Research Journal of Recent Sciences ISSN 2277-2502
Vol. **15(4),** 41-44, October **(2026)** *Res. J. Recent Sci.*

Review Paper

Embryonic Genome Editing: Scientific Progress and Ethical Boundaries

Harshitha V and Sarina P Khabade*
Department of PG studies in Biotechnology, Nrupathunga University, Bengaluru, India
sarinapk2008@gmail.com

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me
Received 14th April 2026, revised 18th June 2026, accepted 14th July 2026

Abstract

The appearance of the precise gene-editing tool, unveiled by the development of the technology known as CRISPR-Cas9, has allowed the creation of new remedial strategies for genetically caused conditions analogous to sickle cell anemia and cystic fibrosis. Nevertheless, germline editing, having an impact on future generations, stays a contentious issue. This review aims to critically assess the scientific foundations for editing the genome in embryos, the operations of this procedure, as well as ethical dilemma that surfaced after a procedure was conducted by He Jiankui in 2018 in which he edited mortal embryos without proper regulation. Current technical issues, analogous to out-target and mosaicism and nonsupervisory programs in different countries, are mooted. Although the use of Host Directed Therapy in remedy for rare heritable conditions is apparently promising, there remain major safety and ethical enterprises. The agreement among the international community is strict regulation of the use of this technology, with clear governance and use for the prevention of complaint rather than enhancement. This review article elaborates on different perspectives from bioethics, regulatory bodies, and public opinion to provide a balanced assessment of the current technology.

Keywords: Embryonic genome editing, CRISPR-Cas9, germline modification, bioethics, genetic diseases, regulatory frameworks.

Introduction

Inheritable conditions have defied medicine for generations. Multitudinous conditions that are inherited are the result of damage (mutations) from the parents to their children that affect health problems that last a lifetime. Recent progress in genome editing technology provides this opportunity to correct these mutations at the embryonic stage before they begin complaint[1].

The idea of altering the mortal genome isn't new- wisdom fabrication used to write about it for decades. The 1997 film Gattaca explored the world of a society in which social status was determined by heritable engineering. However, in 2018 it was reality when Chinese researcher He Jiankui announced that he would edit the genes of double embryos so that they were resistant to HIV. He used the technology of CCR5 gene modification by means of a natural mutation that is set up in some European population by using the heritable technology[2,3]. The announcement caused a shock in the scientific community and poses pressing questions on regulation and ethics[4].

The Evolution of Germline Editing: The fate of genome editing. The path to modern genome editing started with the introductory discoveries in molecular natural Scientists in the 1970s discovered restriction enzymes, molecular scissors that could cut DNA at specific sequences[5]. This meant they could introduce simple heritable manipulation in bacteria to form a base for farther sophisticated tools.

The 1990s and 2000s saw the emergence of Zinc Finger Nucleases (ZFNs) and transgenic actuated companion RNA (TALENs), which made it possible to make targeted changes in mammalian cells[6]. Since they need extreme engineering of proteins, making them tedious for widespread use. The real advance came in 2012 when Jennifer Doudna and Emmanuelle Charpentier proved that the bacterial vulnerable system known as CRISPR-Cas9 can be used to edit the genome of mammals in a way that had never been achieved before with analogous simplicity and perfection[7].

Germline Vs Physical Editing: The pivotal distinction between physical and germline editing. Physical cell remedy target certain specific Akins living cases. This is farther of what people visualize with sickle cell complaints (where they are editing stem blood cells to cure them).

Germline editing is largely different. By altering embryos or reproductive cells, all of the cells in the performing person partake the edit, and she can transmit it to his/ her own seed[1]. This lack of change gets both tiresome and impossible. On one hand, by a single correction, the entire family with heritable complaints can be corrected. On the other hand, any misapprehensions come to inheritable problems for several generations[8]. This distinction influences policy from the global position all the way down to the original. Multitudinous countries allow physical gene remedy under supervision, for the value of this treatment and the risks contained therein. Further

than 40 countries enjoin or severely limit germline editing due to fears of making unrecoverable changes to humankind's gene pool[9].

The HE Jiankui Case: In 2015, Chinese researchers published that the germ line embryos can be edited by using the latest technology called CRISPR by using non-feasible tri-pro-nuclear zygotes[10]. Subsequently, posterior studies indicated better results. In 2017, scientists managed to deliver mutations leading to hypertrophic cardiomyopathy to mortal embryos with advanced success and lower off-target goods[11]. Still, these weren't yet paraphrased into gestation; all were disquisition studies. He Jiankui edited embryos to disable the CCR5 gene and implanted them[2,12]. The trial was against Chinese regulations, demanded proper oversight and took advantage of vulnerable populations seeking IVFtreatment[13].

Methodology

Working of CRISPR-Case: CRISPR-Cas9 is relatively straight forward in its simplicity. The system has two primary parts, a guide RNA, which recognizes the target DNA sequence, and the Cas9 protein that cuts the DNA[7]. Depending on the gene that scientists want to edit, the researchers design the Guide RNA accordingly. The Guide RNA binds to the gene that we want to edit, and Cas9 cuts the double strand of DNA.

Then the cell's normal repair mechanisms take over. Non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) does a rapid join of the broken ends and often causes small errors in the process - insertion or deletion that causes problems with the gene[14]. This is a great method for 'knocking out' disease-causing genes. Alternatively, homology-directed repair (HDR) can insert a provided DNA template, so that corrections for the DNA can be made precisely. However, HDR is inefficient and normally exclusively functionality when cells divide[11].

Application of CRISPR in Embryo Editing: Embryo editing normally starts with eggs from IVF treatment. Researchers inject the components of the gene-editing tool, called the 'nuclease', which is the Cas9 protein, or it is mRNA, along with the guide RNA and sometimes a repair template, into newly fertilized eggs[11]. Timing is important: the optimum strategy is injection at the single cell stage if there is any chance to edit all the cells in the same way.

Medical Application and Limitation: Not all genetic diseases are good candidates for editing embryos, though. The best examples would be monogenic disorders - where conditions are the result of mutations in a single gene. Examples of which include cystic fibrosis and sickle cell disease, Huntington's disease and beta-thalassemia[15]. These follow predictable patterns of inheritance and correction of the mutation would prevent the disease.

However, germline editing has an important competitor – preim plantation genetic testing (PGT). During IVF, doctors can screen embryos and choose embryos which do not have mutations of the disease. For many couples with a risk of passing on (inheriting genetically modified) disease, PGT is a safer alternative in which there isn't genetic modification. The embryos simply contain naturalistic variation for the parents.

Existing Technical Challenges: Despite technological developments, a number of issues exist that limit application to clinical use. Mosaicism is still prevalent - where editing has been successful in some cells, but not in others, leaving a genetic patchwork. Off-target cuts, where Cas9 makes an edit in the wrong location, could result in new mutations[16]. Recent research also found out that the possibility of large deletions or chromosomal rearrangements is much more common during the use of CRISPR than was first believed[8].

Results and Discussion

Core Ethical Principles: Embryo editing raises ethical questions that traditional medicine does not face. Consider informed consent: embryos cannot consent to genetic modification, yet these changes have consequences for the whole of their lives, and possibly their offspring. While parents are the ones who normally make decisions for their children regarding medical matters, embryo editing involves decision-making with irreversible and multi-generational implications.

It is at this point that the concept of an 'open future' is relevant. Children have the right to make their own life choices as adults. Does insurance modification- even for prevention of disease- "limit" this autonomy? What about enhancement edits that could help with the improvement of traits at the cost of limiting other potential? These questions have no clear answers and vary according to cultural values and individual situations.

Treatment Vs Enhancement: Most systems of ethics draw a distinction between treatment of disease and enhancement of normal characteristics. Corrected mutation causing Huntington's disease obviously belongs in the treatment category. But what about editing for greater height or greater intelligence or the ability to be an athlete? These enhancement applications cause concern among ethicists for a number of reasons.

First, enhancement could increase social inequality. If only rich families could afford to make genetic improvements for their children, we may find a genetic stratification, a biological divide between socioeconomic classes. Second, the pressure to improve could turn into pressure. In societies that are competitive, parents may have a sense we must give our kids genetic advantages, even if we are not okay with giving them. Third, we are in danger of turning human procreation in favor of consumerism, when we choose traits such as choosing a product in the store. As such, ongoing conversations between scientists, ethicists, patients, and the public are the only way to address these gray areas.

Alternative Approaches: Pre Implantation Gene Therapy (PGT): PGT provides parents with a well-established volition for multitudinous families. During IVF, the doctors test the embryos for certain heritable conditions and choose for innocent embryos after implantation. This system is one that was used safely for decades; the system does not involve any heritable modification at all.

PGT has limitations. It requires the product of multiple embryos, and this isn't always possible for all couples. It can only choose from available embryos, so if they all have a complaint mutation, PGT is no help. Despite these limitations, PGT is presently the choice of utmost couples who are in trouble.

Somatic gene therapy: Gene Therapy for living cases regular remedy- has made spectacular advances. Treatments are now available for some heritable blood conditions, some cancers, and inherited blindness. These treatments involve modification of cells in affected areas of the body without modification of reproductive cells and keeping goods reverse- held from "hinder" to treated people. As physical remedy is improved, there can be a reduction in the medical demand for germline editing.

Emerging Technologies of Germline Editing: Newer editing technology may have answered some of the shortcomings of using Cas9. Base editing is a system that enables the modification of individual DNA bases without involving double beachfront DNA slices that can lead to large deletions and could therefore decrease unintended large deletions. High editing is indeed more precise than Cas9, allowing us to fit and cancel all base-to- base metamorphoses, without the need for double-stranded breaks to the DNA templates[17]. These advances may be meant to make germline editing safer if clinical operations come to consummation but have specialized hurdles of their own.

Conclusions and Path Forward

Embryo genome editing technology will keep getting better. Yet important walls- both technical and ethical- to the responsible clinical use of this approach live moment. Moving forward involves meeting several conditions at the same time.

First of all, we need a good medical necessity. Operations should give a result to serious conditions where druthers analogous as PGT aren't sufficiently respectable. This restriction precludes enhancement operations and is confined to factual remedial benefit.

Second, we must develop a general societal agreement. There should not be an option on term line editing to scientists or people who are considering having babies. Society as a whole and the mortal gene pool itself are affected by technology. Public engagement and deliberative pro technology have inputs in policy.

Third, international collaboration is the most important thing. Unilateral public action does not serve technologies with global implications. We need harmonized morals and information sharing regarding issues and mechanisms for prevention of nonsupervisory arbitrage.

Looking into the future, there should be further disquisitions conducted with proper oversight. We must get a better understanding of the capabilities and limitations of technology. Embryo genome editing has the implicitness to be salutary to families affected by serious heritable conditions. Still, coming out with these benefits in a responsible way requires forbearance, careful disquisition, transparent governance, and sustained international cooperation[30]. The power of the technology ought to be coupled with corresponding caution and wisdom in its operation.

References

1. Baltimore, D., Berg, P., Botchan, M., Carroll, D., Charo, R. A., Church, G., Corn, J. E., Daley, G. Q., Doudna, J. A., Fenner, M., Greely, H. T., Jinek, M., Martin, G. S., Penhoet, E., Puck, J., Sternberg, S. H., Weissman, J. S., & Yamamoto, K. R. (2015). A prudent path forward for genomic engineering and germline gene modification. Science, 348(6230), 36-38.

2. He J. (2018). Draft ethical principles for therapeutic assisted reproductive technologies. *The CRISPR Journal*, 1(6), 424-426.

3. Cyranoski, D. (2019). The CRISPR-baby scandal: What's next for human gene-editing. *Nature*, 566(7745), 440-442.

4. Lander, E. S., Baylis, F., Zhang, F., Charpentier, E., Berg, P., Bourgain, C., Friedrich, B., Joung, J. K., Li, J., Liu, D., Naldini, L., Nie, J. B., Qiu, R., Schoene-Seifert, B., Shao, F., Terry, S., Wei, W., &Winnacker, E. L. (2019). Adopt a moratorium on heritable genome editing. *Nature*, 567(7747), 165-168.

5. Berg, P., Baltimore, D., Brenner, S., Roblin III, R. O., & Singer, M. F. (1975). Summary statement of the Asilomar conference on recombinant DNA molecules. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 72(6), 1981-1984.

6. Urnov, F. D., Rebar, E. J., Holmes, M. C., Zhang, H. S., & Gregory, P. D. (2010). Genome editing with engineered zinc finger nucleases. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 11(9), 636-646.

7. Jinek, M., Chylinski, K., Fonfara, I., Hauer, M., Doudna, J. A. & Charpentier, E. (2012). A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. *Science*, 337(6096), 816-821.

8. 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.

9. Araki, M., & Ishii, T. (2014). International regulatory landscape and integration of corrective genome editing into in vitro fertilization. *Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology*, 12(1), 108.

10. Liang, P., Xu, Y., Zhang, X., Ding, C., Huang, R., Zhang, Z., Lv, J., Xie, X., Chen, Y., Li, Y., Sun, Y., Bai, Y., Songyang, Z., Ma, W., Zhou, C., & Huang, J. (2015). CRISPR/Cas9-mediated gene editing in human tripronuclear zygotes. *Protein & Cell*, 6(5), 363-372.

11. Ma, H., Marti-Gutierrez, N., Park, S. W., Wu, J., Lee, Y., Suzuki, K., Koski, A., Ji, D., Hayama, T., Ahmed, R., Darby, H., Van Dyken, C., Li, Y., Kang, E., Park, A. R., Kim, D., Kim, S. T., Gong, J., Gu, Y., Xu, X., Battaglia, D., Krieg, S. A., Lee, D. M., Wu, D. H., Wolf, D. P., Heitner, S. B., Belmonte, J. C., Amato, P., Kim, J. S., Kaul, S., & Mitalipov, S. (2017). Correction of a pathogenic gene mutation in human embryos. *Nature*, 548(7668), 413-419.

12. Lovell-Badge, R. (2019). CRISPR babies: A view from the centre of the storm. *Developmen*t, 146(3), dev175778.

13. Normile, D. (2018). CRISPR bombshell: Chinese researcher claims to have created gene-edited twins. *Science*.

14. Cong, L., Ran, F. A., Cox, D., Lin, S., Barretto, R., Habib, N., Hsu, P. D., Wu, X., Jiang, W., Marraffini, L. A., & Zhang, F. (2013). Multiplex genome engineering using CRISPR/Cas systems. *Science*, 339(6121), 819-823.

15. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2020). Heritable human genome editing. *National Academies Press*.

16. Schaefer, K. A., Wu, W. H., Colgan, D. F., Tsang, S. H., Bassuk, A. G., & Mahajan, V. B. (2017). Unexpected mutations after CRISPR-Cas9 editing in vivo. *Nature Methods*, 14(6), 547-548.

17. 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.

18. Adikusuma, F., Piltz, S., Corbett, M. A., Turvey, M., McColl, S. R., Helbig, K. J., Beard, M. R., Hughes, J., Pomerantz, R. T., & Thomas, P. Q. (2018). Large deletions induced by Cas9 cleavage. *Nature*, 560(7717), E8-E9.

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

20. Collins, S. C. & Aboulhosn, J. A. (2020). Preimplantation genetic diagnosis: Technical and ethical considerations. In A. E. Bale & M. F. Murray (Eds.), Clinical genomics (pp. 445-462). Academic Press.

21. Daniels, N. (2000). Normal functioning and the treatment-enhancement distinction. Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 9(3), 309-322.

22. Doudna, J. A. & Charpentier, E. (2014). The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. *Science*, 346(6213), 1258096.

23. Dunbar, C. E., High, K. A., Joung, J. K., Kohn, D. B., Ozawa, K. & Sadelain, M. (2018). Gene therapy comes of age. *Science*, 359(6372), eaan4672.

24. Feinberg, J. (1980). The child's right to an open future. In W. Aiken & H. LaFollette (Eds.), Whose child? Children's rights, parental authority, and state power (pp. 124-153). Rowman & Littlefield.

25. Fogarty, N. M., McCarthy, A., Snijders, K. E., Powell, B. E., Kubikova, N., Blakeley, P., Lea, R., Elder, K., Wamaitha, S. E., Kim, D., Maciulyte, V., Kleinjung, J., Kim, J. S., Wells, D., Vallier, L., Bertero, A., Turner, J. M., & Niakan, K. K. (2017). Genome editing reveals a role for OCT4 in human embryogenesis. *Nature*, 550(7674), 67-73. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24033

26. Greely, H. T. (2019). CRISPR'd babies: Human germline genome editing in the 'He Jiankui affair'. *Journal of Law and Biosciences*, 6(1), 111-183.

27. Kleinstiver, B. P., Pattanayak, V., Prew, M. S., Tsai, S. Q., Nguyen, N. T., Zheng, Z., &Joung, J. K. (2016). High-fidelity CRISPR-Cas9 nucleases with no detectable genome-wide off-target effects. *Natur*e, 529(7587), 490-495.

28. Nuffield Council on Bioethics (2018). Genome editing and human reproduction: Social and ethical issues. *Nuffield Council on Bioethics*.

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

30. WHO (2021). Human genome editing: A framework for governance. World Health Organization.