Mini Review
Volume 7:1, 2023

Journal of Genetics and DNA Research

ISSN: 2684-6039 Open Access

DNA Vaccines for Infectious Disorders

Huira Kopera*

Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

Abstract

Trial formulations are frequently found to be nonspecific, ineffective, thermally or hydrolytically unstable, or toxic, making it extremely difficult to engineer vaccine-based therapeutics for infectious diseases. The therapeutic landscape for treating infectious diseases has greatly improved thanks to vaccines, as has the threat posed by therapeutic and preventative measures. In addition, despite making production processes more cumbersome, the development of recombinant technologies has greatly facilitated vaccine development by mitigating risks like virulence reversion. Recombinant technology can also improve seroconversion through kinetic and nonkinetic strategies that are discussed in this paper. DNA-based vaccines and amino acid-based vaccines have both seen significant advancements thanks to recombinant technologies.

Keywords: DNA vaccine • Immune response • Infectious disease

Introduction

Between the years 2001 and 2010, the scientific community's interest in DNA vaccine projects reached a plateau. Even though there has been research demonstrating improvement and optimization to this end, the difficulties in improving the immunogenic properties of DNA vaccines may be to blame for the decrease in interest. We are aware of no regulatory bodies that have approved DNA vaccines for human use at this time (four vaccines have been approved for animal use), despite improvements. The advantages and disadvantages of engineering DNA vaccines against infectious diseases are discussed in this article, with an emphasis on their applications [1].

Literature Review

Using a variety of methods, genetic engineering modifies DNA sequences in genomes by utilizing technology from molecular biology. Homologous recombination, for instance, can be used to target specific sequences in the genomes of cultured cells or mouse embryonic stem (ES) cells, but it is time-consuming, inefficient, and dependent on drug positive/negative selection in cell culture for success. Random DNA insertion following direct transfection (microinjection), DNA insertion mediated by a transposon, or DNA insertion mediated by viral vectors for the production of transgenic mice and rats are additional methods that are frequently used. Despite its effectiveness, random integration of DNA occurs more frequently than homologous recombination, but it has numerous drawbacks. Because they can target specific DNA sequences, technology based on guided endonucleases is the most elegant and efficient approach.

Discussion

Endonuclease-mediated gene targeting has replaced zinc finger nucleases, transcription activator-like effector nucleases, and meganucleases as the most widely used method of genome engineering since the development of CRISPR/Cas9 technology or clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats. By improving homology-directed repair's effectiveness, CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing could advance in the future. In this section, we detail and explain the fundamentals of genetic engineering) how a chromosome break is a common feature of current technologies, how specific and sensitive genotyping assays are used to find altered genomes, and how delivery methods affect how genes are characterized. In conclusion, while some fundamentals of genetic engineering remain unchanged, others shift as technologies continue to revolutionize research in numerous fields.

Each of the two haploid sets of 23 chromosomes that make up the human genome has approximately six billion nucleotides. Each chromosome contains approximately 20,000 genes. The individual's entire transcriptome is made up of these genes, which are transcribed into messenger RNA (mRNA), ribosomal RNA (rRNA), and transfer RNA (tRNA). Other species of RNA are referred to as non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs), which include micro-RNAs (miRNAs), which can either activate or inhibit gene expression but do not encode proteins. Several genes have been shown to be stimulated by miRNAs, which are becoming increasingly important components of disease treatment plans. The Human Genome Project, which was completed in 2003, laid the groundwork for precision medicine based on sequencing technologies. This field has progressed from RNA interference, ZFNs, and TALENs to a novel genome editing tool called CRISPR/Cas9. Due to omics, the current understanding of gene functions and mutations has led to the development of a variety of molecular tools for diagnosing risk factors for a variety of genetic diseases, including diabetes, Alzheimer's, Huntington's, Duchenne muscular dystrophy, inborn blindness, and rheumatoid arthritis. It has been demonstrated that the CRISPR/Cas9 technology can correct the mutations that lead to these diseases, and it has the potential to be developed as a promising genetic therapy to safeguard patients who are at risk [2-4].

In general, a set of characteristics should make vectors suitable for the host organism's transformation and selection. The cellular replication machinery will recognize the origin of replication (ori), which also determines the number of copies of a given plasmid in the cell. Broad-host-range vectors contain origins that are capable of replicating in more than one species or genus because they encode the protein that recognizes their own replication origin within the plasmid. While narrow-host-range vectors typically contain origins that are recognized by their specific organism, broad-host-range vectors also contain origins that are capable of replicating in more than one species or genus. In addition, a group of vectors known as "shuttle vectors" have two distinct origins and selection markers, allowing for their transformation into two distinct organisms. A comparison is made between the hosts' geographic ranges. It is essential to keep in mind that the genetic material inserted into the organisms is stable and able to replicate independently if the final plasmid has the appropriate replication origin for the host. The transformation, on the other hand, necessitates the recombination of the vector into the chromosome of the host, as is the case with suicide plasmids, which inevitably results in genome modification. As a result, the

***Address for Correspondence:** Huira Kopera, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA; E-mail: Huira.Ko@edu*

Received: 28 December, 2022, Manuscript No. jgdr-23-89853; **Editor Assigned:** 30 December, 2022, PreQC No. P-89853; **Reviewed:** 13 January, 2023, QC No. Q-89853; **Revised:** 19 January, 2023, Manuscript No. R-89853; **Published:** 27 January, 2023, DOI: 10.37421/2684-6039.2023.7.142

ability to decouple transformation and genome modification is made possible by the existence of effective replication origins.

The Lactococcus PIP protein, or Phage Infection Protein, is the receptor for bacteriophages of the prolate-headed c2 species. It was thought that all c2 bacteriophages used the pip gene. Using the pGhost9, create c2-resistant mutants of industrial L. lactis strains: We discovered mutants that were resistant to bacteriophages but did not have an ISS1 integration in the pip gene. Instead, it was discovered that the integration was in the yjaE gene, which makes a protein with no known function. A putative ABC-2-like protein with six membrane-spanning regions, N- and C-terminal phage infection protein domains (IPR017500 and IPR17501), and several extended heptad repeats (TIGR03057) is predicted to be encoded by the yjaE gene, which shares only 22% identity with the pip gene [5,6].

Conclusion

Despite the fact that yjaE shares a domain with the pip phage infection domain, its low degree of identity demonstrates that YjaE is a distinct cellular component. The generation of gene disruption mutants demonstrated that strains completely resistant to two bacteriophages from the 936 species and a number of bacteriophages from the c2 species can be achieved by inactivating the yjaE gene.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

There are no conflicts of interest by author.

References

1. Astelbauer, F. and J. Walochnik. "Antiprotozoal compounds: State of the art and new developments." *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 38 (2011): 118-124.
2. Urbina, Julio and Roberto Docampo. "Specific chemotherapy of Chagas disease: Controversies and advances." *Trends Parasitol* 19 (2003): 495-501.
3. Dumonteil, Eric. "DNA vaccines against protozoan parasites: Advances and challenges." *J biotechnol biomed* 2007 (2007): 292-295.
4. Smirlis, Despina and Milena Botelho Pereira Soares. "Selection of molecular targets for drug development against trypanosomatids." *Trypanosoma* 20 (2014): 43-76.
5. Soeiro, M. N. C., K. Werbovetz, D. W. Boykin and W. D. Wilson, et al. "Novel amidines and analogues as promising agents against intracellular parasites: A systematic review." *Parasitology* 140 (2013): 929-951.
6. Ahammad, Ishtiaque and Samia Sultana Lira. "Designing a novel mRNA vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: An immunoinformatics approach." *Int J Biol Macromol* 162 (2020): 820-837.

How to cite this article: Kopera, Huira. "DNA Vaccines for Infectious Disorders." *J Genet DNA Res* 7 (2023): 142.