PAKISTAN JOURNAL OF HEALTH SOLUTIONS

vol:04 issue:01 2026

E-ISSN:2520-0674

THE USE OF CRISPR IN TREATING GENETIC DISORDERS: PROMISE, PROGRESS, AND PRECISION

Rana Khalid Iqbal

Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

Article Info:

Keywords:

CRISPR-Cas9, gene editing, genetic disorders, base editing, prime editing, somatic cell therapy, in vivo delivery, genome engineering, ethical considerations, translational medicine .

Abstract. *CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing technology has revolutionized molecular medicine, offering a highly precise, efficient, and cost-effective method for correcting genetic mutations. This article explores the therapeutic potential of CRISPR in treating monogenic and complex genetic disorders, including sickle cell disease, cystic fibrosis, Duchenne muscular dystrophy, and hereditary blindness. We review the current state of clinical trials, technical advancements, delivery mechanisms, and address bioethical and regulatory challenges. The review also highlights emerging strategies such as base editing, prime editing, and epigenome editing that are poised to enhance safety and broaden therapeutic applications.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) has opened new frontiers in genetic medicine. Originally discovered as a bacterial defense mechanism, CRISPR-Cas systems have been repurposed for precise genome editing in eukaryotic cells. By enabling direct modification of disease-causing genes, CRISPR holds tremendous promise for treating previously incurable genetic disorders. As several therapies enter clinical trials, this review explores the current landscape and future trajectory of CRISPR in human therapeutics.

Overview of CRISPR Technology

CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) technology is a revolutionary tool for precise genome editing, enabling scientists to make targeted modifications to the DNA of living organisms. The CRISPR-Cas9 system is the most widely used form of genome editing.

1. Mechanism of CRISPR-Cas9

The CRISPR-Cas9 system is derived from a natural defense mechanism in bacteria, which use it to protect themselves against viral infections. It consists of two main components:

Guide RNA (gRNA): This RNA sequence is designed to be complementary to the target DNA sequence. The gRNA guides the Cas9 protein to the exact location in the genome where a cut is to be made.

Cas9 Protein: Cas9 is an endonuclease (an enzyme that cuts DNA) that is directed by the gRNA to make a double-strand break in the DNA at the target location.

Once the DNA is cut, the cell's natural repair mechanisms take over:

Non-homologous end joining (NHEJ): This repair pathway often leads to small insertions or deletions (indels), causing a disruption in the gene (gene knockout).

Homology-directed repair (HDR): If a donor template DNA is provided, HDR can be used to insert a specific sequence at the break site, allowing for precise modifications (gene knock-in).

2. Evolution of Genome Editing Tools

Before CRISPR-Cas9, other genome editing tools like Zinc Finger Nucleases (ZFNs) and Transcription Activator-Like Effector Nucleases (TALENs) were used, each with its strengths and limitations:

Zinc Finger Nucleases (ZFNs): ZFNs are engineered proteins that can recognize and bind to specific DNA sequences. These proteins include a DNA-binding domain made of zinc fingers and a nuclease domain that makes a cut in the DNA. While effective, ZFNs are challenging to design for new sequences and often suffer from off-target effects.

Transcription Activator-Like Effector Nucleases (TALENs): TALENs use a different DNA-binding domain based on transcription activator-like effectors, proteins found in certain bacteria. Like ZFNs, TALENs can be customized to target specific DNA sequences. However, TALENs are less efficient and harder to produce compared to CRISPR.

CRISPR-Cas9: In contrast, CRISPR-Cas9 simplifies the design of genome editing tools by using RNA (gRNA) to guide the Cas9 protein, which makes it easier to target any DNA sequence. It also offers higher precision, fewer off-target effects, and is more cost-effective, leading to its rapid adoption.

3. Advances in Guide RNA Design and Cas Variants

The versatility of CRISPR-Cas9 is enhanced by advancements in guide RNA (gRNA) design and the development of various Cas protein variants, each with unique features:

Guide RNA Design: Researchers have worked on optimizing gRNAs to improve targeting accuracy and reduce off-target effects. This includes designing gRNAs with higher affinity for the target DNA and minimizing sequences that could bind non-specifically. Tools such as CRISPR design platforms now assist researchers in selecting the most efficient and accurate gRNAs for their targets.

Cas Variants: Over time, various Cas proteins have been discovered and engineered to overcome specific limitations of the original Cas9. Some notable variants include:

Cpf1/Cas12: Cas12 is similar to Cas9 but cuts DNA in a staggered fashion, which may be more efficient for certain applications. It also has a smaller size, making it easier to deliver to cells.

CjCas9: A compact Cas9 protein that is smaller than the typical Cas9, allowing for easier delivery into cells and tissues.

eSpCas9 and SpCas9-HF1: Engineered versions of Cas9 with reduced off-target activity. These variants are designed to provide more precise edits.

Base Editors: These are a new class of tools based on CRISPR that can directly convert one DNA base pair into another without causing a double-strand break, greatly reducing the risk of errors during repair.

Prime Editing: Prime editing is a more recent development that allows for even more precise genetic modifications, with fewer errors than CRISPR-Cas9. It involves a fusion of a catalytically impaired Cas9 and a reverse transcriptase, offering unprecedented control over gene editing.

These advancements continue to expand the range of applications for CRISPR technology, from correcting genetic disorders to developing genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and new forms of gene therapies.

CRISPR-Cas9 technology has revolutionized the field of genetic research and therapeutic development. With improvements in gRNA design, Cas protein variants, and new methods like base editing and prime editing, the precision and applications of CRISPR are continually advancing, holding great promise for treating genetic diseases, enhancing agriculture, and more.

CRISPR Applications in Monogenic Disorders

Monogenic disorders are caused by mutations in a single gene, and CRISPR technology has shown immense potential in offering therapies to treat or even cure such diseases. Below are some of the prominent applications of CRISPR in treating monogenic disorders:

1. Sickle Cell Disease (SCD) and β-thalassemia

Both Sickle Cell Disease (SCD) and β-thalassemia are inherited blood disorders caused by mutations in the β-globin gene. These diseases lead to abnormal hemoglobin production, resulting in anemia, pain, and other complications.

Clinical Trials (e.g., CTX001): The CTX001 trial is one of the most notable examples of CRISPR being applied in clinical settings. It uses CRISPR-Cas9 to edit the BCL11A gene, a regulator of fetal hemoglobin expression. By silencing BCL11A in the patients' hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs), researchers encourage the production of fetal hemoglobin, which compensates for the defective adult hemoglobin.

The CTX001 trial has shown promising results in early-phase studies for both SCD and β-thalassemia. Patients treated with CTX001 have seen a reduction or elimination of disease symptoms, such as pain crises and the need for blood transfusions. This approach is designed to provide a long-term cure by allowing patients' own cells to produce functional hemoglobin.

2. Cystic Fibrosis (CF)

Cystic fibrosis (CF) is a genetic disorder caused by mutations in the CFTR (Cystic Fibrosis Transmembrane Conductance Regulator) gene, leading to thick mucus production, respiratory infections, and digestive issues. A common mutation, ΔF508, causes the CFTR protein to misfold, preventing its proper function.

Editing CFTR Mutations in Lung Cells: CRISPR technology is being explored for directly editing CFTR mutations in the lung cells of patients. Researchers are developing methods to deliver CRISPR-Cas9 components to lung tissue to correct the

mutations responsible for CF. This could potentially restore normal CFTR function and alleviate the symptoms associated with cystic fibrosis.

The challenge with CF is that the target tissues (lungs and other organs) are difficult to access with gene-editing tools. However, ongoing advancements in CRISPR delivery systems, such as nanoparticle-based delivery, are improving the efficiency of these approaches.

Additionally, ex vivo approaches, where cells are removed from the patient, edited in the lab, and then reintroduced into the body, are also under investigation. These approaches aim to correct the mutations in airway cells, leading to long-term therapeutic effects.

3. Leber Congenital Amaurosis (LCA)

Leber Congenital Amaurosis (LCA) is a rare inherited retinal disease that leads to severe vision impairment or blindness at an early age. It is caused by mutations in several genes, such as CEP290, RPE65, and GUCY2D, among others. These mutations disrupt the function of retinal cells, which leads to the degeneration of photoreceptor cells.

In Vivo Retinal Editing Approaches: CRISPR-based therapies for LCA aim to edit the mutated genes directly in the retina using in vivo (direct) gene editing methods. One of the leading strategies involves using a vector, such as a viral delivery system, to deliver the CRISPR-Cas9 machinery into the eye. This allows for targeted editing of the mutated genes in retinal cells, potentially restoring normal function and improving vision.

For instance, researchers are investigating the use of AAV (adeno-associated virus) vectors, which can deliver the CRISPR components directly to the retinal cells. One promising study involved editing the CEP290 gene in a mouse model of LCA, restoring some visual function. Clinical trials for retinal gene editing are expected to follow as this technology progresses.

4. Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy (DMD)

Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy (DMD) is a severe form of muscular dystrophy caused by mutations in the dystrophin gene. The loss of functional dystrophin protein leads to muscle weakness, degeneration, and eventual loss of mobility and life-threatening complications. DMD is X-linked and affects primarily males.

Exon Skipping and Correction Strategies: CRISPR is being explored for DMD primarily through exon skipping and gene correction strategies:

Exon Skipping: This strategy involves using CRISPR-Cas9 to skip over faulty exons in the dystrophin gene, allowing the remaining exons to be pieced together in a way that produces a shortened, yet functional version of the dystrophin protein. This is achieved by targeting specific exons in the gene and causing a deletion or modification that "skips" over the defective region.

Gene Correction: Another approach aims to directly correct the mutation in the dystrophin gene. CRISPR-Cas9 can be used to edit the specific mutation in the gene, potentially restoring the production of functional dystrophin. This technique involves repairing the gene or inserting a corrected version of the gene into the patient’s muscle cells.

Clinical trials using CRISPR-Cas9 for DMD are still in early stages, but preclinical studies have shown promise in both mouse models and human cells, with some evidence that exon skipping can improve muscle function.

The challenges in treating DMD with CRISPR involve delivering the editing machinery to muscle cells efficiently, as well as ensuring that the editing process is precise and does not cause off-target effects.

CRISPR technology holds immense potential in the treatment of various monogenic disorders, providing new hope for patients with conditions that previously had no cure. From blood disorders like sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia to genetic blindness and muscular dystrophy, CRISPR-based therapies are moving from preclinical models to clinical trials. Although there are still challenges to overcome—particularly with delivery systems and minimizing off-target effects—the progress made so far in treating these disorders with CRISPR is groundbreaking and could lead to life-changing therapies in the near future.

Emerging CRISPR Approaches

CRISPR technology has evolved beyond the initial Cas9-based genome editing, leading to the development of several innovative approaches that offer greater precision and versatility. These emerging CRISPR techniques include base editing, prime editing, epigenome editing, and RNA editing using Cas13 systems. Here's a detailed look at these advancements:

1. Base Editing and Prime Editing

Base Editing: Base editing is a revolutionary technique that allows for precise conversion of one DNA base pair into another without causing a double-strand break. This method was developed to overcome some of the limitations of traditional CRISPR-Cas9, such as unwanted insertions or deletions (indels) caused by error-prone DNA repair mechanisms.

Mechanism: Base editing uses a catalytically impaired Cas9 (nickase) fused to a DNA deaminase enzyme. The Cas9 protein makes a single-strand cut at the target site, and the deaminase enzyme chemically alters a single base pair (e.g., converting an adenine to guanine or a cytosine to thymine).

Applications: Base editing is highly efficient for correcting point mutations that are responsible for many genetic diseases, such as sickle cell disease, cystic fibrosis, and certain forms of muscular dystrophy. Since this technique avoids double-strand breaks, it minimizes the risk of unwanted mutations, making it a powerful tool for precise gene correction.

Prime Editing: Prime editing is another breakthrough in genome editing that is even more precise than CRISPR-Cas9 and base editing. It is often referred to as "the most accurate genetic modification tool ever developed."

Mechanism: Prime editing uses a modified Cas9 protein (called "nCas9") that is unable to induce a double-strand break. Instead, it is fused with a reverse transcriptase enzyme. The system uses a prime editing guide RNA (pegRNA) to direct the Cas9-nickase to the target site, where the reverse transcriptase synthesizes the desired DNA sequence, effectively replacing a stretch of the genome with a more accurate sequence.

Applications: Prime editing is capable of correcting a broad range of genetic mutations, including those responsible for rare genetic diseases. It provides unparalleled precision in gene editing and is expected to significantly improve the treatment of disorders such as sickle cell disease, cystic fibrosis, and Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Because it offers minimal off-target effects and does not rely on HDR for efficiency, it is considered a major advancement in genetic therapy.

2. Epigenome Editing for Gene Regulation

Epigenome editing refers to the targeted modification of the epigenetic landscape, which includes changes to DNA methylation, histone modification, and chromatin structure, without altering the underlying DNA sequence.

Mechanism: Epigenome editing involves the use of CRISPR-associated proteins like dCas9 (dead Cas9), which can bind to specific DNA sequences without cutting the DNA. By attaching effector proteins to dCas9, researchers can modify epigenetic marks on the target genes.

DNA Methylation: DNA methylation regulates gene expression, and epigenome editing can be used to add or remove methyl groups from the promoter regions of genes. This can switch gene expression on or off.

Histone Modification: Epigenome editing can also be used to add or remove histone modifications (such as acetylation or methylation) that regulate chromatin structure and gene expression. This can be used to activate or silence specific genes.

Applications: Epigenome editing has vast potential in regulating gene expression for therapeutic purposes, particularly for diseases caused by aberrant gene silencing or activation, such as cancer and neurological disorders. For example, it could be used to reactivate silenced tumor suppressor genes or to suppress the expression of oncogenes. Additionally, it could help in reprogramming cells for regenerative medicine or controlling immune responses in autoimmune diseases.

3. RNA Editing Using Cas13 Systems

RNA editing using CRISPR-Cas13 systems is a promising new approach that allows for the direct modification of RNA, rather than DNA. This technique provides a way to alter gene expression without permanently changing the genome, offering a reversible and dynamic way to treat diseases.

Mechanism: Cas13 is a type of CRISPR protein that targets RNA molecules instead of DNA. It can be programmed with a guide RNA to bind to specific RNA sequences, and once bound, it can either cut the RNA or insert/edit bases in the RNA sequence.

RNA Editing: Cas13 can be engineered to target specific RNA sequences for base editing, such as converting adenine to inosine, which is read as guanine by the ribosome, effectively changing the amino acid encoded by that codon. This allows for precise modifications of RNA without modifying the underlying DNA.

Applications: RNA editing has the potential to treat diseases caused by RNA mutations, such as certain genetic disorders, viral infections, and cancers. For example, in diseases like amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) and Huntington's disease, where RNA processing is disrupted, RNA editing could correct the defects without altering the DNA itself. Additionally, RNA editing could be used to modify the viral RNA of infections like HIV or the SARS-CoV-2 virus, offering a new avenue for antiviral therapies.

These emerging CRISPR-based approaches—base editing, prime editing, epigenome editing, and RNA editing using Cas13—represent the forefront of genetic and therapeutic advancements. Each of these technologies offers distinct advantages:

Base editing and prime editing provide precise, efficient, and minimal-risk methods for correcting genetic mutations at the DNA level, with prime editing leading the way in terms of accuracy.

Epigenome editing enables targeted regulation of gene expression without modifying the DNA sequence, which could have broad applications in treating diseases linked to gene silencing or activation.

RNA editing offers the ability to edit RNA molecules, providing a dynamic, reversible mechanism for gene regulation and potential therapies for RNA-based disorders.

These innovations continue to open new avenues for treating genetic diseases, offering safer, more precise, and more adaptable tools for researchers and clinicians. As these technologies are further refined, they hold the potential to revolutionize the way we approach genetic therapies and disease treatments.

Delivery Methods for CRISPR Therapeutics

One of the key challenges in CRISPR-based gene editing therapies is efficiently delivering the CRISPR machinery (such as the Cas9 protein and guide RNA) to the target cells or tissues. The method of delivery plays a critical role in the success of gene-editing therapies, as it needs to be both effective and safe. There are two main categories of delivery methods: viral vectors and non-viral delivery systems. Additionally, CRISPR delivery can be performed in vivo (directly in the patient) or ex vivo (outside the body and then reintroduced). Here's an overview of each delivery method:

1. Viral Vectors (AAV, Lentivirus)

Viral vectors are commonly used for gene therapy due to their ability to efficiently deliver genetic material into cells. Two of the most widely used viral vectors in CRISPR therapeutics are Adeno-Associated Virus (AAV) and lentivirus.

Adeno-Associated Virus (AAV):

Advantages: AAVs are non-pathogenic and can efficiently deliver CRISPR components (such as Cas9 and guide RNA) to a wide range of cell types. They are particularly effective for targeting tissues like the liver, muscle, and retina.

Challenges: AAV vectors have limited cargo capacity (around 4.7 kb), which restricts the size of the CRISPR components that can be packaged. This is a significant limitation when delivering large Cas9 proteins or other large genetic elements. Additionally, pre-existing immunity to AAV in the population could reduce the effectiveness of repeated treatments.

Applications: AAVs have been used in trials targeting diseases like hemophilia and Leber congenital amaurosis (a retinal disease), where efficient delivery to the target tissue is crucial.

Lentivirus:

Advantages: Lentiviral vectors can integrate into the host genome, allowing for long-term expression of the CRISPR machinery. They have a larger cargo capacity compared to AAVs, making them more suitable for delivering larger genes or constructs.

Challenges: Lentivirus is derived from HIV, which raises safety concerns related to potential integration events or unintended immune responses. Moreover, lentiviral vectors are generally more difficult to produce in large quantities compared to AAVs.

Applications: Lentiviral vectors are widely used in ex vivo gene therapies, especially for hematopoietic stem cell editing (e.g., in the treatment of sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia).

2. Non-Viral Delivery Methods

Non-viral delivery methods have gained attention as they offer several advantages over viral vectors, such as reduced risk of immune responses, easier scalability, and the ability to deliver large genetic material. Common non-viral delivery techniques include nanoparticles and electroporation.

Nanoparticles:

Advantages: Nanoparticles (such as lipid nanoparticles or polymer-based nanoparticles) can encapsulate the CRISPR components and deliver them directly into cells. Nanoparticles are relatively easy to produce, can be engineered for tissue-specific targeting, and avoid the immunogenicity associated with viral vectors.

Challenges: One of the major challenges with nanoparticles is ensuring efficient cellular uptake and endosomal escape, which is required for the CRISPR components to reach the nucleus. There is also a need to fine-tune the size, charge, and surface properties of nanoparticles for optimal delivery.

Applications: Lipid nanoparticles have been used in the delivery of mRNA vaccines (e.g., Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna COVID-19 vaccines) and are being investigated for CRISPR-based therapies, such as sickle cell disease and genetic disorders of the liver.

Electroporation:

Advantages: Electroporation involves applying an electrical field to cells, which temporarily opens the cell membrane, allowing CRISPR components (such as Cas9 protein and guide RNA) to enter. This method is simple, effective, and can be used in both in vivo and ex vivo settings.

Challenges: While electroporation can deliver CRISPR components into a wide variety of cell types, it is not tissue-specific, and the electrical pulses can potentially cause cell damage or death. It also requires careful optimization of parameters to avoid these negative effects.

Applications: Electroporation is widely used in ex vivo CRISPR-based therapies, such as gene editing of hematopoietic stem cells for diseases like sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia.

3. In Vivo vs Ex Vivo Approaches

The choice between in vivo and ex vivo delivery methods depends on the disease being treated, the target tissue, and the safety profile required.

In Vivo CRISPR Delivery:

Mechanism: In vivo delivery involves administering the CRISPR components (Cas9 and guide RNA) directly into the patient, typically via an injection or infusion. This approach aims to edit cells directly in the body, avoiding the need for ex vivo manipulation.

Advantages: In vivo gene editing is a less invasive approach since it doesn't require cell extraction or reinfusion. It is ideal for diseases where the target tissue is difficult to harvest (e.g., the liver, retina, or lungs).

Challenges: Achieving precise and efficient delivery to specific tissues is challenging. Additionally, there are potential concerns regarding off-target effects and immune responses to the CRISPR machinery.

Applications: In vivo CRISPR delivery is being tested in clinical trials for diseases like Leber congenital amaurosis (retinal diseases), hemophilia, and muscle dystrophies, where direct editing of target tissues is desirable.

Ex Vivo CRISPR Delivery:

Mechanism: In ex vivo CRISPR therapies, cells are extracted from the patient, edited in the laboratory, and then reintroduced into the body. This method allows for precise control over the editing process.

Advantages: Ex vivo editing allows for the careful selection of edited cells, improving the efficiency and accuracy of gene editing. This approach also reduces the risk of off-target effects, as the edited cells can be closely monitored before being reintroduced.

Challenges: The ex vivo approach is more invasive, requiring cell extraction, editing, and reinfusion. Additionally, it is not suitable for diseases where the affected tissues cannot be easily harvested (e.g., certain neurological disorders).

Applications: Ex vivo approaches have been successfully used in hematopoietic stem cell editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. These approaches are also being explored for treating certain cancers by editing immune cells to recognize and attack tumor cells.

The delivery of CRISPR-based therapeutics remains a major challenge, with viral vectors, non-viral delivery methods, and both in vivo and ex vivo strategies offering different advantages and limitations. The choice of delivery method will depend on factors like the disease being treated, the target tissue, the safety concerns, and the desired therapeutic outcomes. Advances in delivery technologies, such as improving viral vector efficiency, developing more targeted nanoparticles, and optimizing electroporation, are crucial for making CRISPR therapeutics a viable option for a broad range of genetic diseases. As these methods continue to evolve, CRISPR-based therapies are likely to become more precise, efficient, and accessible, offering new hope for patients with previously untreatable genetic disorders.

Safety and Off-Target Concerns in CRISPR Therapeutics

As CRISPR technology advances toward clinical applications, ensuring its safety is paramount. One of the primary concerns with CRISPR-based gene editing is the potential for off-target effects, where the CRISPR system may edit unintended regions of the genome. These off-target modifications can lead to harmful mutations or disrupt the function of important genes, posing risks for both the patient and the broader population. Addressing these safety concerns is crucial for the success and acceptance of CRISPR-based therapies. Here's a look at the mechanisms of off-target effects, strategies to enhance specificity, and approaches for long-term safety monitoring:

1. Mechanisms of Off-Target Effects

Off-target effects in CRISPR arise primarily due to the guide RNA (gRNA) that directs the Cas9 protein to a specific location in the genome. While CRISPR-Cas9 is designed to cut at a precise location in the DNA, there are several mechanisms that can lead to off-target cleavage:

Mismatches between Guide RNA and DNA Sequence: Cas9 relies on sequence complementarity between the gRNA and the target DNA. If the gRNA binds to a sequence that is not an exact match (i.e., with one or a few mismatches), Cas9 may still make a cut at that location. The likelihood of such mismatches increases when the gRNA is designed to target similar sequences that exist elsewhere in the genome.

Non-Specific Binding of Cas9: Even if the gRNA binds specifically to a target DNA sequence, the Cas9 protein may occasionally bind nonspecifically to nearby sequences, leading to unintended cuts or chromosomal rearrangements.

Chromatin Structure and Accessibility: The accessibility of the target DNA also plays a role in off-target effects. In regions of the genome with tightly packed chromatin (heterochromatin), Cas9 may have difficulty making precise cuts, increasing the likelihood of unintended interactions.

DNA Repair Mechanisms: After Cas9 creates a double-strand break, the cell's DNA repair mechanisms (such as non-homologous end joining, NHEJ) attempt to fix the break. If these repair mechanisms are inaccurate, they can introduce mutations at the target site or in off-target locations.

2. Strategies to Enhance Specificity

To reduce the risks of off-target effects, several strategies have been developed to enhance the specificity and accuracy of CRISPR gene editing:

High-Fidelity Cas9 Variants: Several modified Cas9 proteins have been engineered to enhance specificity, including high-fidelity Cas9 (HF-Cas9), eSpCas9, and HypaCas9. These Cas9 variants have been optimized to reduce nonspecific binding to the DNA while maintaining editing efficiency. They have a higher stringency for recognizing the target sequence and are less likely to cause off-target cuts.

Optimized Guide RNA Design: One of the most important strategies for improving specificity is the careful design of the guide RNA. Researchers use computational tools to predict the likelihood of off-target binding and to design guide RNAs that are highly specific to the target sequence. Avoiding PAM (protospacer adjacent motif) sites that are common in off-target regions can also help to minimize the likelihood of undesired editing.

Using Paired Nickases: Instead of using a single Cas9 nuclease that creates a double-strand break, researchers can use paired nickases, which involves using two Cas9 proteins that each induce a single-strand break at adjacent sites. This reduces the chances of off-target effects because both nickases need to bind close to each other, which increases the specificity of the edit.

Base Editing and Prime Editing: Techniques such as base editing and prime editing avoid double-strand breaks altogether and allow for more precise editing. Base editing converts one DNA base pair to another without inducing a break, while prime editing uses a reverse transcriptase enzyme to directly edit the target DNA sequence. Both methods are less prone to off-target effects compared to traditional CRISPR-Cas9.

CRISPR-Cas12 and Cas13 Systems: Alternative CRISPR systems, such as Cas12 (Cpf1) and Cas13 (a RNA-targeting enzyme), have different target recognition and cleavage mechanisms, which can be more specific in certain contexts. Cas12, for example, requires a smaller protospacer adjacent motif (PAM) than Cas9, which can reduce off-target effects.

Improvements in Delivery Systems: The method of delivery can also affect specificity. Viral vectors, nanoparticles, and electroporation can be optimized to ensure that the CRISPR components reach the intended target tissue without spreading to off-target sites. More targeted delivery could reduce the chances of off-target effects in non-target cells.

3. Long-Term Safety Monitoring

Even with advancements in specificity, long-term safety monitoring is essential to ensure that CRISPR gene editing does not result in unintended consequences or delayed effects. There are several strategies for monitoring the safety of CRISPR-based therapies:

Off-Target Sequencing and Whole-Genome Sequencing (WGS): To detect off-target effects, researchers perform whole-genome sequencing (WGS) on edited cells to identify unintended changes. This can help in identifying any off-target mutations, insertions, or deletions (indels) caused by CRISPR. High-throughput sequencing technologies can now detect very low-frequency off-target events, which improves the sensitivity of monitoring.

Long-Term Follow-Up Studies: Clinical trials using CRISPR-based therapies require long-term follow-up of patients to monitor potential side effects. This includes regular testing for any signs of immune responses or unintended genomic alterations that could manifest later. Monitoring may include tracking any signs of tumor formation or abnormal cell growth, which could arise from off-target edits.

In Vivo Tracking of Edited Cells: One method of monitoring gene-edited cells in vivo involves labeling edited cells with unique markers or using imaging techniques to track the distribution and health of modified cells. This is particularly useful in ex vivo therapies, where edited cells are reintroduced into the patient.

Transcriptomic and Proteomic Analysis: Comprehensive analyses of gene expression (transcriptomics) and protein production (proteomics) can help detect any unexpected changes in cellular function due to off-target editing. This kind of analysis can be particularly useful in identifying potential risks in tissues that were not directly targeted by the CRISPR system.

Immune Response Monitoring: As CRISPR components, such as Cas9, are derived from bacterial systems, there is a potential for immune responses against the gene-editing tools themselves. Long-term safety monitoring includes tracking the immune response to CRISPR components, particularly for viral delivery systems or when repeated dosing is required.

While CRISPR technology offers tremendous potential for treating genetic diseases, ensuring its safety remains a significant challenge. Off-target effects are a primary concern, but with advances in high-fidelity Cas9 variants, guide RNA optimization, and alternative editing methods like base editing and prime editing, the specificity and safety of CRISPR therapies are continuously improving. Additionally, robust long-term safety monitoring strategies—ranging from genome sequencing and immune monitoring to in vivo tracking of edited cells—are essential for identifying and mitigating any risks associated with gene editing. As these strategies continue to evolve, they will help ensure that CRISPR-based therapies are both effective and safe for patients.

Ethical and Regulatory Challenges in CRISPR Therapeutics

As CRISPR technology continues to advance and move toward clinical applications, several ethical and regulatory challenges must be addressed. These challenges encompass concerns about germline vs somatic editing, the informed consent process in genetic trials, and the global regulatory landscape governing gene editing technologies. Here's an overview of these important issues:

1. Germline vs Somatic Editing Debates

One of the most profound ethical debates surrounding CRISPR revolves around whether it is acceptable to edit germline cells (sperm, eggs, and embryos) versus somatic cells (cells that do not contribute to reproduction). The two approaches raise different ethical, societal, and regulatory concerns.

Germline Editing:

Definition: Germline editing involves making changes to the DNA of embryos or reproductive cells, which can then be passed on to future generations.

Ethical Concerns:

Heritable Modifications: Germline editing has the potential to create heritable genetic changes, which could have unpredictable long-term effects on the human gene pool. This raises concerns about unintended consequences, such as genetic diseases or unforeseen health issues in future generations.

Designer Babies: One of the major ethical concerns is the potential for "designer babies"—using gene editing to select for desired traits (such as intelligence, appearance, or athletic ability). This could lead to social inequality and "genetic enhancement," where only the wealthy have access to genetic modifications, creating new ethical and social divides.

Informed Consent: Germline editing involves making decisions for future generations who cannot consent. The ethical dilemma lies in whether it is morally acceptable to alter the genetic makeup of future generations without their input.

Eugenics Concerns: There is also the risk that germline editing could be misused for eugenics—the practice of selectively breeding for desirable traits, often with harmful social implications.

Regulatory Stance: Many countries have placed strict regulations or outright bans on germline editing. The He Jiankui incident (in which a Chinese scientist used CRISPR to edit human embryos) brought international attention to the need for stringent ethical and regulatory oversight. Despite this, some countries are still considering allowing germline editing for specific therapeutic purposes (e.g., to prevent inherited diseases like cystic fibrosis).

Somatic Editing:

Definition: Somatic editing refers to making genetic changes to non-reproductive cells (e.g., blood cells, lung cells, or liver cells), with the intention of treating diseases in an individual without affecting their descendants.

Ethical Advantages: Somatic editing generally raises fewer ethical concerns since the changes are not passed down to future generations. It is seen as more acceptable for therapeutic purposes (e.g., curing genetic diseases such as sickle cell anemia, muscular dystrophy, or cystic fibrosis) without the same concerns about heritable genetic modifications.

Risks and Challenges: While somatic editing does not affect future generations, it still raises concerns about off-target effects, unintended consequences, and the safety of editing a patient's DNA. The potential for cancer or immune responses from editing cells, especially in ex vivo gene therapies, must be carefully monitored.

2. Informed Consent in Genetic Trials

Informed consent is a cornerstone of ethical clinical research. In genetic trials involving CRISPR, obtaining informed consent becomes especially complex, due to the nature of gene editing and the potential risks involved.

Complexity of CRISPR Technology:

Many patients, especially in early-phase trials, may have limited understanding of the intricacies of CRISPR technology. Researchers need to ensure that patients fully understand the potential risks and benefits of the treatment, including off-target effects, unknown long-term consequences, and the possibility of needing repeated treatments.

Informed consent must explain the potential for both intended and unintended genetic changes, as well as the possibility of passing these changes on to future generations (in the case of germline editing).

Vulnerable Populations:

Genetic trials often involve vulnerable populations, such as those with rare genetic diseases or terminal conditions, who may be desperate for treatment. These individuals may be particularly susceptible to pressure or coercion to participate in trials, making it essential to ensure voluntary and truly informed consent.

Informed consent processes must also be culturally sensitive, ensuring that patients from diverse backgrounds fully understand the implications of genetic interventions.

Ongoing Consent:

Since CRISPR therapies are still relatively new, ongoing consent is important, especially for long-term monitoring. Patients need to be kept informed of any new risks or developments related to their participation in trials, and they must have the option to withdraw from studies if they choose.

3. Global Regulatory Landscape

The regulatory environment for CRISPR varies significantly across countries, creating challenges for international collaboration, research, and commercialization of CRISPR-based therapies.

Regulations by Country:

United States: The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) plays a key role in regulating gene therapies, including CRISPR-based treatments. The FDA has approved several CRISPR-based trials, particularly for somatic cell therapies, such as editing blood cells for sickle cell anemia. However, there is no current federal approval for germline editing, and the FDA has emphasized the need for comprehensive safety and efficacy data before any gene-editing treatments are widely approved.

European Union: The European Medicines Agency (EMA) regulates gene therapies within the EU, and similar to the U.S., it has approved CRISPR-based therapies for clinical trials involving somatic cell editing. The EU has a strict regulatory stance on germline editing, which is generally prohibited, though there are discussions about allowing exceptions for certain genetic diseases.

China: China has been more permissive regarding CRISPR research and clinical trials. However, the He Jiankui incident (the creation of genetically edited twins) led to severe international backlash and a crackdown on unethical practices. The Chinese government has since reinforced stricter regulations on gene editing and has called for ethical guidelines in genetic research.

Other Countries: Many countries, particularly in the developing world, have limited or unclear regulations on CRISPR research. Some nations may have more lenient regulations, which could potentially lead to unsafe practices or exploitation of vulnerable populations in gene-editing trials.

International Collaboration and Consensus:

The International Summit on Human Gene Editing (organized by the National Academies of Sciences, the National Academy of Medicine, and others) was a landmark conference aimed at establishing global consensus on the ethical and regulatory standards for gene editing. While there is agreement that somatic editing for disease treatment is generally acceptable, a global consensus on germline editing remains elusive.

Some advocacy groups and scientific organizations, such as the World Health Organization (WHO), are working to establish international guidelines for gene editing, particularly in the areas of germline editing, to ensure that research is conducted ethically and that safety is prioritized.

The ethical and regulatory challenges associated with CRISPR-based therapies are profound and complex. Key issues include:

Germline vs somatic editing, where the potential for heritable changes in the genome introduces concerns about safety, eugenics, and the rights of future generations.

Informed consent, which must ensure that patients fully understand the risks, benefits, and potential long-term implications of CRISPR-based therapies, particularly in genetic trials.

The global regulatory landscape, which remains fragmented, with countries taking differing approaches to gene editing, especially regarding germline editing. Ongoing international dialogue is essential to create consistent and robust ethical and regulatory frameworks.

As CRISPR technology moves from the laboratory to the clinic, addressing these ethical and regulatory concerns will be critical in ensuring that its benefits are maximized while minimizing the risks to individuals and society.

Shahzad (2025) examined economic innovation in public markets through the case of Punjab Sahulat Bazaars Authority (PSBA), highlighting its contribution to affordable essential commodities and improved market governance. The study emphasized innovative strategies, including dynamic pricing mechanisms, solar-powered market infrastructure, women-friendly vendor facilities, and mobile bazaars designed to serve underserved communities. Using a qualitative documentary approach, Shahzad (2025) reported that these initiatives improved operational efficiency, market accessibility, and consumer affordability, with price reductions of up to 35% without direct government subsidies. The findings suggest that transparent governance, institutional reforms, and innovative market management can strengthen public welfare and provide a potentially replicable model for developing economies.

Suggested Graphs & Figures

Figure 1: CRISPR-Cas9 mechanism of DNA editing

Figure 2: Timeline of CRISPR clinical trial milestones

Figure 3: Comparison of traditional and next-gen editing tools (CRISPR, base/prime editing)

Figure 4: In vivo vs ex vivo delivery flowchart

Figure 5: World map showing global regulatory stances on gene editing

Kayitesi and Sohail (2026) examined the challenges and enabling factors affecting women entrepreneurs involved in avocado exports in Kigali City, Rwanda. The study identified key barriers including limited access to finance, lack of training, social constraints, and market-related difficulties. The authors highlighted that supportive financial policies, entrepreneurial skills development, and improved business resources are essential for strengthening women's participation and sustainable growth in export-oriented entrepreneurship.

Summary

CRISPR is transforming the treatment paradigm for genetic disorders by enabling precise correction of faulty genes. From sickle cell disease to inherited blindness, CRISPR-based therapies are showing promising results in clinical trials. As researchers address concerns about off-target effects, delivery efficiency, and long-term outcomes, the field is rapidly progressing toward safer and more effective treatments. Ethical oversight and global collaboration will be essential to ensure responsible deployment of this powerful technology.

References

Doudna JA, Charpentier E. The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. *Science*. 2014;346(6213):1258096.

Jinek M et al. A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. *Science*. 2012;337(6096):816–821.

DeWitt MA et al. Genome editing via delivery of Cas9 ribonucleoprotein. *Nat Biomed Eng*. 2017;1:889–901.

Frangoul H et al. CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(3):252–260.

Maeder ML et al. Development of a gene-editing approach to restore vision loss in LCA10. *Nat Med*. 2019;25(2):229–233.

Nelson CE et al. In vivo genome editing improves muscle function in a mouse model of DMD. *Science*. 2016;351(6271):403–407.

Anzalone AV et al. Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. *Nature*. 2019;576(7785):149–157.

Komor AC et al. Programmable editing of a target base in genomic DNA without double-stranded DNA cleavage. *Nature*. 2016;533(7603):420–424.

Mali P et al. RNA-guided human genome engineering via Cas9. *Science*. 2013;339(6121):823–826.

Hsu PD, Lander ES, Zhang F. Development and applications of CRISPR-Cas9. *Cell*. 2014;157(6):1262–1278.

Hendel A et al. Chemically modified guide RNAs enhance CRISPR-Cas genome editing. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2015;33(9):985–989.

Yin H et al. Genome editing with Cas9 in adult mice corrects a disease mutation and phenotype. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2014;32(6):551–553.

Liang P et al. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated gene editing in human tripronuclear zygotes. *Protein Cell*. 2015;6(5):363–372.

Charlesworth CT et al. Identification of pre-existing adaptive immunity to Cas9 proteins in humans. *Nat Med*. 2019;25(2):249–254.

Kleinstiver BP et al. High-fidelity CRISPR-Cas9 nucleases with no detectable genome-wide off-target effects. *Nature*. 2016;529(7587):490–495.

Bak RO, Porteus MH. CRISPR-mediated integration of large gene cassettes. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2017;35(3):204–206.

Cyranoski D. CRISPR gene-editing tested in a person for the first time. *Nature*. 2016;539(7630):479.

Baylis F. Human germline genome editing and broad societal consensus. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2019;3(3):198–200.

Carroll D. Genome editing: past, present, and future. *Yale J Biol Med*. 2017;90(4):653–659.

Li L et al. Non-viral delivery of CRISPR/Cas9 for genome editing. *Signal Transduct Target Ther*. 2020;5:1–19.

Shahzad, K. (2025). Economic innovation in public markets: The case of Naveed Rafaqat and Punjab Model Bazaars delivering essentials below government-set prices. Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2025.v13i1.2942