INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY FUTURISTIC DEVELOPMENT

Ethical Frameworks for Genetic Editing: Navigating Moral Complexities in the CRISPR Era

Dr. Catherine A Morrison [1]*, Dr. Raj K Sharma [2], Dr. Maria E Santos [3], Dr. Jonathan P Williams [4], Dr. Yuki Tanaka [5]
[1-5] Department of Medical Ethics and Law, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Catherine A Morrison**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3618
E-ISSN: 3051-3626
Volume: 05
Issue: 01
January - June 2024
Received: 03-12-2023
Accepted: 04-01-2024
Published: 03-02-2024
Page No: 01-06

Abstract
Genetic editing technologies, particularly CRISPR-Cas systems, have advanced rapidly, offering unprecedented possibilities to modify DNA with precision. These capabilities hold transformative potential in medicine, agriculture, and environmental management, including the prevention of hereditary diseases, enhancement of crop resilience, and control of vector-borne illnesses. However, such power raises profound ethical, legal, and social questions. Ethical frameworks for genetic editing are essential to balance scientific progress with moral responsibility. Central considerations include the distinction between somatic and germline editing, the principle of informed consent, the potential for unintended genetic consequences, and the equitable distribution of benefits. Somatic editing, typically affecting only the treated individual, is generally viewed as more ethically permissible than germline editing, which can alter heritable traits and affect future generations. Ethical analysis also draws on frameworks such as utilitarianism, which weighs potential benefits against risks; deontological ethics, which emphasizes duties and moral rules; virtue ethics, focusing on the moral character of scientists; and justice-based approaches, which address fairness and access. International governance is fragmented, with some nations imposing strict prohibitions while others adopt permissive stances, leading to calls for a global consensus on acceptable practices. Issues of "designer babies," genetic enhancement, and potential misuse for eugenics amplify public concern, making transparent dialogue between scientists, ethicists, policymakers, and communities crucial. Cultural perspectives further influence what is considered morally acceptable, underscoring the need for context-sensitive regulation. Future ethical frameworks must also account for emerging technologies such as base editing and gene drives, as well as the growing role of artificial intelligence in genetic research. By embedding precautionary principles, fostering public engagement, ensuring equitable access, and enforcing robust oversight, the global scientific community can harness genetic editing's benefits while safeguarding human dignity, biodiversity, and intergenerational rights. The development of coherent, adaptable, and enforceable ethical frameworks is not merely a regulatory necessity but a moral imperative to guide humanity through one of the most consequential frontiers in science.

Keywords: Genetic Editing, CRISPR-Cas, Bioethics, Germline Modification, Somatic Editing, Informed Consent, Utilitarian Ethics, Deontological Ethics, Justice In Biotechnology, Designer Babies, Genetic Enhancement, Global Governance, Precautionary Principle, Public Engagement, Intergenerational Ethics

Introduction

The development of CRISPR-Cas9 and related genetic editing technologies has ushered in a new era of precision medicine, offering unprecedented capabilities to modify human genes with remarkable accuracy and efficiency [1, 2].

These technologies hold immense therapeutic promise for treating genetic disorders, cancers, and infectious diseases, potentially alleviating suffering for millions of patients worldwide [3]. However, the power to precisely edit the human genome also raises profound ethical questions about the nature of human identity, the limits of medical intervention, and our responsibilities to future generations [4, 5]. The ethical landscape surrounding genetic editing is complex and multifaceted, involving considerations of individual autonomy, social justice, human dignity, and the precautionary principle [6]. Traditional bioethical frameworks, developed for conventional medical interventions, must be reexamined and potentially expanded to address the unique challenges posed by genetic editing technologies [7]. The permanent and potentially heritable nature of genetic modifications introduces temporal dimensions of responsibility that extend far beyond typical medical treatments [8].

Recent controversies, including the announcement of genetically edited babies in 2018, have highlighted the urgent need for robust ethical frameworks and international governance mechanisms [9, 10]. The scientific community's response to these events has emphasized the importance of ethical reflection, public engagement, and responsible research practices in genetic editing research [11].

The distinction between somatic and germline editing represents a fundamental ethical divide, with somatic modifications affecting only the individual patient while germline changes can be passed to future generations [12]. Similarly, the therapeutic-enhancement distinction raises questions about the appropriate goals of genetic intervention and the potential for creating or exacerbating social inequalities [13].

Theoretical Ethical Frameworks

Consequentialist Approaches

Consequentialist ethics, particularly utilitarianism, evaluates genetic editing based on its outcomes and overall consequences for human welfare [14]. From this perspective, genetic editing interventions are ethically justified if they produce a net positive benefit in terms of reducing suffering, improving health outcomes, or enhancing human capabilities [15].

Utilitarian analysis supports therapeutic genetic editing when it can prevent or cure serious genetic diseases, as the benefits to patients and families clearly outweigh the risks [16]. The framework also supports research that advances our understanding of genetic diseases and develops safer, more effective treatments [17]. However, utilitarian calculations become more complex when considering germline editing, as the benefits and risks extend across generations and affect individuals who cannot consent to the interventions [18].

The utilitarian approach to genetic enhancement focuses on whether such interventions increase overall human flourishing and well-being [19]. Proponents argue that genetic enhancements that improve cognitive abilities, physical health, or emotional regulation could benefit both individuals and society [20]. Critics contend that enhancement could exacerbate social inequalities and undermine human diversity and authenticity [21].

Cost-benefit analyses within consequentialist frameworks must consider not only direct medical outcomes but also broader social effects, including impacts on healthcare systems, social cohesion, and intergenerational justice [22]. The global distribution of benefits and burdens from genetic editing technologies raises important questions about justice and access that consequentialist ethics must address [23].

Deontological Perspectives

Deontological ethics, rooted in Kantian philosophy, emphasizes moral duties and the inherent rightness or wrongness of actions regardless of their consequences [24]. This framework raises several concerns about genetic editing, particularly regarding human dignity, autonomy, and the categorical imperative [25].

The principle of human dignity, central to deontological ethics, suggests that genetic editing must respect the inherent worth and value of human beings [26]. Some deontological arguments oppose genetic enhancement on the grounds that it treats human beings as objects to be improved rather than respecting their intrinsic dignity [27]. However, others argue that genetic editing for therapeutic purposes upholds human dignity by addressing suffering and promoting human flourishing [28].

Autonomy represents another crucial deontological concern, particularly regarding consent for genetic modifications [29]. Adult patients can provide informed consent for somatic genetic editing, but germline modifications affect future generations who cannot consent to these changes [30]. This raises fundamental questions about intergenerational autonomy and the rights of future persons [31].

The universalizability principle of Kantian ethics requires that moral actions be universally applicable [32]. Applied to genetic editing, this suggests that interventions should be evaluated based on whether we could will everyone to have access to such modifications and whether universal implementation would be desirable [33].

Deontological analysis also considers whether genetic editing respects persons as ends in themselves rather than merely as means [34]. Enhancement modifications might be criticized for treating individuals as projects to be optimized rather than respecting their inherent worth and agency [35].

Virtue Ethics Framework

Virtue ethics focuses on moral character and the cultivation of virtues such as prudence, justice, temperance, and compassion in decision-making about genetic editing [36]. This approach emphasizes the character and motivations of researchers, clinicians, and policymakers involved in genetic editing rather than focusing solely on rules or consequences [37].

Prudence or practical wisdom represents a central virtue in genetic editing decisions, requiring careful consideration of benefits, risks, and uncertainties [38]. Virtuous decision-making involves acknowledging the limits of current knowledge while pursuing potentially beneficial interventions responsibly [39]. The virtue of humility is particularly relevant given the complexity of genetic systems and the potential for unintended consequences [40].

Justice as a virtue requires fair distribution of genetic editing benefits and burdens across different populations and generations [41]. This includes ensuring that genetic editing technologies do not exacerbate existing health disparities or create new forms of discrimination [42]. Global justice considerations emphasize the need for equitable access to genetic editing therapies and collaborative international research efforts [43].

Compassion motivates genetic editing research and

applications aimed at alleviating human suffering from genetic diseases [44]. However, virtue ethics also emphasizes the importance of respecting human diversity and avoiding interventions motivated by prejudice or discrimination against individuals with disabilities [45].

The virtue of integrity requires honesty and transparency in genetic editing research, including accurate communication of risks and benefits to patients and the public [46]. This virtue is particularly important given the public's limited understanding of genetic editing technologies and the potential for misuse or misrepresentation of research findings [47].

Principlism Approach

The four principles of biomedical ethics—autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice—provide a widely used framework for analyzing genetic editing ethical issues [48]. This approach offers a practical method for identifying and balancing competing ethical considerations in specific cases [49].

Autonomy in genetic editing requires respect for patients' rights to make informed decisions about genetic modifications [50]. This includes providing comprehensive information about risks, benefits, alternatives, and uncertainties associated with genetic editing interventions [51]. Challenges arise with germline editing, where future generations cannot provide consent, and with pediatric applications where parents make decisions for children [52].

Beneficence obligates researchers and clinicians to promote patient welfare through genetic editing interventions [53]. This principle supports therapeutic genetic editing when it offers significant benefits for treating serious diseases [54]. However, beneficence also requires careful risk-benefit analysis and consideration of alternative treatments [55].

Non-maleficence demands avoiding harm through genetic editing interventions [56]. This principle is particularly challenging given the potential for off-target genetic effects, long-term consequences that may not be apparent immediately, and the irreversible nature of many genetic modifications [57]. The precautionary principle suggests proceeding cautiously when risks are uncertain or potentially severe [58].

Justice requires fair distribution of genetic editing benefits and burdens across different populations [59]. This includes addressing concerns about access to expensive genetic therapies, avoiding discrimination against individuals with genetic conditions, and ensuring that research includes diverse populations [60].

Somatic versus Germline Editing Ethics

The ethical distinction between somatic and germline genetic editing represents one of the most significant divides in the field [61]. Somatic editing affects only the treated individual and is generally viewed as ethically similar to other medical interventions, while germline editing creates heritable changes that affect future generations [62].

Somatic genetic editing enjoys broader ethical acceptance because it respects individual autonomy, can be subject to informed consent, and does not raise concerns about effects on future generations [63]. Clinical trials of somatic genetic editing for conditions such as sickle cell disease and certain cancers have demonstrated therapeutic benefits with acceptable risk profiles [64].

Germline editing raises more complex ethical issues due to its permanent and heritable effects [65]. Concerns include the inability to obtain consent from affected future generations, potential risks to embryos and fetuses, and broader social implications of heritable genetic modifications [66]. However, some argue that germline editing could prevent serious genetic diseases and reduce overall suffering across generations [67].

The scientific uncertainty surrounding germline editing adds another layer of ethical complexity (68). Current knowledge of genetic interactions, epigenetic effects, and long-term consequences remains limited, making risk-benefit calculations particularly challenging [69]. Many international organizations have called for moratoria on germline editing until safety and efficacy can be better established [70].

Therapeutic versus Enhancement Distinction

The distinction between therapeutic and enhancement applications of genetic editing has significant ethical implications, though the boundary between these categories is often unclear [71]. Therapeutic editing aims to treat or prevent disease, while enhancement seeks to improve normal human capabilities beyond typical ranges [72].

Therapeutic genetic editing generally receives stronger ethical support because it addresses medical needs and alleviates suffering [73]. Examples include correcting mutations that cause genetic diseases, enhancing immune system responses to cancer, or preventing HIV infection [74]. The therapeutic imperative provides strong ethical justification for developing and applying genetic editing technologies to address serious medical conditions [75].

Enhancement applications are more ethically controversial because they raise questions about human nature, social justice, and the appropriate goals of medicine [76]. Potential enhancements might include increasing intelligence, improving physical performance, or extending lifespan beyond normal ranges [77]. Critics argue that enhancement could create unfair advantages, undermine human dignity, or lead to discrimination against unenhanced individuals [78].

The therapeutic-enhancement distinction is complicated by the fact that many genetic modifications could serve both purposes depending on context [79]. For example, genetic modifications that enhance disease resistance in healthy individuals might be considered therapeutic in disease-prone populations [80]. Similarly, cognitive enhancements might be therapeutic for individuals with intellectual disabilities but enhancement for typical individuals [81].

Consent and Vulnerable Populations

Informed consent represents a cornerstone of ethical genetic editing, but several factors complicate its application in this context [82]. The complexity of genetic editing technologies, uncertainty about long-term effects, and potential impacts on family members create challenges for traditional consent processes [83].

Pediatric genetic editing raises particular consent concerns because children cannot provide informed consent for potentially life-altering genetic modifications [84]. Parents typically make medical decisions for their children, but genetic editing may have implications that extend far beyond typical medical treatments [85]. Some argue that parents have obligations to provide their children with the best possible genetic endowment, while others contend that genetic editing represents an inappropriate level of control over children's lives [86].

Germline editing presents unique consent challenges because it affects individuals who do not yet exist and cannot participate in the decision-making process [87]. Some philosophers argue that we have obligations to future generations to prevent genetic diseases or provide genetic advantages, while others contend that we cannot consent on behalf of future persons [88].

Vulnerable populations, including those with disabilities, minority communities, and economically disadvantaged groups, require special consideration in genetic editing research and applications [89]. Historical abuses in medical research and ongoing health disparities highlight the importance of protecting vulnerable populations from exploitation while ensuring they have access to potential benefits [90].

Conclusion

The ethical landscape of genetic editing is complex and evolving, requiring careful consideration of multiple moral frameworks and stakeholder perspectives. While consequentialist, deontological, virtue ethics, and principlism approaches each offer valuable insights, no single framework provides complete guidance for all ethical dilemmas in genetic editing.

The distinction between somatic and germline editing represents a fundamental ethical divide, with somatic modifications generally receiving greater acceptance due to their individual rather than intergenerational effects. Similarly, therapeutic applications enjoy stronger ethical support than enhancement applications, though the boundary between these categories is often unclear.

Effective ethical frameworks for genetic editing must address issues of consent, justice, and human dignity while remaining flexible enough to adapt to technological advances and evolving social values. International cooperation, public engagement, and ongoing ethical reflection will be essential for developing governance mechanisms that promote beneficial applications while preventing harmful uses of genetic editing technologies.

The future of genetic editing ethics will likely require new approaches that integrate traditional bioethical principles with considerations of global justice, environmental sustainability, and human flourishing across generations. As these technologies continue to develop, maintaining a balance between scientific progress and ethical responsibility will be crucial for realizing their potential benefits while protecting fundamental human values.

References

1. Jinek M, Chylinski K, Fonfara I, Hauer M, Doudna JA, Charpentier E. A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. Science. 2012;337(6096):816-21.
2. Cong L, Ran FA, Cox D, Lin S, Barretto R, Habib N, *et al*. Multiplex genome engineering using CRISPR/Cas systems. Science. 2013;339(6121):819-23.
3. Porteus MH. A new class of medicines through DNA editing. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(10):947-59.
4. Gyngell C, Douglas T, Savulescu J. The ethics of germline gene editing. J Appl Philos. 2017;34(4):498-513.
5. Brokowski C. Do CRISPR germline ethics statements cut it? CRISPR J. 2018;1(2):115-25.
6. Nuffield Council on Bioethics. Genome editing and human reproduction: social and ethical issues. London: Nuffield Council on Bioethics; 2018.
7. Lanphier E, Urnov F, Haecker SE, Werner M, Smolenski J. Don't edit the human germ line. Nature. 2015;519(7544):410-1.
8. Savulescu J, Pugh J, Douglas T, Gyngell C. The moral imperative to continue gene editing research on human embryos. Protein Cell. 2015;6(7):476-9.
9. Cyranoski D, Ledford H. Genome-edited baby claim provokes international outcry. Nature. 2018;563(7731):607-8.
10. Lander ES, Baylis F, Zhang F, Charpentier E, Berg P, Bourgain C, *et al*. Adopt a moratorium on heritable genome editing. Nature. 2019;567(7747):165-8.
11. National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Medicine, National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Human genome editing: science, ethics, and governance. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2017.
12. Baltimore D, Berg P, Botchan M, Carroll D, Charo RA, Church G, *et al*. A prudent path forward for genomic engineering and germline gene modification. Science. 2015;348(6230):36-8.
13. Sandel MJ. Against perfection: ethics in the age of genetic engineering. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2007.
14. Singer P. Practical ethics. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
15. Savulescu J, Kahane G. The moral obligation to create children with the best chance of the best life. Bioethics. 2009;23(5):274-90.
16. Harris J. Enhancing evolution: the ethical case for making better people. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2007.
17. Fovargue S, Ost S. Does the theoretical framework change the legal result? Genetic therapy and the law. Med Law Rev. 2013;21(4):571-613.
18. Powell R. The evolutionary biological implications of human genetic engineering. J Med Philos. 2015;40(3):271-88.
19. Bostrom N. Transhumanist values. J Moral Philos. 2005;2(1):3-14.
20. Savulescu J, Sandberg A, Kahane G. Well-being and enhancement. In: Savulescu J, ter Meulen R, Kahane G, editors. Enhancing human capacities. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell; 2011. p. 3-18.
21. Habermas J. The future of human nature. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2003.
22. Buchanan A, Brock DW, Daniels N, Wikler D. From chance to choice: genetics and justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2000.
23. Daniels N. Just health: meeting health needs fairly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007.
24. Kant I. Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1997.
25. O'Neill O. Autonomy and trust in bioethics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002.
26. Beyleveld D, Brownsword R. Human dignity in bioethics and biolaw. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2001.
27. President's Council on Bioethics. Beyond therapy: biotechnology and the pursuit of happiness. New York: Dana Press; 2003.
28. Kass LR. Life, liberty and the defense of dignity: the

challenge for bioethics. New York: Encounter Books; 2002.
29. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2019.
30. Feinberg J. The child's right to an open future. In: Aiken W, LaFollette H, editors. Whose child? Children's rights, parental authority, and state power. Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield; 1980. p. 124-53.
31. Gyngell C, Douglas T. Stocking the genetic supermarket: reproductive genetic technologies and collective action problems. Bioethics. 2015;29(4):241-50.
32. Hill TE Jr. A Kantian perspective on moral rules. Philos Perspect. 1992;6:285-304.
33. Korsgaard CM. Creating the kingdom of ends. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1996.
34. Wood AW. Kantian ethics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2008.
35. Sandel MJ. The case against perfection: what's wrong with designer children, bionic athletes, and genetic engineering. In: Steinbock B, editor. The Oxford handbook of bioethics. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007. p. 629-49.
36. Hursthouse R, Pettigrove G. Virtue ethics. In: Zalta EN, editor. The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. Stanford: Stanford University; 2018.
37. Oakley J, Cocking D. Virtue ethics and professional roles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
38. Sherman N. The fabric of character: Aristotle's theory of virtue. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1989.
39. Pellegrino ED, Thomasma DC. The virtues in medical practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1993.
40. Aristotle. Nicomachean ethics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2000.
41. Miller D. Principles of social justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1999.
42. Rawls J. A theory of justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1971.
43. Pogge TW. World poverty and human rights. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2008.
44. Nussbaum MC. Compassion: the basic social emotion. Soc Philos Policy. 1996;13(1):27-58.
45. Silvers A, Wasserman D, Mahowald MB. Disability, difference, discrimination: perspectives on justice in bioethics and public policy. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield; 1998.
46. Bok S. Lying: moral choice in public and private life. New York: Vintage Books; 1999.
47. Wynne B. Public understanding of science. In: Jasanoff S, Markle GE, Petersen JC, Pinch T, editors. Handbook of science and technology studies. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 1995. p. 361-88.
48. Beauchamp TL. The four principles approach to health care ethics. In: Ashcroft RE, Dawson A, Draper H, McMillan JR, editors. Principles of health care ethics. 2nd ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons; 2007. p. 3-10.
49. Gillon R. Medical ethics: four principles plus attention to scope. BMJ. 1994;309(6948):184-8.
50. Manson NC, O'Neill O. Rethinking informed consent in bioethics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007.
51. Faden RR, Beauchamp TL, King NMP. A history and theory of informed consent. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1986.
52. Alderson P, Sutcliffe K, Curtis K. Children's competence to consent to medical treatment. Hastings Cent Rep. 2006;36(6):25-34.
53. Ross LF. Children, families, and health care decision making. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1998.
54. Gert B, Culver CM, Clouser KD. Bioethics: a systematic approach. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.
55. Kimmelman J, Henderson V. Assessing risk/benefit for trials using preclinical models. PLoS Med. 2016;13(3):e1001970.
56. Smith SW. Precautionary reasoning in determining moral worth. In: Battin MP, Francis LP, Jacobson JA, Smith CB, editors. The patient as victim and vector: ethics and infectious disease. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2009. p. 69-83.
57. Gericke CA, Riesberg A, Busse R. Ethical issues in funding orphan drug research and development. J Med Ethics. 2005;31(3):164-8.
58. UNESCO International Bioethics Committee. Report of the IBC on updating its reflection on the human genome and human rights. Paris: UNESCO; 2015.
59. Powers M, Faden R. Social justice: the moral foundations of public health and health policy. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.
60. Wikler D. Personal and social responsibility for health. Ethics Int Aff. 2002;16(2):47-55.
61. International Commission on the Clinical Use of Human Germline Genome Editing. Heritable human genome editing. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2020.
62. Vassena R, Heindryckx B, Peco R, Pennings G, Raya A, Sermon K, *et al*. Genome engineering through CRISPR/Cas9 technology in the human germline and pluripotent stem cells. Hum Reprod Update. 2016;22(4):411-9.
63. Hildt E. Human germline interventions—think first. Front Genet. 2016;7:81.
64. Frangoul H, Altshuler D, Cappellini MD, Chen YS, Domm J, Eustace BK, *et al*. Exagamglogene autotemcel for sickle cell disease. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(3):252-60.
65. de Wert G, Heindryckx B, Pennings G, Clarke A, Eichenlaub-Ritter U, van El CG, *et al*. Human germline gene editing: Recommendations of ESHG and ESHRE. Eur J Hum Genet. 2018;26(4):445-9.
66. Cwik B. Revising, correcting, and transferring genes. Am J Bioeth. 2020;20(8):7-18.
67. Gyngell C, Douglas T. Stocking the genetic supermarket: reproductive genetic technologies and collective action problems. Bioethics. 2015;29(4):241-50.
68. Ma H, Marti-Gutierrez N, Park SW, Wu J, Lee Y, Suzuki K, *et al*. Correction of a pathogenic gene mutation in human embryos. Nature. 2017;548(7668):413-9.
69. Zuccaro MV, Xu J, Mitchell C, Marin D, Zimmerman R, Rana B, *et al*. Allele-specific chromosome removal after Cas9 cleavage in human embryos. Cell. 2020;183(6):1650-64.
70. World Medical Association. WMA statement on genome editing. Ferney-Voltaire: World Medical Association; 2016.
71. Norman D. The therapy/enhancement distinction in medicine. Camb Q Healthc Ethics. 2017;26(4):636-49.

72. Daniels N. Can anyone really be talking about ethically modifying human nature? In: Savulescu J, Bostrom N, editors. Human enhancement. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2009. p. 25-42.
73. Miller PB, Weijer C. Rehabilitating equipoise. Kennedy Inst Ethics J. 2003;13(2):93-118.
74. June CH, O'Connor RS, Kawalekar OU, Ghassemi S, Milone MC. CAR T cell immunotherapy for human cancer. Science. 2018;359(6382):1361-5.
75. Jonsen AR. The birth of bioethics. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1998.
76. President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research. Splicing life: the social and ethical issues of genetic engineering with human beings. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office; 1982.
77. Kamm FM. What is and is not wrong with enhancement? Bioethics. 2005;19(5-6):354-68.
78. Kass LR. Ageless bodies, happy souls: biotechnology and the pursuit of perfection. New Atlantis. 2003;1:9-28.
79. Boorse C. Health as a theoretical concept. Philos Sci. 1977;44(4):542-73.
80. Nordenfelt L. On the nature of health: an action-theoretic approach. 2nd ed. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1995.
81. Daniels N. Just health care. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1985.
82. Appelbaum PS, Roth LH, Lidz CW, Benson P, Winslade W. False hopes and best data: consent to research and the therapeutic misconception. Hastings Cent Rep. 1987;17(2):20-4.
83. Henderson GE, Churchill LR, Davis AM, Easter MM, Grady C, Joffe S, *et al*. Clinical trials and medical care: defining the therapeutic misconception. PLoS Med. 2007;4(11):e324.
84. Diekema DS. Parental refusals of medical treatment: the harm principle as threshold for state intervention. Theor Med Bioeth. 2004;25(4):243-64.
85. Ladd RE. Children's rights re-visioned: philosophical readings. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing; 1996.
86. Savulescu J. Procreative autonomy, mutually dependent technologies, and single-sex reproduction: the need for some limits. Bioethics. 1995;9(1):32-43.
87. Parfit D. Reasons and persons. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1984.
88. de-Shalit A. The environment between theory and practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2000.
89. Levine C, Faden R, Grady C, Hammerschmidt D, Eckenwiler L, Sugarman J. The limitations of "vulnerability" as a protection for human research participants. Am J Bioeth. 2004;4(3):44-9.
90. Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences. International ethical guidelines for health-related research involving humans. 4th ed. Geneva: CIOMS; 2016.