

 Open Access

Article Information

Received: May 18, 2026

Accepted: September 28, 2026

Published: October 20, 2026

Authors' Contribution

MAA designed the study. SRR, RF and DP accomplished data organization. MAA, DK and MNI wrote, read, and approved the final manuscript.

Citation

Abdel-Raheem, M.A., Rajkumar, S.R., Fausto, R., Philip, D., Kilic, D., Iqbal, M.N., 2026. Developing Conceptual Strategies to Understand Bioethical Issues in Genome Engineering. PSM Microbiol., 11(1): 131-138.

*Correspondence

Abdel-Raheem, M.A.

Email:

ma.abdelraheem@nrc.sci.eg

Possible submissions

 [Submit your article](#)

Developing Conceptual Strategies to Understand Bioethical Issues in Genome Engineering

M.A. Abdel-Raheem^{1*}, S.R. Rajkumar², Rajan Fausto³, Denny Philip⁴, Dilek Kilic⁵, Muhammad Naeem Iqbal⁶

¹Pests & Plant Protection Department, Agricultural and Biological Research Institute, National Research Centre, 33rd El Buhouth St, (postal code: 12622), Dokki, Cairo, Egypt.

²Head & Librarian, Rev.Fr.E.J.Thomas. SJ. Library & Information Centre, St. Joseph's College, Pilathara, Kannur University, Kerala, India.

³Manager, St.Joseph's College, Pilathara, Kannur University, Kerala, India.

⁴Planning Officer, St.Joseph's College, Pilathara, Kannur University, Kerala, India.

⁵Langgarden 3 / 69124 Heidelberg - Germany.

⁶Prolific Science Media, London, E6 2JA, United Kingdom.

Abstract:

Genetic engineering has transformed the way we live today, allowing us to eradicate genetic diseases, improve our agriculture, and help save the planet. These incredible tools, while awe-inspiring, also present very daunting moral concerns. This essay explores a possible approach to understanding the moral, social and environmental implications of genetic engineering. It focuses on how we can develop systems that include some of our key moral values-autonomy, justice, beneficence, and non-maleficence. The research investigates several methods of proactively identifying potential problems, evaluating environmental risks, and incorporating diverse inputs in decision-making processes. It blends the study of ethical principles with scientific research and public policy. This article presents a framework for addressing the ethical issues of genome engineering, a framework that will be important to apply for the responsible and equitable use of innovations for the benefit of all.

Keywords: Genome engineering; bioethics; ethical frameworks; intergenerational equity; responsible innovation; conceptual strategies.



Scan QR code to visit
this journal.

©2026 PSM Journals. This work at PSM Microbiology; ISSN (Online): 2518-3834, is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. To view a copy of this licence, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

INTRODUCTION

Genome engineering is one of the major revolutions of modern science, which allows scientists to make certain precise changes in the DNA of humans, plants, animals, and microbes. Technologies like CRISPR-CAS systems, TALEN, or other gene-editing tools have created a future to find solutions for genetic diseases, improve crop quality, and solve the world's ecological issues (Ashraf and Iqbal, 2021; Ayanoğlu *et al.*, 2020; Iqbal, 2020; Iqbal *et al.*, 2019; Joo *et al.*, 2025). But the tool also comes with some ethical issues that go far beyond the laboratory. The ethical issues related to genome engineering are complex. For example, altering human genes in a human embryo raises issues of consent, future generations, and whether gene editing should be used to treat disease; also, altering the genes of plants or animals, such as genetically modified crop plants or using gene drives, may damage biodiversity and disrupt natural ecosystems (Ayanoğlu *et al.*, 2020). Scientific discoveries and innovation involve human values, laws and cultural differences, and require a robust framework for impact assessment and decision-making. The ongoing policy debate focuses on how to incorporate ethics, science and law, with issues such as respecting autonomy, taking into consideration "welfare," preventing harm and delivering justice being addressed. All of this is far from straightforward, as new emerging technologies are faced with the problem of the unknown, of new complex situations in multiple regulatory systems around the world, and the importance of public debate and cross-disciplinary work (Adjovi, 2025; Namdarian *et al.*, 2022).

This paper explores the ethical considerations of genome engineering by combining normative principles, risk assessment, stakeholder perspective, and policy processes. This paper supports responsible decision-making in genome engineering by focusing on the negative aspects as well as possible directions for development. These frameworks illuminate the risks and benefits of genome engineering.

Analysis of Bioethical Challenges in Genome Engineering

Genome engineering raises many profound ethical and moral issues that have to be investigated properly. These issues include changing the genes of human eggs or sperm, the moral obligation we have towards future generations, and how to provide access to this technology, all of which can influence society, morality and the law profoundly (Almeida and Ranisch, 2022).

Human germline modification

Germline editing is changing the genes in eggs, sperm or embryos, and the changes can be passed down the generations (Ormond *et al.*, 2017). Germline editing can be used to help stop serious diseases, but it raises big moral questions about whether it's safe, whether it should be used without the consent of future generations, and whether it should be used to enhance characteristics rather than treat disease (Rubeis and Steger, 2018). There is ongoing moral debate about whether it is right to make potentially permanent changes to the human genome when we don't know the long-term consequences, and some believe it is against human dignity to go ahead with the changes. There is also concern about pressure to create 'designer babies' or enhance the human population by selecting favourable characteristics not linked to health. Germline editing is considered the most difficult of the three to get right. Studies indicate that there is some openness to using germline editing to treat or prevent serious genetic diseases, but to enhance intelligence, looks, and physical characteristics, there is mainly strong opposition (Hayenhjelm and Nordlund, 2025).

Ethical concerns focus on the implications of this kind of germline editing has not yet been fully understood, and there are risks involved for future generations. Genetic enhancement of the entire population could result in social pressure, discrimination, or normalization of engineering of gains in genetic enhancement (Macpherson *et al.*, 2019).

The research indicates that altering genes is only acceptable if there is a medical need and there are very firm regulations about how it should be done. It will be necessary to proceed with caution, particularly when the changed DNA can't be reversed. These types of alterations must be relevant to health, not enhancement, and people will need to be persuaded that it has been performed ethically and transparently (Baylis *et al.*, 2020).

Intergenerational responsibility

An important ethical concern is the impact on future generations. Somatic gene therapy treats just the one person, while germline modification affects every future person, too. These future individuals cannot consent to this intervention, and this brings about questions of accountability: how to assess the risk and decide if it is ethical to decide for future generations. We need to carefully consider the consequences that can be inherited in the future, including health complications, unfair benefits, and generational changes. Performing genome editing results in a moral obligation to future generations, and evidence suggests that our current decisions can either benefit or harm those yet to be born (Gyngell, 2017). Germline edits impact future generations, who did not choose to take on any risks. Genetic/ ecological harm can only occur years or even generations later, raising many concerns about who is responsible for it. Ethical approaches must consider both the immediate impact and the risk of future effects of decisions about genome engineering to address intergenerational responsibilities (Joseph *et al.*, 2022).

Equitable access to technology

Genome engineering technologies are expensive and difficult to manipulate, thus may only be affordable to the rich and the privileged. It exacerbates the disadvantages of the weak and poor, promoting disparity in social, economic, and health systems. Genetic modification that only a few members of society can afford promotes elitism and unethical discrimination. It also promotes inequality in

health and results in unequal distribution of benefits from these technologies, resulting in unethical discrimination. Therefore, effective access to genome editing technology promotes equity through the development of policies that ensure non-discrimination, job promotion of therapy intervention, and the protection of technology from monopoly. Principles of justice must also be addressed during the research phase and fair distribution of benefits during the utilization phase for the progress of an equitable society (Bojarczuk, 2024).

Additional ethical considerations

Apart from the major concerns listed above, other ethical issues need to be considered, such as: conditions for a full understanding of the possible harm and risks for those taking the treatment, concerns of the possible destructive application of genomics for biological warfare, and the implications of altering animals and other organisms that also inhabit our world. These issues emphasize the great need to find good ethical principles and the intervention of many experts to assess and assist in applying these principles. The ethical challenges of manipulating genes are complex, continent-wide, yet to be addressed fairly and practically by valuing the benefit of disease reduction, crop improvement, and environmental management against the need to respect human rights, equity, and social acceptance. Ethical values combined with science, guidelines, and public participation are the cornerstone of these dilemmas (Solti and Fébel, 2026). Other challenges that have been noted include:

Informed consent: Making sure everyone taking part in genome editing research understands the possible risks and benefits.

Dual-use risks: Potential misuse of genome engineering for non-therapeutic or harmful purposes.

Environmental and non-human ethics: Do moral obligations extend beyond the human species to the environment and non-human organisms affected by the above interventions?

Many ethical questions regarding genome engineering are linked and need to be discussed on a global scale. Genome editing and the care for future generations and equal access to technology deserve ethics, regulation, and inclusion. Ethical considerations need to work together with science and laws to lead genome engineering toward the right path. Failure to implement the ethical challenges appropriately could lead to detrimental consequences, inequality, and public distrust. Addressing the ethical challenges will lead to a responsible, sustainable, and ethical application of genome editing (Cyranoski, 2019).

Conceptual Strategies for Bioethical Dilemmas

Conceptual strategies help to provide frameworks that will allow researchers, policymakers, and society to deal with the bioethical concerns of genome engineering in a systematic and structured manner. They tend to incorporate the principles of theory, science, and policy.

Integrating ethical theory

One important strategy to provide a framework for bioethical dilemmas is making decisions based on some ethical principles. Decisions on genetic modification can be made using systems based on respect for individuals' freedom, doing good, avoiding harm, and fairness (justice). This can be used, for example:

- If you respect freedom, you give people or groups who are affected by genetic modification a say.
- Contributing to overall welfare involves acting in ways that will have the most positive impact, such as the eradication of disease.
- Avoiding harm means protecting from being harmed, especially in cases where there is some uncertain long-term effect.
- Fairness involves equal participation in the opportunity and the equitable distribution of risks and benefits.

Considering the ethics of these new technologies is also useful in talking about obligations we have to future generations, restrictions on enhancing human beings, or the rights of other creatures, such as animals, that might be impacted by genetic modifications.

Ethics provide a way of determining what is right and wrong and avoiding potential harm and injustice. Any research, action, or policy requires careful ethical reflection (Goyal, 2023).

Incorporating scientific knowledge

Another way of addressing an ethical issue is to consider the science: the evidence base, the facts derived from real-world experiments. The more we understand about biology, genomes and where the world of genome editing is heading, the more we can expect that projects will yield (Niemiec and Howard, 2020). Analysis of risks, scenario-planning and research on how small tweaks change nature all whisper to us what might go wrong (genes escaping into the wild, ecosystems toppling). If you blend ethics with science, you can help policymakers make wiser decisions that support innovation but also the wisdom to deal with failure.

Science will show us whether genome engineering is feasible, what the risks are, and what side effects we will have to manage.

The research demonstrates that:

- Using models to assess risks, knowing the impacts of nature, and efforts to re-gene - these can all reveal what could befall people and the planet.
- Provide facts to assess the ethical decision as feasible. Science provides information about what is known and unknown and guides one to think carefully and safely.

We put science into the decision-making process so it's based on concrete evidence. Without a solid scientific backing, ethics becomes a matter of speculation, and we cannot advance towards better responsible genome engineering.

Embedding policy and regulatory considerations

Conceptual strategies should be framed within the frameworks of law and policy. Governance instruments including biosafety policies, international standards and external regulation provide enabling control and accountability. Strategies should have regard to the following fundamental principles: compliance, overseas cooperation, monitoring and measurement of genome engineering activities. Emphasizing clarity in policy-making may bring improved success and implementation of, or compliance with, biosafety and bioethics frameworks, shown to be positively correlated by some earlier studies. Conceptual approaches appear to be more successful when presented in regulatory and governance concepts. A good conceptual approach has the following bioethics and biosafety rules.

- Clinical testing standards for how knowledge is released into the environment and utilized around the world.
- The ability of flexible governance systems to adapt to new technologies.

Linking ethics and policy is about having a sense of responsibility and rules of implementation. Such methods, with the moral ideas and the legal and regulatory processes are regulating making decision and guide it to them and make them more confident, more canonical and fashionable (Gaudelli *et al.*, 2017).

Structured deliberation and decision-making models

Decision-making tools may be used within a framework to represent or help analyse the risks and benefits of different choices, for example through an ethical matrix, multi-criteria analysis or scenario-based appraisal. Such tools facilitate considering multiple factors, including multiple values, risks and benefits, in a structured way. An ethical matrix might explore the implications of genome editing for a range of overarching issues such as: human health, our environment, fairness and the future; while scenario planning

can assist in considering how things might play out, for example in relation to potential impacts on future generations (Bojarczuk, 2024; Namdarian *et al.*, 2022).

Findings show that these structured tools work well, such as:

- Facilitate comparing the implications of genome engineering across different ethics fields, for example: human health, environmental effects, equity.
- Assist in the prediction of the generational and long-term effects of genome editing.
- May give rise to the need to trade off between competing normative and social considerations.

Together, these tools empower humanity to guide the trajectory of genome engineering in a manner that is simple, systematic and reproducible. They allow everyone involved in a decision to think about its ethical, societal and safety consequences in a clear manner.

Stakeholder engagement and interdisciplinary collaboration

Effective conceptual approaches will also look at accessibility and interaction. This can include scientists and ethicists, policy makers and members of the public. Inter-disciplinary interaction can also help contribute to a more in-depth understanding of the impact of genome manipulation, technically, ethically, socially and environmentally. It also introduces a transparent process that would result in gaining trust with the public and could help support responsible innovation. Ethical approaches to genome engineering are not able to offer concrete solutions to complex ethical questions, but they do provide systems which account for scientific information, policy framework and consumer preferences, and can be used to influence responsible and transparent choices and possibly to help facilitate precautionary measures for scientists and society to ensure genome manipulation advances safely and in accordance with environmental needs (Jasanoff *et al.*, 2019).

Promoting stakeholder engagement in genome engineering

Public engagement is a core aspect for the responsible development and use of genome engineering techniques. The study concluded that public awareness, multidisciplinary collaboration and participatory decision-making would be decisive in the question of whether genome engineering techniques would be societally, ethically and ecologically appropriate. The study additionally concluded that public awareness, multidisciplinary collaboration and participatory decision-making are critical in steering responsible research and innovation in genome engineering techniques (Lu *et al.*, 2023).

Public awareness and education

Public education activities, including science communication and communication materials in general, such as workshops and the information below, can raise awareness and educate the public and communities to help them understand both the possible positive and negative impacts of genome engineering. In this way, more informed participation of individuals and communities in decisions about genome engineering can increase the legitimacy and confidence in society. Furthermore, the researchers also suggest that communicating uncertainty, potential long-term effects, and side effects of genome engineering as well as its ethical concerns to the public can help prevent that they are misled by false information (Martin *et al.*, 2020).

Adaptive and interdisciplinary governance

Genome engineering is developing at such a rapid pace, and with such diversity, that governance mechanisms must be highly flexible and highly responsive. For this reason, we suggest governance strategies that include advisory committees with diverse multidisciplinary expertise, flexible regulatory regimes, and international harmonisation of standards. The integration of scientific, social, ethical and policy input offers a mechanism by

which governance can remain highly responsive to emerging developments in the field, for example, gene drives, human germline editing, or synthetic biology. We conclude that flexibility and responsiveness are central to governance mechanisms and that external technology assessment and wider social engagement, including ethics, must be integrated into governance to ensure that it can respond rapidly to new concerns (Zuo *et al.*, 2019).

Responsible innovation in genome engineering should encompass a holistic approach that would facilitate safe innovation. This can be achieved by integrating ethical principles into the innovation process, by establishing mechanisms for engaging the public and other stakeholders, by ensuring equity and inclusiveness, and by protecting the environment and ecosystems. Robust adaptive governance and societal dialogue could help ensure accountability and trust (Zeng *et al.*, 2018).

CONCLUSION

Genome engineering is certainly one of the most promising technologies that can revolutionize the field of medicine, agriculture, and the environment. Considering the fact that current technologies are developing at an incredible rate, ethically and socially sensitive questions are brought to light concerning their social and ecological impact. Especially GMOs and gene editing might have a drastic impact on our biodiversity and ecosystems and reduce our resilience in the long run. The implementation of genome engineering and of artificial life development will need to be done in an ethically and socially responsible manner. The application of the principles that integrate responsibility and social and ecological justice to genome engineering and GMOs would help to achieve responsible innovation.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest.

GENERATIVE AI STATEMENT

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used for the writing of this manuscript, nor for the creation of images, graphics, tables, or their corresponding captions.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. The publisher does not guarantee or endorse any product that may be reviewed in this article or any claim made by its manufacturer.

REFERENCES

- Adjovi, I.S.M., 2025. A worldwide itinerary of research ethics in science for a better social responsibility and justice: a bibliometric analysis and review. *Front. Res. Metr. Anal.*, 10: 1504937.
- Almeida, M., Ranisch, R., 2022. Beyond safety: mapping the ethical debate on heritable genome editing interventions. *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, 9(1): 139.
- Ashraf, A., Iqbal, M.N., 2021. Genital Diseases are a Serious Limitation to Animal Reproduction. *PSM Vet. Res.*, 6(1): 16-18.
- Ayanoğlu, F.B., Elçin, A.E., Elçin, Y.M., 2020. Bioethical issues in genome editing by CRISPR-Cas9 technology. *Turk. J. Biol.*, 44(2): 110-120.
- Baylis, F., Darnovsky, M., Hasson, K., Krahn, T.M., 2020. Human germline and heritable

genome editing: the global policy landscape. *CRISPR J.*, 3(5): 365-377.

- Bojarczuk, A., 2024. Ethical aspects of human genome research in sports—A narrative review. *Genes.*, 15(9): 1216.
- Cyranoski, D., 2019. The CRISPR-baby scandal: what's next for human gene-editing. *Nature.*, 566(7745): 440-443.
- 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.
- Goyal, Y., 2023. The moral implications of genetic engineering. *Int. J. Adv. Res.*, 11(08): 1094-8.
- Gyngell, C., 2017. Gene editing and the health of future generations. *J. R. Soc. Med.*, 110(7): 276-279.
- Hayenhjelm, M., Nordlund, C., 2025. Consequence Arguments for and Against Germline Editing. In: Hayenhjelm, M., Nordlund, C. (Eds.), *The Risks and Ethics of Human Gene Editing: A Philosophical Guide to the Arguments*. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden, pp. 117-151.
- Iqbal, M.N., 2020. COVID-19 Pandemic: The Potential Role of Nanotechnology and Nanomedicine in Vaccine Development. *Int. J. Nanotechnol. Allied Sci.*, 4(2): 44-46.
- Iqbal, M.N., Ashraf, A., Iqbal, A., 2019. Can Nanotechnology Improve Detection of the Seed-borne Pathogens through PCR? *Int. J. Nanotechnol. Allied Sci.*, 3(2): 50-52.
- Jasanoff, S., Hurlbut, J.B., Saha, K., 2019. Democratic governance of human germline genome editing. *CRISPR J.*, 2(5): 266-271.
- Joo, J.H., Lee, S., Kim, K.P., 2025. Precision gene editing: The power of CRISPR-Cas in modern genetics. *Mol. Ther. Nucleic Acids.*, 36(4): 102733.

- Joseph, A.M., Karas, M., Ramadan, Y., Joubran, E., Jacobs, R.J., 2022. Ethical Perspectives of Therapeutic Human Genome Editing From Multiple and Diverse Viewpoints: A Scoping Review. *Cureus*, 14(11): e31927.
- Lu, Y., Yan, J., Ou, G., Fu, L., 2023. A review of recent progress in drug doping and gene doping control analysis. *Molecules (Basel, Switzerland)*, 28(14): 5483.
- Macpherson, I., Roqué, M.V., Segarra, I., 2019. Ethical Challenges of Germline Genetic Enhancement. *Front. Genet.*, 10: 767.
- Martin, P., Morrison, M., Turkmendag, I., Nerlich, B., McMahon, A., de Saille, S., Bartlett, A., 2020. Genome editing: the dynamics of continuity, convergence, and change in the engineering of life. *New Genet. Soc.*, 39(2): 219-242.
- Namdarian, L., Sharifzadeh, R., Khedmatgozar, H.R., 2022. Ethics in Science and Technology Policy-Making: A Proposed Normative Framework. *Bull. Sci. Technol. Soc.*, 42(4): 117-132.
- Niemiec, E., Howard, H.C., 2020. Ethical issues related to research on genome editing in human embryos. *Comput. Struct. Biotechnol. J.*, 18: 887-896.
- Ormond, K.E., Mortlock, D.P., Scholes, D.T., Bombard, Y., Brody, L.C., Faucett, W.A., Garrison, N.A., Hercher, L., Isasi, R., Middleton, A., 2017. Human germline genome editing. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.*, 101(2): 167-176.
- Rubeis, G., Steger, F., 2018. Risks and benefits of human germline genome editing: An ethical analysis. *Asian Bioeth. Rev.*, 10(2): 133-141.
- Solti, L., Fébel, H., 2026. Genetically Modified and Gene-Edited Organisms—Objectives, Public Perception and Applications. *Biol.*, 15(17): 1563.
- Zeng, Y., Li, J., Li, G., Huang, S., Yu, W., Zhang, Y., Chen, D., Chen, J., Liu, J., Huang, X., 2018. Correction of the Marfan syndrome pathogenic FBN1 mutation by base editing in human cells and heterozygous embryos. *Mol. Ther.*, 26(11): 2631-2637.
- Zuo, E., Sun, Y., Wei, W., Yuan, T., Ying, W., Sun, H., Yuan, L., Steinmetz, L.M., Li, Y., Yang, H., 2019. Cytosine base editor generates substantial off-target single-nucleotide variants in mouse embryos. *Science*, 364(6437): 289-292.