OPEN ∂ ACCESS

IŞIK SPECTRUM
Journal **3** (1): 32-41, 2026

The Ethical Ramifications of CRISPR-Cas9's Therapeutic Potential and Bioethical Responsibility in Modern Medicine

Alp Mülayimsi, Burçak Gökmen
FMV Ayazağa Işık High School

Abstract

The advent of CRISPR-Cas9 technology has transitioned gene editing from theoretical discourse to a transformative reality in the field of clinical medicine and bio-engineering. By enabling precise genomic modifications, these technologies offer unprecedented potential to extripate hereditary disorders such as Beta Thalassemia and Sickle Cell Disease, as evidenced by the recent regulatory approval of therapies like Casgevy (exagamglogene autotemcel). However, the clinical integration of such powerful tools stipulates a meticulous examination of their intricate ethical implications. This paper evaluates the dichotomy between the therapeutic benefits and the bioethical risks inherent in human genome editing technologies; thoroughly analyzing the concerns regarding erroneous effects and long-term genomic stability, the socio-economic threat of a "genetic divide" arising from unequal access to treatment, and the contentious transition from medical necessity to human enhancement technologies. By synthesizing current clinical milestones with international regulatory warnings from bodies like the United Nations (UN) and World Health Organisation (WHO), this paper argues the necessity for a global ethical framework in order to create a safety net for CRISPR-Cas9's usage; postulating the future of gene editing relies on the rigorous balance between scientific innovation and the preservation of humanity's ethics.

Keywords: *CRISPR-Cas9, Gene Editing, Bioethics, Human Enhancement, Genomic Equity*

1.Introduction

1.1. CRISPR-Cas9 Technology and its Transition from Theory to Clinical Reality

The emergence of CRISPR-Cas9 (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) has fundamentally redefined genome editing from a specialized laboratory technique to a primary pillar of modern clinical intervention of today and future. By employing a guide Ribonucleic Acid (gRNA) to direct the Cas9 nuclease to specific genomic coordinates, this technology allows for the precise rewriting and restructuring of genetic code to eliminate pathogenic mutations (Adli, 2018). Unlike previously developed genome editing tools, CRISPR's programmable nature makes it highly adaptable for targeting diverse sequences across an organism's genome as desired.

The transition from theoretical discourse to clinical reality reached a pivotal moment with the recent regulatory approval from both U.S. Food and Drug Agency (FDA) and European Medicines Agency

(EMA) of Casgevy (exagamglogene autotemcel) treatment; by being described as ‘‘decided that Casgevy's benefits are greater than its risks and it can be authorised for use’’. This therapy addresses hemoglobinopathies like Sickle Cell Disease by targeting the BCL11A enhancer in hematopoietic stem cells, effectively demonstrating that CRISPR can offer life changing cures by shifting a patient's hemoglobin production (O’Hanlon Cohrt, 2026). This milestone marks the beginning of a new era where biology and medical areas can be used to treat previously present terminal or chronic genetic conditions.

1.2. Tension between Rapid Scientific Innovation and Lagging Ethical Frameworks

While the technical velocity of CRISPR development is exponential, the establishment of corresponding ethical and legal frameworks remains linear and fragmented. This issue of ethical lagging creates a precarious vacuum where the rapid integration of genetic modifications outpaces the global ability to mitigate systemic and biological risks. As clinical trials expand, the disconnectivity between what science can do and the boundaries of the ‘ethics’ of human society gets observable more than ever.

The primary bioethical tension lies in the potential for off-target effects such as unintended mutations that could lead to genomic instability or oncogenesis, and the philosophical dilemma of germline modifications on an organism. If CRISPR is applied to embryos, it may irreversibly alter the human gene pool, potentially introducing changes that future generations never consented to (Myngbay, 2026). Without a synchronized international consensus, the line between life saving therapy and unregulated genetic experimentation remains dangerously blurred, which brings the problem of ‘designer babies’ to the world arena.

1.3. Therapeutic Benefits vs. Bioethical Risks and The Necessity of Global Regulation

This paper evaluates the dichotomy between the profound therapeutic potential of CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technology and the inherent bioethical risks that it imposes on the modern medical field and humanity. The core objective is to synthesize current clinical milestones with international regulatory measures to evaluate the safety and implementation of somatic gene editing (Prasad, 2026). By establishing a baseline of current successes, the research aim to highlight where technical precision meets ethical uncertainty. By examining how unequal access to high-cost therapies could create a new form of biological inequality, this paper investigates thoroughly that scientific innovation must be balanced with the preservation of biological integrity and genomic equity (Subica, 2023; Özanatça, n.d.). The ultimate goal is to propose a safety net that protects humanity’s ethics without stifling the medical progress.

2. Methodology

2.1. Qualitative Analysis of Recent Clinical Milestones and Synthesis of International Regulatory Reports

This paper employs a qualitative research design based on the systematic synthesis of primary clinical data, international regulatory reports and past studies of professionals from the area of molecular biology and genetics. The methodology is structured around a comparative analysis of the safety profiles found in the U.S. Food and Drug Agency (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) approval processes for CRISPR-based treatments such as Casgevy. This allows for a data-driven understanding of the benefit-to-risk ratio that currently governs the clinical acceptance of gene-editing technologies (Prasad, 2026).

To address the bioethical dimension, this paper evaluates the governance frameworks proposed by the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations (UN). By cross-referencing clinical success rates with sociological research on healthcare disparities, the paper identifies critical variables such as off-target risk and distributive justice, that must inform a global safety net. This approach ensures that the conclusions are grounded in both the biological realities of the technology and the ethical standards of International Human Rights Law (IHRL), drawing attention to the involvement of all parts of the society: from medical industries to international policy regulators.

3. Therapeutic Potential and Clinical Milestones

The therapeutic landscape of CRISPR-Cas9 has transitioned from foundational proof-of-concept studies to transformative clinical applications. By enabling precise double-strand breaks (DSBs) guided by synthetic RNA, the system allows for targeted gene disruption or correction that was previously unattainable with viral-based gene therapies.

3.1. Eradicating Hereditary Disorders: Case studies on β-Thalassemia and Sickle Cell Disease

The clinical management of hemoglobinopathies, specifically transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia (TDT) and sickle cell disease (SCD), has historically been limited to symptomatic relief through chronic blood transfusions and iron chelation therapy, or high-risk allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation (HSCT). The latter, while potentially curative, is often constrained by the scarcity of HLA-matched donors and the significant risk of graft-versus-host disease (Frangoul et al., 2021). The advent of CRISPR-Cas9 technology has fundamentally shifted this paradigm by offering an autologous solution that bypasses these immunological barriers. The biological rationale for this intervention is rooted in the natural history of hereditary persistence of fetal hemoglobin (HPFH), where individuals with sustained fetal hemoglobin (HbF) levels exhibit significantly milder clinical phenotypes despite harboring mutations for SCD or TDT (Steinberg, 2020). By leveraging this observation, researchers identified the BCL11A gene—a zinc-finger transcription factor—as the master repressor of γ-globin expression during the transition from fetal to adult erythropoiesis.

The primary therapeutic strategy involves the ex vivo genetic modification of autologous hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells (HSPCs). Rather than directly correcting the diverse array of mutations in the β-globin gene (HBB), the CRISPR-Cas9 system is programmed to target the +58 kb erythroid-specific enhancer of the BCL11A gene. This site-specific disruption effectively "silences the silencer," preventing the BCL11A protein from binding to the γ-globin promoter and thereby reactivating the production of HbF (Canver et al., 2015). Once these edited HSPCs are re-infused into the patient following a myeloablative conditioning regimen, they engraft in the bone marrow and give rise to a progeny of red blood cells with high HbF content. This endogenous production of $\alpha_2\gamma_2$ tetramers serves a dual purpose: in TDT, it compensates for the quantitative deficiency of adult β-globin chains, while in SCD, it inhibits the polymerization of deoxygenated sickle hemoglobin (HbS), which is the fundamental driver of vaso-occlusion and subsequent organ damage (Locatelli et al., 2022).

The clinical translation of this mechanism reached a historical milestone with the development and subsequent regulatory approval of exagamglogene autotemcel (Casgevy). In pivotal phase 3 clinical trials (CLIMB-111 and CLIMB-121), the efficacy of this CRISPR-based therapy demonstrated

unprecedented durability and clinical impact. For patients with SCD, the treatment resulted in the complete elimination of severe vaso-occlusive crises for at least 12 consecutive months in the vast majority of participants, fundamentally altering their quality of life and reducing long-term morbidity (Haydar et al., 2024). Similarly, patients with TDT achieved sustained transfusion independence, a feat that renders the previously mandatory and burdensome clinical interventions obsolete. These outcomes, validated by the FDA and EMA in late 2023 and early 2024, represent the first-ever regulatory authorization of a CRISPR-Cas9-edited product. This "watershed moment" not only confirms the therapeutic viability of gene-editing but also establishes a rigorous clinical and regulatory framework for future applications in genomic medicine, signaling the beginning of an era where hereditary molecular defects can be addressed at their source rather than merely managed through life-long palliation.

3.2. Technological Precision: How Precise Genomic Modification is Transforming Modern Medicine

The evolution from first-generation Streptococcus pyogenes Cas9 (SpCas9) nucleases to more sophisticated second-generation tools represent a pivotal shift in the safety and efficacy of clinical genomic interventions. While the canonical CRISPR-Cas9 system is highly effective for gene disruption via non-homologous end joining (NHEJ), its reliance on double-strand breaks (DSBs) often introduces unpredictable insertions and deletions (indels), which can lead to genomic instability or large-scale chromosomal translocations (Kosicki et al., 2018). To circumvent these risks, modern medicine has transitioned toward "surgical" editing modalities that operate without the need for DSBs. Base editing (BE) has emerged as a cornerstone of this transition, utilizing a catalytically impaired Cas9 (nuclease-dead or nickase) fused to a deaminase enzyme to achieve direct chemical conversion of one DNA base into another, such as C to T or A to G. This approach, pioneered for adenine conversions by Gaudelli et al. (2017), offers a high degree of precision for correcting pathogenic point mutations while significantly reducing the likelihood of unintended genomic rearrangements associated with DSBs.

Further extending the reach of genomic surgery, prime editing (PE) functions as a versatile "search-and-replace" mechanism that does not require donor DNA or DSBs. By employing a Cas9 nickase fused to a reverse transcriptase and a specialized prime editing guide RNA (pegRNA), this technology can introduce precise point mutations, small insertions, and deletions with unprecedented specificity (Anzalone et al., 2019). The biological versatility of PE allows for the correction of a vast majority of known human pathogenic variants, positioning it as a transformative tool for personalized genetic medicine. However, the success of these editing modalities is intrinsically linked to the advancement of targeted delivery systems, particularly for in vivo applications. The transition from ex vivo manipulation to systemic therapy has been largely facilitated by lipid nanoparticles (LNPs), which serve as non-viral vehicles capable of protecting CRISPR components and ensuring their delivery to specific tissues. A landmark clinical demonstration of this capability was the treatment of Transthyretin (ATTR) amyloidosis, where a single systemic administration of CRISPR-loaded LNPs achieved significant and durable reduction in toxic serum TTR protein levels (Gillmore et al., 2021). This milestone proves that systemic genomic modification is no longer a theoretical prospect but a clinical reality capable of achieving therapeutic levels of protein knockdown with minimal systemic toxicity.

4. Bioethical Risks and Technical Challenges

Despite the clinical momentum, the inherent risks of permanent genomic alteration necessitate a cautious ethical and technical appraisal. The "programmability" of CRISPR does not inherently equate to absolute safety or social neutrality.

4.1. Genomic Stability: Analyzing Erroneous (Off-target) Effects and Long-term Consequences

Despite the revolutionary potential of CRISPR-Cas9, its clinical translation is fundamentally constrained by the persistent challenge of off-target activity and unintended structural genomic alterations. The primary technical barrier remains the occurrence of off-target mutations, which arise when the Cas9/gRNA complex binds to and cleaves genomic loci that exhibit high sequence homology to the intended target site.

These unintended double-strand breaks (DSBs) can lead to a spectrum of mutations, ranging from simple insertions and deletions (indels) to more deleterious genomic rearrangements. Furthermore, the risk is not confined to off-target sites; even at the intended on-target locus, CRISPR-mediated editing can induce profound structural risks. Research by Kosicki et al. (2018) has demonstrated that Cas9-induced DSBs can result in large-scale chromosomal deletions, inversions, and complex rearrangements that extend far beyond the immediate target site. Such structural variations are of significant clinical concern, as they pose a latent risk for oncogenic activation or the inadvertent disruption of essential tumor suppressor genes, potentially leading to malignant transformations in edited cell populations.

The complexity of ensuring genomic stability is further exacerbated by the detection hurdles inherent in current gene-editing workflows. While computational algorithms have become increasingly sophisticated in predicting potential off-target sites based on sequence homology, they often fail to capture the stochastic nature of DNA repair in different cellular contexts. Consequently, empirical high-throughput sequencing methods, such as CIRCLE-seq and GUIDE-seq, have become essential for the unbiased identification of off-target cleavage (Tsai et al., 2017). However, the biological reality of "genomic mosaicism"—a condition where different cells within the same tissue or organ harbor distinct genetic modifications—presents a formidable challenge for long-term safety monitoring. In systemic in vivo applications or early-stage embryo editing, mosaicism complicates the assessment of therapeutic efficacy and renders the detection of rare, potentially harmful mutations mathematically difficult. This lack of uniformity in editing outcomes complicates regulatory standardization and necessitates the development of more stringent longitudinal observation protocols to ensure that the cumulative genomic burden of CRISPR interventions does not compromise patient safety over time.

4.2. Human Enhancement: The Contentious Transition from Medical Necessity to "Designer" Technologies

The technical success of CRISPR in treating disease has revived the debate over "liberal eugenics" and the potential for non-therapeutic enhancement.

4.2.1. Defining the Boundary: Where Does Therapy End and Enhancement Begin?

The conceptual distinction between "therapy," defined as the restoration of species-typical biological functioning to alleviate disease, and "enhancement," which seeks to augment traits beyond the normative physiological range, is increasingly becoming an ontological and ethical challenge. As CRISPR-Cas9 technologies advance in precision, the boundary separating medical necessity from elective augmentation is becoming dangerously porous. While current international consensus, reinforced by the World Health Organization (WHO) Expert Advisory Committee on Human Genome Editing (2021), maintains a stringent moratorium on clinical germline editing due to its heritable nature, the rapid development of somatic gene therapies introduces a "dual-use" dilemma. For instance, genomic interventions designed to treat somatic conditions such as muscular dystrophy or age-related cognitive decline could, in principle, be repurposed to enhance athletic performance or neuro-cognitive capacity in healthy individuals (Gyngell & Douglas, 2018). This transition from restorative medicine to "designer" applications raises profound questions about the telos of medical practice and the potential for a new era of liberal eugenics.

Beyond the immediate concerns of biological safety, the move toward enhancement invokes significant risks regarding distributive justice and the emergence of a "genomic divide." As Baylis (2019) argues, the high costs and specialized infrastructure required for CRISPR therapies create a socio-economic bottleneck that threatens to exacerbate existing global inequalities. If enhancement technologies become accessible primarily to the affluent, society risks a form of biological stratification where "genetic capital" is inherited alongside financial wealth, effectively hard-coding class distinctions into the human genome. This scenario suggests a future where social mobility is no longer determined solely by environmental or educational factors, but by a technologically mediated biological destiny. Furthermore, the lack of intergenerational consent in germline interventions underscores the gravity of these decisions, as the modification of the human gene pool reflects contemporary social biases that may permanently alter the evolutionary trajectory of the species (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2017). Consequently, the bioethical discourse must move beyond simple risk-benefit analyses to address the broader implications of genomic sovereignty and the preservation of human diversity.

4.2.2. Intergenerational Consent and the "Slippery Slope"

The most significant ethical challenge of germline modification is the lack of consent from future generations. By altering the human gene pool, we impose our current—and potentially flawed—values on descendants who have no voice in the decision. This creates a "slippery slope" where the initial goal of preventing severe genetic disease may gradually expand to include socially "desirable" traits, threatening human diversity and dignity.

5. Socio-economic Division of CRISPR-Cas9 Treatment's Ramification

5.1. Unequal Access to CRISPR Treatment and Socio-economic Threats Arising from the Lack of Universal Treatment Protocols

The commercialization of CRISPR-Cas9 technology introduces a profound ethical risk for the treatment, the transformation of life-saving genomic interventions into a solely financial purpose. Current gene therapies, such as Casgevy, carry price tags reaching around two million US dollars per single-dose

treatment, a cost structure that is inherently exclusionary for those in need of this therapy but cannot afford because of their current socio-economical position (Prasad, 2026). This financial cliff tends to create a genetic hierarchy, where the ability to eradicate hereditary disorders is determined by socio-economic status rather than medical necessity of the situation. If access to CRISPR remains dependent on high-value insurance or personal wealth, society is at risk of a future where biological well-being is no longer a human right, but a financial asset available only to those who can afford it. This would clash with the Hippocratic Oath, which forms the historical foundation of medical ethics. This oath establishes two primary principles regarding patient well-being: beneficence and non-maleficence (Askitpolou, 2024).

Furthermore, the concentration of these technologies within private pharmaceutical sectors in high income societies limits the focus of research and development of the treatment. As mentioned, as market profitability dictates the direction of gene editing, conditions prevalent in low-income populations are often neglected in favor of more lucrative therapeutic markets (Subica, 2023).

This imbalance ensures that the benefits of the CRISPR revolution remain localized within wealthy demographics if the treatment is solely purposed on financial aims rather than the morality that imposes ethics within, potentially leading to a scenario where certain populations are biologically optimized while others remain burdened by preventable genetic pathologies, effectively codifying class distinctions into the human genome itself such as the ‘designer babies’ or life saving treatments including Casgevy, Lyfgenia, Roctavian, Lenmeldy, Beqvez and Zevaskyn (Laurent, 2026).

6. Towards a Global Ethical Framework

6.1. Evaluation of United Nations (UN) and World Health Organisation’s (WHO) Warnings and Recommendations

The governance of CRISPR-Cas9 technology is currently shaped by a cautious consensus among international bodies and local governments, which emphasize the common heritage of the human genome. The United Nations, through UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, asserts that the human genome is fundamentally a heritage of humanity and should not be compromised by unregulated scientific intervention (United Nations, 1997). This perspective is further structured by the UN Resolution 73/218, which underscores the necessity of international cooperation to ensure that biotechnological advancements do not violate human dignity or lead to eugenic practices, both in the areas of medicine and socioeconomic practices of the society (Seventy-third session Agenda item 17, 2018). These UN frameworks serve as an ethical framework, warning that without oversight, gene editing could threaten the biological unity of the human species.

As well as these bioethical declarations, the World Health Organization (WHO) has established concrete technical standards for governance of this issue. The WHO Expert Advisory Committee has released comprehensive reports calling for the creation of a global registry to track all human genome editing trials, aiming to prevent ethics violations where researchers move to jurisdictions with weaker laws (WHO, 2026). Within the European Union’s (EU) context, these recommendations are legally codified through the EU Clinical Trials Regulation No. 536/2014. Specifically, Article 90 of this regulation strictly prohibits the performance of clinical trials that result in modifications to the subject’s germline

genetic identity (EUR-Lex, 2014). This legal framework ensures that while somatic therapies can progress, the limits of heritable changes remain legally protected across all EU member states.

6.1. Proposing Safety Regulations for the Future Usage of CRISPR Therapies

Creating an unbreachable safety network for the future of CRISPR-Cas9 therapy's usage requires a dual track approach that facilitates medical breakthroughs while enforcing non-negotiable ethical boundaries for the safety of the human race. The proposed frameworks must transition from passive guidelines to active genetic diplomacy and politics where scientific progress is measured not just by technical success, but by distributive justice (Subica, 2023), which is currently trying to be implemented by international bodies such as the UN. This safety net should include access boundaries, which require pharmaceutical organizations to provide tiered pricing for CRISPR-based cures in all countries around the globe. By treating the biotechnology sector as a public good rather than a primary financial income, the international community could ensure that no disease is 'untreatable' for a specific group in society.

To safeguard the biological future of the species, this safety net must also be implemented as a mandatory moratorium on germline editing for enhancement purposes. Drawing from the precision requirements cited in recent meta analyses of the issue, a technical standard must be met globally before any non therapeutic application is implemented or planned, in order to eliminate the risk of technologies such as designer babies, except the therapeutic usages implemented to eliminate genetic conditions such done in In Vitro Fertilization (IVF) method (Prasad, 2026). These standards would require the large scale elimination of off target effects and a full understanding of epigenetic stability over multiple generations. By adhering to the precautionary principle, we can foster an environment where scientific curiosity does not override the fundamental preservation of human ethics and biological diversity of all.

7. Conclusion

The evolution of CRISPR-Cas9 from a microbial defense mechanism to a transformative clinical reality represents one of the most significant leaps in the history of biomedicine and genetics, yet its true success will be measured by the ethical framework that shapes its use. While developments like the approval of Casgevy treatment offer a definitive cure for eliminating hereditary disorders; they simultaneously expose dangerous vulnerabilities regarding genomic stability and global equity. To prevent the emergence of a genetic divide between the humanity through unregulated enhancement, scientific progress must be controlled carefully, the international safety net grounded in distributive justice and the precautionary principle. To conclude with, the future of gene editing necessitates a harmonious balance between how the technology is used, and how its usage shapes the community that is shaped through it. As Jennifer Doudna, a Nobel Laureate and Co-inventor of CRISPR said: "Scientists have a responsibility to come together to articulate professional standards and live by them... One has to raise the bar very high to define what the standards of safety and efficacy are." (Bergman, 2019).

References

Adli, M. (2018). The CRISPR tool kit for genome editing and beyond. Nature Communications, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04252-2

Anzalone, A. V., Randolph, P. B., Davis, J. R., Sousa, A. A., Koblan, L. W., Levy, J. M., Chen, P. J., Wilson, C., Newby, G. A., Raguram, A., & Liu, D. R. (2019). Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. Nature, 576(7785), 149–157.

Askitopoulou, H. (2024). The Hippocratic Principle “to help or at least to do no harm.” Transfusion Clinique et Biologique, 31(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tracli.2024.06.002

Baylis, F. (2019). Altered inheritance: CRISPR and the ethics of human genome editing. Harvard University Press.

Bergman, M. T. (2019, January 9). Perspectives on Gene Editing. The Harvard Gazette; Harvard University. https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2019/01/perspectives-on-gene-editing/

Canver, M. C., Smith, E. C., Sher, F., Pinello, L., Sanjana, N. E., Shalem, O., Castro-Mondragon, J. A., Hankyung, L., Seligson, M. T., Wu, X., Zheng, Z., Liu, T., Zevina, S., Meyer, R., Bauer, D. E., & Orkin, S. H. (2015). BCL11A enhancer determinant of fetal hemoglobin level and disease severity in β-thalassemia. Nature, 527(7577), 192–197.

European Medicines Agency. (2024, December 3). Casgevy. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/EPAR/casgevy

Food and Drug Administration. (2023, December 8). FDA Approves First Gene Therapies to Treat Patients with Sickle Cell Disease. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-gene-therapies-treat-patients-sickle-cell-disease

Frangoul, H., Altshuler, D., Cappellini, M. D., Chen, Y. S., Domm, J., Eustace, B. K., Isaacson, J., Kremer, V., Locatelli, F., Magrin, E., de la Fuente, J., & Corbacioglu, S. (2021). CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. New England Journal of Medicine, 384(3), 252–260.

Gaudelli, N. M., Komor, A. C., Rees, H. A., Packer, M. S., Badran, A. H., Bryson, D. I., & Liu, D. R. (2017).Programmable base editing of A•T to G•C in genomic DNA without DNA cleavage. Nature, 551(7681), 464–471.

Gillmore, J. D., Gane, E., Taubel, J., Kao, J., Fontana, M., Maitland, M. L., Seitzer, J., O’Kelley, K., Stephens, K., Xu, Y., & Lebwohl, D. (2021). CRISPR-Cas9 in vivo gene editing for transthyretin amyloidosis. New England Journal of Medicine, 385(6), 493–502.

Gyngell, C., & Douglas, T. (2018). Selecting against disability: The ethical significance of the genetic-environmental distinction. Inquiry, 61(5-6), 584–605.

Kosicki, M., Tomberg, K., & Bradley, A. (2018). Repair of double-strand breaks induced by CRISPR–Cas9 leads to large deletions and complex rearrangements. Nature Biotechnology, 36(8), 765–771.

Laurent, A. (2026, January 7). Gene Therapy Pricing: The Economics of Million-Dollar Cures. IntuitionLabs. https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/gene-therapy-pricing-economics

Leibowitz, M. L., Papathanasiou, S., Doerfler, P. A., Blaine, L. J., Sun, L., Yao, Y., Zhang, C. Z., Weiss, M. J., & Pellman, D. (2021). Chromothripsis as an on-target consequence of CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing. Nature Genetics, 53(6), 895–905.

Locatelli, F., Lang, P., Wall, D., Meisel, R., de la Fuente, J., Rallapalli, S., & Frangoul, H. (2024). Exagamglogene autotemcel for transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia. New England Journal of Medicine, 390(18), 1663–1676.

Myngbay, A., & Kabyl, A. (2026). Ethical Aspects of Using CRISPR-Cas9 in Medicine in Kazakhstan and Worldwide. Journal of Clinical Medicine of Kazakhstan, 23(1), 93. https://doi.org/10.23950/jcmk/17746

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). Human genome editing: Science, ethics, and governance. The National Academies Press.

O'Hanlon Cohrt, K., & O'Dea, S. (2026). Clinical Trial Landscape of Gene-Edited Autologous Hematopoietic Stem Cells for Hemoglobinopathies and Immunodeficiencies. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 27(8), 3384. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms27083384

Özanatça, L. (n.d.). CRISPR-Cas9 technology: In biotechnology a breakthrough innovation. DergiPark. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/4557753

Prasad, R. B. K. (2026). Efficacy and safety of gene therapy in β-thalassemia and sickle cell disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science. https://www.japsonline.com/admin/php/uploads/4749_pdf.pdf

Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use. EUR-Lex. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2014/536/oj/eng

Sandel, M. J. (2007). The case against perfection: Ethics in the age of genetic engineering. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Steinberg, M. H. (2020). Fetal hemoglobin in sickle cell anemia. Blood, 136(21), 2392–2400.

Subica, A. M. (2023). CRISPR in public health: The health equity implications and role of community in gene-editing research and applications. American Journal of Public Health, 113(8), 874–882. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2023.307315

Tsai, S. Q., Nguyen, N. T., Malagon-Lopez, J., Topkar, V. V., Aryee, M. J., & Joung, J. K. (2017). CIRCLE-seq: A highly sensitive, in vitro method for identifying genome-wide CRISPR-Cas9 nuclease off-targets. Nature Methods, 14(6), 607–614.

United Nations. (1997, November 11). Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights. OHCHR. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/universal-declaration-human-genome-and-human-rights

United Nations General Assembly. (2018). Resolution 73/218: Impact of rapid technological change on the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and targets. https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Regional-Presence/UN/Documents/GA_Resolutions_ICTs/ares73d218_en.pdf

Wienert, B., & Conklin, B. R. (2020). Predicting and detecting off-target effects in CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing. The CRISPR Journal, 3(3), 136–138.

World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: A framework for governance. WHO. https://iris.who.int/server/api/core/bitstreams/ab6c4224-711d-4740-bfed-b0776cd5e785/content