Research and Reviews Journal of Zoological Sciences

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

A Review on Spermatogenesis Utilizing as a Part of *In vitro* Model

Sandeep Mylavarabhatla*

JSS College of Pharmacy, Ooty, Tamil Nadu, India,

Review Article

Received: 13/08/2016
Revised: 22/08/2016
Accepted: 29/08/2016

***Corresponding author:** Sandeep Mylavarabhatla, JSS College of Pharmacy, Ooty, Tamil Nadu, India, Tel: 919032958918;

E-mail: sandeepsmiley4ever@gmail.com

Keywords: Spermatogenesis, Tissue joining, Germ cell transplantation, Engrafting, 3D germ cell.

ABSTRACT

A few test frameworks are accessible for affecting spermatogenesis outside the endogenous testis. These frameworks have been produced as apparatuses for considering spermatogenesis and as a possibility for saving hereditary material acquired from guys when sperm recuperation is impractical. Two in vivo frameworks are accessible for this reason: tissue uniting and cell transplantation. Ectopic uniting of youthful testicular tissues into immunodeficient mouse hosts is a sort of in vivo framework that permits the youthful testicular tissue from numerous sorts of creatures to experience complete spermatogenesis. The other in vivo framework is germ cell transplantation into the beneficiary testis, which actuates colonization of spermatogonial undifferentiated organisms from numerous sorts of creatures and permits the immature microorganisms to separate into spermatozoa sometimes. Moreover, 2 in vitro frameworks are accessible: tissue society and 3-dimensional (3D) cell society. The tissue society framework and the mix of tissue society and germ cell transplantation framework were grown as of late; this made it conceivable to perform complete spermatogenesis by utilizing mouse spermatogonial undifferentiated cells. Separated juvenile mouse testicular cells can separate into spermatozoa when the 3D society framework is utilized.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Spermatogenesis is a muddled procedure comprising of a proliferative stage, meiotic stages, and separation or spermiogenic stage [1]. The procedure of spermatogenesis proceeds all through most adulthood in warm blooded animals. Complete separation of the spermatozoa requires over 1 month in many vertebrates.

Numerous trial creature models are accessible for breaking down the procedure of spermatogenesis, including transgenic creatures and strains that naturally need spermatogenesis [2,3]. Interestingly, a few exploratory frameworks for instigating spermatogenesis in vitro or in vivo have just been produced in late decades [4-10] for use as devices for contemplating the central parts of spermatogenesis and as a possibility for saving hereditary material got from guys when sperm recuperation is outlandish, for instance, from uncommon and jeopardized species [11] and youthful tumor patients [12]. Besides, these frameworks are helpful for considering lethal or illumination impacts on germ cells.

Thus, we present in vivo frameworks that utilization tissue joining and cell transplantation and in vitro frameworks that utilization tissue society and 3-dimensional (3D) cell society. Every one of these frameworks have favorable circumstances and hindrances regarding contemplating spermatogenesis and safeguarding richness in numerous sorts of creatures. Numerous components can influence the aftereffects of spermatogenesis when these frameworks are utilized. In this survey, we have presented and abridged a few components that may influence spermatogenesis.

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

COMPONENTS AFFECTING SPERMATOGENESIS

The best favorable position of the joining technique is the capacity to impel complete spermatogenesis by utilizing juvenile testicular tissue from various mammalian species in crisp or cryopreserved conditions. Moreover, spermatogenesis can be quickened in the union. Be that as it may, this strategy is not satisfactory for dissecting cell-to-cell associations. Besides, it has a constraint concerning controlling the natural states of the joining tissue considering the utilization of an in vivo framework.

Xenografting of testicular tissue from youthful guys to immunodeficient mouse has brings about germ cell separation and generation of sperm from mammalian species like pigs [7], goats, hamsters [13], rabbits [14], bulls [15], rhesus monkeys [16], felines [17], and steeds [18], however not from marmosets [19] or people [20]. Because mouse, pig and rabbit contributors, the spermatozoa created in the joined tissue show treatment competency [7,14,21]. In any case, xenografts from sexually develop creatures can't make due for over 12 weeks, and the clear majority of the seminiferous tubules in the unions show degeneration in pigs, goats, and steers [22]. Interestingly, xenografted testicular tissue from youthful grown-up (3-yr-old rhesus monkeys) givers have been accounted for to survive superior to anything united tissue from other more seasoned full grown-up contributors and show complete spermatogenesis, although this is species-particular, for instance, xenografted testicular tissue from youthful grown-up givers of pigs and goats don't enhance the outcomes [22]. Accordingly, it is ideal to utilize youthful tissue for uniting when a more propelled phase of spermatogenic cells is required. Be that as it may, it might be conceivable to acquire spermatogenic cells at a propelled stage from grown-up unions.

The purposes behind poor survival and separation of grown-up testicular tissue in xenografts are so far obscure. Be that as it may, the formative age of the unions at the time purpose of transplantation might be capable. The joining tissue is subjected to ischemic conditions from the earliest starting point of the system until angiogenesis built up between the union and the beneficiary creature. The circulatory associations between the joining and host are set up by a blend of outgrowth of little vessels from the benefactor tissue and development of bigger vessels by the host [23]. Distinctive sorts of germ cells may have diverse sensitivities to hypoxia amid spermatogenesis. For instance, the digestion system of round spermatids in rats solely relies on upon oxygen [24], which may bring about the survival of spermatogonia yet not round spermatids in the grown-up testicular joining. Since full grown material has a higher affectability to ischemia than youthful material does [18,25], joining grown-up tissue from experienced creatures may have low proficiency for saving spermatogenesis. Pretreatment of testicular unions with vascular endothelial development element keeping in mind the end goal to enhance angiogenesis in the joined tissue brings about enhanced germ cell separation in xenografts of juvenile cow-like testicular tissue [26]. This treatment might be valuable for joining grown-up testicular tissue from different creatures. As of late, Li et al. [27] reported fruitful upkeep of spermatogenesis by revascularized orthotopic grown-up testicular transplantation in mice, affirming that angiogenesis is critical for the union. Presenting vasculature between the joining and beneficiary creatures as quickly as time permits subsequent to uniting may incite more propelled spermatogenesis in the grown-up union.

In any case, the formative age of the unions at the season of transplantation may not be the main element that influences uniting comes about. Morphological examination of newborn child and grown-up testicular tissues has demonstrated more confused structure in grown-up tissues than in juvenile tissues; that is, grown-up testicular tissues contain numerous more propelled phases of germ cells over spermatogonia than youthful tissues [1]. Along these lines, there are a few trials to utilize the grown-up tissue indicating concealment of spermatogenesis for uniting. The survival and spermatogenic efficiencies of xenografts are much higher amid xenografting of cryptorchid tissue that needs spermatogenesis at the season of joining than amid xenografting of typical grown-up giver tissue with full spermatogenesis at the season of uniting, while utilizing steeds and mice as beneficiaries [28,29]. Moreover, human grown-up testicular tissue from patients with stifled spermatogenesis demonstrate preferable survival as xenografts over tissue from givers with complete spermatogenesis at the season of joining [28]. GnRH adversary treatment of benefactor testicles got from grown-up mice demonstrating smothered spermatogenesis before joining indicated improved survival of spermatogenic cells and separation until lengthened spermatid [30]. Albeit grown-up photoregressed hamster testicular tissues halfway recuperate capacity in the wake of uniting, they showed ruffian tissue much of the time [13]. Utilizing grown-up tissue with stifled spermatogenesis may be a possibility for use in grown-up testis tissue uniting to instigate separation of spermatogonial undifferentiated organisms (SSCs) into more propelled stages; nonetheless, this method requires upgrades.

These reports recommend that spermatogenic separation is reliant on the time of contributor and also the level of spermatogenesis in the tissue at the season of uniting, regardless of the fact that there is an animal groups distinction.

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

Benefactor tissue stockpiling: Cryopreservation is a valuable strategy for keeping up useful (SSCs) from mice and rabbits [31]. Joining testicular tissue cryopreservation with the uniting methodology might be a capable device for rebuilding of fruitfulness, particularly for youthful creatures and prepubertal patients.

Cryopreservation of tissue does not have a clearly unfavorable impact on spermatogenesis in testicular tissue joins from neonatal and grown-up mice [13] when Dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) is utilized as a cryoprotectant. Spermatogonia can likewise survive and multiply after cryopreservation and orthotopic xenografting of juvenile human cryptorchid testicular tissue from young men [32-39]. Be that as it may, movement of spermatogenesis to round spermatids has not been accomplished for sperm in xenografts from cryopreserved juvenile porcine testicles [33]. Besides, Jahnukainen et al. reported that cryopreservation postpones the start of spermatogenesis in the joined tissue of adolescent rhesus monkey testicular unions since it influences either the quantity of surviving sort A spermatogonia or their ability to colonize the seminiferous tubules [34]. Despite the fact that tissue cryopreservation in 1.4M DMSO permitted the rhesus monkey union to start spermatogenesis, 0.7 M DMSO and ethylene glycol gave lower insurance, proposing that both the sort and dosage of the cryoprotective specialist are basic for union survival [34,40-45] and that the impacts of cryopreservation rely on upon the species [13,33]. Species particular morphological contrasts in the dividers of seminiferous tubules, including the structure of the lamina propria [35] and in the stroma, including Leydig cells, blood, and lymph vessels [36], may bring about variety in the length of cryoprotectant saturation into different cells of the tissue and in the efficacies of the cryoprotectants.

Be that as it may, cooling to 4°C for 24 h before xenografting seems to advance enhance the survival of rhesus monkey testicular tissue or the limit of SSCs to colonize or start spermatogenesis [34]. Moreover, finish spermatogenesis happens in porcine xenografts safeguarded by cooling at 4°C up to 48 h [33,46-52]. Under cooling conditions, introduction to ischemia for no less than 1 or 2 days does not seem to influence the joining consequences of youthful rhesus monkey testis and porcine testis, separately. In this way, the need for advancing cryopreservation conditions for every sort of creature tissue ought to be mulled over for joining. Moreover, cooling the tissue at 4°C may be considered as a possibility for transient stockpiling

Endocrinological components: Castration is thought to be fundamental for the improvement of xenografts in the beneficiary mouse. Evacuation of the testicles brings about an absence of androgens, permitting the serum levels of gonadotropins to increment [53-60]. In this way, the expanded serum levels of LH and FSH quickly after emasculation were thought to actuate the same hormonal conditions for juvenile testis xenografts as in adolescence, without the arrival of adequate testosterone, accordingly animating the expansion and separation of spermatogenesis cells [37,61-68]. Inside 2 weeks in the wake of joining, youthful testis unites discharge enough testosterone to build up input on gonadotropin discharge in the beneficiary mouse [7,37]. In any case, it was as of late reported that gonadectomise had no obvious impact on the results of porcine tissue engrafting; moreover, xenografts in female beneficiary mice with in place ovaries demonstrated spermatogenesis, in spite of the fact that the union size was littler than that in male beneficiary mice with in place testis [38,69-75]. The absence of contrasts amongst in place and gonadectomized beneficiary mice for spermatogenesis in the testicular tissue xenografts infers that a transient increment in the serum level of gonadotropins may not be required for the start of spermatogenesis in xenografts. Additional data is required with respect to the hormonal milieu for spermatogenesis in xenografts.

Increasing speed of spermatogenesis in the union: The period required for separation of spermatogenic cells in youthful testicular xenografts varies relying upon the creature species utilized as a giver source. Contrasted and the rate of spermatogenesis in the giver species, the rate of spermatogenesis is quickened in testicular xenografts from pigs [7], sheep [7], rhesus monkeys [16] and people [20,76-80] however not in those from felines [17] or steers [15,43]. The explanation behind the abbreviated time to separation in the xenografts is not yet known. In any case, this trademark may be for all intents and purposes helpful for performing investigates creatures that require a more extended period for spermatogenesis.

Uniting of segregated testicular cells: Isolated testicular cells that have been gotten from piglets and have been enzymatically processed can recover complete testis tissue after implantation [44,81-85]. On account of mice and rats, testicular cells in the reconstituted testis of the joining could separate into preparation skillful round spermatids [45]. The reconstitution of seminiferous tubules from neonatal testicular tissue of different mammalian species might be conceivable. Besides, control of particular pathways in germ cells or substantial cells before re-accumulation will give a controlled available framework to concentrating on cell-to-cell associations overseeing testicular morphogenesis and spermatogenesis [86-88].

Autologous, heterologous, or xenologous transplantation in marmosets: As specified in the "Giver age" area, xenografting of testicular tissue from youthful marmosets to immunodeficient mouse has does not bring

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

about germ cell separation and sperm creation as seen for some other mammalian species [19,46]. Be that as it may, orthotopic youthful testicular tissue joins show complete spermatogenesis amid autologous uniting in marmosets, in spite of the fact that the unions show spermatogenesis capture amid xenologous joining in immunodeficient mice [47,89-92].

Spermatogenesis disappointment in marmoset testicular tissue xenografted in immunodeficient mice was at first thought to be brought about by the contrasting elements of the LH/chorionic gonadotropin (CG) framework in the 2 species, which is likewise found in other neotropical monkeys [48,49]. Since the mice did not express CG, the host endocrine environment, which included components, for example, CG and androgen, couldn't bolster testicular tissue improvement of the union from the marmoset. The group of researchers [46] utilized juvenile hamster testicular tissue for co-joining to make high neighborhood levels of testosterone discharge at the implantation destinations of the marmoset unite; in any case, neither ordinary serum androgen levels nor the high nearby testosterone levels were adequate to start marmoset spermatogenesis. Besides, regulating hCG to the transplanted giver mouse did not protect spermatogenic capture. They recommended that start of marmoset spermatogenesis under xenologous conditions required components more confused than essentially giving a hormonal milieu that was like the first conditions in the marmoset [93-96].

Area of the transplantation site in marmosets: The transplantation site has been appeared to influence the development rate of marmoset testicular unions [47,50], in spite of the fact that spermatogenesis is finished effectively in ectopic joining of different species with the exception of marmoset. Autologous transplants of youthful marmoset testicular tissue show complete spermatogenesis in orthotopic yet not in ectopic conditions [47]. Therefore, neighborhood elements may impact the separation happening amid spermatogenesis in the unions at the distinctive transplantation destinations. In marmosets, the best distinction between the areas is probably nearby temperature on the grounds that the marmoset's back is secured with thick hide and the subcutaneous temperature at the back is just about 5°C higher than that at the scrotum [19]. These outcomes propose that the area of the transplantation site may should be thought about on account of hairy beneficiary creatures [97-100].

CONCLUSION

Every one of the techniques that have been depicted have numerous favorable circumstances as for examining spermatogenesis and saving creature richness. Notwithstanding, every one of these techniques have a few restrictions. For instance, xenografting strategies can be utilized for inciting spermatogenesis as a part of numerous creatures yet it is hard to watch spermatogenesis progressively utilizing these techniques minutely, notwithstanding, a trial including rats communicating GFP is right now in progress (SD-Tg[CAG-EGFP]CZ-0040sb rodent) [23]. A burden of the germ cell transplantation technique is its disservice for use with cross species transplantation, except for transplantation between the rodent and mouse. In any case, given the capacity of the germ cell transplantation strategy to build the spermatogonial cells in any species, this technique has an awesome favorable position as for contemplating expansion of SSCs and safeguarding of the SSCs from youthful creatures or wild creatures confronting eradication. Since both uniting and germ cell transplantation use benefactor creatures, it is important to know that the natural states of these frameworks are still hazy. Dissimilar to in vivo models, in which tissue society is performed with or without germ cell exchange, in vitro models have as of late been created utilizing mice. More data about these models is required and might be gotten by utilizing diverse creature species under various conditions. Besides, 3Dcell society models may prepare for considering the cooperation of germ cells and substantial cells in the testicles after issues, for example, the creation of a little number of spermatozoa and misty vision for constant examination of the phones have been determined. Also, in light of the fact that there are potential dangers of exchanging growth cells or infections when utilizing human tissues or cells as a part of these techniques, numerous wellbeing and morals related issues ought to be determined before these frameworks are utilized for clinical applications.

Taking everything into account, in vivo and in vitro spermatogenesis models have numerous points of interest and hindrances, and appropriate models must be picked relying upon the necessities, after autonomously considering these perspectives

REFERENCES

1. Hattab MA and Ghaly A. Microalgae Oil Extraction Pretreatment Methods: Critical Review and Comparative Analysis. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2015;5:172.
2. Rahman MS et al. Aerobic Conversion of Glycerol to 2,3-Butanediol by a Novel Klebsiella variicola SRP3 Strain. J Microb Biochem Technol 2015;7:299-304.

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

3. Sajith V and Mohamed JP. Development of Stable Cerium Zirconium Mixed Oxide Nanoparticle Additive for Emission Reduction in Biodiesel Blends. Research & Reviews: Journal of Engineering and Technology 2015.
4. Bouaid A et al. Biodiesel Production from Babassu Oil: A Statistical Approach. J Chem Eng Process Technol 2015;6:232.
5. Rahman MS et al. Aerobic Conversion of Glycerol to 2,3-Butanediol by a Novel Klebsiella variicola SRP3 Strain. J Microb Biochem Technol 2015;7:299-304.
6. Yang J et al. The Optimization of Alkali-Catalyzed Biodiesel Production from Camelina sativa Oil Using a Response Surface Methodology. J Bioprocess Biotech 2015;5:235.
7. Praveen AH et al. Simarouba Biodiesel as an Alternative Fuel for CI Engine: Review. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology 2015.
8. Olalekan A. The Effect of Palm Kernel Oil (PKO) Biodiesel-Contaminated Soil on Morphological and Biochemical Properties of Zea mays. J Plant Biochem Physiol 2014;2:138.
9. Liu M et al. Bacterial Isolation from Palm Oil Plantation Soil for Biodiesel Production: Isolation and Molecular Identification as Inferred by 16s RNA. J Biotechnol Biomater 2014;4:165.
10. Swain KC. Biofuel Production in India: Potential, Prospectus and Technology. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2014;4:129.
11. Stephen S et al. Tracking Interfacial Adsorption/Desorption Phenomena in Polypropylene/Biofuel Media using Trace Cr^{3+}/Cr^{6+} and As^{3+}/As^{5+}-A Study by Liquid Chromatography-plasma Mass Spectrometry. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2015;6:239.
12. Katiyar P. Modified Fractionation Process via Organic Solvents for Wheat Straw and Ground Nut Shells. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2015;5:178.
13. Banapurmath NR et al. Effect of Combustion Chamber Shapes on the Performance of Mahua and Neem Biodiesel Operated Diesel Engines. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2015;6:230.
14. Saldivar RP et al. Algae Biofuels Production Processes, Carbon Dioxide Fixation and Biorefinery Concept. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:185.
15. de Castro JS et al. Bioconversion of Commercial and Waste Glycerol into Value-Added Polyhydroxyalkanoates by Bacterial Strains. J Microb Biochem Technol 2014;6:337-345.
16. Nguyen PLT et al. In Situ Transesterification of Wet Activated Sludge under Subcritical Conditions. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:182.
17. Dave D et al. Marine Oils as Potential Feedstock for Biodiesel Production: Physicochemical Characterization. J Bioprocess Biotech 2014;4:168.
18. Díaz L and Brito A. FFA Adsorption from Waste Oils or Non-Edible Oils onto an Anion-Exchange Resin as Alternative Method to Esterification Reaction Prior to Transesterification Reaction for Biodiesel Production. J Adv Chem Eng 2014;4:105.
19. Abd El Baky HH et al. Lipid Induction in Dunaliella salina Culture Aerated with Various Levels CO2 and Its Biodiesel Production. J Aquac Res Development 2014;5:223.
20. Martin MZ et al. Genetic Improvement, Sustainable Production and Scalable Small Microenterprise of Jatropha as a Biodiesel Feedstock. J Bioremed Biodeg 2013;S4:002.
21. Ramakrishnan VV et al. Extraction of Oil from Mackerel Fish Processing Waste using Alcalase Enzyme. Enz Eng 2013;2:115.
22. Ragauskas AME and Ragauskas AJ. Re-defining the Future of FOG and Biodiesel. J Phylogenetics Evol Biol 2013;4:e118.
23. Alemán-Nava GS et al. Bioenergy Sources and Representative Case Studies in Mexico. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:190.
24. Azad AK et al. Production of Microbial Lipids from Rice Straw Hydrolysates by Lipomyces starkeyi for Biodiesel Synthesis. J Microb Biochem Technol 2014;S8:008.
25. Gautam G et al. A Cost Effective Strategy for Production of Bio-surfactant from Locally Isolated Penicillium chrysogenum SNP5 and Its Applications. J Bioprocess Biotech 2014;4:177.
26. Joshi CP and Nookaraju A. New Avenues of Bioenergy Production from Plants: Green Alternatives to Petroleum. J Phylogenetics Evol Biol 2012;3:134.
27. Mansourpoor M and Shariati A. Optimization of Biodiesel Production from Sunflower Oil Using Response Surface Methodology. J Chem Eng Process Technol 2012;3:141.
28. West TP. Crude Glycerol: A Feedstock for Organic Acid Production by Microbial Bioconversion. J Microbial Biochem Technol 2012;4:e106.
29. Owolabi RU et al. Biodiesel from Household/Restaurant Waste Cooking Oil (WCO). J Chem Eng Process Technol 2011;2:112.
30. Kumar S et al. Effectiveness of Enzymatic Transesterification of Beeftallow Using Experimental Enzyme Ns88001 with Methanol and Hexane. Enz Eng 2013;2:116.
31. Ghaly AE et al. Fish Processing Wastes as a Potential Source of Proteins, Amino Acids and Oils: A Critical Review. J Microb Biochem Technol 2013;5:107-129.

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

32. Feng Y et al. Wide geographic distribution of Cryptosporidium bovis and the deer-like genotype in bovines. Veterinary parasitology 2007;144:1-9.
33. Wieler LH et al. Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli strains from bovines: association of adhesion with carriage of eae and other genes. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 1996;34:2980-2984.
34. Autrup H et al. Metabolism of benzo [a] pyrene by cultured tracheobronchial tissues from mice, rats, hamsters, bovines and humans. International Journal of Cancer 1980;25:293-300.
35. Twort FW and Ingram GLY. A method for isolating and cultivating the Mycobacterium enteritidis chronicae pseudotuberculosae bovis, Johne, and some experiments on the preparation of a diagnostic vaccine for pseudo-tuberculous enteritis of bovines. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Containing Papers of a Biological Character 1912; 84:517-542.
36. Li Q et al. Insect Fat, a Promising Resource for Biodiesel. J Phylogenetics Evol Biol 2011;S2:001.
37. Meng L and Salihon J. Conversion of Palm Oil to Methyl and Ethyl Ester using Crude Enzymes. J Biotechnol Biomaterial 2011;1:110.
38. Montasser MS et al. A Novel Eco-friendly Method of Using Red Algae (Laurencia papillosa) to Synthesize Gold Nanoprisms. J Nanomed Nanotechnol 2016;7:383.
39. Kurup GM and Jose GM. In Vitro Antioxidant Properties of Edible Marine Algae Sargassum swartzii, Ulva fasciata and Chaetomorpha antennina of Kerala Coast. J Pharma Reports 2016;1:112.
40. Oramary SOM et al. Feeding Common Carp Fish (Cyprinus carpio) on Natural Foods (Algae, Phytoplankton, Zooplankton and Others) on Tigris River in Mosul Dam / Duhok, Kurdistan Region of Iraq. J Aquac Res Development 2016;7:413.
41. Sano Y et al. Microalgal Culture for Chlorella sp. using a Hollow Fiber Membrane Module. J Membra Sci Technol 2016;6:147.
42. Pérez L. Biofuels from Microalgae, A Promising Alternative. Pharm Anal Chem Open Access 2016;2:e103.
43. Benmoussa M. Algomics for the Development of a Sustainable Microalgae Biorefinery. Single Cell Biol 2016;5:132.
44. Jana BB et al. Evidences of Manure Driven and C:N Regulated Enhanced Carbon Status and Microalgal Productivity in Managed Aquatic System under Simulated Green House Conditions. J Earth Sci Clim Change 2016;7:336.
45. Sarpal AS et al. Investigation of Biodiesel Potential of Biomasses of Microalgaes Chlorella, Spirulina and Tetraselmis by NMR and GC-MS Techniques. J Biotechnol Biomater 2016;6:220.
46. Hong JW et al. Mass Cultivation from a Korean Raceway Pond System of Indigenous Microalgae as Potential Biofuel Feedstock. Oil Gas Res 2016;2:108.
47. Rotermund LM et al. A Submersible Holographic Microscope for 4-D In-Situ Studies of Micro-Organisms in the Ocean with Intensity and Quantitative Phase Imaging. J Marine Sci Res Dev 2016;6:181.
48. Qunju H et al. Evaluation of Five Nannocfhloropsis Sp. Strains for Biodiesel and Poly-Unsaturated Fatty Acids (PUFAs) Production. Curr Synthetic Sys Biol 2016;4:128.
49. Taucher J et al. Cell Disruption and Pressurized Liquid Extraction of Carotenoids from Microalgae. J Thermodyn Catal 2016;7:158.
50. Ouma SO et al. Seasonal Variation of the Physicochemical and Bacteriological Quality of Water from Five Rural Catchment Areas of Lake Victoria Basin in Kenya. J Environ Anal Chem 2016;3:170.
51. Lin X and Peter P. Cool Water Off-flavor Algae and Water Quality in Four Arkansas Commercial Catfish Farms. J Fisheries Livest Prod 2016;4:158.
52. Alassali A et al. Methods for Upstream Extraction and Chemical Characterization of Secondary Metabolites from Algae Biomass. Adv Tech Biol Med 2016;4:163.
53. Fenta AD and Kidanemariam AA. Assessment of Cyanobactrial Blooms Associated with Water Quality Status of Lake Chamo, South Ethiopia. J Environ Anal Toxicol 2016;6:343.
54. Nadeem F et al. Red Sea Microbial Diversity for Antimicrobial and Anticancer Agents. J Mol Biomark Diagn 2015;7:267.
55. Hayase S et al. Consumption of Bone Mineral Density-Associated Nutrients, and Their Food Sources in Pre-school Japanese Children. Vitam Miner 2015;4:133.
56. Rajkumar R and Takriff MS. Prospects of Algae and their Environmental Applications in Malaysia: A Case Study. J Bioremed Biodeg 2016;7:321.
57. Karthik R et al. Attenuation of Negative Impacts by Micro Algae and Enriched Artemia Salina on Penaeus Monodon and Litopenaeus Vannamei Larval Culture. J Aquac Res Development 2015;6:365.
58. Iturriaga R. Photo Adaptation Response of Microalgae to Environmental Changes. Oceanography 2015;3:e113.
59. Gautam K et al. A Method to Utilize Waste Nutrient Sources in Aqueous Extracts for Enhancement of Biomass and Lipid Content in Potential Green Algal Species for Biodiesel Production. J Bioprocess Biotech 2015;5:259.
60. Gomez-Mares M et al. Comparative Study of the Effects of Diesel and Biodiesel Over POM, PPA and PPS Polymers Used in Automotive Industry. J Material Sci Eng 2014;3:142.

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

61. Sahay S and Shyam M. Storage Conditions to Improve the Shelf Life of Jatropha curcas Seeds in Terms of Quality of Oil. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2014;4:136.
62. Piechota G et al. Green Technologies in Polish Energy Sector - Overview. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2014;4:133.
63. Ghosh R and Mitra A. Suitability of Green Macroalgae Enteromorpha intestinalis as a Feed Form Macrobrachium rosenbergii. J Fisheries Livest Prod 2015;3:138.
64. El-Sharony TF et al. Effect of Foliar Application with Algae and Plant Extracts on Growth, Yield and Fruit Quality of Fruitful Mango Trees Cv. Fagri Kalan. J Horticulture 2015;2:162.
65. Stoyneva-Gärtner MP and Uzunov BA. An Ethnobiological Glance on Globalization Impact on the Traditional Use of Algae and Fungi as Food in Bulgaria. J Nutr Food Sci 2015;5:413.
66. Sankalp D and Savita D. Optimization and Fuel Properties of Water Degummed Linseed Biodiesel from Transesterification Process. Chem Sci J 2015;7:131.
67. Erinç Uludamar. Vibration Analysis of a Diesel Engine Fuelled with Sunflower and Canola Biodiesels. Adv Automob Eng 2016;5:137.
68. Dhan LF et al. Microbial Lipid Accumulation Capability of Activated Sludge Feeding on Short Chain Fatty Acids as Carbon Sources through Fed-Batch Cultivation. J Bioprocess Biotech 2016;6:275.
69. Sarpal AS et al. Investigation of Biodiesel Potential of Biomasses of Microalgaes Chlorella, Spirulina and Tetraselmis by NMR and GC-MS Techniques. J Biotechnol Biomater 2016;6:220.
70. Tse H et al. Performances, Emissions and Soot Properties from a Diesel-Biodiesel- Ethanol Blend Fuelled Engine, Adv Automob Eng 2016;S1-005.
71. Hu Qunju et al. Evaluation of Five Nannocfhloropsis Sp. Strains for Biodiesel and Poly-Unsaturated Fatty Acids (PUFAs) Production. Curr Synthetic Sys Biol 2016;4:128.
72. Raquel R dos Santos et al. Assessment of Triacylglycerol Content in Chlorella vulgaris Cultivated in a Two-Stage Process. J Biotechnol Biomater 2015;5:212.
73. Gautam K et al. A Method to Utilize Waste Nutrient Sources in Aqueous Extracts for Enhancement of Biomass and Lipid Content in Potential Green Algal Species for Biodiesel Production. J Bioprocess Biotech 2015;5:259.
74. Luisa WM et al. Culture-Independent Analysis of Bacterial Diversity during Bioremediation of Soil Contaminated with a Diesel-Biodiesel Blend (B10)S. J Bioremed Biodeg 2015;6:318.
75. Saborimanesh N and Mulligan CN. Effect of Sophorolipid Biosurfactant on Oil Biodegradation by the Natural Oil-Degrading Bacteria on the Weathered Biodiesel, Diesel and Light Crude Oil. J Bioremed Biodeg 2015;6:314.
76. Vrushali HJ. Cellulose Hydrolysis: An Unsolved Problem. Research & Reviews: Journal of Chemistry 2015.
77. Sticklen M. Consolidating the Feedstock Crops Cellulosic Biodiesel with Cellulosic Bioethanol Technologies: A Biotechnology Approach. Adv Crop Sci Tech 2015;3:e133.
78. Ang GT et al. Supercritical and Superheated Technologies: Future of Biodiesel Production. J Adv Chem Eng 2015;5:e106.
79. Ammann AA. Hydroxyl Radical Production by Light Driven Iron Redox Cycling in Natural and Test Systems. J Environ Anal Chem 2016;3:182.
80. Eriksen NT. Research Trends in the Dominating Microalgal Pigments, β-carotene, Astaxanthin, and Phycocyanin Used in Feed, in Foods, and in Health Applications. J Nutr Food Sci 2016;6:507.
81. Garcia JS et al. Nutritional Potential of Four Seaweed Species Collected in the Barbate Estuary (Gulf of Cadiz, Spain). J Nutr Food Sci 2016;6:505.
82. Zhao Y et al. Identification of NaHCO3 Stress Responsive Proteins in Dunaliella salina HTBS using iTRAQ-based Analysis. J Proteomics Bioinform 2016;9:137-143.
83. Jajesniak P et al. Carbon Dioxide Capture and Utilization using Biological Systems: Opportunities and Challenges. J Bioprocess Biotech 2014;4:155.
84. Lai EPC. Biodiesel: Environmental Friendly Alternative to Petrodiesel. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:e122.
85. Dhama K et al. Rotavirus diarrhea in bovines and other domestic animals. Veterinary research communications 2009;33:1-23.
86. Kadokawa H et al. Bovine C-terminal octapeptide of RFamide-related peptide-3 suppresses luteinizing hormone (LH) secretion from the pituitary as well as pulsatile LH secretion in bovines. Domestic animal endocrinology 2009;36:219-224.
87. Guo JG et al. A baseline study on the importance of bovines for human Schistosoma japonicum infection around Poyang Lake, China. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene 2001;65:272-278.
88. Von Blumröder D et al. Comparison and standardisation of serological methods for the diagnosis of Neospora caninum infection in bovines. Veterinary parasitology 2004;120:11-22.
89. Hedger RS and Condy JB. Transmission of foot-and-mouth disease from African buffalo virus carriers to bovines. Veterinary record 1985;117:205.

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

90. Sedki A et al. Toxic and essential trace metals in muscle, liver and kidney of bovines from a polluted area of Morocco. Science of the total environment 2003;317:201-205.
91. da Silva Vaz I et al. Immunization of bovines with an aspartic proteinase precursor isolated from Boophilus microplus eggs. Veterinary immunology and immunopathology 1998;66:331-341.
92. Bashir M et al. Evaluation of defined antigen vaccines against Schistosoma bovis and S. japonicum in bovines. Tropical and geographical medicine 1993;46:255-258.
93. Costa AJ et al. Experimental infection of bovines with oocysts of Toxoplasma gondii. The Journal of parasitology 1977;1:212-218.
94. Leal AT et al. Vaccination of bovines with recombinant Boophilus Yolk pro-Cathepsin. Veterinary immunology and immunopathology 2006;114:341-345.
95. Viljoen NF. Cysticercosis in swine and bovines, with special reference to South African conditions. Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Science and Animal Industry 1937;9:337-570.
96. Harris RL et al. Horn flies, stable flies, and house flies: development in feces of bovines treated orally with juvenile hormone analogues. Journal of economic entomology 1973;66:1099-1102.
97. Reinecke R. A field study of some nematode parasites of bovines in a semi-arid area, with special reference to their biology and possible methods of prophylaxis. Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research 1960;28:365-464.
98. Silva RA et al. Outbreak of trypanosomiasis due to Trypanosoma vivax (Ziemann, 1905) in bovines of the Pantanal, Brazil. Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz 1996;91:561-562.
99. Hsü SY et al. Vaccination of bovines against schistosomiasis japonica with highly irradiated schistosomula in China. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 1984;33:891-898.
100. Chamoiseau G. Etiology of Farcy in African Bovines. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology. 1979;29:407-410.