



Group 2 focused on the proposed review categories and the types of research that should fall under each heading.

The 2016 guidelines had three categories of review; the new guidelines divide two of these categories, to provide clearer delineation of the different levels of review.

**2016 Category 1:** Exempt from review

**New Category 1A:** Exempt from review

**New Category 1B:** Reportable to an oversight process but normally exempt from review

**2016 Category 2:** Requires review; category is unchanged although the areas of research under this heading have increased

**2016 Category 3:** Prohibited research activities

**New Category 3A:** Research activities currently not permitted

**New Category 3B:** Prohibited research activities

The rationale for these changes, as well as the areas of research that could fall into the different categories are described in more detail in the following sections. It is important to note up front that the culture of human embryos or organized embryo-like structures beyond 14 days, or formation of the primitive streak, whichever occurs first (herein referred to as the “14-day rule”), has been removed from category 3, prohibited activities. This was the subject of many levels of discussion, debate, and consultation over many months. While recognizing that human embryo culture beyond 14 days is prohibited by law or regulation in many jurisdictions, the committee felt that this is an area where a blanket prohibition could inhibit important research directions. The scientific, ethical, and regulatory background to this recommendation is discussed further in later sections.

#### *The decision to update the categories of scientific and ethical review*

The decision of the committee to update the laboratory science covered by the different categories reflects not only the changing landscape of stem cell research but also the challenge in defining the concept of “organism”.

**Category 3A:** Research activities currently not permitted. Research under this category should not be pursued at this time because the approaches are currently unsafe or raise unresolved ethical issues. Some examples include:

- a. The use of human gametes differentiated from human stem cells for the purposes of fertilization and human reproduction.
- b. Research in which human embryos that have undergone modification of their nuclear genome are transferred into or gestated in a human uterus.

**Category 3B:** Prohibited research activities. Research under this category should not be pursued because of broad international consensus that such experiments lack a compelling scientific rationale and are widely considered to be unethical. Such research includes:

- a. Transfer of human stem cell-based embryo models to the uterus of either a human or animal host.
- b. Research in which animal chimeras incorporating human cells with the potential to form human

use of the umbrella term “embryo model” or “stem cell-based embryo model” is encouraged, while the use of the term “synthetic embryo” or “artificial embryo” or “embryoids” should be avoided. Furthermore, the establishment of a terminology precisely reflecting the degree of integration and the type of model is encouraged (e.g., *integrated embryo model* [Zheng et al., 2019], *stem cell-based embryo model* [Rivron et al., 2018a]).

#### *Integrated versus non-integrated embryo models*

Here, we propose a classification of human embryo models with the aim of guiding the decisions of the scientific and ethical oversight process. The *integrated embryo models* will be models that mimic only specific aspects/tissues of human embryo development and often do not have an associated extra-embryonic membranes. *Non-integrated embryo models* are reportable but not normally subject to further review (category 1B). In contrast, the *integrated embryo models* which contain the relevant embryonic and extra-embryonic cell types and could potentially achieve the complete here they might realistically manifest the ability to undergo further integrated development if cultured for additional time *integrated embryo models* should be subjected to a full specialized review (category 2). Given that the stem cell-based embryo models are not considered equivalent to human embryos under most legislation (as described in detail above), the decision is made that the integrated embryo models should not be subject to the restrictions of the 14-day rule. In addition, for both ethical and safety reasons, transferring any human embryo model into the uterus of a living animal or human is prohibited (category 3B).

#### *Examples and potential applications*

By recapitulating the early human embryonic events, the use of human embryo models for scientific discovery opens ethical alternatives to addressing important biomedical problems. For example, in the next decade, *integrated embryo models* are likely to model specific events that occur during the first few months of human embryo development, including gastrulation, body axis formation, and somitogenesis, thus allowing the investigation of numerous aspects of embryogenesis-related pregnancy problems and genetically inherited defects. Furthermore, the *integrated embryo models* are likely to help researchers to gain basic knowledge of the specific molecular and cellular events associated with genome mutations associated with developmental origins of disease. They should also guide drug discovery and biomedical strategies aiming at managing genetic diseases or forming or regenerating complex organs for regenerative medicine. Examples of such models include human pluripotent stem cells grown on micropatterned two-dimensional surfaces with controlled geometry (Warmflash et al., 2014), *integrated embryo models* (Moris et al., 2020; van den Brink et al., 2014), *integrated embryo models* (Zheng et al., 2019), or *integrated embryo models* (Harembaki et al., 2019).

Stem cell-derived *integrated embryo models* that mimic the blastocyst stage of development have been produced in the mouse (Kime et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019; Rivron et al., 2018b; Soen et al., 2019) and very recently in the human (Liu et al., 2021; Yanagida et al., 2021);





including PGCLCs, oogonia- or oocyte-like cells, or

critical specifier of human primordial germ cell fate. *Cell* *160*, 253–268.

Ishikura, Y., Yabuta, Y., Ohta, H., Hasegawa, K., Nakamura, T., Okamoto, I., Yamamoto, T., Kurimoto, K., Shirane, K., Sasaki, H., et al. (2016). In vitro derivation and propagation of spermatogonial stem cell activity from mouse pluripotent stem cells. *Cell Rep.* *17*, 2789–2804.

Kime, C., Konari, H., Ohtsuka, S., Kohbayashi, E., Asahi, M., Yamanaka, S., Takahashi, M., and Tomoda, K. (2019). Induced 2C gene expression and implantation-competent blastocyst-like structures from primed pluripotent stem cells. *Stem Cell Reports* *13*, 485–498.

Li, R., Zhong, C., Yu, Y., Liu, H., Sakurai, M., Yu, L., Min, Z., Shi, L., Wei, Y., Takahashi, Y., et al. (2019). Generation of blastocyst-like structures from mouse embryonic and adult cell cultures. *Cell* *179*, 687–702 e618.

Liu, X., Tan, J.P., Schroder, J., Aberkane, A., Ouyang, J.F., Mohenska, M., Lim, S.M., Sun, Y.B.Y., Chen, J., Sun, G., et al. (2021).



patterning in human embryonic stem cells. *Nat. Methods* *11*, 847-854.