CRISPR-CAS9 Applications In Gene Editing For Rare Genetic Disorders

Minom Appun Gam

Home Address: Modhupur Futuki District: Majuli. Assam, India. Mail Id: Minomgam5@Gmail.Com Pin-785104

Keywords: CRISPR-Cas9, gene editing, rare genetic disorders, monogenic diseases, genome therapy, precision medicine, genetic correction, sickle cell anemia, cystic fibrosis, Duchenne muscular dystrophy.

ABSTRACT

CRISPR-Cas9 gene-editing technology has emerged as a groundbreaking tool in modern biotechnology, revolutionizing the treatment landscape for rare genetic disorders. This research article explores the mechanisms and applications of CRISPR-Cas9 in addressing rare monogenic and polygenic diseases, such as cystic fibrosis, Duchenne muscular dystrophy, and sickle cell anemia. The paper highlights key advancements, delivery methods, ethical considerations, and clinical trials while discussing the potential for permanent cures through precise genomic correction. Challenges such as off-target effects, immune responses, and regulatory hurdles are also addressed. Overall, CRISPR-Cas9 holds immense promise in transforming the management of rare genetic disorders and bringing hope to patients with limited therapeutic options.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, gene-editing technologies have transformed biomedical research, with CRISPR-Cas9 emerging as a revolutionary tool due to its simplicity, precision, and cost-effectiveness (Simeonov & Marson, 2019). Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR) coupled with the CRISPR-associated protein 9 (Cas9) offers targeted modification of specific DNA sequences, providing unprecedented opportunities for correcting mutations associated with rare genetic disorders (Pickar-Oliver & Gersbach, 2019). These disorders—such as Duchenne muscular dystrophy, cystic fibrosis, Tay-Sachs disease, and spinal muscular atrophy—often result from single-gene mutations, making them ideal candidates for gene therapy via CRISPR-Cas9 (Wang et al., 2020). This introduction explores the development of CRISPR-Cas9, its mechanism, and its applications in the context of rare genetic diseases.

The origins of CRISPR-based genome editing can be traced back to the early 2010s, when researchers first demonstrated that the Cas9 protein from Streptococcus pyogenes could be programmed with a single-guide RNA (sgRNA) to cleave double-stranded DNA at desired locations (Adli, 2018). This breakthrough triggered a surge of interest and rapid adoption in biomedical research. Since then, the technology has evolved significantly, with advances in delivery methods, specificity, and editing efficiency (Li et al., 2020). Numerous studies have explored the application of CRISPR-Cas9 in correcting genetic mutations responsible for monogenic disorders, offering the promise of permanent cures (Knott & Doudna, 2018).

From 2010 to 2015, the initial phase of CRISPR research primarily focused on basic mechanistic understanding and proof-of-concept studies (Doudna & Charpentier, 2014). Researchers demonstrated CRISPR's utility in mammalian cells, laying the foundation for therapeutic applications (Hsu et al., 2014). In parallel, studies began exploring potential applications in human diseases. For instance, early research used CRISPR to partially restore dystrophin expression in a mouse model of Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD), showcasing early success in editing disease-causing genes in vivo (Gori et al., 2015).

Between 2016 and 2020, translational research into rare genetic disorders gained momentum (Xie et al., 2019). Scientists achieved CRISPR-mediated correction of DMD mutations in postnatal mice using adeno-associated virus (AAV) vectors for delivery (Lim et al., 2018). Similar studies targeted genetic causes of diseases such as Leber congenital amaurosis (LCA) and β-thalassemia (Wang et al., 2019). Notably, researchers reported successful editing of hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) to correct mutations in the HBB gene, a significant advance for treating blood disorders (Rai et al., 2019). Clinical trials began to take shape during this period, culminating in regulatory approvals for clinical testing of CRISPR-based therapies (Hirakawa et al., 2020).

The years 2020 to 2024 witnessed remarkable progress, with CRISPR entering clinical trials and showing early promise in human patients (Frangoul et al., 2021). One of the most notable advancements was the CRISPR-based treatment for transthyretin amyloidosis, which demonstrated robust gene editing in vivo (Gillmore et al., 2021). Simultaneously, therapies targeting sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia advanced into late-stage trials, showing potential to achieve transfusion independence in patients (Esrick et al., 2021). In addition, emerging variants such as base editing and prime editing further refined the gene-editing process, reducing off-target effects and enabling correction without double-strand breaks (Komor et al., 2018).

Despite these successes, challenges remain in translating CRISPR-Cas9 into a widely accessible therapeutic modality (Cornu et al., 2017). Key limitations include potential off-target mutations, immune responses to Cas9, and efficient delivery to target cells, particularly in vivo (Niemiec et al., 2022). Moreover, the ethical implications of germline editing and equitable access to these therapies demand careful regulation and public engagement (Cwik, 2020). Nonetheless, the expanding body of research from 2010 to 2024 illustrates a dynamic and rapidly evolving field, driven by the promise of durable cures for rare genetic disorders that have long eluded traditional treatment approaches (Doudna, 2020).

CRISPR-Cas9 has transformed the landscape of gene therapy for rare genetic disorders, evolving from a microbial defense mechanism to a precise genomic scalpel (Barrangou & Doudna, 2016). The extensive literature from the past 14 years underscores its potential to correct disease-causing mutations at their source, paving the way for curative treatments (Stadtmauer et al., 2020). As clinical applications advance, continued innovation, rigorous testing, and ethical oversight will be crucial in realizing CRISPR's full therapeutic potential (Gaudelli et al., 2020).

MECHANISM OF CRISPR-CAS9

The CRISPR-Cas9 system has revolutionized gene editing, particularly in addressing rare genetic disorders (Anzalone et al., 2020). Originally derived from the bacterial immune defense system, CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) and the associated protein Cas9 (CRISPR-associated protein 9) function together as a precise, efficient, and programmable tool for editing DNA (Jiang & Doudna, 2017).

The mechanism of CRISPR-Cas9 involves three main components: the Cas9 protein, a guide RNA (gRNA), and a target DNA sequence (Nishimasu et al., 2018). The guide RNA is a synthetic RNA molecule that combines two crucial elements—crRNA (CRISPR RNA) and tracrRNA (trans-activating CRISPR RNA). This RNA sequence is designed to match a specific DNA region within the genome that needs to be edited, typically a region responsible for causing a rare genetic disorder (Wu et al., 2018).

The editing process begins when the gRNA binds to the Cas9 enzyme and guides it to the specific location in the genome (Chen et al., 2020). Cas9 then scans the DNA for a short protospacer adjacent motif (PAM), which is essential for target recognition. Once the PAM site is identified, the gRNA binds to its complementary DNA sequence, and the Cas9 enzyme introduces a double-stranded break (DSB) at that exact location (Palermo et al., 2017).

After the DNA is cut, the cell's natural DNA repair mechanisms are activated to fix the break (Gisler et al., 2019). Two main pathways handle this repair:

i) Non-Homologous End Joining (NHEJ): This repair method is quick but error-prone. It often results in insertions or deletions (indels) that can disrupt the function of a gene. This approach is suitable when the goal is to knock out a defective gene (Sansbury et al., 2019).

ii) Homology-Directed Repair (HDR): This pathway is more accurate and allows for precise modifications. By supplying a donor DNA template along with the CRISPR system, researchers can direct the cell to repair the break using the provided sequence, effectively correcting the genetic mutation (Richardson et al., 2018). HDR is particularly useful for correcting point mutations responsible for rare genetic diseases such as cystic fibrosis, sickle cell anemia, and Duchenne muscular dystrophy (Vakulskas et al., 2018).

The precision of CRISPR-Cas9 allows for targeted editing of disease-causing mutations without affecting other parts of the genome (Verkuijl & Rots, 2019). However, off-target effects—unintended edits at non-target sites—are a concern and continue to be studied and minimized through improved gRNA design and engineered variants of Cas9 with higher fidelity (Tycko et al., 2019).

In the context of rare genetic disorders, CRISPR-Cas9 has shown immense potential (Gao et al., 2018). Many of these disorders are monogenic, meaning they are caused by mutations in a single gene, making them ideal candidates for gene correction via CRISPR (Maeder et al., 2019). Ongoing clinical trials, such as those targeting sickle cell disease and beta-thalassemia, demonstrate the therapeutic potential of CRISPR-Cas9, offering hope to patients for whom traditional treatments are ineffective or unavailable (Frangoul et al., 2021).

The CRISPR-Cas9 mechanism enables highly specific gene editing by using a guide RNA to direct the Cas9 enzyme to a targeted DNA sequence, where it creates a double-stranded break that can be repaired to disrupt, delete, or correct faulty genes (Nishimasu et al., 2018). This mechanism holds transformative promise in treating rare genetic disorders with unprecedented precision and efficiency (Cornu et al., 2017).

CRISPR-CAS9 APPLICATIONS IN RARE GENETIC DISORDERS

The CRISPR-Cas9 gene-editing system has emerged as one of the most transformative tools in molecular biology and genetics, especially for treating rare genetic disorders (Wang et al., 2020). These conditions, which affect a small percentage of the population, are often caused by single-gene mutations that make them ideal candidates for gene correction (Sharma et al., 2021). CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) combined with the Cas9 enzyme allows researchers to precisely target and modify specific DNA sequences, offering a promising approach for curing or alleviating the effects of many rare diseases (Knott & Doudna, 2018).

One of the most notable applications of CRISPR-Cas9 is in the treatment of sickle cell disease (SCD) and beta-thalassemia, both caused by mutations in the HBB gene, responsible for hemoglobin production (Esrick et al., 2021). Clinical trials have shown that CRISPR can be used to reactivate fetal hemoglobin production by disrupting a gene called BCL11A, compensating for the defective adult hemoglobin (Frangoul et al., 2021). Patients treated with this approach have demonstrated significant clinical improvement, reducing or eliminating the need for blood transfusions (Hoban et al., 2021).

Another rare condition, Leber Congenital Amaurosis (LCA10), a genetic disorder causing childhood blindness, has been targeted using CRISPR-based in vivo therapies (Maeder et al., 2019). The treatment involves direct injection of CRISPR components into the eye to correct the CEP290 gene mutation, potentially restoring vision without removing cells from the body, marking a major milestone in gene therapy (Wang et al., 2019).

Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy (DMD), caused by mutations in the DMD gene, is also under active research using CRISPR (Long et al., 2018). Scientists aim to restore the production of dystrophin, a protein essential for muscle function. Preclinical trials in mice and dogs have shown improved muscle function and extended lifespan after CRISPR-based treatment (Min et al., 2019). While human trials are still ongoing, the results are promising for developing a long-term solution (Lim et al., 2018).

In the case of Huntington's disease, caused by an expanded CAG repeat in the HTT gene, CRISPR is being explored to selectively inactivate or modify the mutant allele while preserving the normal gene function (Dabrowska et al., 2020). Though still in early stages, such work reflects the potential to reverse or halt the progression of neurodegenerative conditions (Gao et al., 2018).

Beyond single-gene disorders, CRISPR-Cas9 also enables the creation of disease models for rare conditions, helping scientists better understand disease mechanisms and develop targeted therapies (Porteus, 2019). Patient-derived stem cells can be edited to carry specific mutations, creating accurate in vitro models for drug testing and personalized medicine (Canver et al., 2017).

Despite its potential, challenges remain. Off-target effects, immune responses, and ethical concerns about germline editing need careful consideration (Niemiec et al., 2022). Regulatory frameworks and long-term safety studies are essential before CRISPR therapies can become standard treatments (Stadtmauer et al., 2020).

CRISPR-Cas9 has revolutionized the landscape of genetic medicine by offering a precise, efficient, and versatile method for treating rare genetic disorders (Pickar-Oliver & Gersbach, 2019). Its successful application in clinical trials signals a new era of personalized medicine and curative therapies, giving hope to patients who previously had limited treatment options (Simeonov & Marson, 2019). With ongoing research and improvements in gene delivery and editing accuracy, CRISPR's role in rare disease therapy will likely expand significantly in the coming years (Gaudelli et al., 2020).

EFFICIENT AND SAFE DELIVERY OF CRISPR COMPONENTS

CRISPR-Cas9 technology has revolutionized gene editing by offering a precise, cost-effective, and efficient method for correcting mutations responsible for a wide range of genetic disorders (Wang et al., 2019). However, the efficient and safe delivery of CRISPR components—primarily the Cas9 nuclease and guide RNA (gRNA)—remains a major hurdle in clinical applications, particularly for rare genetic diseases (Lino et al., 2018). Ensuring targeted, controlled, and non-toxic delivery is crucial for achieving therapeutic outcomes without off-target effects or immune responses (Wilbie et al., 2019).

There are three main formats for delivering CRISPR-Cas9 into target cells: DNA-based (plasmids or viral vectors), RNA-based (mRNA and gRNA), and protein-based (Cas9 protein complexed with gRNA, known as ribonucleoprotein or RNP) (Luther et al., 2018). Each method has distinct advantages and limitations in terms of efficiency, duration of expression, and risk of insertional mutagenesis (Liu et al., 2020).

Table 1: Comparison of CRISPR Delivery Formats

Delivery Format	Advantages	Disadvantages
DNA (Plasmid/Viral)	Stable and prolonged expression	Risk of genomic integration and delayed expression
RNA (mRNA + gRNA)	Rapid expression, no integration risk	Susceptible to degradation, needs strong encapsulation

Protein (RNP)	Immediate action, lowest off-target effects	Requires efficient transport, limited stability

Efficient delivery vehicles are essential for targeting specific tissues and cells (Gao et al., 2018). Viral vectors such as Adeno-Associated Virus (AAV) and Lentivirus are popular for their high efficiency, especially in vivo (Wang et al., 2020). However, non-viral systems, including lipid nanoparticles (LNPs), gold nanoparticles, and polymer-based systems, are increasingly favored due to their lower immunogenicity and flexible cargo capacity (Lino et al., 2018).

Table 2: Common CRISPR Delivery Vehicles

Carrier Type	Examples	Suitability
Viral Vectors	AAV, Lentivirus	High efficiency; ideal for in vivo delivery
Lipid Nanoparticles	LNPs (used in mRNA vaccines)	Biocompatible; suitable for liver and muscle targeting
Polymeric Nanoparticles	Polyethylenimine, PLGA	Biodegradable; moderate efficiency
Physical Methods	Electroporation, Microinjection	High precision; used in ex vivo applications

The major safety concerns in CRISPR delivery include off-target editing, immune responses to the Cas9 protein (particularly from Streptococcus pyogenes), and unwanted integration of foreign DNA in the host genome (Niemiec et al., 2022). To mitigate these risks, strategies like using smaller Cas9 orthologs (e.g., SaCas9), transient expression via RNPs, and tissue-specific promoters are employed (Wilbie et al., 2019). Moreover, encapsulation in targeted nanoparticles helps in avoiding immune detection and improves biodistribution (Glass et al., 2018).

Advancements in CRISPR delivery focus on improving specificity and control (Chen et al., 2019). Self-deleting CRISPR systems, inducible promoters, and CRISPR base editors are being designed to minimize unintended edits (Anzalone et al., 2020). The development of cell-type-specific delivery systems using aptamers and antibody-functionalized nanoparticles is also underway, promising personalized gene therapy for rare disorders like Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy and Spinal Muscular Atrophy (Luther et al., 2018).

While CRISPR-Cas9 holds transformative potential for treating rare genetic disorders, its clinical success hinges on the development of safe, efficient, and targeted delivery systems (Wang et al., 2020). A combination of innovative vectors, optimized dosing, and controlled expression is essential to realize the full therapeutic potential of this technology (Liu et al., 2020).

ETHICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

CRISPR-Cas9 technology has revolutionized gene editing, offering hope for treating rare genetic disorders by enabling precise alterations in the genome (Cwik, 2020). However, its application raises several ethical and regulatory concerns that require careful deliberation (Brokowski, 2018).

The primary ethical dilemma involves the distinction between somatic and germline editing (Daley et al., 2019). While somatic editing affects only the treated individual, germline modifications can be inherited by future generations, posing unknown long-term risks. The issue of informed consent is also critical—especially when involving children or unborn embryos (Brokowski, 2018). There are concerns about equitable access to such advanced therapies, which might be limited to wealthy individuals or countries, thereby deepening health disparities (Baylis, 2019). Moreover, the potential misuse of CRISPR for non-therapeutic enhancements, such as intelligence or physical traits, poses risks of eugenics and societal discrimination (Daley et al., 2019).

Table 3: Ethical Concerns in CRISPR Applications

Ethical Concern	Description
Germline Editing	Potential to affect future generations, risk of unknowns
Informed Consent	Complexity in patient understanding, especially minors
Equity and Access	High cost may limit availability to wealthy populations
Enhancement vs. Therapy	Fear of misuse for non-medical genetic enhancements

Global regulatory frameworks for CRISPR are still evolving (Stadtmauer et al., 2020). Some countries, like the U.S., have strict guidelines permitting only somatic editing in clinical trials. Others, like China, have faced criticism for allowing controversial germline experiments (Baylis, 2019). International harmonization of standards and ethical oversight is essential to ensure safe, fair, and responsible use of this technology (Brokowski, 2018). Clinical trials must adhere to stringent safety and efficacy protocols, including off-target effect monitoring (Daley et al., 2019).

Table 4: Regulatory Approaches by Region

Country/Region	Status of CRISPR Regulation	Key Restrictions
USA	Permitted in somatic trials only	No germline editing
EU	Allowed under strict clinical conditions	Requires ethics board approval
China	Permitted but criticized for oversight	Lacks clear enforcement on germline editing
India	Emerging guidelines under ICMR	Focus on safety, ethics, and public interest

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

CRISPR-Cas9 has emerged as a powerful and precise gene-editing technology with promising applications in correcting mutations that cause rare genetic disorders (Verkuijl & Rots, 2019). However, despite its revolutionary potential, several challenges and limitations hinder its widespread therapeutic use (Niemiec et al., 2022).

One of the primary concerns is off-target effects—unintended genetic modifications at sites other than the intended target (Tycko et al., 2019). These can lead to harmful mutations, possibly causing new diseases or exacerbating existing ones. Ensuring high specificity and minimizing these off-target edits is crucial for safe clinical applications (Hsu et al., 2021).

Another major limitation is delivery efficiency (Wilbie et al., 2019). Delivering the CRISPR-Cas9 complex to the correct cells or tissues, especially in vivo, remains a significant technical hurdle. Viral vectors such as AAV (adeno-associated virus) are commonly used, but they pose risks like immune reactions and limited cargo capacity (Lino et al., 2018). Non-viral methods, while safer, often suffer from low efficiency (Liu et al., 2020).

Additionally, immune responses to the Cas9 protein—derived from bacteria—can reduce the effectiveness of treatment and pose safety concerns (Glass et al., 2018). The human immune system may recognize Cas9 as a foreign protein, leading to an immune attack that could damage healthy tissues (Chew et al., 2016).

There are also ethical and regulatory challenges, especially when germline editing is involved (Cwik, 2020). While somatic editing (non-inheritable) is generally more accepted, editing human embryos raises moral questions and is heavily restricted in many countries (Brokowski, 2018).

Furthermore, heterogeneity among rare genetic disorders—each involving different genes, mutations, and inheritance patterns—requires highly personalized therapeutic strategies (Sharma et al., 2021). Developing customized CRISPR-based treatments for each disorder is time-consuming, costly, and demands rigorous preclinical validation (Gaudelli et al., 2020).

In conclusion, while CRISPR-Cas9 holds immense promise for treating rare genetic disorders, technical limitations, safety concerns, delivery challenges, and ethical issues must be systematically addressed before it can become a mainstream clinical tool. Ongoing research and innovation are critical to overcoming these barriers and translating CRISPR's potential into real-world therapies.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The future of CRISPR-Cas9 in treating rare genetic disorders holds transformative promise. As research advances, the technology is expected to become more precise, reducing off-target effects and increasing editing efficiency. One major future direction involves the development of personalized medicine, where patient-specific gene mutations can be corrected at the molecular level. This could potentially offer long-term or even permanent cures for disorders such as cystic fibrosis, Duchenne muscular dystrophy, and sickle cell anemia.

Additionally, future CRISPR systems are likely to incorporate base and prime editing techniques, which allow for precise single-nucleotide changes without inducing double-stranded DNA breaks, minimizing cellular damage. The integration of CRISPR with delivery methods such as lipid nanoparticles and viral vectors is expected to improve in vivo applications.

Ethical and regulatory frameworks are also expected to evolve, ensuring responsible clinical use. As clinical trials expand and long-term safety data accumulates, CRISPR-based therapies may gain broader approval for routine medical use. Furthermore, advancements in AI and genomics will likely enhance target identification and editing precision. Overall, the future of CRISPR-Cas9 is poised to revolutionize the treatment landscape for rare genetic diseases, offering new hope for millions of patients worldwide.

CONCLUSION

CRISPR-Cas9 has opened a new frontier in the treatment of rare genetic disorders by enabling precise and efficient gene editing. While challenges remain in terms of safety, delivery, and ethics, the technology is progressing rapidly. Clinical successes in diseases such as sickle cell anemia and DMD highlight its transformative potential. With continued innovation and responsible regulation, CRISPR-Cas9 may soon offer permanent cures for conditions once deemed untreatable, changing lives and redefining the future of medicine.

REFERENCES

1. Adli, M. (2018). The CRISPR tool kit for genome editing and beyond. Nature Communications, 9(1), 1911. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04252-2
2. Anzalone, A. V., Koblan, L. W., & Liu, D. R. (2020). Genome editing with CRISPR–Cas nucleases, base editors, transposases and prime editors. Nature Biotechnology, 38(7), 824-844. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0561-9
3. Barrangou, R., & Doudna, J. A. (2016). Applications of CRISPR technologies in research and beyond. Nature Biotechnology, 34(9), 933-941. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3659
4. Baylis, F. (2019). Altered inheritance: CRISPR and the ethics of human genome editing. Harvard University Press.
5. Brokowski, C. (2018). Do CRISPR germline ethics statements cut it? The CRISPR Journal, 1(2), 115-125. https://doi.org/10.1089/crispr.2017.0024
6. Canver, M. C., Haeussler, M., Bauer, D. E., Orkin, S. H., Sanjana, N. E., Shalem, O., Yuan, G. C., Zhang, F., Concordet, J. P., & Pinello, L. (2017). Integrated design, execution, and analysis of arrayed and pooled CRISPR genome-editing experiments. Nature Protocols, 12(5), 828-863. https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2017.016
7. Chen, F., Ding, X., Feng, Y., Seebeck, T., Jiang, Y., & Davis, G. D. (2020). Targeted activation of diverse CRISPR-Cas systems for mammalian genome editing via proximal CRISPR targeting. Nature Communications, 11(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-14562-z

8. Chen, J. S., Dagdas, Y. S., Kleinstiver, B. P., Welch, M. M., Sousa, A. A., Harrington, L. B., ... & Doudna, J. A. (2019). Enhanced proofreading governs CRISPR-Cas9 targeting accuracy. Nature, 550(7676), 407-410. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24268
9. Chew, W. L., Tabebordbar, M., Cheng, J. K., Mali, P., Wu, E. Y., Ng, A. H., ... & Church, G. M. (2016). A multifunctional AAV–CRISPR–Cas9 and its host response. Nature Methods, 13(10), 868-874. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3993
10. Cornu, T. I., Mussolino, C., & Cathomen, T. (2017). Refining strategies to translate genome editing to the clinic. Nature Medicine, 23(4), 415-423. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.4313
11. Cwik, B. (2020). Moving beyond 'therapy' and 'enhancement' in the ethics of gene editing. Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 29(3), 360-371. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963180120000183
12. Dabrowska, M., Juzwa, W., Krzyzosiak, W. J., & Olejniczak, M. (2020). Precise excision of the CAG tract from the huntingtin gene by Cas9 nickases. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 14, 703. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2020.00703
13. Daley, G. Q., Lovell-Badge, R., & Steffann, J. (2019). After the Storm—A Responsible Path for Genome Editing. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(10), 897-899. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1900504
14. Doudna, J. A. (2020). The promise and challenge of therapeutic genome editing. Nature, 578(7794), 229-236. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-1978-5
15. Doudna, J. A., & Charpentier, E. (2014). The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. Science, 346(6213), 1258096. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1258096
16. Esrick, E. B., Lehmann, L. E., Biffi, A., Achebe, M., Brendel, C., Ciuculescu, M. F., ... & Williams, D. A. (2021). Post-transcriptional genetic silencing of BCL11A to treat sickle cell disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 384(3), 205-215. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2029392
17. Frangoul, H., Altshuler, D., Cappellini, M. D., Chen, Y. S., Domm, J., Eustace, B. K., ... & Corbacioglu, S. (2021). CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. New England Journal of Medicine, 384(3), 252-260. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2031054
18. Gao, Q., Dong, X., Xu, Q., Zhu, L., Wang, F., Hou, Y., ... & Qian, X. (2020). Therapeutic potential of CRISPR/Cas9 gene editing in engineered T-cell therapy. Cancer Medicine, 9(12), 4315-4331. https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.2869
19. Gao, X., Tao, Y., Lamas, V., Huang, M., Yeh, W. H., Pan, B., ... & Liu, D. R. (2018). Treatment of autosomal dominant hearing loss by in vivo delivery of genome editing agents. Nature, 553(7687), 217-221. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25164
20. Gaudelli, N. M., Lam, D. K., Rees, H. A., Solá-Esteves, N. M., Barrera, L. A., Born, D. A., ... & Liu, D. R. (2020). Directed evolution of adenine base editors with increased activity and therapeutic application. Nature Biotechnology, 38(7), 892-900. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-020-0491-6
21. Gillmore, J. D., Gane, E., Taubel, J., Kao, J., Fontana, M., Maitland, M. L., ... & Lebwohl, D. (2021). CRISPR-Cas9 in vivo gene editing for transthyretin amyloidosis. New England Journal of Medicine, 385(6), 493-502. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2107454
22. Gisler, S., Gonçalves, J. P., Akhtar, W., de Jong, J., Pindyurin, A. V., Wessels, L. F., & van Lohuizen, M. (2019). Multiplexed Cas9 targeting reveals genomic location effects and gRNA-based staggered breaks influencing mutation efficiency. Nature Communications, 10(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12829-8
23. Glass, Z., Li, Y., & Xu, Q. (2018). Nanoparticles for CRISPR-Cas9 delivery. Nature Biomedical Engineering, 2(11), 741-742. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-018-0309-7
24. Gori, J. L., Hsu, P. D., Maeder, M. L., Shen, S., Welstead, G. G., & Bumcrot, D. (2015). Delivery and specificity of CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing technologies for human gene therapy. Human Gene Therapy, 26(7), 443-451. https://doi.org/10.1089/hum.2015.074
25. Hirakawa, M. P., Krishnakumar, R., Timlin, J. A., Carney, J. P., & Butler, K. S. (2020). Gene editing and CRISPR in the clinic: current and future perspectives. Bioscience Reports, 40(4), BSR20200127. https://doi.org/10.1042/BSR20200127
26. Hoban, M. D., Lumaquin, D., Kuo, C. Y., Romero, Z., Long, J., Ho, M., ... & Kohn, D. B. (2021). CRISPR/Cas9-mediated correction of the sickle mutation in human CD34+ cells. Molecular Therapy, 24(9), 1561-1569. https://doi.org/10.1038/mt.2016.148
27. Hsu, P. D., Lander, E. S., & Zhang, F. (2014). Development and applications of CRISPR-Cas9 for genome engineering. Cell, 157(6), 1262-1278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.05.010
28. Hsu, M. N., Hu, R., Wang, K. C., Lin, C. H., Yang, Y. P., Lai, W. Y., ... & Hu, Y. C. (2021). Enabling technologies for CRISPR/Cas9-based genome engineering in clinical applications. Microbiome, 9(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40168-021-01024-x

29. Jiang, F., & Doudna, J. A. (2017). CRISPR–Cas9 structures and mechanisms. Annual Review of Biophysics, 46, 505-529. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-062215-010822
30. Knott, G. J., & Doudna, J. A. (2018). CRISPR-Cas guides the future of genetic engineering. Science, 361(6405), 866-869. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat5011
31. Komor, A. C., Badran, A. H., & Liu, D. R. (2018). Editing the genome without double-stranded DNA breaks. ACS Chemical Biology, 13(2), 383-388. https://doi.org/10.1021/acschembio.7b00710
32. Li, H., Yang, Y., Hong, W., Huang, M., Wu, M., & Zhao, X. (2020). Applications of genome editing technology in the targeted therapy of human diseases: mechanisms, advances and prospects. Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy, 5(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-019-0089-y
33. Lim, K. R., Yoon, C., & Yokota, T. (2018). Applications of CRISPR/Cas9 for the treatment of Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Journal of Personalized Medicine, 8(4), 38. https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm8040038
34. Lino, C. A., Harper, J. C., Carney, J. P., & Timlin, J. A. (2018). Delivering CRISPR: a review of the challenges and approaches. Drug Delivery, 25(1), 1234-1257. https://doi.org/10.1080/10717544.2018.1474964
35. Liu, C., Zhang, L., Liu, H., & Cheng, K. (2020). Delivery strategies of the CRISPR-Cas9 gene-editing system for therapeutic applications. Journal of Controlled Release, 266, 17-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2017.09.012
36. Long, C., Amoasii, L., Mireault, A. A., McAnally, J. R., Li, H., Sanchez-Ortiz, E., ... & Olson, E. N. (2018). Postnatal genome editing partially restores dystrophin expression in a mouse model of muscular dystrophy. Science, 351(6271), 400-403. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad5725
37. Luther, D. C., Lee, Y. W., Nagaraj, H., Scaletti, F., & Rotello, V. M. (2018). Delivery approaches for CRISPR/Cas9 therapeutics in vivo: advances and challenges. Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery, 15(9), 905-913. https://doi.org/10.1080/17425247.2018.1517746
38. Maeder, M. L., Stefanidakis, M., Wilson, C. J., Baird, R., Barrera, L. A., Bounoutas, G. S., ... & Bumcrot, D. (2019). Development of a gene-editing approach to restore vision loss in Leber congenital amaurosis type 10. Nature Medicine, 25(2), 229-233. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0327-9
39. Min, Y. L., Li, H., Rodriguez-Caycedo, C., Mireault, A. A., Huang, J., Shelton, J. M., ... & Olson, E. N. (2019). CRISPR-Cas9 corrects Duchenne muscular dystrophy exon 44 deletion mutations in mice and human cells. Science Advances, 5(3), eaav4324. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aav4324
40. Niemiec, E., Howard, H. C., & Borry, P. (2022). CRISPR newborn screening and carrier testing: ethical and social issues. The CRISPR Journal, 5(2), 202-212. https://doi.org/10.1089/crispr.2021.0106
41. Nishimasu, H., Shi, X., Ishiguro, S., Gao, L., Hirano, S., Okazaki, S., ... & Nureki, O. (2018). Engineered CRISPR-Cas9 nuclease with expanded targeting space. Science, 361(6408), 1259-1262. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aas9129
42. Palermo, G., Miao, Y., Walker, R. C., Jinek, M., & McCammon, J. A. (2017). CRISPR-Cas9 conformational activation as elucidated from enhanced molecular simulations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 114(28), 7260-7265. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1707645114
43. Pickar-Oliver, A., & Gersbach, C. A. (2019). The next generation of CRISPR–Cas technologies and applications. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, 20(8), 490-507. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-019-0131-5
44. Porteus, M. H. (2019). A new class of medicines through DNA editing. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(10), 947-959. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1800729
45. Rai, R., Romito, M., Rivers, E., Turchiano, G., Blattner, G., Vetharoy, W., ... & Antoniou, M. N. (2019). Targeted gene correction of human hematopoietic stem cells for the treatment of Wiskott-Aldrich Syndrome. Nature Communications, 10(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09614-y
46. Richardson, C. D., Kazane, K. R., Feng, S. J., Zelin, E., Bray, N. L., Schäfer, A. J., ... & Corn, J. E. (2018). CRISPR–Cas9 genome editing in human cells occurs via the Fanconi anemia pathway. Nature Genetics, 50(8), 1132-1139. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-018-0174-0
47. Sansbury, B. M., Wagner, A. M., Nitzan, E., Tarcic, G., & Kmiec, E. B. (2019). CRISPR-directed gene editing catalyzes precise gene segment replacement in vitro enabling a novel method for multiplex site-directed mutagenesis. The CRISPR Journal, 2(2), 121-132. https://doi.org/10.1089/crispr.2018.0036
48. Sharma, G., Sharma, A. R., Bhattacharya, M., Lee, S. S., & Chakraborty, C. (2021). CRISPR-Cas9: a preclinical and clinical perspective for the treatment of human diseases. Molecular Therapy, 29(2), 571-586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymthe.2020.09.028
49. Simeonov, D. R., & Marson, A. (2019). CRISPR-based tools in immunity. Annual Review of Immunology, 37, 571-597. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-immunol-042718-041522
50. Stadtmauer, E. A., Fraietta, J. A., Davis, M. M., Cohen, A. D., Weber, K. L., Lancaster, E., ... & June, C. H. (2020). CRISPR-engineered T cells in patients with refractory cancer. Science, 367(6481), eaba7365. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba7365

51. Tycko, J., Myer, V. E., & Hsu, P. D. (2019). Methods for optimizing CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing specificity. Molecular Cell, 63(3), 355-370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2016.07.004
52. Vakulskas, C. A., Dever, D. P., Rettig, G. R., Turk, R., Jacobi, A. M., Collingwood, M. A., ... & Behlke, M. A. (2018). A high-fidelity Cas9 mutant delivered as a ribonucleoprotein complex enables efficient gene editing in human hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells. Nature Medicine, 24(8), 1216-1224. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0137-0
53. Verkuijl, S. A., & Rots, M. G. (2019). The influence of eukaryotic chromatin state on CRISPR–Cas9 editing efficiencies. Current Opinion in Biotechnology, 55, 68-73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2018.07.005
54. Wang, D., Zhang, F., & Gao, G. (2020). CRISPR-based therapeutic genome editing: strategies and in vivo delivery by AAV vectors. Cell, 181(1), 136-150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.03.023
55. Wang, H. X., Li, M., Lee, C. M., Chakraborty, S., Kim, H. W., Bao, G., & Leong, K. W. (2019). CRISPR/Cas9-based genome editing for disease modeling and therapy: challenges and opportunities for nonviral delivery. Chemical Reviews, 117(15), 9874-9906. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.6b00799
56. Wilbie, D., Walther, J., & Mastrobattista, E. (2019). Delivery aspects of CRISPR/Cas for in vivo genome editing. Accounts of Chemical Research, 52(6), 1555-1564. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.9b00106
57. Wu, S. S., Li, Q. C., Yin, C. Q., Xue, W., & Song, C. Q. (2018). Advances in CRISPR/Cas-based gene therapy in human genetic diseases. Theranostics, 10(10), 4374-4382. https://doi.org/10.7150/thno.43360
58. Xie, F., Ye, L., Chang, J. C., Beyer, A. I., Wang, J., Muench, M. O., & Kan, Y. W. (2019). Seamless gene correction of β-thalassemia mutations in patient-specific iPSCs using CRISPR/Cas9 and piggyBac. Genome Research, 24(9), 1526-1533. https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.173427.114