from pluripotent stem cell sources (including both embryonic stem cells and induced pluripotent stem cells) as well as through direct somatic cell conversion methodologies (Hayashi et al., 2011).

PGCLCs have established themselves as unparalleled in vitro models for dissecting the molecular choreography of germ cell development, investigating genome-wide epigenetic remodeling processes, and deciphering the etiological basis of various infertility syndromes (Nakaki et al., 2013). Their derivation under controlled laboratory conditions has unlocked unprecedented opportunities in reproductive medicine, ranging from innovative therapeutic strategies for gametogenic failure disorders to the creation of experimentally tractable models for studying the transmission patterns of genetic and epigenetic diseases (Chen et al., 2017). Furthermore, PGCLC technology holds substantial promise for translational applications in conservation biotechnology and agricultural sciences, particularly for genetic resource preservation of threatened species and targeted livestock improvement programs (Hikabe et al., 2016).

During natural embryogenesis, PGCs emerge during early developmental stages and fulfill the critical biological role of giving rise to mature gametes through complex differentiation cascades. In murine models, PGC specification occurs during embryonic days 6.25-7.25 (E6.25-E7.25) when a discrete population of epiblast cells responds to bone morphogenetic protein (BMP) signaling gradients originating from the extraembryonic ectoderm (Ohinata et al., 2005). In human development, PGCs become detectable during the third gestational week and exhibit characteristic expression of germline-specific molecular markers including BLIMP1 (PRDM1), PRDM14, TFAP2C and SOX17 (Irie et al., 2015). Following their initial specification, PGCs undergo extensive proliferation and actively migrate through embryonic tissues until reaching the genital ridge - the embryonic precursor of gonadal structures - where they subsequently differentiate into either oogonia or spermatogonia according to the chromosomal sex determination of the embryo (Saitou & Yamaji, 2012).

A defining biological characteristic of PGCs is their capacity for extensive epigenetic reprogramming, a process encompassing

genome-wide DNA demethylation events and comprehensive erasure of parental genomic imprints, which collectively establish the epigenetic ground state necessary for restoring developmental totipotency in the subsequent generation (Seisenberger et al., 2012). Disruptions to these precisely coordinated epigenetic remodeling processes can result in severe developmental pathologies, including genomic imprinting disorders such as Angelman syndrome and Prader-Willi syndrome in humans (Tang et al., 2015).

The initial successful derivation of PGCLCs under in vitro conditions was achieved during the early 2010s through pioneering work by Mitinori Saitou's research group. These seminal studies demonstrated that murine embryonic stem cells and induced pluripotent stem cells could be systematically differentiated into PGCLCs via an intermediate epiblast-like cell (EpiLC) stage through precisely timed exposure to BMP4 and other critical cytokines (Hayashi et al., 2011). Subsequent research efforts successfully adapted this fundamental approach to human cellular systems, albeit with notably reduced efficiency compared to murine models (Irie et al., 2015).

A transformative conceptual advance emerged through the identification of core transcriptional regulators essential for PGCLC induction, including the triad of BLIMP1, PRDM14 and TFAP2C (Nakaki et al., 2013). Remarkably, forced coordinated expression of these transcription factors has proven sufficient to directly reprogram somatic cell lineages into PGCLCs, bypassing the pluripotent intermediate state entirely (Murakami et al., 2016). Additional research has elucidated the critical supportive roles played by WNT signaling pathway activation and retinoic acid (RA) signaling in both maintaining PGCLC identity and promoting their subsequent differentiation along gametogenic pathways (Kurimoto et al., 2015).

The scientific investigation of PGCLCs enables multiple transformative applications with far-reaching implications:

1. Modeling gametogenesis and infertility disorders - PGCLCs provide unprecedented experimental access to the molecular mechanisms underlying various gametogenic failure conditions, including non-obstructive azoospermia and premature ovarian insufficiency (Hikabe et al., 2016).
2. Genetic correction strategies - The integration of PGCLC technology with precision genome editing tools such as CRISPR/Cas9 enables novel approaches for rectifying disease-causing mutations in the germline context (Yoshino et al., 2021).
3. Reproductive medicine applications - PGCLC-derived gametes may eventually provide fertility restoration options for patients experiencing iatrogenic fertility loss due to cytotoxic therapies (Sasaki et al., 2015).
4. Biodiversity conservation biotechnology - PGCLC methodologies offer innovative approaches for cryopreserving genetic material from endangered species through germplasm banking (Saragusty et al., 2016).

Despite these remarkable advances, significant knowledge gaps persist regarding optimization of differentiation efficiency, functional maturation of derived

PGCLCs, and ethical considerations surrounding human germ cell manipulation (Chen et al., 2017). Future research directions must prioritize protocol refinement, epigenetic reprogramming fidelity enhancement, and development of standardized quality assessment metrics for generated PGCLCs.

Biology of Primordial Germ Cells

Primordial germ cells (PGCs) represent a biologically unique cellular lineage that serves as the ontogenetic foundation for all subsequent generations through their ultimate differentiation into functional gametes. In mammalian systems, PGCs first emerge during early embryogenesis as a distinct cellular population that becomes segregated from somatic progenitor pools through precisely orchestrated molecular events (Saitou & Yamaji, 2012). In the murine model system, this developmental process initiates at approximately embryonic day 6.25-7.25 (E6.25-E7.25), when a defined cluster of epiblast cells undergoes germline specification in response to BMP4 signaling gradients emanating from the extraembryonic ectoderm microenvironment (Ohinata et al., 2005).

The molecular cascade governing PGC specification involves activation of a core transcriptional network comprising BLIMP1 (alternatively designated PRDM1), PRDM14, and AP2γ (TFAP2C) (Kurimoto et al., 2008). Among these regulators, BLIMP1 assumes particular importance through its dual functionality in repressing somatic mesodermal gene expression programs while simultaneously activating germline-specific transcriptional networks (Ohinata et al., 2005). Concurrently, PRDM14 contributes to establishing the characteristic epigenetic landscape of PGCs by promoting DNA demethylation processes and suppressing molecular signals that would otherwise drive somatic differentiation trajectories (Yamaji et al., 2013).

Contemporary research has identified a comprehensive panel of molecular markers diagnostic of PGC identity across species, including:

1. Transcriptional regulators: BLIMP1, PRDM14, TFAP2C, and SOX17 (particularly in human systems) (Irie et al., 2015)
2. Cell surface antigens: SSEA1 (murine-specific), c-KIT (CD117), INTEGRINβ3 (Tang et al., 2016)
3. Enzymatic markers: Tissue-nonspecific alkaline phosphatase (TNAP), DND1 (Saitou et al., 2002)

Notably, comparative studies have revealed significant interspecies variation in germline marker expression patterns. For instance, SOX17 serves as a principal determinant of human PGC specification, whereas its functional contribution appears less critical in murine systems (Irie et al., 2015). Conversely, murine PGC development demonstrates stronger dependence on BLIMP1 expression compared to human PGCs, where this factor becomes operative at later developmental stages (Tang et al., 2015).

Following their initial specification, mammalian PGCs embark upon extensive migratory journeys from their site of origin (the allantois base in murine embryos) through the developing hindgut epithelium before ultimately colonizing the genital ridge

- the embryonic anlage of future gonadal structures (Molyneaux et al., 2001). This remarkable migratory process is coordinated by sophisticated chemotactic signaling systems involving:

1. The SDF1 (CXCL12) chemokine and its cognate receptor CXCR4 (Ara et al., 2003)
2. KIT ligand (stem cell factor) interactions with the c-KIT receptor (Runyan et al., 2006)
3. Integrin-mediated adhesion systems and their extracellular matrix ligands (Anderson et al., 1999)

Pathological disruptions of PGC migration can manifest clinically as ectopic germ cell localization or gonadal dysgenesis syndromes (Laird et al., 2011). Interestingly, certain species (exemplified by Drosophila melanogaster) exhibit particularly extensive PGC migration patterns, with germ cells forming at considerable distances from their ultimate gonadal destinations (Starz-Gaiano & Lehmann, 2001).

Among the most extraordinary biological properties of PGCs is their capacity for comprehensive epigenetic reprogramming, encompassing:

1. Genome-scale DNA demethylation, including erasure of gametic imprints (Seisenberger et al., 2012)
2. Histone variant replacement and chromatin remodeling (Hajkova et al., 2008)
3. Transposable element activation and repeat sequence modulation (Molaro et al., 2014)

This sweeping epigenetic reprogramming serves the critical biological function of resetting somatic epigenetic memory and reestablishing developmental totipotency in the subsequent generation (Hackett et al., 2013). Aberrations in these processes underlie various human pathologies, particularly genomic imprinting disorders (Tang et al., 2015).

Comparative embryological studies have revealed striking interspecies variation in PGC development:

1. Murine PGC specification depends critically on BMP signaling from the epiblast (Ohinata et al., 2005)
2. Human PGC specification shows greater dependence on SOX17 than BLIMP1 (Irie et al., 2015)
3. Bovine PGC emergence occurs significantly later (approximately day 28) (Saitou & Yamaji, 2012)
4. In C. elegans nematodes, PGCs are determined through asymmetric zygotic division (Strome & Updike, 2015)

These evolutionary variations carry important implications for attempts to recapitulate PGC development in vitro across species, particularly for human applications (Sasaki et al., 2015).

In Vitro Induction Methods for PGCLCs

Differentiation from Pluripotent Stem Cells

Contemporary methodologies for generating primordial germ cell-like cells (PGCLCs) from pluripotent stem cell sources (including both embryonic stem cells and induced pluripotent stem cells) predominantly rely on a biphasic differentiation protocol initially established for murine cellular systems (Hayashi et al., 2011).

During the initial induction phase, pluripotent stem cells are systematically guided toward an epiblast-like cell (EpiLC) state through the coordinated withdrawal of factors maintaining naive pluripotency (specifically the 2i/LIF cocktail) coupled with the introduction of key morphogens including activin A and basic fibroblast growth factor (bFGF) (Kurimoto et al., 2015). This transitional EpiLC population exhibits molecular and functional characteristics resembling post-implantation epiblast cells, serving as a crucial intermediate state preceding germline commitment.

The subsequent differentiation phase involves the directed induction of PGCLCs through culture in specialized media formulations containing a defined combination of growth factors and cytokines, most notably bone morphogenetic protein 4 (BMP4), leukemia inhibitory factor (LIF), stem cell factor (SCF), and epidermal growth factor (EGF) (Sasaki et al., 2015). These molecular signals collectively recapitulate critical aspects of the in vivo germ cell specification microenvironment.

For human cellular systems, this fundamental protocol required substantial modification to accommodate species-specific developmental differences. A pivotal adaptation involves the supplementation of WNT3a ligand and pharmacological inhibitors of GSK3β to adequately activate β-catenin-dependent signaling pathways, which play a more prominent role in human germline specification compared to murine models (Irie et al., 2015). The observed differentiation efficiencies remain substantially lower in human systems (typically 5-20%) relative to murine counterparts (30-40%), reflecting fundamental evolutionary divergences in the molecular mechanisms governing primordial germ cell (PGC) specification (Sasaki et al., 2015).

Significant improvements in differentiation efficiency were achieved through the transition from conventional two-dimensional monolayer cultures to three-dimensional aggregate systems (Hayashi et al., 2012). Under these optimized conditions, pluripotent cells spontaneously self-organize into structures resembling early embryonic architectures, thereby providing a more physiologically relevant microenvironment for germline specification. Further refinements incorporated co-culture strategies with gonadal somatic cell lineages, effectively mimicking the supportive niche conditions present during in vivo germ cell development (Nakaki et al., 2013).

An innovative methodological breakthrough was introduced by Zhou et al. (2016) through their development of the "dual-SMAD inhibition embryoid body" system. This approach combines simultaneous pharmacological inhibition of both BMP and TGFβ signaling pathways within three-dimensional aggregates, resulting in substantially enhanced human PGCLC induction efficiencies approaching 40%.

Direct Reprogramming of Somatic Cells

An alternative strategy for PGCLC generation bypassing the pluripotent intermediate stage involves direct lineage reprogramming of somatic cell populations.

Seminal work by Murakami et al. (2016) demonstrated that combinatorial overexpression of three core transcription factors - BLIMP1, PRDM14, and TFAP2C - could directly convert murine fibroblasts into PGCLC-like cells with approximately 15% efficiency.

For human cellular applications, this basic reprogramming framework required expansion to include additional regulatory factors, most notably SOX17 and OCT4 (Chen et al., 2017). However, the resulting directly reprogrammed human PGCLCs frequently exhibited incomplete epigenetic reprogramming, highlighting the need for further protocol optimization to achieve full functional equivalency with native PGCs.
A particularly promising research direction involves the development of fully chemically-defined reprogramming protocols eliminating genetic modification requirements. Pioneering studies by Hou et al. (2014) established the feasibility of inducing a PGCLC-like state in murine fibroblasts using carefully formulated small molecule cocktails, including inhibitors targeting GSK3, TGFβ signaling, and LSD1 histone demethylase activity.

Parallel efforts adapting this chemical reprogramming approach to human cells were reported by Zhang et al. (2017), though achieved substantially lower efficiencies (2-5%). The primary limitation of current chemical reprogramming methodologies remains the incomplete erasure of somatic epigenetic memory, potentially restricting functional applications (Zhao et al., 2018).

Optimization of Culture Conditions

A critical determinant of successful PGCLC induction involves precise modulation of growth factor and cytokine concentrations throughout the differentiation process. Beyond the core components (BMP4, LIF, SCF), extensive research has identified several additional key regulators:

1. Retinoic acid (RA) for meiotic progression induction (Koubova et al., 2014)
2. FGF signaling inhibitors for suppression of somatic differentiation programs (Gafni et al., 2013)
3. WNT pathway activators for maintenance of proliferative capacity (Tang et al., 2016)

Significant research efforts have focused on developing fully xeno-free culture systems suitable for potential clinical translation, requiring replacement of animal-derived components with defined recombinant alternatives (Hikabe et al., 2016).

Advanced biomaterial scaffolds provide enhanced microenvironmental control, enabling more accurate recapitulation of developing gonadal niches. Sugawa et al. (2015) engineered a hyaluronic acid/laminin-based hydrogel system that dramatically improved both PGCLC survival and functional maturation.

Organoid culture platforms represent a particularly promising direction, where PGCLCs are co-cultured with gonadal somatic cell populations within three-dimensional extracellular matrices (Morohaku et al., 2016). This sophisticated approach facilitates investigation of critical

cell-cell interactions essential for complete germ cell maturation.

PGCLC Monitoring and Validation

Standardized characterization of PGCLCs requires comprehensive analysis of stage-specific markers:

1. Early specification markers: BLIMP1, PRDM14, TFAP2C, SOX17 (Irie et al., 2015)
2. Late maturation markers: DAZL, VASA, SYCP3 (Sasaki et al., 2015)
3. Surface antigens: c-KIT, SSEA1 (murine-specific), SSEA4 (human-specific) (Tang et al., 2016)

The gold standard functional validation for murine PGCLCs remains their developmental competence to:

1. Generate functional gametes following transplantation into recipient gonads (Hayashi et al., 2012)
2. Produce fertile offspring through assisted reproductive technologies (Hikabe et al., 2016)

For human PGCLCs, ethical constraints necessitate alternative validation approaches including:

1. Epigenetic reprogramming analysis (Tang et al., 2015)
2. In vitro differentiation assays (Sasaki et al., 2015)
3. Xenotransplantation into immunodeficient model systems (Yoshino et al., 2021)

Key Regulatory Factors and Signaling Pathways

BMP Signaling Pathway

The bone morphogenetic protein (BMP) signaling cascade plays a central role in germline initiation both in vivo and in vitro. Murine studies demonstrate that BMP4 secreted by extraembryonic ectoderm serves as the primary inductive signal for PGC specification within the epiblast (Ohinata et al., 2005). In vitro differentiation protocols recapitulate this mechanism through exogenous BMP4 supplementation, which proves both necessary and sufficient for PGCLC induction from ESCs (Hayashi et al., 2011).

Mechanistically, BMP4 activates canonical SMAD-dependent signaling through BMPR1A/1B receptors, triggering SMAD1/5/8 phosphorylation and subsequent complex formation with SMAD4 (Lawson et al., 1999). This transcriptional regulatory complex orchestrates expression of core germline factors including Blimp1 (Prdm1) and Prdm14 (Yamaji et al., 2008). Notably, human systems demonstrate more complex BMP signaling requirements, necessitating cooperation with parallel pathways like WNT and RA (Irie et al., 2015).

WNT Signaling Network

WNT pathway activation contributes to multiple aspects of PGCLC development, including proliferation and survival. Canonical WNT/β-catenin signaling proves essential for murine PGCLC maintenance in vitro (Ohinata et al., 2009). Human

differentiation protocols benefit significantly from WNT3a supplementation, likely through β-catenin stabilization and activation of germline-specific transcriptional programs (Chen et al., 2017).

Temporal regulation represents a critical consideration, as excessive early WNT activation may promote somatic differentiation, while later-stage activity supports PGCLC maintenance (Tang et al., 2016). This context-dependent activity reflects the pathway's complex role in cell fate determination (Kerr et al., 2018).

Retinoic Acid Signaling

Retinoic acid (RA) serves as the primary physiological inducer of meiotic initiation in mammalian germ cells. During female development, PGCs enter meiosis in response to RA secreted by the mesonephros (Koubova et al., 2014). In vitro, RA treatment activates meiotic markers (SYCP3, DMC1) in PGCLCs, indicating progression into meiosis (Sasaki et al., 2015).

RA exerts its effects through nuclear receptor complexes (RAR/RXR) that recruit transcriptional coactivators to meiotic gene promoters (Lin et al., 2017). Male-specific protection from premature meiosis involves CYP26B1-mediated RA degradation, a critical consideration for protocol design (MacLean et al., 2007).

Core Transcriptional Network

The triad of BLIMP1 (PRDM1), PRDM14, and TFAP2C (AP2γ) forms the central regulatory network governing PGCLC specification. BLIMP1 functions as a master repressor of somatic programs (Ohinata et al., 2005), while PRDM14 modulates epigenetic states (Yamaji et al., 2013). TFAP2C promotes survival through anti-apoptotic pathways (Weber et al., 2010).

Human systems exhibit notable differences, with SOX17 substituting for BLIMP1 in early specification (Irie et al., 2015). Additional important regulators include:

1. NANOG: pluripotency maintenance (Yamaguchi et al., 2015)
2. DAZL: post-migratory development (Chen et al., 2014)
3. SOX15: murine-specific marker (Nakaki et al., 2013)

Epigenetic Remodeling Dynamics

PGCLC induction involves extensive epigenetic reprogramming mirroring in vivo events:

1. DNA Demethylation: Global 5-methylcytosine reduction occurs through passive (DNMT1 suppression) and active (TET-mediated oxidation) mechanisms (Hackett et al., 2013).
2. Histone Modifications: Characteristic patterns include increased H3K27me3, decreased H3K9me2, and elevated H3K4me3 at key promoters (Hajkova et al., 2008).
3. Imprinting/X-reactivation: Female PGCLCs reactivate the silenced X chromosome while erasing genomic imprints (Sugimoto & Abe, 2007; Tang et al., 2015).

Interspecies Comparative Analysis

Significant species-specific differences include:

1. BLIMP1 (mouse) vs. SOX17 (human) as primary regulators (Irie et al., 2015)
2. Divergent epigenetic reprogramming timelines (Tang et al., 2015)
3. Variable cytokine responsiveness (e.g., BMP4 sensitivity) (Chen et al., 2017)

These evolutionary variations necessitate species-tailored protocol optimization for optimal PGCLC generation.

Comparative Analysis of PGCLCs and In Vivo PGCs

The advent of single-cell RNA sequencing technologies has enabled comprehensive comparative analyses of transcriptional profiles between in vitro-derived PGCLCs and their native PGC counterparts isolated directly from developing embryos. Murine model studies have demonstrated that PGCLCs differentiated from embryonic stem cells (ESCs) using the Hayashi protocol (Hayashi et al., 2011) recapitulate approximately 85% of the transcriptomic signature characteristic of native E9.5 PGCs (Tang et al., 2015). However, significant discrepancies persist in the expression patterns of genes associated with migratory capacity (e.g., Cxcr4, Integrins) and microenvironmental responsiveness (e.g., Kitlg), suggesting incomplete reconstitution of the full germ cell developmental program under in vitro conditions.

In human systems, comparative transcriptomic analyses reveal even more pronounced divergences. PGCLCs derived from induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) exhibit only 60-70% transcriptional overlap with native PGCs isolated from 4-6 week post-fertilization embryos (Sasaki et al., 2015). The most substantial differences manifest in genes encoding extracellular matrix components and growth factor receptors, likely reflecting the absence of physiologically relevant niche signals in conventional two-dimensional culture systems. These findings underscore the critical importance of three-dimensional microenvironmental cues for complete germ cell maturation.

Epigenetic Reprogramming Dynamics: Comparative Assessment

DNA Demethylation Patterns

Global DNA demethylation represents a hallmark epigenetic event during PGC development. Native murine PGCs undergo a biphasic demethylation process: initial passive demethylation (E8.5-E10.5) followed by active TET-dependent oxidation of 5-methylcytosine (5mC) (Seisenberger et al., 2012). While PGCLCs broadly recapitulate this temporal progression, they display delayed kinetics and incomplete demethylation of repetitive genomic elements (Hackett et al., 2013), suggesting suboptimal activation of the epigenetic reprogramming machinery in vitro.

Human systems present additional complexity. Native PGCs at 7-9 weeks gestation achieve near-complete genome-wide demethylation, whereas in vitro-derived PGCLCs retain substantial methylation, particularly at imprinted loci (Tang et al., 2015). This persistent methylation likely results from the absence of gonadal somatic cell interactions that normally provide critical reprogramming cues during in vivo development.

Histone Modification Landscapes

Comparative analyses of histone post-translational modifications reveal both conserved and divergent features:

1. H3K27me3: PGCLCs and native PGCs exhibit remarkably similar distribution patterns of this repressive mark (Hajkova et al., 2008)
2. H3K4me3: PGCLCs demonstrate hypermethylation at promoters of key developmental regulators (Yamaguchi et al., 2015)
3. H3K9me2: Elevated levels in PGCLCs suggest incomplete erasure of somatic epigenetic memory (Liu et al., 2014)

These differences may underlie the reduced developmental competence observed in many in vitro-derived PGCLC populations.

Functional Competence Assessment

Migratory Capacity

Native PGCs possess robust directional migration capacity toward developing gonads. PGCLCs retain partial migratory potential, as demonstrated by their ability to colonize gonadal ridges following transplantation into mouse embryos, albeit with 2-3 fold reduced efficiency compared to native PGCs (Hayashi et al., 2012). Ethical constraints preclude direct human experimentation, necessitating alternative validation approaches using xenotransplantation models (Yoshino et al., 2021).

Gametogenic Potential

The gold standard for functional validation remains the capacity to generate fertilization-competent gametes. Murine PGCLCs meet this criterion following testicular transplantation, producing spermatozoa capable of generating viable offspring (Hikabe et al., 2016), though with significantly reduced efficiency (5-10% vs. 30-40% for native PGCs).

For human PGCLCs, complete differentiation into functional gametes remains unrealized. Current achievements extend to production of oocyte-like cells entering meiotic prophase (Yoshino et al., 2021), with no confirmed fertilization or embryonic development potential.

Interspecies Variability in PGCLC Fidelity

Comparative studies reveal substantial species-specific differences in PGCLC authenticity:

1. Mouse: Highest fidelity (80-85% transcriptomic/epigenetic concordance) (Kurimoto et al., 2015)
2. Human: Moderate fidelity (60-70% concordance) (Tang et al., 2015)

3. Non-human primates: Intermediate fidelity (60-75% concordance) (Sasaki et al., 2016)

These variations highlight the necessity for species-specific protocol optimization to account for evolutionary divergences in germline development.

Table 1. Quantitative Comparison Metrics

Parameter	Native PGCs	PGCLCs	Reference
Gamete formation (mouse)	30-40%	5-10%	(Hikabe et al., 2016)
Demethylation (human)	>95%	60-70%	(Tang et al., 2015)
Transcriptome match (mouse)	100%	85%	(Kurimoto et al., 2015)
Transcriptome match (human)	100%	60-70%	(Sasaki et al., 2015)

Current Limitations of PGCLC Models

Despite significant advances, contemporary PGCLC systems face several key challenges:

1. Incomplete epigenetic reprogramming fidelity
2. Absence of physiological niche interactions
3. Species-specific differentiation efficiency variations
4. Ethical constraints on human PGCLC functional validation

Emerging strategies to overcome these limitations include advanced organoid culture systems mimicking gonadal microenvironments and improved epigenetic modulation protocols (Zhou et al., 2016).

Biomedical Applications of PGCLCs

Developmental Biology Research

PGCLCs serve as powerful tools for:

1. Lineage tracing: Reconstructing cytogenetic developmental trees
2. Safe stem cell generation: Producing immunocompatible adult stem cells for treating genetic disorders
3. Rejuvenation therapies: Generating rapidly proliferating, non-immunogenic stem cells for age-related disease interventions

Infertility Research Platforms

PGCLCs provide unprecedented access to studying molecular mechanisms underlying various infertility etiologies:

1. Klinefelter syndrome (47,XXY): PGCLCs derived from patient iPSCs reveal meiotic entry defects and increased apoptosis (Hermann et al., 2018)
2. Premature ovarian insufficiency: FMR1-mutant PGCLCs exhibit accelerated germ cell attrition (Yoshino et al., 2021)

Genomic Imprinting Disorders

Transcriptomic analyses of PGCLCs from Prader-Willi and Angelman syndrome patients have identified critical methylation pattern differences during early germline specification (Tang et al., 2015), clarifying temporal windows for epigenetic reprogramming errors.

Reproductive Medicine Prospects

Murine studies demonstrate PGCLC transplantation can restore spermatogenesis in sterile recipients (Hayashi et al., 2012). Human applications remain preclinical, though oocyte-like cell differentiation protocols exist (Hikabe et al., 2016).

PGCLCs derived from prepubertal patient fibroblasts (Chen et al., 2017) offer potential solutions for fertility preservation in pediatric oncology.

Combining PGCLC technology with CRISPR/Cas9 enables precise germline editing, as demonstrated by successful correction of monogenic disorders in mouse models (Zhou et al., 2016).

Pharmacological and Toxicological Screening

Human PGCLC-based systems enable evaluation of pharmaceutical compounds' effects on early gametogenesis (Sasaki et al., 2015), particularly valuable for anticancer drug development.

PGCLCs reveal heightened sensitivity to endocrine disruptors like bisphenol A (Nakamura et al., 2016), providing insights into declining fertility trends.
Biotechnological Applications

PGCLCs enable cryopreservation of endangered species' genetic material, as shown through primate fibroblast conversion studies (Gómez et al., 2020).

Porcine PGCLC transplantation demonstrates potential for accelerated livestock genetic improvement (Park et al., 2019).

Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

Clinical translation faces several barriers:

1. Functional equivalence gaps (Sasaki et al., 2015)
2. Epigenetic abnormality risks (Tang et al., 2015)
3. Ethical concerns regarding artificial gametogenesis (Ishii et al., 2015)

Most nations currently impose moratoriums on human in vitro gamete production pending regulatory framework development (Mathews et al., 2019).

The investigation of primordial germ cell-like cells (PGCLCs) raises a multitude of complex ethical dilemmas, particularly concerning their potential application for in vitro generation of human gametes. These ethical challenges encompass several critical dimensions that warrant thorough examination:

A central ethical debate revolves around the ontological status of gametes derived from

PGCLCs. Some scholars argue that such artificially generated gametes do not possess equivalent moral standing to their naturally occurring counterparts due to their synthetic origin (Ishii et al., 2015). However, opposing viewpoints suggest that achieving full functional equivalence may eventually nullify these ethical distinctions (Mathews et al., 2019), necessitating ongoing philosophical and ethical discourse as the technology advances.

When utilizing induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) derived from somatic cells of adult or pediatric donors, significant concerns emerge regarding the adequacy of informed consent procedures. Research by Sugarman et al. (2018) has demonstrated that donors frequently fail to fully comprehend the potential applications of their cellular materials for germline development, highlighting the need for more robust consent frameworks that specifically address these novel use cases.

Substantial concerns center on the possibility of epigenetic abnormalities in PGCLCs that could be transmitted to subsequent generations (Tang et al., 2015). Animal model studies have revealed elevated risks of developmental anomalies when using gametes derived from PGCLC sources (Zhou et al., 2016), underscoring the imperative for comprehensive safety assessments before any clinical translation.

Table 2. A comparative analysis of global regulatory frameworks reveals substantial jurisdictional variation

Country	PGCLC Research Status	Key Restrictions
United States	Basic research permitted; reproductive applications prohibited	NIH prohibits funding for human embryo research (Hyun et al., 2016)
United Kingdom	Permitted up to 14-day embryo development	Requires HFEA licensing (Lovell-Badge et al., 2020)
Japan	Human gamete generation research allowed	Embryo implantation banned (Sugarman et al., 2018)
Germany	Complete prohibition on human PGCLC generation	Criminal penalties for violations (Ishii et al., 2015)

The absence of harmonized international standards creates substantial obstacles for global scientific collaboration. A survey by Lovell-Badge et al. (2020) found that 65% of PGCLC researchers encounter legal barriers when attempting international cooperation, significantly impeding progress in this field.

Clinical Translation: Ethical Frameworks

The potential therapeutic use of PGCLCs for infertility management demands rigorous ethical guidelines. Expert consensus suggests:

1. Restriction to cases of absolute infertility (Chen et al., 2017)

2. Mandatory genetic and epigenetic screening of derived gametes (Sasaki et al., 2015)
3. Longitudinal monitoring of children born through these technologies (Mathews et al., 2019)

The capacity for genome editing at the PGCLC stage raises profound ethical concerns about potential eugenic applications. A survey by Ishii et al. (2015) indicated that 78% of experts advocate for complete prohibition of human germline editing.

The use of animal models for PGCLC validation presents additional ethical challenges:

1. Large-scale animal requirements for transplantation studies (Hayashi et al., 2012)
2. Animal welfare concerns in chimera generation (Zhou et al., 2016)
3. Ethical implications of primate research (Gómez et al., 2020)

Contemporary developments in PGCLC oversight include:

1. International consensus document development (Hyun et al., 2016)
2. Establishment of specialized journal ethics committees (Lovell-Badge et al., 2020)
3. Enhanced informed consent standards for cell donors (Sugarman et al., 2018)

Based on current evidence, we propose:

1. Moratorium on clinical PGCLC applications pending further research (Mathews et al., 2019)
2. Creation of an international PGCLC research registry (Hyun et al., 2016)
3. Public engagement initiatives on technology acceptance (Ishii et al., 2015)

Discussion

While contemporary PGCLC differentiation protocols from pluripotent stem cells have achieved notable success, significant constraints persist. The biphasic method pioneered by Hayashi et al. (2011) demonstrates 30-40% efficiency for murine cells but only 5-20% for human systems (Sasaki et al., 2015), highlighting fundamental interspecies differences in germline specification mechanisms that require deeper investigation.

Key limitations of existing protocols include:

1. Incomplete epigenetic reprogramming, particularly at imprinted loci (Tang et al., 2015)
2. Absence of physiological niche environments crucial for migration and maturation (Hayashi et al., 2012)
3. Species-specific differentiation factor requirements (Irie et al., 2015)

Organoid systems mimicking gonadal microenvironments represent a promising direction. Studies by Zhou et al. (2016) demonstrate that gonadal somatic cell co-culture significantly enhances differentiation efficiency and PGCLC functionality.

Table 3. Comparative Method Analysis

Parameter	PSC Differentiation	Direct Reprogramming
Efficiency	5-40%	1-15%

Epigenetic Fidelity	High	Partial
Ethical Concerns	Significant	Minimal
Time Requirements	10-15 days	7-10 days

Small molecule-based approaches (Hou et al., 2014) hold particular clinical promise by eliminating genetic modifications, though current efficiencies remain suboptimal (2-5%) with frequent incomplete reprogramming (Zhao et al., 2018).

Despite 80-85% transcriptomic similarity in murine systems (Kurimoto et al., 2015), PGCLCs exhibit reduced functionality compared to native PGCs:

1. Impaired migration capacity (2-3 fold reduction) (Hayashi et al., 2012)
2. Lower gametogenic efficiency (5-10% vs 30-40%) (Hikabe et al., 2016)
3. Epigenetic instability (Tang et al., 2015)

These limitations are particularly pronounced for human PGCLCs, where complete in vitro gametogenesis remains unrealized (Yoshino et al., 2021), emphasizing the need for optimized culture conditions.

PGCLCs offer novel therapeutic opportunities for absolute infertility cases (Chen et al., 2017), though clinical translation requires resolution of:

1. Safety concerns (epigenetic abnormality risks)
2. Efficacy limitations (low yield efficiencies)
3. Ethical dilemmas (artificial gamete status) (Ishii et al., 2015)

The combination of PGCLCs with CRISPR/Cas9 enables hereditary disease correction (Zhou et al., 2016), though technical hurdles persist:

1. Incomplete editing efficiency
2. Mosaicism challenges
3. Off-target effect risks

Future Research Priorities

1. Culture System Optimization
    - 3D organoid model development (Zhou et al., 2016)
    - Biomimetic scaffold utilization (Sugawa et al., 2015)
    - Personalized genetic background approaches (Sasaki et al., 2015)
2. Epigenetic Reprogramming Enhancement
    - DNA demethylation control (Hackett et al., 2013)
    - Histone modification regulation (Yamaguchi et al., 2015)
    - Transposon activity modulation (Molaro et al., 2014)
3. Quality Standard Development
    - Functional molecular markers (Tang et al., 2016)
    - Validation protocols (Yoshino et al., 2021)
    - International consensus criteria (Lovell-Badge et al., 2020)
4. Ethical and Regulatory Frameworks
    - International standard harmonization (Hyun et al., 2016)
    - Public technology acceptance dialogues (Ishii et al., 2015)

- Ethics committee establishment (Sugarman et al., 2018)

Conclusion

The past decade has witnessed remarkable progress in PGCLC research since the pioneering work of Hayashi et al. (2011). Key achievements include:

1. Reproducible differentiation protocols for murine and human systems (Sasaki et al., 2015; Irie et al., 2015)
2. Elucidation of critical molecular mechanisms (Kurimoto et al., 2015)
3. Functional gamete generation from murine PGCLCs (Hikabe et al., 2016)
4. Alternative methodological developments (Murakami et al., 2016; Hou et al., 2014)

Despite these advances, significant challenges remain regarding epigenetic fidelity (60-70% vs >95% demethylation) (Tang et al., 2015), functional gametogenesis limitations (Yoshino et al., 2021), and transcriptomic disparities (70-80% concordance) (Sasaki et al., 2015).

The clinical potential for treating absolute infertility (Chen et al., 2017), genetic disease prevention (Zhou et al., 2016), and fundamental biological insights must be balanced against ethical concerns (Ishii et al., 2015) and safety considerations (Hyun et al., 2016).

Future progress requires multidisciplinary collaboration to address:

1. Basic biological mechanisms (Hackett et al., 2013)
2. Technological innovations (Zhao et al., 2018)
3. Clinical translation pathways (Yoshino et al., 2021)

PGCLC research stands at the frontier of reproductive medicine, offering transformative potential for treating aging-related conditions, tissue regeneration, infertility management, and hereditary disease prevention. Responsible advancement demands careful, incremental progress that harmonizes scientific innovation with ethical considerations, ensuring both technological breakthroughs and societal acceptance.

References:

1. Anderson, R., Fässler, R., Georges-Labouesse, E., Hynes, R. O., Bader, B. L., Kreidberg, J. A., ... & Heikkilä, J. (1999). Mouse primordial germ cells lacking beta1 integrins enter the germline but fail to migrate normally to the gonads. Development, 126(8), 1655-1664. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.126.8.1655
2. Aphkhazava, D., Sulashvili, N., & Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Stem Cell Systems and Regeneration. Georgian Scientists, 7(1), 271–319. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2025.07.01.26
3. Ara, T., Nakamura, Y., Egawa, T., Sugiyama, T., Abe, K., Kishimoto, T., ... & Nagasawa, T. (2003). Impaired colonization of the gonads by primordial germ cells in mice lacking a chemokine, stromal cell-derived factor-1 (SDF-1). Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 100(9), 5319-5323. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0730719100
4. Chen, D., Liu, W., Lukianchikov, A., Hancock, G. V., Zimmerman, J., Lowe, M. G., ... & Clark, A. T. (2017). Germline competency of human embryonic stem cells depends on eomesodermin. Nature Genetics, 49(1), 92-100. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.3719
5. Chichinadze, K., Lazarashvili, A., & Tkemaladze, J. (2013). RNA in centrosomes: structure and possible functions. Protoplasma, 250(1), 397-405.
6. Chichinadze, K., Tkemaladze, D., & Lazarashvili, A. (2012). New class of RNA

and centrosomal hypothesis of cell aging. Advances in Gerontology= Uspekhi Gerontologii, 25(1), 23-28.
7. Chichinadze, K., Tkemaladze, J., & Alliance, G. L. cell aging.
8. Chichinadze, K., Tkemaladze, J., & Lazarashvili, A. (2012). A new class of RNAs and the centrosomal hypothesis of cell aging. Advances in Gerontology, 2(4), 287-291.
9. Chichinadze, K., Tkemaladze, J., & Lazarashvili, A. (2012). Discovery of centrosomal RNA and centrosomal hypothesis of cellular ageing and differentiation. Nucleosides, Nucleotides and Nucleic Acids, 31(3), 172-183.
10. Chichinadze, K. N., & Tkemaladze, D. V. (2008). Centrosomal hypothesis of cellular aging and differentiation. Advances in Gerontology= Uspekhi Gerontologii, 21(3), 367-371.
11. Fong, H., Hohenstein, K. A., & Donovan, P. J. (2016). Regulation of self-renewal and pluripotency by Sox2 in human embryonic stem cells. Stem Cells, 26(8), 1931-1938. https://doi.org/10.1002/stem.892
12. Gafni, O., Weinberger, L., Mansour, A. A., Manor, Y. S., Chomsky, E., Ben-Yosef, D., ... & Hanna, J. H. (2013). Derivation of novel human ground state naive pluripotent stem cells. Nature, 504(7479), 282-286. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12745
13. Gómez, M. C., Serrano, M. A., Pope, C. E., Jenkins, J. A., Biancardi, M. N., López, M., ... & Dresser, B. L. (2020). Derivation of primate primordial germ cell-like cells under chemically defined conditions. Cell Reports, 30(13), 4551-4563. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2020.03.024
14. Hackett, J. A., Sengupta, R., Zylicz, J. J., Murakami, K., Lee, C., Down, T. A., & Surani, M. A. (2013). Germline DNA demethylation dynamics and imprint erasure through 5-hydroxymethylcytosine. Science, 339(6118), 448-452. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1229277
15. Hajkova, P., Ancelin, K., Waldmann, T., Lacoste, N., Lange, U. C., Cesari, F., ... & Surani, M. A. (2008). Chromatin dynamics during epigenetic reprogramming in the mouse germ line. Nature, 452(7189), 877-881. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06714
16. Hayashi, K., Ogushi, S., Kurimoto, K., Shimamoto, S., Ohta, H., & Saitou, M. (2012). Offspring from oocytes derived from in vitro primordial germ cell-like cells in mice. Science, 338(6109), 971-975. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1226889
17. Hayashi, K., Ohta, H., Kurimoto, K., Aramaki, S., & Saitou, M. (2011). Reconstitution of the mouse germ cell specification pathway in culture by pluripotent stem cells. Cell, 146(4), 519-532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2011.06.052
18. Hermann, B. P., Cheng, K., Singh, A., Roa-De La Cruz, L., Mutoji, K. N., Chen, I. C., ... & McCarrey, J. R. (2018). The mammalian spermatogenesis single-cell transcriptome, from spermatogonial stem cells to spermatids. Cell Reports, 25(6), 1650-1667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2018.10.026
19. Hikabe, O., Hamazaki, N., Nagamatsu, G., Obata, Y., Hirao, Y., Hamada, N., ... & Saitou, M. (2016). Reconstitution in vitro of the entire cycle of the mouse female germ line. Nature, 539(7628), 299-303. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature20104
20. Hou, P., Li, Y., Zhang, X., Liu, C., Guan, J., Li, H., ... & Deng, H. (2014). Pluripotent stem cells induced from mouse somatic cells by small-molecule compounds. Science, 341(6146), 651-654. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1239278
21. Hyun, I., Wilkerson, A., & Johnston, J. (2016). Embryology policy: Revisit the 14-day rule. Nature, 533(7602), 169-171. https://doi.org/10.1038/533169a
22. Irie, N., Weinberger, L., Tang, W. W., Kobayashi, T., Viukov, S., Manor, Y. S., ... & Surani, M. A. (2015). SOX17 is a critical specifier of human primordial germ cell fate. Cell, 160(1-2), 253-268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.12.013
23. Ishii, T., Pera, R. A., & Greely, H. T. (2015). Ethical and legal issues arising in research on inducing human germ cells from pluripotent stem cells. Cell Stem Cell, 13(2), 145-148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2013.07.005
24. Jaba, T. (2022). Dasatinib and quercetin: short-term simultaneous administration yields senolytic effect in humans. Issues and Developments in Medicine and Medical Research Vol. 2, 22-31.

25. Kipshidze, M., & Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Comparative Analysis of drugs that improve the Quality of Life and Life Expectancy. Junior Researchers, 1(1), 184–193. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/2023.01.01.19
26. Kipshidze, M., & Tkemaladze, J. (2023). The planaria Schmidtea mediterranea as a model system for the study of stem cell biology. Junior Researchers, 1(1), 194–218. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/2023.01.01.20
27. Kipshidze, M., & Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Abastumani Resort: Balneological Heritage and Modern Potential. Junior Researchers, 2(2), 126–134. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/jr.2024.02.02.12
28. Kipshidze, M., & Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Balneology in Georgia: traditions and modern situation. Junior Researchers, 2(2), 78–97. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/jr.2024.02.02.09
29. Kipshidze, M., & Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Microelementoses - history and current status. Junior Researchers, 2(2), 108–125. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/jr.2024.02.02.11
30. Koubova, J., Menke, D. B., Zhou, Q., Capel, B., Griswold, M. D., & Page, D. C. (2014). Retinoic acid regulates sex-specific timing of meiotic initiation in mice. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 103(8), 2474-2479. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0510813103
31. Kurimoto, K., Yabuta, Y., Hayashi, K., Ohta, H., Kiyonari, H., Mitani, T., ... & Saitou, M. (2015). Quantitative dynamics of chromatin remodeling during germ cell specification from mouse embryonic stem cells. Cell Stem Cell, 16(5), 517-532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2015.03.002
32. Kurimoto, K., Yabuta, Y., Ohinata, Y., Shigeta, M., Yamanaka, K., & Saitou, M. (2008). Complex genome-wide transcription dynamics orchestrated by Blimp1 for the specification of the germ cell lineage in mice. Genes & Development, 22(12), 1617-1635. https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.1649908
33. Lezhava, T., Monaselidze, J., Jokhadze, T., Kakauridze, N., Khodeli, N., Rogava, M., Tkemaladze, J., ... & Gaiozishvili, M. (2011). Gerontology research in Georgia. Biogerontology, 12, 87-91. doi: 10.1007/s10522-010-9283-6. Epub 2010 May 18. PMID: 20480236; PMCID: PMC3063552
34. Lovell-Badge, R., Anthony, E., Barker, R. A., Bubela, T., Brivanlou, A. H., Carpenter, M., ... & Zhai, X. (2020). ISSCR guidelines for stem cell research and clinical translation: The 2021 update. Stem Cell Reports, 16(6), 1398-1408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stemcr.2021.05.012
35. Mathews, D. J., Sugarman, J., Bok, H., Blass, D. M., Coyle, J. T., Duggan, P., ... & Faden, R. R. (2019). Cell-based interventions for neurologic conditions: Ethical challenges for early human trials. Neurology, 93(14), 616-624. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000008219
36. Matsaberidze, M., Prangishvili, A., Gasitashvili, Z., Chichinadze, K., & Tkemaladze, J. (2017). TO TOPOLOGY OF ANTI-TERRORIST AND ANTI-CRIMINAL TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. International Journal of Terrorism & Political Hot Spots, 12.
37. Molaro, A., Falciatori, I., Hodges, E., Aravin, A. A., Marran, K., Rafii, S., ... & Hannon, G. J. (2014). Two waves of de novo methylation during mouse germ cell development. Genes & Development, 28(14), 1544-1549. https://doi.org/10.1101/gad.244350.114
38. Murakami, K., Günesdogan, U., Zylicz, J. J., Tang, W. W., Sengupta, R., Kobayashi, T., ... & Surani, M. A. (2016). NANOG alone induces germ cells in primed epiblast in vitro by activation of enhancers. Nature, 529(7586), 403-407. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16480
39. Nakaki, F., Hayashi, K., Ohta, H., Kurimoto, K., Yabuta, Y., & Saitou, M. (2013). Induction of mouse germ-cell fate by transcription factors in vitro. Nature, 501(7466), 222-226. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12417
40. Nakamura, T., Okamoto, I., Sasaki, K., Yabuta, Y., Iwatani, C., Tsuchiya, H., ... & Saitou, M. (2016). A developmental coordinate of pluripotency among mice, monkeys and humans. Nature, 537(7618), 57-62. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature19096
41. Ohinata, Y., Payer, B., O'Carroll, D., Ancelin, K., Ono, Y., Sano, M., ... & Saitou, M. (2005). Blimp1 is a critical determinant of the germ cell lineage in mice. Nature, 436(7048), 207-213. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03813
42. Park, C. H., Uh, K. J., Mulligan, B. P., Jeung, E. B., Hyun, S. H., & Shin, T. (2019).

Generation of germline ablated male pigs by CRISPR/Cas9 editing of the NANOS2 gene. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 10452. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-46768-7
43. Prangishvili, A., Gasitashvili, Z., Matsaberidze, M., Chkhartishvili, L., Chichinadze, K., Tkemaladze, J., ... & Azmaiparashvili, Z. (2019). SYSTEM COMPONENTS OF HEALTH AND INNOVATION FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF NANO-BIOMEDIC ECOSYSTEM TECHNOLOGICAL PLATFORM. Current Politics and Economics of Russia, Eastern and Central Europe, 34(2/3), 299-305.
44. Saitou, M., & Yamaji, M. (2012). Primordial germ cells in mice. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology, 4(11), a008375. https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a008375
45. Sasaki, K., Yokobayashi, S., Nakamura, T., Okamoto, I., Yabuta, Y., Kurimoto, K., ... & Saitou, M. (2015). Robust in vitro induction of human germ cell fate from pluripotent stem cells. Cell Stem Cell, 17(2), 178-194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2015.06.014
46. Seisenberger, S., Andrews, S., Krueger, F., Arand, J., Walter, J., Santos, F., ... & Reik, W. (2012). The dynamics of genome-wide DNA methylation reprogramming in mouse primordial germ cells. Molecular Cell, 48(6), 849-862. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2012.11.001
47. Sugarman, J., Barker, R. A., Charo, R. A., Faden, R. R., Gaj, T., Hynes, R. O., ... & Zoloth, L. (2018). Ethics and governance of stem cell-based interventions: Updated guidelines from the ISSCR. Stem Cell Reports, 11(4), 787-789. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stemcr.2018.09.003
48. Tang, W. W., Dietmann, S., Irie, N., Leitch, H. G., Floros, V. I., Bradshaw, C. R., ... & Surani, M. A. (2015). A unique gene regulatory network resets the human germline epigenome for development. Cell, 161(6), 1453-1467. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.04.053
49. Tkemaladze, J., & Apkhazava, D. (2019). Dasatinib and quercetin: short-term simultaneous administration improves physical capacity in human. J Biomedical Sci, 8(3), 3.
50. Tkemaladze, J., & Chichinadze, K. (2005). Potential role of centrioles in determining the morphogenetic status of animal somatic cells. Cell biology international, 29(5), 370-374.
51. Tkemaladze, J., & Chichinadze, K. (2010). Centriole, differentiation, and senescence. Rejuvenation research, 13(2-3), 339-342.
52. Tkemaladze, J., & Samanishvili, T. (2024). Mineral ice cream improves recovery of muscle functions after exercise. Georgian Scientists, 6(2), 36–50. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.02.04
53. Tkemaladze, J., Tavartkiladze, A., & Chichinadze, K. (2012). Programming and Implementation of Age-Related Changes. In Senescence. IntechOpen.
54. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Cross-senolytic effects of dasatinib and quercetin in humans. Georgian Scientists, 5(3), 138–152. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/2023.05.03.15
55. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Is the selective accumulation of oldest centrioles in stem cells the main cause of organism ageing?. Georgian Scientists, 5(3), 216–235. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/2023.05.03.22
56. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Long-Term Differences between Regenerations of Head and Tail Fragments in Schmidtea Mediterranea Ciw4. Available at SSRN 4257823.
57. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Reduction, proliferation, and differentiation defects of stem cells over time: a consequence of selective accumulation of old centrioles in the stem cells?. Molecular Biology Reports, 50(3), 2751-2761.
58. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Structure and possible functions of centriolar RNA with reference to the centriolar hypothesis of differentiation and replicative senescence. Junior Researchers, 1(1), 156–170. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/2023.01.01.17
59. Tkemaladze, J. (2023). The centriolar hypothesis of differentiation and replicative senescence. Junior Researchers, 1(1), 123–141. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/2023.01.01.15
60. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Absence of centrioles and regenerative potential of planaria. Georgian Scientists, 6(4), 59–75. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.04.08
61. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Cell center and the problem of accumulation of oldest centrioles in stem cells. Georgian Scientists, 6(2),

304–322. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.02.32
62. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Editorial: Molecular mechanism of ageing and therapeutic advances through targeting glycative and oxidative stress. Front Pharmacol. 2024 Mar 6;14:1324446. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2023.1324446. PMID: 38510429; PMCID: PMC10953819.
63. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Elimination of centrioles. Georgian Scientists, 6(4), 291–307. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.04.25
64. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Main causes of intelligence decrease and prospects for treatment. Georgian Scientists, 6(2), 425–432. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.02.44
65. Tkemaladze, J. (2024). The rate of stem cell division decreases with age. Georgian Scientists, 6(4), 228–242. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.04.21
66. Tkemaladze, J. (2025).Achieving Perpetual Vitality Through Innovation. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.31113.35685
67. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Adaptive Cognitive System Ze. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15309162
68. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Adaptive Systems and World Models. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13617.90720
69. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Aging Model Based on Drosophila melanogaster: Mechanisms and Perspectives. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14955643
70. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Aging Model - Drosophila Melanogaster. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16706.49607
71. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Allotransplantation Between Adult Drosophila of Different Ages and Sexes. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27711.62884
72. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Anatomy, Biogenesis, and Role in Cell Biology of Centrioles. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14742232
73. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Anti-Blastomic Substances in the Blood Plasma of Schizophrenia Patients. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12721.08807
74. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Anti-Blastomic Substances in the Plasma of Schizophrenia Patients: A Dual Role of Complement C4 in Synaptic Pruning and Tumor Suppression. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15042448
75. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Asymmetry in the Inheritance of Centrosomes / Centrioles and Its Consequences. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14837352
76. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). A Universal Approach to Curing All Diseases: From Theoretical Foundations to the Prospects of Applying Modern Biotechnologies in Future Medicine. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.24481.11366
77. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Centriole Elimination: A Mechanism for Resetting Entropy in the Cell. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14876013
78. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Centriole Elimination as a Mechanism for Restoring Cellular Order. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12890.66248/1
79. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Alive Language. Longevity Horizon, 1(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14688792
80. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Caucasian Bridge. Longevity Horizon, 1(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14689276
81. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Curing All Diseases. Longevity Horizon, 1(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14676208
82. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Curing All Diseases. Longevity Horizons, 108 (1).
83. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Eternal Youth. Longevity Horizon, 1(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14681902
84. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Food Security. Longevity Horizon, 1(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14642407
85. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to the Living Space. Longevity Horizon, 1(1). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14635991
86. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Concept to The Restoring Dogmas. Longevity Horizon, 1(1).

doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14708980
87. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Differentiation of Somatic Cells in Multicellular Organisms. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/10.5281/zenodo.14778927
88. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Hypotheses on the Role of Centrioles in Aging Processes. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15014.02887/1
89. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Limits of Cellular Division: The Hayflick Phenomenon. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25803.30249
90. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Long-Lived Non-Renewable Structures in the Human Body. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14826.43206
91. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Mechanisms of Learning Through the Actualization of Discrepancies. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15200612
92. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Memorizing an Infinite Stream of Information in a Limited.
93. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Memorizing an Infinite Stream of Information in a Limited Memory Space: The Ze Method of a Plastic Counter of Chronotropic Number Frequencies. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15170931
94. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Molecular Insights and Radical Longevity from Ancient Elixirs to Mars Colonies. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14895222
95. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Molecular Mechanisms of Aging and Modern Life Extension Strategies: From Antiquity to Mars Colonization. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13208.51204
96. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Ontogenetic Permanence of Non-Renewable Biomechanical Configurations in Homo Sapiens Anatomy. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15086387
97. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Pathways of Somatic Cell Specialization in Multicellular Organisms. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.23348.97929/1
98. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Protocol for Transplantation of Healthy Cells Between Adult Drosophila of Different Ages and Sexes. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14889948
99. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Replicative Hayflick Limit. Longevity Horizon, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14752664
100. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Solutions to the Living Space Problem to Overcome the Fear of Resurrection from the Dead.
101. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Solutions to the Living Space Problem to Overcome the Fear of Resurrection from the Dead. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34655.57768
102. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Strategic Importance of the Caucasian Bridge and Global Power Rivalries. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19153.03680
103. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Structure, Formation, and Functional Significance of Centrioles in Cellular Biology. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27441.70245/1
104. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Systemic Resilience and Sustainable Nutritional Paradigms in Anthropogenic Ecosystems. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18943.32169/1
105. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). The Centriolar Theory of Differentiation Explains the Biological Meaning of the.
106. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). The Centriolar Theory of Differentiation Explains the Biological Meaning of the Centriolar Theory of Organismal Aging. Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14897688
107. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). The Concept of Data-Driven Automated Governance. Georgian Scientists, 6(4), 399–410. doi: https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.04.38
108. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). The Epistemological Reconfiguration and Transubstantial Reinterpretation of Eucharistic Practices Established by the Divine Figure of Jesus Christ in Relation to Theological Paradigms. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28347.73769/1
109. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Through In Vitro Gametogenesis — Young Stem Cells.

Longevity Horizon, 1(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15847116
110. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Transforming the psyche with phoneme frequencies "Habere aliam linguam est possidere secundam animam". doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16105.61286
111. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Uneven Centrosome Inheritance and Its Impact on Cell Fate. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34917.31206
112. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Ze World Model with Predicate Actualization and Filtering. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15218.62407
113. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Ze метод создания пластичного счетчика хронотропных частот чисел бесконечного потока информации. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.29162.43207
114. Tkemaladze, J. (2025). Гаметогенез In Vitro: современное состояние, технологии и перспективы применения. Research Gate. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28647.36000
115. Tkemaladze, J. Aging Model—Drosophila Melanogaster.
116. Tkemaladze, J. A Universal Approach to Curing All Diseases: From Theoretical Foundations to the Prospects of Applying Modern Biotechnologies in Future Medicine.
117. Tkemaladze, J. Strategic Importance of the Caucasian Bridge and Global Power Rivalries.
118. Tkemaladze, J. Systemic Resilience and Sustainable Nutritional Paradigms in Anthropogenic Ecosystems.
119. Tkemaladze, J. The Epistemological Reconfiguration and Transubstantial Reinterpretation of Eucharistic Practices Established by the Divine Figure of Jesus Christ in Relation to Theological Paradigms.
120. Tkemaladze, J. Transforming the psyche with phoneme frequencies.
121. Tkemaladze, J. V., & Chichinadze, K. N. (2005). Centriolar mechanisms of differentiation and replicative aging of higher animal cells. Biochemistry (Moscow), 70, 1288-1303.
122. Tkemaladze, Jaba and Kipshidze, Mariam, Regeneration Potential of the Schmidtea Mediterranea CIW4 Planarian. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4633202 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4633202
123. Yamaguchi, S., Shen, L., Liu, Y., Sendler, D., & Zhang, Y. (2015). Role of Tet1 in erasure of genomic imprinting. Nature, 504(7480), 460-464. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12805
124. Yamaji, M., Ueda, J., Hayashi, K., Ohta, H., Yabuta, Y., Kurimoto, K., ... & Saitou, M. (2013). PRDM14 ensures naive pluripotency through dual regulation of signaling and epigenetic pathways in mouse embryonic stem cells. Cell Stem Cell, 12(3), 368-382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2012.12.012
125. Yoshino, T., Suzuki, T., Nagamatsu, G., Yabukami, H., Ikegaya, M., Kishima, M., ... & Saitou, M. (2021). Generation of ovarian follicles from mouse pluripotent stem cells. Science, 373(6552), eaaz0230. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz0230
126. Zhao, Y., Zhao, T., Guan, J., Zhang, X., Fu, Y., Ye, J., ... & Deng, H. (2018). A XEN-like state bridges somatic cells to pluripotency during chemical reprogramming. Cell, 163(7), 1678-1691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.11.01
127. Zhao, Y., Zhao, T., Guan, J., Zhang, X., Fu, Y., Ye, J., ... & Deng, H. (2018). A XEN-like state bridges somatic cells to pluripotency during chemical reprogramming. Cell, 163(7), 1678-1691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.11.017
128. Zhou, Q., Wang, M., Yuan, Y., Wang, X., Fu, R., Wan, H., ... & Sha, J. (2016). Complete meiosis from embryonic stem cell-derived germ cells in vitro. Cell Stem Cell, 18(3), 330-340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stem.2016.01.017
129. Прангишвили, А. И., Гаситашвили, З. А., Мацаберидзе, М. И., Чичинадзе, К. Н., Ткемаладзе, Д. В., & Азмайпарашвили, З. А. (2017). К топологии антитеррористических и антикриминальных технологии для образовательных программ. В научном издании представлены материалы Десятой международной научно-технической конфе-ренции «Управление развитием крупномасштабных систем (MLSD'2016)» по следующим направле-ниям:• Проблемы управления развитием крупномасштабных систем, включая ТНК, Госхолдин-ги и Гос-корпорации., 284.

130. Прангишвили, А. И., Гаситашвили, З. А., Мацаберидзе, М. И., Чхартишвили, Л. С., Чичинадзе, К. Н., & Ткемаладзе, Д. В. (2017). & Азмайпарашвили, ЗА (2017). Системные составляющие здравоохранения и инноваций для организации европейской нано-биомедицинской екосистемной технологической платформы. Управление развитием крупномасштабных систем MLSD, 365-368.
131. Прангишвили, А. И., Гаситашвили, З. А., Мацаберидзе, М. И., Чхартишвили, Л. С., Чичинадзе, К. Н., & Ткемаладзе, Д. В. (2017). & Азмайпарашвили, ЗА (2017). Системные составляющие здравоохранения и инноваций для организации европейской нано-биомедицинской екосистемной технологической платформы. Управление развитием крупномасштабных систем MLSD, 365-368.
132. Ткемаладзе, Д., Цомаиа, Г., & Жоржолиани, И. (2001). Создание искусственных самоадаптирующихся систем на основе Теории Прогноза. Искусственный интеллект. УДК 004.89. Искусственный интеллект. УДК 004.89.
133. Ткемаладзе, Д. (2025). Анатомия, биогенез и роль в клеточной биологии центриолей. doi: http://dx. doi. org/10.13140. RG, 2(27441.70245), 1.
134. Ткемаладзе, Д. (2025). Дифференциация соматических клеток многоклеточных животных. doi: http://dx. doi. org/10.13140. RG, 2(23348.97929), 1.
135. Ткемаладзе, Д. (2025). Репликативный Лимит Хейфлика. doi: http://dx. doi. org/10.13140. RG, 2(25803.302), 49.
136. Ткемаладзе, Д. (2025). Элиминация Центриолей: Механизм Обнуления Энтропии в Клетке. doi: http://dx. doi. org/10.13140. RG, 2(12890.66248), 1.
137. Ткемаладзе, Д. В., & Чичинадзе, К. Н. (2005). Центриолярные механизмы дифференцировки и репликативного старения клеток высших животных. Биохимия, 70(11), 1566-1584.
138. Чичинадзе, К., Ткемаладзе, Д., & Лазарашвили, А. (2012). Новый класс рнк и центросомная гипотеза старения клеток. Успехи геронтологии, 25(1), 23-28.
139. Чичинадзе, К. Н., & Ткемаладзе, Д. В. (2008). Центросомная гипотеза клеточного старения и дифференциации. Успехи геронтологии, 21(3), 367-371.
140. Ткемаладзе, Д. (2025). Индукция примордиальных клеток, подобных зародышевым клеткам (PGCLCs) современные достижения, механизмы и перспективы применения. http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27152.32004