

CRISPR Technology and Ethical Implications

Abstract

- CRISPR is a precise gene-editing tool with applications in medicine, agriculture, and biotechnology.
- Raises ethical concerns, particularly in human genetic modification.
- This paper explores ethical issues, case studies, societal concerns, and regulatory developments in CRISPR use.

Introduction

- CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) is a breakthrough in molecular genetics.
- Its main value lies in treating previously untreatable genetic diseases.
- Ethical concerns arise regarding germline editing and its potential social consequences (Ishii¹).

Ethical Concerns in CRISPR Applications

- **Eugenics & Social Division:** Enhancements may be available only to the wealthy, increasing social inequality. ²
- **Access & Equity:** Proprietary CRISPR technologies limit accessibility, worsening health disparities (Egellie et al.³).
- **Consent Issues:** Germline editing affects future generations who cannot consent (Ishii¹).
- **Unintended Consequences:** Off-target gene edits pose unpredictable health risks. ⁴

Case Studies in CRISPR Gene Editing

- **CTX001 for Genetic Disorders:** CRISPR-Cas9 modifies hematopoietic stem cells, potentially curing sickle cell disease and β -thalassemia (Frangoul et al.⁶).
- **Congenital Heart Disease:** CRISPR corrects genes causing heart defects (Seok et al.⁷).
- **Cancer Therapies:** Modified T cells enhance cancer treatment precision. ⁴

Societal Implications of Human Genetic Modification

- **Genetic Inequality:** Limited access may deepen health disparities (Subica⁹).
- **Designer Babies:** Gene selection could undermine genetic diversity (Wiley⁵).
- **Long-Term Risks:** Genetic modifications may have unforeseen consequences (Ishii¹).
- **Human Identity & Agency:** Raises ethical debates on human nature and autonomy (Howell et al.⁸).

Regulatory & Policy Development

- **National Guidelines & Public Engagement:** U.S. National Academies advocate public input in germline editing policies (Howell et al.⁸).
- **European Regulation:** Requires extensive preclinical research before human applications (Wert et al.¹⁰).

- **Transparency & Inclusivity:** Calls for stakeholder involvement in regulations (Egelie et al.³).
- **Adaptive Frameworks:** Regulations must evolve with technology (Boni et al.¹¹).

Benefits & Arguments Supporting CRISPR's Medical Use

- **Curative Treatments:** CRISPR offers potential long-term cures for genetic disorders (Frangoul et al.⁶).
- **Medical Research Advancement:** CRISPR aids disease modeling and target treatment identification (Boni et al.¹¹).
- **Cost Savings:** One-time treatments reduce healthcare costs (Egelie et al.³).
- **Ethical Oversight:** Proper regulations ensure responsible CRISPR use. ⁴

Conclusion

- CRISPR has transformative potential in medicine but raises ethical challenges.
- Germline editing concerns include social inequality, genetic enhancement, and unintended consequences.
- Regulatory frameworks must evolve with public engagement and ethical safeguards.
- Collaboration among scientists, ethicists, and policymakers is crucial for responsible CRISPR implementation.

References

1. Ishii, T. Germline Genome-Editing Research and Its Socioethical Implications. *Trends Mol. Med.* 2015, *21*, 473–481, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2015.05.006>.
2. Seiter, K.; Fuselier, L. Content Knowledge, and Social Factors Influence Student Moral Reasoning about CRISPR/Cas9 in Humans. *J. Res. Sci. Teach.* 2021, *58*, 790–821, <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21679>.
3. Egelie, K.; Strand, S.; Johansen, B.; Myskja, B. The Ethics of Access to Patented Biotech Research Tools from Universities and Other Research Institutions. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 2018, *36*, 495–499, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4165>.
4. Baltimore, D.; Berg, P.; Botchan, M.; Carroll, D.; Charo, R.; Church, G.; ... Yamamoto, K. A Prudent Path Forward for Genomic Engineering and Germline Gene Modification. *Science* 2015, *348*, 36–38, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab1028>.
5. Wiley, L. The Ethics of Human Embryo Editing via CRISPR-Cas9 Technology: A Systematic Review of Ethical Arguments, Reasons, and Concerns. *Hec Forum* 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10730-024-09538-1>.
6. Frangoul, H.; Bobruff, Y.; Cappellini, M.; Corbacioglu, S.; Fernandez, C.; Fuente, J.; ... Wall, D. Safety and Efficacy of CTX001 in Patients with Transfusion-Dependent β -Thalassemia and Sickle Cell Disease: Early Results from the CLIMB THAL-111 and CLIMB SCD-121 Studies of Autologous CRISPR-Cas9-Modified CD34⁺ Hematopoietic Stem and Progenitor Cells. *Blood* 2020, *136* (Suppl 1), 3–4, <https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2020-139575>.
7. Seok, H.; Deng, R.; Cowan, D.; Wang, D. Application of CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Congenital Heart Disease. *Clin. Exp. Pediatr.* 2021, *64*, 269–279, <https://doi.org/10.3345/cep.2020.02096>.
8. Howell, E.; Wirz, C.; Scheufele, D.; Brossard, D.; Xenos, M. Deference and Decision-Making in Science and Society: How Deference to Scientific Authority Goes Beyond Confidence in Science and Scientists to Become Authoritarianism. *Public Underst. Sci.* 2020, *29*, 800–818, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662520962741>.
9. Subic, A. CRISPR in Public Health: The Health Equity Implications and Role of Community in Gene-Editing Research and Applications. *Am. J. Public Health* 2023, *113*, 874–882, <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2023.307315>.
10. Wert, G.; Pennings, G.; Eichenlaub-Ritter, U.; El, C.; Forzano, F.; Goddijn, M.; ... Cornel, M. Human Germline Gene Editing: Recommendations of ESHG and ESHRE. *Eur. J. Hum. Genet.* 2018, *26*, 445–449, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41431-017-0076-0>.
11. Boni, A.; York, J.; Boyette, N.; Im, D. Seeking Life Science Innovation Opportunities and Beyond: The Art of Blending Science, Medicine, and Business. *Med. Res. Arch.* 2023, *11*, 3443, <https://doi.org/10.18103/mra.v11i2.3443>.