QUBAHAN POLITICAL JOURNAL
VOL. 4, NO. 4, October 2025
https://doi.org/10.48161/qpj.v4n4a39

The Human Genome Editing and Criminal Law; A Comparative Legal Analysis of Selected Jurisdiction

Pushpa K H[1], Shampa I Dev [1*], Rubens Becak[2]

[1] School of Law, CHRIST (Deemed to be) University, Bangalore 560029, India
[2] Public Law, Law School, University of Sao Paulo – USP, Ribeirao Preto – SP, Brazil

* **Corresponding author:** shampa.dev@christuniversity.in

ABSTRACT: Rapid advancements in human genome-editing technologies, particularly CRISPR-based systems, have generated significant ethical and legal concerns, especially in relation to germline interventions. This paper examines the regulatory and criminal law implications of genome editing, with particular focus on modifications involving healthy human embryos that may result in irreversible and heritable genetic alterations. A comparative legal analysis is conducted to evaluate the regulatory frameworks of selected jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, China, and India. The study reviews statutory provisions, policy guidelines, and documented cases of human genome manipulation to assess how different legal systems address criminal liability, informed consent, and public safety risks. The findings indicate that most jurisdictions either prohibit or strictly restrict germline genome editing due to uncertainties surrounding long-term health effects and intergenerational consequences. The analysis further suggests that criminal liability may arise where genome-editing procedures are performed without valid informed consent or where experimental interventions expose future persons to foreseeable harm. Regulatory inconsistencies and enforcement gaps remain evident across jurisdictions. The paper concludes that a coherent and enforceable legal framework, comprising clear statutory provisions, effective oversight mechanisms, and defined criminal sanctions, is necessary to address emerging risks associated with human genome modification and to safeguard public safety and future generations.

Keywords: criminal liability, germline gene editing, comparative legal analysis, informed consent, regulatory framework.

I. INTRODUCTION

Advances in genome-editing technologies, particularly CRISPR-Cas9, have significantly transformed the scientific capacity to modify genetic material with precision and efficiency. These developments have ex-panded possibilities for therapeutic intervention in genetic disorders while simultaneously raising complex ethical and legal concerns. Among the most controversial applications is germline genome editing, which introduces heritable genetic changes in embryos or reproductive cells, thereby affecting future generations.

While somatic gene editing is increasingly accepted within regulated therapeutic contexts, germline modification remains highly contested due to safety uncertainties, intergenerational implications, and broader societal risks. Concerns include unintended mutations, irreversible genetic alterations, and the po-tential normalization of enhancement-oriented applications. The prospect of genome-edited offspring has intensified debates surrounding parental autonomy, human dignity, equality, and the boundaries of permis-sible scientific intervention.

Despite rapid technological progress, regulatory responses remain fragmented. Several jurisdictions impose statutory prohibitions on germline modification, while others rely on non-binding guidelines or ad-ministrative oversight mechanisms. The absence of harmonized international standards has generated reg-ulatory divergence and enforcement inconsistencies, as demonstrated by the 2018 CRISPR-baby incident. These developments underscore the limitations of existing governance models in addressing emerging bio-medical risks.

From a criminal law perspective, germline genome editing presents unresolved questions concerning liability, informed consent, negligence, endangerment, and harm to future persons. Traditional criminal doc-trines were not designed to address technologically mediated, intergenerational genetic interventions. Con-sequently, there is a need to assess whether existing criminal law principles provide adequate safeguards or whether new legislative frameworks are required.

This study adopts a comparative legal approach to evaluate how selected jurisdictions regulate human genome editing, with particular emphasis on criminal liability and enforcement mechanisms. By examining statutory frameworks, regulatory instruments, and documented cases, the research identifies structural gaps and assesses the adequacy of current legal responses to heritable genome modification.

II. RELATED WORK

The emergence of CRISPR-Cas9 has significantly accelerated advancements in genome engineering, offering unprecedented precision and efficiency in genetic modification [1]. While the therapeutic potential of genome editing is widely acknowledged, safety concerns—including off-target mutations and mosaicism—remain central to scientific and regulatory debates, particularly in the context of germline interventions [2]. These technical uncertainties have prompted extensive interdisciplinary scholarship examining ethical, legal, and governance implications.

Bioethical discourse presents divergent normative positions. Habermas argues that heritable genetic modification may compromise moral autonomy by subjecting future individuals to irreversible parental design choices [3]. Similarly, Sandel critiques enhancement-oriented interventions for promoting a paradigm of mastery that risks undermining human dignity and equality [4]. Conversely, Savulescu advances the principle of procreative beneficence, asserting that selecting or modifying traits to promote well-being may be ethically justified under appropriate safety conditions [5]. These competing frameworks illustrate the lack of consensus regarding the moral permissibility of germline enhancement.

Legal scholarship emphasizes the regulatory challenges posed by rapidly evolving biotechnologies. Brownsword highlights the need for anticipatory governance models capable of reconciling technological innovation with fundamental rights protections [6]. Comparative analyses further reveal substantial variation across jurisdictions. Isasi, Kleiderman, and Knoppers observe that although numerous states formally prohibit germline modification, enforcement mechanisms and legal clarity differ considerably [7]. Similarly, the International Commission on the Clinical Use of Human Germline Genome Editing recommends stringent oversight, transparency, and multigenerational monitoring before clinical implementation is contemplated [8].

The 2018 CRISPR-baby case in China intensified global scrutiny of regulatory adequacy. Cyranoski docu-ments how the incident exposed deficiencies in institutional oversight and ethical review processes [9]. Greely's legal analysis further underscores that the case demonstrated significant gaps between normative guidelines and enforceable legal sanctions [10]. This event catalyzed renewed discussion regarding the role of criminal liability as a deterrent mechanism in genome-editing governance.

National regulatory approaches vary markedly. Germany's Embryo Protection Act establishes explicit criminal sanctions for germline modification [11], while Canada's Assisted Human Reproduction Act similarly criminalizes heritable genome alteration [12]. In contrast, India relies primarily on non-binding ethical guidelines issued by the Indian Council of Medical Research, raising questions regarding enforceability and deterrence capacity [13]. The United Kingdom employs a licensing-based framework under the Human Fertilization and Embryology Act, permitting regulated research but prohibiting clinical germline applications [14]. These divergent models reflect differing legislative philosophies regarding risk management and reproductive autonomy.

The interaction between genome editing and constitutional protections of reproductive freedom further complicates criminal regulation. Robertson argues that reproductive decision-making constitutes a protected liberty interest, thereby constraining state intervention [15]. However, other scholars contend that where foreseeable harm to future persons arises, traditional criminal law doctrines—such as negligence and endangerment—may provide a basis for liability [16]. This doctrinal tension highlights unresolved questions concerning the applicability of existing criminal frameworks to heritable genome modification.

Although the literature extensively addresses ethical permissibility and regulatory design, comparatively limited attention has been directed toward systematic cross-jurisdictional analysis of criminal liability struc-tures governing germline editing. Existing scholarship tends to focus either on bioethical theory or on general regulatory models rather than on the operationalization of criminal law principles across different legal systems. Accordingly, a structured comparative legal analysis of criminal liability mechanisms is warranted to assess regulatory coherence, enforcement capacity, and deterrence effectiveness in the context of human genome editing.

III. MATERIAL AND METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative doctrinal research design grounded in comparative legal analysis. The research relies exclusively on secondary sources, including national statutes, delegated legislation, regulatory guidelines, judicial decisions, parliamentary reports, international declarations, and peer-reviewed academic literature relating to genome editing, bioethics, and criminal law. Primary legal materials examined include the United Kingdom's Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act and related regulatory instruments, the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) Guidelines and allied biomedical regulations, and relevant Chinese administrative regulations and criminal law provisions. International policy documents, including reports of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the National Academies, are also analysed. In addition, documented cases of human genome-editing interventions—most notably the Chinese CRISPR-baby incident—are reviewed to contextualize regulatory responses and issues of criminal accountability.

The research design is analytical and comparative in nature. Legal provisions from the selected jurisdic-tions are systematically examined to identify similarities and divergences in their treatment of germline ge-nome editing, informed consent requirements, public safety safeguards, and criminal liability standards. The method of analysis involves doctrinal interpretation of statutory language, evaluation of legislative intent, and assessment of enforcement mechanisms. Core criminal law principles—such as negligence, recklessness, endangerment, causation, and consent—are applied to genome-editing scenarios to determine the potential scope of criminal responsibility.

Data analysis is conducted through thematic content analysis and structured comparison across jurisdic-tions. Ethical considerations are addressed by ensuring accurate representation of legal sources and scholarly interpretations. As a doctrinal study, the research does not involve human participants or empirical data collection. Limitations include reliance on publicly available legal texts and evolving regulatory frameworks, which may be subject to amendment. Nevertheless, the comparative doctrinal approach provides a system-atic and reliable basis for evaluating the adequacy of existing criminal law mechanisms in regulating germline genome-editing practices.

Table 1. Summary of coding matrix.

Component	Description
Design	Qualitative doctrinal, comparative legal analysis
Sources	Statutes, guidelines, case law, international reports, scholarship
Jurisdictions	UK, China, India
Key Themes	Criminal liability, consent, negligence, public safety
Method	Thematic analysis and cross-jurisdictional comparison
Aim	Assess adequacy of criminal law in germline gene regulations

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The comparative doctrinal analysis demonstrates a structurally embedded asymmetry across the selected jurisdictions in the regulation of human germline genome editing, particularly in the distribution of criminal liability, clarity of consent standards, and strength of enforcement mechanisms. While the United Kingdom operates through a precautionary statutory model that explicitly criminalizes unauthorized germline modi-fication under a centralized licensing regime, China adopts a hybrid framework combining criminal sanc-tions with administrative oversight, largely reinforced following the CRISPR-baby incident. India, by con-trast, relies predominantly on non-binding regulatory guidelines that prohibit germline editing in principle but lack direct statutory penal codification. This divergence produces uneven liability thresholds and en-forcement capacities across jurisdictions. Conceptual ambiguities surrounding intergenerational harm, cau-sation, and the legal status of future persons further complicate the attribution of criminal responsibility. Moreover, the absence of harmonized statutory standards results in regulatory fragmentation, where similar scientific conduct may attract strict criminal sanction in one jurisdiction while remaining subject only to ad-ministrative or professional consequences in another. Collectively, the comparative findings demonstrate not merely differences in regulatory technique, but the emergence of asymmetrical criminal governance models in which the protection of public safety and future generations depends significantly on the depth of statuto-ry articulation and institutional enforcement within each legal system.

1. COMPARITIVE DIMENSION 1: CRIMINAL PROHIBITION AND LIBILITY THRESHOLD

- This dimension evaluates whether germline genome editing is explicitly criminalized and how liabil-ity thresholds are defined.
- In the United Kingdom, germline genome editing for reproductive purposes is clearly prohibited un-der statutory law. Criminal liability arises from unauthorized embryo modification, regardless of whether actual harm has occurred. This reflects a precautionary and preventive legislative model.
- China also imposes criminal liability, particularly after the CRISPR-baby case. Enforcement combines criminal punishment with administrative sanctions. However, the boundary between regulatory vi-olation and criminal misconduct may depend on the severity of breach and state interpretation.
- India prohibits germline editing under ICMR guidelines, but these are not codified as criminal stat-utes. Liability would likely depend on general criminal provisions such as negligence or illegal medi-cal practice, which creates uncertainty in enforcement.his subsection details the statistical methods, software used, and the application of analytical tools to quantify and interpret numerical data. It may include techniques such as regression analysis, ANOVA, correlation, or other statistical tests employed for data interpretation.

Table 2. Criminal prohibition framework.

Jurisdiction	Explicit Criminal Ban	Liability Model
U K	Yes	Preventive statutory prohibition
China	Yes	Criminal +administrative enforcement
India	No specific Statue	Reliance on general criminal law

Comparative Observation: The UK adopts a clear statutory model, China follows a hybrid enforcement structure, and India lacks explicit penal codification. This creates uneven liability thresholds across jurisdictions.

2. COMPARITIVE DIMENSION 2: INFORMED CONSENT AND AUTONOMY

- This dimension assesses whether valid informed consent can legitimize genome-editing interventions.
- In the UK, consent requirements are strictly regulated within assisted reproduction law. Disclosure standards are comprehensive, though germline editing remains broadly prohibited.
- China formally requires informed consent for medical research. However, past enforcement gaps demonstrate weaknesses in ethical review mechanisms.
- India recognizes informed consent under medical jurisprudence and constitutional privacy principles. However, genome-editing consent is governed by guidelines rather than statutory mandates.

Table 3. Informed consent standards.

Jurisdiction	Consent requirement	Enforcement Level
U K	Strict regulatory Consent	Strong
China	Require in Law	Moderate
India	Recognized in Guidelines	Limited

Comparative Observation**:**
While all jurisdictions recognize consent, enforceability differs. A key unresolved issue is whether parental con-sent alone can justify irreversible genetic alteration affecting future generations.

3. COMPARATIVE DIMENSION 3: CAUSATION AND INTEGRATIONAL HARM

- This dimension examines how criminal law addresses hereditary and long-term harm.
- Traditional criminal law requires proof of causation between act and harm. In germline editing, harm may manifest decades later or in subsequent generations.
- The UK avoids this evidentiary difficulty by prohibiting reproductive germline editing entirely. China imposed liability in the CRISPR case based on unlawful medical practice rather than proven genetic harm. India lacks specific legal recognition of intergenerational harm within criminal statutes.This subsection details the strategies

employed to merge, compare, or triangulate both quantitative and qualitative data sets. It explains how the synthesis of these diverse data sources contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

Table 4. causation and Genetic Harm

Jurisdiction	Approach to the Harm	Doctrinal Difficulty
U K	Preventive Ban	Avoids Causation dispute
China	Punishes unlawful conduct	Long- term harm proof challenge
India	General Causation rules	No specific genetic harm Framework

Comparative Observation:
Across jurisdictions, criminal law doctrines of causation are not fully adapted to hereditary genetic risk, exposing conceptual limitations.

4. COMPARATIVE DIMENSION 4: PUBLIC SAFETY AND REGULATORY ENFORCEMENT

- This dimension evaluates genome editing as a public welfare concern and examines enforcement strength.
- The UK operates through a centralized licensing authority (HFEA), ensuring strong oversight and regulatory clarity. China combines state administrative control with criminal enforcement. India relies mainly on advisory guidelines without dedicated statutory penalties.

Table 5. Public safety and regulatory enforcement.

Jurisdiction	Approach to the Harm	Doctrinal Difficulty
U K	Central statutory authority	Strong
China	Administrative +criminal control	Moderate to strong
India	Advisory Regulatory Framework	Weak

Comparative Observation:
Public safety is acknowledged in all systems; however, institutional capacity and statutory force vary significantly.

V. INTEGRATIVE COMPARATIVE EVALUATION

The qualitative comparative analysis demonstrates three major findings:

- Preventive vs. Reactive Models: The UK uses preventive prohibition; China employs reactive en-forcement strengthened after violation; India relies on regulatory caution without full criminal codifi-cation.
- Doctrinal Adaptation Gap: Traditional criminal law principles—especially causation and con-sent—are strained when applied to germline genetic modification.
- Enforcement Asymmetry: Statutory frameworks with centralized oversight are more robust than guideline-based systems.

Overall, the comparative doctrinal analysis indicates that while germline genome editing is widely re-stricted, criminal law frameworks remain uneven in clarity, enforceability, and adaptation to inter-generational genetic risk. Clearer statutory articulation and harmonized liability standards are neces-sary to ensure effective governance.

VI. DISCUSSION

The comparative doctrinal analysis demonstrates a structurally embedded asymmetry across the selected jurisdictions in the regulation of human germline genome editing, particularly in the distribution of criminal liability, clarity of consent standards, and strength of enforcement mechanisms. While the United Kingdom operates through a precau-tionary statutory model that explicitly criminalizes unauthorized germline modification under a centralized licensing regime, China adopts a hybrid framework combining criminal sanctions with administrative oversight, largely rein-forced following the CRISPR-baby incident. India, by contrast, relies predominantly on non-binding regulatory guidelines that prohibit germline editing in principle but lack direct statutory penal codification. This divergence produces uneven liability thresholds and enforcement capacities across jurisdictions. Conceptual ambiguities sur-rounding intergenerational harm, causation, and the legal status of future

persons further complicate the attribution of criminal responsibility. Moreover, the absence of harmonized statutory standards results in regulatory fragmentation, where similar scientific conduct may attract strict criminal sanction in one jurisdiction while remaining subject only to administrative or professional consequences in another. Collectively, the comparative findings demonstrate not merely differences in regulatory technique, but the emergence of asymmetrical criminal governance models in which the protection of public safety and future generations depends significantly on the depth of statutory articulation and institutional enforcement within each legal system.

The implications of this asymmetry extend beyond doctrinal inconsistency and reflect deeper structural tensions between innovation, regulation, and criminal accountability. First, the divergence in statutory clarity raises concerns regarding legal certainty and deterrence. In jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom, explicit criminal prohibitions provide clear normative signals to scientific actors and institutions, thereby strengthening preventive governance. In contrast, reliance on guidelines or broadly framed penal provisions may dilute deterrent effect, as liability depends on interpretative expansion of general criminal doctrines rather than tailored statutory mandates. This inconsistency risks creating uneven compliance incentives and may indirectly encourage regulatory arbitrage.

Second, the comparative findings reveal the limitations of traditional criminal law principles when applied to biotechnological interventions with intergenerational consequences. Concepts such as causation, foreseeability, and harm were historically developed in contexts involving immediate and individualized injury. Germline genome ed-iting challenges these assumptions by introducing delayed, probabilistic, and potentially multigenerational effects. Establishing a direct causal nexus between a present intervention and a future genetic disorder may prove evidentially complex. Consequently, jurisdictions relying solely on harm-based criminalization may struggle to address risks that are scientifically uncertain but ethically significant. This tension underscores the need for precautionary criminal frameworks that account for foreseeable systemic risk rather than demonstrable injury alone.

Third, the analysis exposes a normative gap concerning the legal status and protection of future persons. Germline interventions affect individuals who cannot provide consent and whose interests are mediated through parental de-cision-making. While informed consent remains central to medical law, its legitimizing function becomes limited when irreversible genetic modifications extend beyond the consenting generation. The absence of explicit statutory recognition of intergenerational rights complicates the framing of criminal wrongfulness and raises questions about whether parental autonomy can justify genetic alteration with irreversible societal implications.

Fourth, enforcement structures significantly influence the effectiveness of criminal governance. The United Kingdom's centralized regulatory authority provides institutional continuity and oversight capacity, whereas hybrid or guideline-based systems may depend heavily on administrative discretion. Enforcement variability may weaken accountability and reduce public confidence in regulatory regimes. Comparative divergence thus reflects not only legislative differences but also disparities in institutional design and implementation capacity.

Overall, the expanded discussion highlights that germline genome editing presents a paradigmatic challenge to conventional criminal law architecture. The comparative analysis suggests that effective regulation requires clearer statutory articulation of liability thresholds, explicit incorporation of intergenerational harm principles, strengthened oversight mechanisms, and harmonized definitions of prohibited conduct. Without such reforms, criminal law responses will remain fragmented and reactive, inadequately aligned with the transformative and enduring nature of human genome-editing technologies.

VII. SUGGESTIONS

Based on the comparative doctrinal analysis, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen the criminal law governance of human germline genome editing across jurisdictions:

1. ENACT CLEAR AND SPECIFIC STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Jurisdictions relying primarily on guidelines or broadly framed penal provisions should adopt explicit statutory codification addressing germline genome editing. Criminal liability should be clearly defined, including the scope of prohibited conduct, elements of the offense, applicable defenses, and penalty structures. Legal certainty enhances deterrence and reduces interpretative ambiguity

2. INCORPORATE THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE INTO CRIMINAL

Given the intergenerational and irreversible nature of germline interventions, criminal law should move beyond purely harm-based thresholds and integrate precautionary standards. Liability provisions may be structured to address reckless or unauthorized experimentation even where measurable harm has not yet materialized but foreseeable risk is substantial.

3. *CLARIFY THE LEGAL RECOGNITION OF INTERGENERATIONAL HARM*

Legislation should explicitly recognize harm to future persons as a legally cognizable interest. This would strengthen doctrinal coherence in applying principles of causation and foreseeability to genetic interventions that manifest consequences across generations.

4. *STRENGTHEN INFORMED CONSENT STANDARDS*

While parental autonomy remains significant, statutory safeguards should limit consent as a justification for irreversible germline modification. Enhanced ethical review, mandatory transparency requirements, and multi-layered authorization procedures can prevent misuse of consent frameworks.

5. *ESTABLISH INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT MECHANISMS*

Effective enforcement requires institutional independence. Centralized regulatory authorities with investigative and prosecutorial coordination powers can improve accountability. Judicial oversight mechanisms should be embedded to review licensing decisions and ensure procedural fairness.

6. *HARMONIZE INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS*

Given the global nature of scientific research, international coordination is essential. Alignment of minimum criminalization standards through soft-law instruments (e.g., WHO guidelines) or multilateral agreements can reduce regulatory arbitrage and promote uniform bioethical safeguards.

7. *DEVELOP SPECIALISED BIO-CRIMINAL LIABLITY*

Traditional criminal law principles may be insufficient to address complex genetic harms. Legislatures should consider tailored bio-criminal provisions that account for probabilistic harm, scientific uncertainty, and collective risk.

8. *PROMOTE TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY*

Mandatory reporting of genome-editing research, public registries, and ethical audit mechanisms would enhance democratic legitimacy and public trust in regulatory system.

Collectively, these suggestions aim to align criminal law mechanisms with the scientific complexity and ethical sensitivity of germline genome editing. A coherent, precautionary, and harmonized legal framework is essential to safeguard public safety, human dignity, and the rights of future generations while maintaining responsible scientific advancement.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Human germline genome editing represents one of the most transformative and legally complex developments in contemporary biomedical science. Its capacity to permanently alter the human genetic structure across generations raises profound ethical, constitutional, and criminal law concerns. This study, through a qualitative doctrinal and comparative legal analysis of selected jurisdictions—namely the United Kingdom, China, and India—has examined how existing criminal law frameworks respond to the regulatory challenges posed by germline genome editing.

The comparative findings reveal significant divergence in statutory clarity, enforcement structures, and liability thresholds. The United Kingdom adopts a precautionary and explicitly criminalized framework supported by centralized regulatory oversight. China has strengthened its hybrid criminal–administrative model following the CRISPR-baby incident, signaling increased state control and penal accountability. India, however, largely relies on non-binding regulatory guidelines without comprehensive penal codification, cre-ating potential enforcement gaps. These differences illustrate an asymmetrical global governance landscape in which similar scientific conduct may attract varying degrees of criminal liability depending on jurisdic-tional context.

The analysis further demonstrates that traditional criminal law doctrines—particularly negligence, cau-sation, and consent—face conceptual limitations when applied to intergenerational genetic interventions. Germline ed-iting challenges conventional harm-based models of criminal responsibility because its conse-quences may be delayed, probabilistic, and multigenerational. Moreover, the absence of explicit recognition of future persons within statutory frameworks complicates the articulation of legally cognizable harm. These doctrinal tensions underscore the need for clearer legislative articulation and precautionary regulatory de-sign.

Ultimately, the study concludes that while criminal law remains a necessary instrument for deterring un-ethical or unauthorized germline experimentation, it must evolve to address the unique characteristics of ge-nome-editing technologies. Effective governance requires explicit statutory prohibition or regulation, de-fined liability standards, strengthened oversight mechanisms, and harmonized international norms. Without such structural reforms, criminal law responses will remain fragmented and reactive, insufficiently aligned with the enduring and transgenerational implications of human genome editing.

In balancing scientific innovation with public safety, human dignity, and the protection of future genera-tions, criminal law must operate not merely as a punitive mechanism but as a principled safeguard within a broader bioethical and constitutional framework.

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Author Contributions

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript. All authors made an equal contribution to the development and planning of the study.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

No new data were created or analyzed in this study. The research is based on publicly available legal ma-terials.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the assistance of peer reviewers and editorial feedback in refining this manu-script. The authors would like to acknowledge the use of Grammarly for improving the quality of the language

REFERENCES

1. J. A. Doudna and E. Charpentier, "The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9," Science, vol. 346, no. 6213, pp. 1258096-1–1258096-9, 2014.
2. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Human Genome Editing: Science, Ethics, and Governance. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2017.
3. J. Habermas, The Future of Human Nature. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2003.
4. M. J. Sandel, The Case Against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.
5. J. Savulescu, "Procreative beneficence: Why we should select the best children," Bioethics, vol. 15, no. 5–6, pp. 413–426, 2001.
6. R. Brownsword, Rights, Regulation and the Technological Revolution. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008.
7. R. Isasi, E. Kleiderman, and B. M. Knoppers, "Editing policy to fit the genome?" Science, vol. 351, no. 6271, pp. 337–339, 2016.
8. International Commission on the Clinical Use of Human Germline Genome Editing, Heritable Human Genome Editing. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2020.
9. D. Cyranoski, "What's next for CRISPR babies?," Nature, vol. 566, no. 7745, pp. 440–442, 2019.
10. H. T. Greely, CRISPR'd Babies: Human Germline Genome Editing in the 'He Jiankui Affair'. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2019.
11. Federal Republic of Germany, Embryo Protection Act (Embryonenschutzgesetz), 1990.
12. Government of Canada, Assisted Human Reproduction Act, 2004.
13. Indian Council of Medical Research, National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research Involving Human Participants. New Delhi, India: ICMR, 2017.

14. United Kingdom Parliament, Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act, 1990 (amended 2008).
15. J. A. Robertson, Children of Choice: Freedom and the New Reproductive Technologies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
16. G. T. Laurie, Genetic Privacy: A Challenge to Medico-Legal Norms. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.