Scientific Research Publishing

Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology, 2026, 17(7), 292-302
https://www.scirp.org/journal/abb
ISSN Online: 2156-8502
ISSN Print: 2156-8456

Ethics of CRISPR/Cas9 Gene Editing Technologies

Mateo Ibrahim Ghaleb, Melhem Ghaleb

Independent Researcher, El Paso, Texas, USA
Email: mateoghaleb1@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Ghaleb, M.I. and Ghaleb, M. (2026) Ethics of CRISPR/Cas9 Gene Editing Technologies. *Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology*, **17**, 292-302.
https://doi.org/10.4236/abb.2026.177019

Received: May 8, 2026
Accepted: July 17, 2026
Published: July 20, 2026

Abstract

Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR/Cas9) gene editing technology represents one of the most transformative biomedical innovations of the twenty-first century. By enabling precise modifications to the human genome, including the targeted addition, deletion, or replacement of DNA sequences, CRISPR holds enormous potential for treating and preventing hereditary and genetic diseases previously considered incurable. This paper examines the ethical landscape surrounding CRISPR technologies, distinguishing between somatic editing, which modifies only the treated individual's cells, and germline editing, which introduces heritable changes passed to future generations. The paper analyzes the central tension between two opposing viewpoints: those who advocate for a moratorium on germline genomic editing due to fears of eugenics and permanent generational alteration, and those who argue that restricting CRISPR would deny patients access to life-saving somatic treatments. At the molecular level, this paper reviews the CRISPR/Cas9 mechanism in detail, including guide RNA design, PAM recognition, double-strand break induction, and the competing DNA repair pathways of NHEJ and HDR, to contextualize the ethical stakes of this precision technology. Drawing on scientific literature and real-world case studies, including the successful personalized somatic CRISPR treatment of infant KJ in Philadelphia, this paper argues that neither a full moratorium nor unregulated adoption constitutes an adequate solution. Instead, the establishment of an international regulatory body, empowered to monitor, report, and govern the use of gene editing technologies, offers the most balanced and utilitarian path forward. Ultimately, society must prioritize both the life-saving potential of somatic CRISPR and the strict prevention of germline misuse to ensure equitable, ethical, and scientifically responsible global implementation.

Keywords

CRISPR/Cas9, Gene Editing, Bioethics, Eugenics, Somatic Editing, Germline

Editing, Cas9 Endonuclease, Guide RNA, NHEJ, HDR, International Governance, Genomic Modification

1. Introduction

Gene editing technology has long existed as a theoretical frontier, a scientific horizon perpetually approached but never fully reached. With the emergence of Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR/Cas9) technology, that horizon has collapsed into the present, transforming gene editing from speculative science into clinical reality. CRISPR/Cas9 enables researchers to add, delete, and replace specific DNA sequences with unprecedented precision, offering the possibility of treating and preventing hereditary and genetic diseases that have historically defied medical intervention. A critical distinction underlies this paper's analysis: somatic editing targets non-reproductive cells in a living patient and does not affect future generations, while germline editing modifies embryos, eggs, sperm, or early-stage embryos, making changes heritable across all subsequent descendants. These two categories carry fundamentally different ethical implications and must be regulated accordingly [1]. Yet the same capabilities that make CRISPR so medically promising simultaneously introduce profound ethical risks, particularly its capacity to introduce germline modifications that can be passed from one generation to the next. These risks have ignited a fierce and consequential debate within the scientific community: should CRISPR technologies be subject to a moratorium on heritable germline genomic editing, or should the undeniable benefits of somatic therapy compel society toward its broader adoption? This paper argues that neither extreme constitutes an adequate response. Instead, the establishment of a structured international regulatory body represents the most ethically sound and practically viable path forward. To fully appreciate the stakes of this debate, it is first necessary to understand the molecular mechanisms that make CRISPR so powerful, the ethical tensions it has generated, and the real-world consequences that both action and inaction carry for patients and future generations alike.

2. Molecular Mechanisms of CRISPR/Cas9

CRISPR technology was inspired by the natural defense mechanisms of bacteria and was later transformed into a modern gene editing system through the targeted modification of DNA, specifically by cutting and replacing DNA segments with new, customized ones. "When infected with viruses, bacteria capture small pieces of the viruses' DNA and insert them into their own DNA… allow[ing] the bacteria to 'remember' the viruses" [2]. CRISPR specifically implements this concept by incorporating pieces of DNA into new genetic material, mimicking this bacterial adaptive immune response. Specifically, CRISPR accomplishes this genetic alteration through the system of cutting DNA to "…use the cell's own DNA repair

machinery to add or delete pieces of genetic material, or to make changes to the DNA by replacing an existing segment with a customized DNA sequence" [2]. In short, gene editing is achieved by replacing old segments with a customized DNA sequence, permitting the deliberate customization of genetic material.

At the molecular level, the CRISPR/Cas9 system operates through two primary components working in precise coordination: the Cas9 endonuclease protein and a synthetic single guide RNA (sgRNA). The Cas9 protein, derived most commonly from the bacterium Streptococcus pyogenes (SpCas9), functions as a pair of molecular scissors capable of cutting both strands of the DNA double helix at a specified location. The sgRNA is an engineered fusion of two naturally occurring RNA molecules: the CRISPR RNA (crRNA), which contains an approximately 20-nucleotide spacer sequence precisely complementary to the genomic target site, and the trans-activating crRNA (tracrRNA), which serves as a structural scaffold that enables Cas9 binding and activation. Together, these two components assemble into a ribonucleoprotein complex that actively surveys the genome, scanning along the DNA for sequences matching the guide. The programmability of this system is one of its most revolutionary features: researchers need only redesign the 20-nucleotide spacer within the sgRNA to redirect the entire Cas9 complex to any desired genomic locus, making CRISPR vastly more accessible and flexible than prior gene editing technologies such as zinc-finger nucleases or TALENs [3].

Target recognition by the Cas9-sgRNA complex is governed by two critical molecular requirements. First, the spacer sequence of the sgRNA must be complementary to one strand of the target DNA, enabling sequence-specific binding through Watson-Crick base pairing. Second, the genomic target site must be immediately flanked by a short, conserved DNA sequence known as the Protospacer Adjacent Motif (PAM). For SpCas9, this motif is 5'-NGG-3', where "N" denotes any nucleotide. The PAM is indispensable: without it, Cas9 cannot efficiently unwind the DNA double helix to expose the target strand for RNA-DNA hybridization. Once the sgRNA identifies a complementary sequence adjacent to a valid PAM, Cas9 initiates local DNA unwinding and forms an R-loop, a structure in which the sgRNA displaces one DNA strand and hybridizes with the complementary strand, anchoring the complex to the target site. Upon successful R-loop stabilization, the Cas9 protein undergoes a conformational change that activates its two catalytic nuclease domains: the HNH domain, which cleaves the DNA strand complementary to the sgRNA, and the RuvC domain, which cleaves the opposing, non-complementary strand. This coordinated dual cleavage produces a precise double-strand break (DSB) in the target DNA, typically located three base pairs upstream of the PAM sequence [3].

Once a DSB is introduced, the cell's endogenous DNA repair machinery is engaged through one of two major pathways, each with distinct implications for therapeutic applications.

The first, Non-Homologous End Joining (NHEJ), is a rapid but error-prone mechanism that ligates the broken DNA ends directly without using a repair tem-

plate. NHEJ frequently introduces small insertions or deletions, known as indels, at the cut site. While NHEJ-mediated indels can effectively disrupt or "knock out" a gene's function, their inherent imprecision limits their utility in therapeutic settings that require exact sequence correction. The second pathway, Homology-Directed Repair (HDR), enables highly precise genome editing when a donor DNA template is co-delivered alongside the CRISPR components. HDR uses this provided template as a blueprint to faithfully restore or replace the cut sequence, permitting the correction of specific pathogenic mutations with single-base-pair precision. However, HDR occurs predominantly in actively dividing cells and is considerably less efficient than NHEJ, posing ongoing challenges for therapeutic applications in post-mitotic, non-dividing tissues such as neurons or cardiac muscle cells [3]. These technical constraints carry direct ethical weight. The low efficiency of HDR means that for somatic therapies, some cells may receive imprecise edits, raising questions of informed consent and the acceptable threshold of therapeutic risk. In germline contexts, even a small frequency of off-target mutations would be amplified across every cell of every descendant, making the ethical bar for germline editing substantially higher than for somatic therapy [1]. A critical additional concern is the potential for off-target cleavage: the Cas9-sgRNA complex can occasionally bind and cut at unintended genomic loci bearing partial complementarity to the guide sequence, potentially introducing harmful mutations elsewhere in the genome. In somatic editing, such off-target events are confined to the treated patient and can be monitored clinically; in germline editing, they become permanent heritable mutations with unknowable multigenerational consequences. This risk of off-target editing underscores the absolute necessity of rigorous off-target profiling, careful guide RNA design, and thorough preclinical validation before any CRISPR-based therapy advances to clinical use [3].

Through a thorough understanding of the molecular functions of CRISPR systems, from guide RNA design and PAM recognition, to nuclease-induced double-strand breaks and repair pathway selection, we gain a significantly richer appreciation for how CRISPR impacts human genes and the profound ethical implications that follow. Crucially, the molecular distinctions between somatic and germline applications are not merely technical: they define the boundary between a reversible clinical intervention and an irreversible alteration of the human germplasm [1].

3. The Case against: Calls for a Moratorium on Germline Editing

By customizing DNA with such precision, CRISPR technologies possess life-saving abilities against hereditary and genetic diseases; but despite this potential, the innate ability to alter germline composition and pass those alterations on to future offspring has raised major ethical concerns regarding generations being permanently shaped through a single artificial genetic intervention. Scientists fear a dystopian future where one person's decision to alter their germline, for some aes-

thetic or non-medical reason, will affect every one of their offspring, forcing those descendants to live in an unnatural state that was artificially constructed by a predecessor they never met or knew. "This intervention with human germplasm cells resulted in wide disapproval in the scientific community due to ethical concerns and calls for a moratorium on inheritable genomic manipulations" [3]. The core of scientific disapproval has centered on CRISPR's ability to alter the genetic composition of embryos. This power to alter a baby's genetic composition, and the eventual composition of their descendants, has subsequently led to "wide disapproval in the scientific community" because scientists are highly concerned about the cascading ethical consequences. Specifically, CRISPR's capacity to transmit "inheritable genomic manipulations" has raised the gravest ethical concerns, rooted in fears of generations being permanently shaped by unwanted artificial editing. Therefore, some scientists have begun to "[call] for a moratorium" on heritable genetic alterations, an attempt to directly address the ethical concerns that CRISPR raises regarding the transmission of unwanted genomic changes. Ultimately, CRISPR's ability to pass on artificial genomic manipulations to generations of offspring has sparked significant ethical concerns and widespread scientific disapproval.

4. The Case for: Life-Saving Potential of Somatic CRISPR Therapy

The concerns raised about germline editing must not be conflated with the substantial and growing body of evidence supporting the safety and efficacy of somatic CRISPR therapy. CRISPR technologies have been crucial in treating and preventing hereditary and genetic diseases through somatic interventions that do not affect future generations; the efficiency and reliability of somatic CRISPR highlight its potential for widespread adoption despite prevalent ethical concerns about germline editing. Therefore, some scientists claim that by broadly restricting CRISPR without distinguishing between somatic and germline applications, its full therapeutic potential will be sacrificed out of fears of potential misuse in a categorically different context. Already, CRISPR can begin to make a direct impact on society through its remarkable versatility in combating various genetic diseases, allowing CRISPR to treat previously incurable conditions today. Said versatility is highlighted through its documented successes in treating inherited blood disorders, metabolic diseases, and other single-gene conditions through somatic gene therapy trials [4] [5].

Despite ethical concerns and backlash, somatic CRISPR technologies have already begun to be implemented globally; notably, the administration of somatic CRISPR saved an infant, KJ, in Philadelphia. This case represents a landmark in somatic gene therapy, not germline editing: KJ's treatment modified cells in his own body to correct a metabolic deficiency, with no heritable changes introduced to his reproductive cells or future children. This success provides a compelling real-world demonstration of how a blanket moratorium on CRISPR could harm

society by preventing access to life-saving somatic treatments that children like KJ depend on. "The infant, KJ, was born with a rare metabolic disease… [CRISPR] was administered safely, and he is now growing well and thriving" [6]. Despite CRISPR's numerous ethical risks in the germline context, its somatic clinical use has emerged from the urgent necessity to treat "rare metabolic disease[s]" that were previously untreatable by any other means. CRISPR has also faced backlash from fears that it could not be implemented safely in human patients; however, a post-treatment KJ is "growing well and thriving", alleviating those fears and confirming that somatic CRISPR can be "administered safely" [6]. Cases like KJ's reaffirm the argument that society stands to benefit far more by implementing and adopting regulated somatic CRISPR therapies than by banning the technology outright.

In the aftermath of a successful case such as KJ's, gene-editing treatments have moved meaningfully closer to broad acceptance and eventual implementation on a larger scale to treat more patients afflicted with genetic diseases. The lead physician who worked on KJ's case stated, "'…we hope that other academic investigators will replicate this method for many rare diseases and give many patients a fair shot at living a healthy life'… 'The promise of gene therapy that we've heard about for decades is coming to fruition, and it's going to utterly transform the way we approach medicine'" [6]. The success of somatic CRISPR in KJ's case has established a critical proof of concept for how gene editing technologies can benefit patients' health safely and effectively. CRISPR technology represents the next great breakthrough in medicine; its mounting successes and expanding capabilities highlight the profound potential CRISPR carries to reshape genetic disease treatment and redefine the landscape of modern healthcare.

Despite the remarkable success of somatic CRISPR and the potential it holds to benefit society, without proper regulation, and instead of serving humanity, germline CRISPR risks reviving a deeply troubling ethical concept. Eugenics is the deliberate arrangement of a human population to increase the prevalence of desirable heritable traits; historically, the Nazis pioneered this concept through enforced selective breeding and institutionalized atrocity. Today, technologies like CRISPR may reawaken eugenics through consumer-driven demand for genetic "improvement". "…CRISPR offers the prospect of biological improvement not for the sake of the gene pool… the most potent force driving its use will be consumer demand" [7]. If genetic editing becomes commercialized, it will be propelled by the personal choices of affluent consumers seeking to improve their offspring's genome; without regulation, there may be little to prevent them from permanently altering not only themselves but every subsequent descendant, entrenching economic and social disparities directly into the genetic makeups of future generations. In short, unregulated germline CRISPR carries dangerous societal ramifications through the looming threat of a modernized, consumer-driven form of eugenics.

In the shadow of the eugenics threat, another equally pressing concern emerges:

society's normalization of genetic edits may trigger a "slippery slope", inducing increasingly permissive attitudes toward enhancement and progressively blurring the line between therapy and elective genetic improvement. "With genetic tools becoming more and more powerful, we must focus on why we are using the tools, on our values, or risk sliding into 'what can be done should be done'" [8]. To properly combat this trajectory, society must ensure that the use of CRISPR is governed through binding legislation that limits its sanctioned application exclusively to the treatment and prevention of hereditary and genetic diseases through somatic means, with strict prohibition on non-therapeutic germline modification [1] [8].

Progress has never come without resistance, as history consistently demonstrates; yet if society allows fear to suppress innovation, genuine advancement becomes impossible. Because of the demonstrated potential of CRISPR, "…we also have reasons to overturn non-directive counseling and apply pressure on people to accept genetic editing for both the removal of genetic 'disorders' and to enable genetic enhancements. They argue that to do otherwise would be to harm particular individuals and reduce general levels of welfare…" [9]. If this innovation is abandoned, it can "harm particular individuals and reduce general levels of welfare" by foreclosing the possibility of treatment for patients and their vulnerable offspring. Overall, as a result of CRISPR's demonstrated somatic successes, it may ultimately prove more unethical to deny widespread CRISPR treatment than to accept the manageable potential risks of a carefully regulated technology.

Justice, Access, and the Risk of Genetic Inequality

The eugenics discussion cannot be fully grounded without addressing the structural inequities that unregulated CRISPR would almost certainly produce. Even setting aside deliberate enhancement, access to somatic CRISPR therapies is already constrained by cost: current approved gene therapies carry price tags in the millions of dollars, placing them far beyond the reach of most patients globally [10]. If germline editing were commercialized without restriction, its benefits would accrue predominantly to wealthy individuals and nations, while its risks, including off-target heritable mutations and unforeseen multigenerational consequences, would be borne disproportionately by communities with less regulatory protection. Disability scholars and bioethicists have further cautioned that the framing of genetic variation as pathology requiring correction risks stigmatizing people with disabilities and reinforcing ableist assumptions about what constitutes a life worth living [9]. Effective regulation must therefore address not only what CRISPR can do, but who has access to it, who bears its risks, and whose values are reflected in decisions about which traits to edit. An international regulatory body must include equitable representation from low- and middle-income countries, disability advocates, and patient communities, not only scientists and government officials from wealthy nations, if it is to produce governance that is just as well as effective [1] [10].

5. The Need for International Regulation

The dichotomy of arguments regarding CRISPR has led to inaction and widespread uncertainty over CRISPR's regulatory future. Some advocate for the regulation and suspension of CRISPR to prevent unethical practices; others campaign for its further implementation to facilitate scientific and societal progress. To bridge the gap between these conflicting ideologies, meaningful middle ground must be established, most practically through the creation of an authoritative international body empowered to regulate, monitor, and report instances of unethical genetic editing. Yet the establishment of such an organization must begin immediately; each day of inaction allows gene editing technology to continue evolving, exponentially increasing the risk of a major ethical catastrophe. Already, because of loose restrictions and inadequate oversight, serious ethical transgressions using gene editing technology have occurred. "Recent reporting found that a number of scientists internationally knew about the experiment resulting in the birth of the first gene-edited babies well before the news broke. Because scientists have a responsibility to reveal such activities, an international governance mechanism for reporting unethical gene editing experiments should be established" [11]. The ramifications of gene-edited babies can ripple throughout society, leading to cascading ethical dilemmas: most prominently, the entrenchment of eugenics and the permanent inheritance of artificially engineered traits across generations.

Several international frameworks have already begun to address these concerns, though none is fully adequate. The World Health Organization (WHO) established a global registry for human genome editing research in 2019 and released governance recommendations in 2021 calling for national oversight, international coordination, and an accessible registry of all somatic and germline editing studies [12]. The International Society for Stem Cell Research (ISSCR) updated its guidelines in 2021 to permit carefully regulated research on human embryos beyond the traditional 14-day limit, while maintaining a moratorium on clinical germline editing [13]. The U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine has similarly called for a translational pathway that permits somatic CRISPR therapies while imposing stringent criteria before any germline application could proceed to clinical trials [1]. This paper's proposal builds on these frameworks by calling for a body with binding authority, not merely advisory power, that can impose enforceable sanctions on institutions and nations that permit non-therapeutic germline editing. Unlike the WHO registry, which is voluntary, or the ISSCR guidelines, which carry no legal force, the proposed body would function analogously to the International Atomic Energy Agency: a treaty-based institution capable of conducting inspections, mandating reporting, and recommending sanctions through existing international legal mechanisms [11].

While international oversight cannot guarantee the prevention of every instance of gene editing abuse, it nonetheless provides a practical and proportionate middle ground, regulating misuse without imposing a full moratorium on somatic

CRISPR. Ultimately, this bridges the gap between the two conflicting ideologies, allowing somatic CRISPR to continue benefiting society while substantially minimizing the harm that unregulated germline editing can inflict.

The future of CRISPR technology hinges on thoughtful regulation and responsible implementation. While a total moratorium could deny life-saving somatic treatments to those suffering from incurable diseases, unregulated germline use risks reviving eugenics and spawning deeply unethical practices that could permanently alter the genetic heritage of humanity. Global awareness and international oversight represent the most viable path to realizing CRISPR's full promise: by confining germline applications to tightly regulated research contexts, and by actively expanding access to somatic therapies through binding governance mechanisms, society can maximize CRISPR's transformative benefits while preserving the ethical foundations upon which both medicine and human dignity rest.

6. Discussion

The evidence presented throughout this paper reveals that the ethical debate surrounding CRISPR is not a binary choice between progress and caution, but rather a question of how to responsibly manage a technology whose implications differ fundamentally depending on whether it is applied somatically or to the germline. The molecular precision of the CRISPR/Cas9 system is impressive, but the HDR inefficiency and off-target risks documented in Section 2 carry direct consequences for both clinical safety and ethical consent frameworks: what is an acceptable risk for a terminally ill patient receiving somatic therapy is categorically different from what is acceptable when the same edit will be inherited by all future descendants without their knowledge or consent. The clinical success of infant KJ illustrates the life-saving potential of somatic CRISPR, but it does not speak to the safety or ethics of germline modification, and conflating the two undermines the precision that both science and ethics require.

The threat of consumer-driven eugenics is not merely hypothetical. As CRISPR technologies become more accessible and commercialized, the pressure to enhance rather than simply treat will inevitably intensify, particularly if germline editing remains unregulated. The justice and access analysis in Section 4.1 further reveals that even somatic CRISPR, if not equitably governed, risks creating a two-tiered medical system in which genetic cures are reserved for the wealthy while the costs and risks are externalized onto vulnerable populations. This dynamic would deepen existing health inequities rather than resolve them, and would lend a different but equally dangerous form to the eugenics concern.

Existing international frameworks, including WHO's governance recommendations, ISSCR guidelines, and National Academies criteria reviewed in Section 5, demonstrate that the scientific community has already recognized the need for differentiated, enforceable governance. The proposal advanced here, a treaty-based body with binding authority over germline editing and a mandate to promote equitable access to somatic therapy, synthesizes these recommendations into

a coherent governance model. The most defensible position is one that channels CRISPR's capabilities toward therapeutic somatic applications, enforces clear boundaries against non-therapeutic germline modification through binding international governance, and ensures that the benefits of the technology are shared equitably across nations and communities. This framework honors both the utilitarian imperative to reduce human suffering and the ethical obligation to prevent the commodification of human genetic identity.

7. Conclusion

CRISPR/Cas9 technology stands at the intersection of extraordinary promise and serious ethical responsibility. The central finding of this paper is that the ethical stakes of CRISPR are inseparable from the somatic/germline distinction: somatic therapies like the one that saved infant KJ represent a legitimate and urgently needed advance in medicine, while non-therapeutic germline editing poses unacceptable risks of heritable harm, entrenched inequality, and the revival of eugenics. A full moratorium would sacrifice proven somatic treatments and harm patients who have no other viable options; unregulated adoption of germline editing would risk entrenching genetic inequalities and reviving long-condemned ideologies in a modern, decentralized form. The most ethical and practical path forward lies in the creation of an authoritative international regulatory body with binding authority, one capable of monitoring gene editing research globally, enforcing the boundary between therapeutic somatic and non-therapeutic germline applications, and ensuring equitable access to the technology's benefits. By committing to thoughtful, binding, and globally coordinated regulation, society can ensure that CRISPR fulfills its role as a force for healing rather than a catalyst for harm, and that the patients, families, and generations who stand to benefit from it are protected by the same ethical standards that medicine has always been obligated to uphold.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2017) Human Genome Editing: Science, Ethics, and Governance. The National Academies Press.

[2] Miller, W.B., Enguita, F.J. and Leitão, A.L. (2021) Non-Random Genome Editing and Natural Cellular Engineering in Cognition-Based Evolution. *Cells*, **10**, Article No. 1125. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells10051125

[3] Gostimskaya, I. (2022) CRISPR-Cas9: A History of Its Discovery and Ethical Considerations of Its Use in Genome Editing. *Biochemistry* (*Moscow*), **87**, 777-788. https://doi.org/10.1134/s0006297922080090

[4] Frangoul, H., Altshuler, D., Cappellini, M.D., Chen, Y., Domm, J., Eustace, B.K., *et al.* (2021) CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Sickle Cell Disease and *β*-Thalassemia. *New England Journal of Medicine*, **384**, 252-260. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa2031054

[5] Gillmore, J.D., *et al*. (2021) CRISPR-Cas9 *in Vivo* Gene Editing for Transthyretin Amyloidosis. *New England Journal of Medicine*, **385**, 493-502.

[6] Musunuru, K., *et al*. (2025) World's First Patient Treated with Personalized CRISPR Gene Editing Therapy at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

[7] Kevles, D.J. (2016) The History of Eugenics. *Issues in Science and Technology*, **32**, 45-50. https://issues.org/the-history-of-eugenics/

[8] Evans, J.H. (2021) Setting Ethical Limits on Human Gene Editing after the Fall of the Somatic/Germline Barrier. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **118**, e2004837117. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2004837117

[9] Bennett, R. (2024) Reasons, Persons, Eugenics and an Argument in Favour of Gene Editing. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, **24**, 37-40. https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2024.2361905

[10] Shahryari, A., Saghaeian Jazi, M., Mohammadi, S., Razavi Nikoo, H., Nazari, Z., Hosseini, E.S., *et al*. (2019) Development and Clinical Translation of Approved Gene Therapy Products for Genetic Disorders. *Frontiers in Genetics*, **10**, Article No. 868. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2019.00868

[11] Schaefer, G.O., Labude, M.K., Zhu, Y., Foo, R.S. and Xafis, V. (2021) International Reporting Mechanism for Unethical Germline Gene Editing Experiments Is Needed. *Trends in Biotechnology*, **39**, 427-430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2020.10.001

[12] World Health Organization (2021) Human Genome Editing: Recommendations. WHO. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240030381

[13] International Society for Stem Cell Research (ISSCR) (2021) Guidelines for Stem Cell Research and Clinical Translation. https://www.isscr.org/guidelines