Int. J. Curr. Res. Med. Sci. (2025). 11(1): 8-21

International Journal of Current Research in Medical Sciences

ISSN: 2454-5716

(A Peer Reviewed, Indexed and Open Access Journal)

www.ijcrims.com

Review Article

Volume 11, Issue 1 -2025

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijcrms.2025.11.01.002

Gene Editing Unveiled: Understanding Systems, Types, and Their Applications

Dr. Sharique Ahmad[1], Subuhi Anwar[2]

[1]Professor, Department of Pathology, Era's Lucknow Medical College & Hospital, Era University, Lucknow, India -226003

[2]Research Assistant, Department of Pathology, Era's Lucknow Medical College & Hospital, Era University, and Lucknow, India

*Corresponding author: *diagnopath@gmail.com*

Abstract

In order to access the field of molecular medicine, the conventional healthcare system is at the doorstep. Now, methods that can change DNA coding have been demonstrated by the vast amount of knowledge and continuous research. The methods for editing or altering the genome have developed from previous attempts, such as homing endonucleases, nuclease technologies, and specific chemical procedures. Mega nuclease, Molecular methods that initially surfaced as genome-editing tools include zinc-finger nucleases (ZFNs) and transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs). Because of their off-target side effects, these early technologies have lesser specificity. Furthermore, the primary challenge from the standpoint of biotechnology was to create straightforward yet efficient delivery systems for host cell entrance. Since then, research laboratories have started using short RNAs, such microRNA (miRNA) and short interfering RNA (siRNA), to replace cell lines and lab animals. Because of its increased viability, effectiveness, and multi-role therapeutic usefulness, the recently discovered CRISPR/Cas9 technology seems more promising

Keywords: Medicine, Genome Editing, Biotechnology, Knock-Out, Techniques

Introduction

Advances in genetic analysis and genetic manipulation have made genetics a fascinating field at this time. Advances in genome editing and high-throughput DNA sequencing have had a wide-ranging impact on everything from model organism research to evolutionary studies, food organism improvement, and medical uses. Genetic research has traditionally depended on the identification and examination of spontaneous mutations. This reliance applied to Mendel, Morgan, Avery, and others. In the middle of the 20th century, Muller [1] and Auerbach[2], showed that chemical or radiation treatment could increase the rate of mutagenesis. Subsequent techniques, like as chemical and radiation mutagenesis, created alterations at random locations in the genome, additionally, Some species may produce transposon insertions, which

they depended on. The first targeted genetic alterations were produced in mice and yeast throughout the 1970s and 1980s [3-6]. The homologous recombination technique was necessary for this gene targeting; it was extremely precise yet ineffective, especially in mouse cells. It took careful selection and in-depth characterization to recover the desired items. Adapting gene targeting to other species was challenging due to the scarcity of culturable embryonic stem cells and their low frequency in mammals other than mice [7].This problem has been fixed by modern genome editing technologies, which enable targeted genetic modifications in nearly every kind of cell and organism [8,9].

This review explores the foundational concepts of gene editing, examining its various systems and the specific mechanisms they employ to target and modify genetic sequences. It delves into the diverse types of gene editing, highlighting key differences and advancements in each approach. Furthermore, the discussion extends to real-world applications, displaying how gene editing has become an integral tool in addressing global challenges, such as combating hereditary diseases, improving crop resilience, and developing innovative biotechnological solutions. By understanding the systems, types, and applications of gene editing, we can better appreciate its profound implications for science and society.

Advances in genetic analysis and genetic manipulation have made genetics a fascinating field at this time. Advances in genome editing and high-throughput DNA sequencing have had a wide-ranging impact on everything from model organism research to evolutionary studies, food organism improvement, and medical uses. Genetic research has traditionally depended on the identification and examination of spontaneous mutations. This reliance applied to Mendel, Morgan, Avery, and others. In the middle of the 20th century, Muller [1] and Auerbach[2], showed that chemical or radiation treatment could increase the rate of mutagenesis. Subsequent techniques, like as chemical and radiation mutagenesis, created alterations at random locations in the genome, additionally, Some

species may produce transposon insertions, which they depended on. The first targeted genetic alterations were produced in mice and yeast throughout the 1970s and 1980s [3-6]. The homologous recombination technique was necessary for this gene targeting; it was extremely precise yet ineffective, especially in mouse cells. It took careful selection and in-depth characterization to recover the desired items. Adapting gene targeting to other species was challenging due to the scarcity of culturable embryonic stem cells and their low frequency in mammals other than mice [7].This problem has been fixed by modern genome editing technologies, which enable targeted genetic modifications in nearly every kind of cell and organism [8,9].

This review explores the foundational concepts of gene editing, examining its various systems and the specific mechanisms they employ to target and modify genetic sequences. It delves into the diverse types of gene editing, highlighting key differences and advancements in each approach. Furthermore, the discussion extends to real-world applications, displaying how gene editing has become an integral tool in addressing global challenges, such as combating hereditary diseases, improving crop resilience, and developing innovative biotechnological solutions. By understanding the systems, types, and applications of gene editing, we can better appreciate its profound implications for science and society.

An overview of gene editing or the genome:

Gene editing is the process of changing an organism's genetic code. The purposefully created cutting phenomenon and the spontaneous repair process that the cutting starts are the two foundations of genome engineering. These are cleverly used in gene editing to accomplish a certain goal. There are several methods for gene editing. However, all of the methods rely on the employment of "nucleases," which are enzymes that directly interact with a cell's DNA. It is possible to repurpose nucleases to target a specific location in the genome. Several editing techniques are possible when the site-directed nuclease identifies, attaches to, and produces a DNA strand.

The purpose of gene editing: Utilizing a variety of tools and methods to comprehend the role of a certain gene, gene regulatory region, Single-nucleotide variations are really responsible for almost half of the harmful genetic variants that currently exist. In order to enhance clinical interpretation and comprehension of the ways in which human genetic variations affect health, it is evident that techniques and instruments that can efficiently rectify or introduce single-nucleotide variants must be developed. Apart from these essential characteristics, any gene editing method needs to offer a variety of methods to modify the genome at a specific spot [10].

Various methods of gene editing: Gene knock-out and gene knock-in are the two primary gene editing techniques that can be used. The nuclease breaking the DNA strand is what these techniques rely on. The cell uses either non-homologous end joining repair (NHEJ) or homology-controlled repair (HDR) to try to repair the break after learning this information. The subsequent gene editing strategy will be determined by the repair response to the breakdown.

- **Gene knock-out (KO):** The simplest gene editing technique is to make a gene non-functional and then observe the effects to learn more about how it functions. We call this strategy knock-out. The targeted gene may be knocked out (KO) as a result of base pair insertions and deletions, or indels, caused by the error-prone NHEJ. These indels may result in premature stop codons and/or frame shift mutations that yield a non-functional mRNA. Alternatively, a two-guide-RNA approach might focus on a specific gene region.

- **Gene Knock-In (KI):** "knock-in" is the term for the second gene editing technique. There are several kinds of knock-in strategies with various uses:

• A transgene is inserted into a specific locus.
• Inserting a tag, no matter how big or little, into a gene's coding sequence.
• The process of switching base pairs to create a point mutation.

These three strategies can be used to accomplish various objectives. In the first method, a gene is introduced into the targeted cell, and its function or impact on the phenotypic is examined. The second technique involves either adding a sequence that facilitates the identification or gene product purification for application in biochemical tests, or locating and identifying the gene product inside a cell (for instance, by introducing a fluorescent tag). In the context of genetic illnesses, the latter method is mostly employed to simulate and ultimately treat the impact of point mutations. The homology-directed repair (HDR) is the foundation of the knock-in [11, 12].

Techniques for Editing Genes: Techniques for Editing Genomes We now know more about the molecular and biochemical processes that alter DNA and, therefore, downstream routes because to the biotechnology industry's recent expansion and advancements. Though the field of genome-editing technologies is developing quickly, some biotechnologies have so far showed promise for therapeutic usage. Although the new methods appear promising, the older ones have also been upgraded and enhanced. The following section discusses representative genome-editing methods.

(1) The standard method of genome editing. In its purest form, the method comprises homologous recombination associated with gene intervention, which may not be connected to developing genome-editing tools. Physiological mechanisms involving a double-stranded repair system provide the basis for the approach, which is not very popular or used in labs today. However, new research has indicated that the RAD52 protein plays a significant role in promoting homologous recombination. As a result, this protein has been studied as a potential therapeutic target for BRCA 1 and 2 repair pathways and other malignancies. [13, 14] However, the advent of newer approaches prevented the technique from being widely used as of yet.

(2) Methods of genome editing that use chemicals. Komiyama employed a non-restriction enzyme method called the ARCUT is an

artificially restricted DNA cutter. The pseudo-complementary peptide nucleic acid (pcPNA) is used in this method to identify the chromosomal or telomeric region's cleavage point. The splicing function and excision are provided by a chemical combination of cerium (CE) and EDTA after pcPNA specifies the position. The technique also uses a DNA ligase, which may attach any desired DNA to the spliced location. This specific method has the benefit of being applicable in situations when the concentration of salt is high. The method appeared to be very promising for the clinical market when it was first introduced, but later problems, such as longer turnaround times and, in particular, the production of site-specific pcPNA, became significant obstacles. [15, 16]

(3) Systems of homing endonucleases. Practically speaking, "homing" endocucleases (HEs) is understood to mean lateral transfer of a genomic DNA sequence. The basic idea is that two DNA fragment segments are created when endocnulceases remove a site from a DNA segment. [17] What are these HEs, then? They are naturally occurring nucleases that can splice somewhat longer DNA sequences. They are around the size of 14 bp.[18] Recombinant adenoassociated viruses (rAAVs) have recently been developed, making them effective carriers of genetic tools for genome editing within cells.[19] The synthesis of these nucleases and the creation of vectors for their entrance into cells are engineering challenges related to this technique.[20]Off-target consequences, such as decreased site specificity, decreased DNA integra-tion, and potential host genome alterations, were another problem with rAAV, despite its improvement with improved biotechnology.[21]

(4) Nuclease systems based on proteins. Nuclease proteins are used in these systems to modify DNA sequences. Below is a description of the typical methods.

• Meganucleases: Sometimes present in the genome, these enormous base pair structures are sometimes known as molecular DNA scissors. They have recently been identified as a genetic tool for DNA modification due to their capacity to remove sizable segments of DNA sequences. By altering the recognition sites to produce nicks, which are necessary for a change in DNA sequence, this genetic potential has been controlled in laboratories. These mega nucleases can occasionally be combined by proteins to produce large variations such as DmoCre and E-Drel, which can add nucleotide site-specific cleavage.[22].Two fundamental processes comprise the technique: first, a cleavage site is identified, and then the area is spliced out by endonucleases.[23] Because meganucleases are found naturally and offer very selective site cleavage, they have the advantage of being less hazardous.

Newer methods in the therapeutic setting, however, have prevented them from thriving further.

(5) ZFNs: Using a combinatorial technique, Zinc-finger-binding domain proteins and restriction endonucleases combine to form ZFNs, which consist of entirely constructed structures. When a binding protein domain gets to the target splicing site, it identifies itself. Fok1 are unique restriction endonucleases.After that, I sliced the binding protein domain at a certain codon. Attachment to the DNA chain is limited by the presence of three codons on either side. Its simplicity and specificity have made the approach quite popular in recent years, and it is currently being used in clinical settings for a number of disorders. [24, 25]

(6) **TALENs**: In 2011, It was found that transcription activator-like effector nucleases, or TALENs, exist. Only one nucleotide level of recognition was possible with transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs), but ZFNs made precise genome editing possible. Similar to ZFNs, TALENs include a nuclease linked to a sequence of DNA-binding domains; however, their capacity to recognize individual nucleotides allows for more accurate targeting and specificity. The need to create and validate a new zinc-finger nuclease or TALEN protein for every new target editing site is one of the main drawbacks of platforms like ZFNs and TALENs. [12, 26]

(7) **DNA systems from RNA**: The main components of these systems are the many CRISPR techniques. Some prokaryotic cells, such as Archea, and most likely some bacteria have absorbed the idea of CRISPR, which is a rudimentary notion that comes from an old immune system. [27] SPR, commonly referred to as spacers, is one of the two components of CRISPR.

➢ **CRISPR-Cas9 (2011):**In genome engineering, the creation of CRISPR technology was a significant advance. [28]. Two essential elements of the method are the Cas9 endonuclease and a guide RNA; the Cas9 endonuclease initiates the repair mechanism and cuts target sites, while the guide RNA finds them. CRISPR is a more attractive alternative because of its lower cost and quicker turnaround time, even though both TALENs and CRISPR can edit single-nucleotide genes.The Cas9 protein uses gRNA to create double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) nicks at the targeted places.when it is directed to target a potential antigenic threat, such a bacteriophage, via CRISPR RNA (crRNA; also known as guide RNA [gRNA]). Site-specific cleavage results in the elimination of the antigen [29]. Moreover, CRISPR serves as a spacer to preserve the memory of the antigen [30]. Numerous studies and biotechnologies based on crRNA processing and subsequent action have identified three distinct CRISPR-Cas kinds. These consist of the following:

- **Cassystem/CRISPR type 1**. This version pre-processed the crRNA using Cas5 or Cas6; Cas3, Cascade, and crRNA are required for the cleavage function and interference.

- **System of CRISPR/Cas type 2.**RNase III, transacting RNA (tracrRNA), and an unidentified protein component are involved in DNA trimming at the 50 end, even though Cas9 normally targets DNA under the guidance of crRNA. [31].

- **CRISPR/Cas type 3 system**. Similar to the type 1 mechanism, this category uses Cas6 to process the 30 end cutting of crRNA. It is unique in that it can target RNA [31]. In addition to the previously mentioned conventional CRISPR/Cas classification, the data analysis identified a number of other biotechnologies now in use. These include hybrid crRNA-tracrRNA alterations [34], Intein-induced split Cas9 [33], and the CRISPR system that is activated by light [32], techniques for gene silencing. These methods can change the DNA sequence even if they might not be regarded as genome editing. • These technologies include RNA interference (RNAi), CRISPR interference (CRISPRi), and morpholino oligonucleotide techniques [35–37].

- **Restriction Enzymes (1970s–):** The earliest examples of contemporary genome editing are restriction enzymes. It became feasible to identify and cut at particular nucleotide sequence patterns for the first time, as well as to introduce fresh DNA material at a precise site. However, some cutting restrictions persisted because of the requirement to work at a specific location. [11]

- **Editing Base (2017):** In contrast to earlier methods, base editing in genomics and transcriptomics directly alters target nucleobases rather than cleaving nucleic acid backbones. [38] A catalytically dead Cas9 (dCas9) coupled to bacterial enzymes called DNA deaminases may be directed by researchers to do single nucleotide changes using a single guide RNA (sgRNA). [39]

- **Prime Editing (2019):**Prime editing provides more versatility than base editing as it can accurately do minor insertions, deletions, and base swaps with less negative effects. The Cas9 nickase, which splits DNA strands one at a time, and the reverse transcriptase enzyme are the foundations of the primary editing method. [40]

CRISPR-cas9 Genome Editing: The Revolution:

The system that revolutionized genome editing, CRISPR-Cas9, deserves its own chapter if we are to provide a succinct account of gene editing strategies.

Origin of CRISPR: CRISPR systems were once thought to provide bacteria with a defense mechanism against bacteriophages. CRISPR systems are now used for gene editing in contemporary biology by causing RNA cleavage or Double-stranded DNA fragments in live cells and animals break at user-specified loci. [28, 41, 42] The 2020 Nobel Prize in Chemistry acknowledged that this discovery had transformed the life sciences. [28] Understanding the fundamentals of the CRISPR-Cas9 system is crucial before delving deeper into the factors that contributed to its success.How is CRISPR functioned? Two components make up the so-called CRISPR-complex, a ribonucleoprotein complex that is essential to the CRISPR-Cas9 system:

• The endonuclease enzymatic activity is carried by the Cas (CRISPR associated) protein, usually Cas9.

• The guide RNA (gRNA), which uses sequence homology with the genomic DNA to direct the complex to the genomic location of interest. An RNA-DNA duplex is created upon binding. Remember that DNA damage can be repaired by other repair processes, such as microhomology mediated end joining (MMEJ).

The impact of CRISPR gene editing on research

CRISPR makes genome editing easier, more flexible, and direct than earlier gene editing techniques. Inserting a gene at a particular locus is a very helpful technique, especially for studying gene function and deconstructing disease causes. From pharmaceutical and basic research to cell and gene therapy and agricultural applications, it should come as no surprise that this extensively applicable and adaptable technique has been widely adopted. Effectiveness of editing and usability the CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technology has definitely outperformed its predecessors. For instance, CRISPR is advised for applications requiring numerous simultaneous modifications inside the same cell line or organism due to its extremely high sensitivity and efficiency.

However, not all of the current issues with genome engineering can be resolved with CRISPR. To establish the best balance between time, money, and safety, each researcher must choose the appropriate genome editing technique and auxiliary resources. Additionally, there are still several obstacles facing CRISPR-Cas9 technology. The success of a gene editing experiment is significantly impacted by other factors, such as the effectiveness of the chosen cell transfection technique, even with its high specificity. Reducing off-target editing is another persistent issue with the method that is important, especially for clinical use. [43]

➢ **Applications: Research fundamentals tools:** Genetically cloning living things using restriction enzymes, the target genes in the particular genome are cut for traditional genetic cloning of microorganisms, plants, and animals. Usually, cloning and screening for the desired ones takes a lot of time and effort. Without being constrained by the availability of restriction sites, current gene editing tools can produce the necessary clones with speed and accuracy [44].

Establishing animal models: The most popular techniques for creating experimental or induced animal models are genetic cloning, gene knock-in, and gene knockout. TALENs, CRISPRs/Cas9, and ZFNs are effective methods. With previously unheard-of speed and accuracy, these cutting-edge gene editing techniques have created specialized animal models of a number of disorders for which there were no animal models accessible. [45-47].

Establishment of testing reagents and instruments: More adaptable to the diversity of food pathogens than traditional methods, bacterial genotypes can optimize CRISPRs/Cas9. Many bacterial species' CRISPR locus has high variation, which makes it an ideal starting point for genotyping [48]. The DNA endonuclease focused CRISPR transreporter (CRISPR/Cas12a (Cpf1) DETECTR) system may be used to detect microbial infections, cancers, and gene changes through specimen analysis and screen for microbial antibiotic resistance [49].

Drug discovery: Drug development relies heavily on target site screening and identification, hence high-quality and appropriate platforms are required. Target site screening and functional gene editing are both possible with gene editing methods. CRISPRs/Cas9, for example, were used to target the exons encoding functional protein domains. Following the evaluation of 192 chromatin regulatory domains in murine AML cells, 19 novel dependencies and six known therapeutic targets were found [50].

Products from agriculture: Utilizing gene editing technologies, agricultural goods may be produced to meet human needs. For instance, aqua products (catfish) with high levels of myostatin (MSTN) gene expression [54], Both crops with high yields and resistance to pests, diseases, herbicides, and harsh environments were produced [51,52], as were domesticated animals with double muscle phenotypes, such as buffalo and pigs. [53].

Food: Gene editing technology can extend the shelf life of food or increase its productivity. For instance, Streptococcus thermophilus, a thermophilic bacterium, was edited using CRISPRs/Cas9 to become a bacteriophage-insensitive mutant, increasing the production of products (such as cheese and yogurt) by preventing phage infection [55]. Using CRISPRs/Cas9, Browning resistance was added to the *Agaricus bisporus* white button mushroom. Targeting and knocking off the genes encoding the browning-causing enzyme polyphenol oxidase produced the desired result [56].

Industrial products: Marine algae, such as diatoms, have shown advantageous in commercial applications, including the use of CRISPRs/Cas9 to bioremediate polluted water, produce fuels, medications, health foods, biomolecules, and materials linked to nanotechnology in a carbon-neutral manner [57]. The technological limitations of this information storage method can be minimized by the use of CRISPRs/Cas9. Numerous actual data may be captured and permanently stored in the genomes of live cells using CRISPRs/Cas9[58].

Protection of the environment: In addition to controlling almost 40% of global primary output, marine microalgae absorb more carbon dioxide than woods. In terms of ecology, diatoms are the most significant unicellular eukaryotic microalgae. Diatoms' genomes might be altered with CRISPRs/Cas9 to further mitigate global warming [59].

Reviving extinct animals: Elephants today are different from woolly mammoths because they have adapted to the cold temperature. The gene for the mammoth TRPV3 gene may have been modified from Asian elephant genes [60]. Encoded by this gene, the temperature-sensitive transient receptor potential (thermoTRP) channel affects both hair formation and heat sensitivity. The edited embryo may be successfully inserted into the uterus of a living elephant, which would allow CRISPR/Cas9 to be used to revive the mammoth.

Medicine screening in human therapeutics: Parkinson's disease (PD) is treated using both non-pharmacological and pharmaceutical approaches. Therefore, choosing the best course of action to treat PD quickly, safely, and effectively is essential. The NanoLuc luciferase tag was added to the 3′ end of CRISPRs/Cas9 to create a novel method for identifying endogenous transcription of alpha-synuclein (α-SYN). With this approach, potential effective PD treatment plans may be tested quickly [61].

Preparation of immunotherapy or cell therapy: Induced pluripotent stem (iPS) cells and chimeric antigen receptor T (CART) cells can be produced by gene editing techniques. CRISPRs/Cas9 have been utilized to edit iPS cells to avoid immunological rejection in individuals who are fully immune competent [62]. By producing therapeutic T cells, CRISPRs/Cas9 may improve the safety and effectiveness of CART cells, as the CD19 CAR was effectively employed in therapy [63].

Possible use in the treatment of Disease

Latent virus infection: Because of their high rates of mutation and latent infections, viruses can create diseases that are challenging to treatLatent virus removal from the human host is almost impossible. The human cytomegalovirus (HCMV), Human TALENs, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), Epstein-Barr virus (EBV), hepatitis B virus (HBV), herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1), CRISPRs/Cas9, and other viruses have been shown to provide effective strategies for reducing their latent and productive infections both in vivo and ex vivo [64–69].

Genetic disorders: Gene therapy can be used to treat sickle cell anemia, β-thalassemia, muscular dystrophy, α1-antitrypsin deficiency, Leber congenital amaurosis, and cystic fibrosis [70]. In vivo and ex vivo research have demonstrated the potential of gene editing techniques (like CRISPRs/Cas9), and some are now undergoing clinical trials. Gene therapy may improve as a result of this.

Neurodegenerative diseases: The Perturbing Regulatory Interactions by Synthetic Modulators (PRISM) study, which employed a yeast model of Parkinson's disease, suggested that sgRNAs may modify transcriptional networks and shield cells from α-Syn toxicity [71]. Alzheimer's disease (AD) is caused by a mutation in the amyloid precursor protein (APP) gene, which is referred to as APPswe in Swedish. Both in vivo and ex vivo, CRISPRs/Cas9 can decrease pathogenic amyloid-β (Aβ) by specifically destroying the mutant APPSW allele. [72].

Cancer: An attempt was made to suppress hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) using CRISPRs/Cas9. By specifically targeting the seed-matching region of SIRT6's 3′UTR, miR-125b can inhibit the production of the gene. HCC cells had reduced vitality and invasiveness following SIRT6 expression knockout using CRISPRs/Cas9, which had a comparable effect to miR-125b overexpression [73]. An attempt was also made to prevent breast cancer using CRISPRs/Cas9. Cyclin-dependent kinases (CDKs) are well-known targets for anti-cancer medications, and patients benefit clinically from a new class of CDK inhibitors. Deactivated CRISPRs/Cas9 (dCRISPR) was used to genetically modify breast cancer cells in order to enhance the endogenous CDK18 promoter's expression and show greater sensitivity [74]

Developments in Genome Engineering: With many additional methods for editing the genome, biotechnology is flourishing. When combined with double-stranded transcription factor decoy (TFD), oligodeoxyribonucleotide (ODN) can be used as a therapeutic target for a variety of disorders that impact the transcription factor, resulting in the required transcriptional change and the ensuing downstream protein activity [75]. Papaioannouetal have created a footprint-free genome-editing method that fixes minuscule point mutations by accurately cutting genomes with single-stranded ODNs. With the help of a particular transposon, the drug (doxycycline)-induced Cs9 transgene enters the cell and enables highly targeted and effective Cas9-mediated genome editing. This method is known as footprint-free genome editing since it does not require the traditional donor template. [76].The method is thought to be a safer variant and appears to have few off-target consequences. With minor adjustments to current methods, further new genome editing modalities are also emerging in the literature. In order to enhance gene editing, MartínezGálvezetal [77] used argonautes and single-stranded DNA (ssDNA). Some scientists have used certain enzymes, like as integrases, which might eliminate the need for nucleases in the future. [78] The complete genome engineering by synthesis method, which would really recreate the genome from start according to the provided specified DNA code, is the most fascinating part of the genome-editing procedure and might be revolutionary. The future of synthetic genomics is probably going to look something like this. [79] Although research in this area is still in its early stages, it is anticipated that this technology will ultimately outperform the concept of genome editing.

Methods of genome editing and bioethical issues: While genome editing techniques might transform human illness and agricultural development through biotechnology, they may also be abused and misused in a variety of ways, including manipulating germ line genetics, if they fall into the wrong hands. Numerous specialists have voiced legitimate bioethical concerns. Even while time will ultimately determine whether these technologies are beneficial or detrimental, they have the potential to have the most devastating effects on humanity, and our future generations may suffer in ways we are not yet aware of. [80, 81] The primary concerns, aside from illegal germ line mutation, are the possibility of creating clones, designer babies, and maybe super humans, continuing clinical disagreements on informed consent; the ethics of eugenics, which aids the fittest in surviving; and religious debates [82, 83]. Additionally, the already published material rules out genome editing as a possible future weapon of war [84].

Although many countries have recognized the right to the greatest possible care and the pursuit of a healthy child, the impending biotechnological revolution appears to be unavoidable and inevitable. Due to the pressing need, Technologies linked to genome editing must be translated in a controlled and regulated way for use in molecular medicine, non-clinical agriculture, and the food industry. Public consensus, expert discussions, biotechnologists' engagement, bioethical experts' viewpoints, legislative regulatory frameworks, final rules and oversight, or the ultimately permitted limited use are all necessary for this.

Discussion

Research progresses: It is reasonable to assume that genome editing will remain a popular technique in both commercial and medical applications as well as research. Whether CRISPR-Cas is the final word in programmable nucleases or if something better is on the horizon is one topic that comes up. It is hard to envision a protein-based system that is essentially less complicated than recognition by base pairing and cleavage by a single protein with little foresight into the future. It's possible that the protein may be smaller and have other advantageous qualities, but it would just be variations on the same theme rather than something really new. Perhaps a completely chemically based reagent that combines DNA cleavage and identification might be created using tiny synthetic molecules. Decades of research have been conducted on this topic, using triplex-forming oligonucleotides, peptide nucleic acids, and polyimines, but no platform with sufficient cleavage efficiency and recognition range has been developed. Since CRISPR-mediated base editing was only introduced, it is probable that any new techniques will come from studies of natural processes rather than from an attempt to enhance CRISPR editing. This platform uses the Cas9 nickase, which is associated with a base-modifying activity and only cuts one strand of the target DNA. Certain coding alterations occur in the extremely small region where C is converted to U within a few base pairs of the RNA-guided binding site. This method will be used in the future for modeling and correcting human disease alleles as well as fusions to alternative activities [85].

Conclusion

Numerous facets of genome-editing technologies were covered in this study, such as categorization, some fundamental explanations of processes, technique comparisons, and more recent developments. It appears that TALENS and ZFNs are likely to be replaced by CRISPR/Cas technology. Nevertheless, the CRIPSR/Cas techniques are also being modified, and more recent developments have improved their functional capacities while lowering off-target impacts. Additionally, the development of improved gene modification tools is progressing and may eventually displace CRISPR/Cas and lead to synthetic genomics. Of all these groundbreaking advancements, bioethical issues require careful consideration.

References

1. Muller HJ. Artificial transmutation of the gene. Science. 1927;66:84–7. doi:10.1126/science.66.1699.84.

2. Auerbach C, Robson JM, Carr JG. Chemical production of mutations. Science. 1947;105:243–7. doi:10.1126/science.105.2723.243.
3. Rothstein RJ. One-step gene disruption in yeast. Methods Enzymol. 1983;101:202–11. doi:10.1016/S0076-6879(83)01015-0.
4. Scherer S, Davis RW. Replacement of chromosome segments with altered DNA sequences constructed in vitro. Proc Natl AcadSci USA. 1979;76:4951–5. doi:10.1073/pnas.76.10.4951.
5. Smithies O, Gregg RG, Boggs SS, Koralewski MA, Kucherlapati RS. Insertion of DNA sequences into the human chromosomal beta-globin locus by homologous recombination. Nature. 1985;317(6034):230–4. doi:10.1038/317230a0.
6. Thomas KR, Folger KR, Capecchi MR. High frequency targeting of genes to specific sites in the mammalian genome. Cell. 1986;44:419–28. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(86)90463-0.
7. Mansour SL, Thomas KR, Capecchi MR. Disruption of the proto-oncogene int-2 in mouse embryo-derived stem cells: a general strategy for targeting mutations to non-selectable genes. Nature. 1988;336:348–52. doi:10.1038/336348a0.
8. Carroll D. Genome Engineering with Targetable Nucleases. Annu Rev Biochem. 2014;83:409–39. doi:10.1146/annurev-biochem-060713-035418.
9. Gaj T, Gersbach CA, Barbas CF 3rd. ZFN, TALEN, and CRISPR/Cas-based methods for genome engineering. Trends Biotechnol. 2013;31(7):397–405. doi:10.1016/j.tibtech.2013.04.004.
10. Cytosurge. Gene Editing Techniques [Internet]. Available from: https://www.cytosurge.com/applications/gene-editing-techniques.
11. Smith HO, Welcox KW. A restriction enzyme from Hemophilusinfluenzae: I. Purification and general properties. J Mol Biol. 1970;51(2):379-391.
12. Komor AC, Badran AH, Liu DR. CRISPR-based technologies for the manipulation of eukaryotic genomes. Cell. 2017;168(1-2):20-36. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.10.044.
13. Claussin C, Chang M. Multiple Rad52-Mediated Homology-Directed Repair Mechanisms Are Required to Prevent Telomere Attrition-Induced Senescence in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. PLoS Genet. 2016;12:e1006176. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1006176.
14. Arai N, Kagawa W. Molecular mechanisms of homologous recombination promoted by budding yeast Rad52. Seikagaku. 2014;86:693–697.
15. Komiyama M. Chemical modifications of artificial restriction DNA cutter (ARCUT) to promote its in vivo and in vitro applications. Artif DNA PNA XNA. 2014;5:e1112457. doi:10.4161/adna.29933.
16. Ito K, Komiyama M. Site-selective scission of human genome using PNA-based artificial restriction DNA cutter. Methods Mol Biol. 2014;1050:111–120. doi:10.1007/978-1-62703-548-0_9.
17. Schultz BR, Chamberlain JS. Recombinant adeno-associated virus transduction and integration. MolTher. 2008;16:1189–1199. doi:10.1038/mt.2008.103.
18. Smith J, Grizot S, Arnould S, Duclert A, Epinat JC, Chames P, et al. A combinatorial approach to create artificial homing endonucleases cleaving chosen sequences. Nucleic Acids Res. 2006;34:e149. doi:10.1093/nar/gkl756.
19. Yoon Y, Wang D, Tai PWL, Riley J, Gao G, Rivera-Pérez JA. Streamlined ex vivo and in vivo genome editing in mouse embryos using recombinant adeno-associated viruses. Nat Commun. 2018;9:412. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-02447-1.
20. Rey-Rico A, Cucchiarini M. Controlled release strategies for rAAV mediated gene delivery. ActaBiomater. 2016;29:1–10. doi:10.1016/j.actbio.2015.09.031.
21. Jin L, Lange W, Kempmann A, Maybeck V, Günther A, Gruteser N, et al. High-efficiency transduction and specific expression of ChR2opt for optogenetic manipulation of primary cortical neurons mediated by recombinant adeno-associated viruses. J Biotechnol. 2016;233:171–180. doi:10.1016/j.jbiotec.2016.07.019.

22. Zaslavskiy M, Bertonati C, Duchateau P, Duclert A, Silva GH. Efficient design of meganucleases using a machine learning approach. BMC Bioinformatics. 2014;15:191. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-15-191.
23. McMurrough TA, Brown CM, Zhang K, Hausner G, Junop MS, Gloor GB, et al. Active site residue identity regulates cleavage preference of LAGLIDADG homing endonucleases. Nucleic Acids Res. 2018;46:11990–12007. doi:10.1093/nar/gky932.
24. Ochiai H, Yamamoto T. Construction and Evaluation of Zinc Finger Nucleases. Methods Mol Biol. 2017;1630:1–24. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-7128-2_1.
25. Ji H, Lu P, Liu B, Qu X, Wang Y, Jiang Z, et al. Zinc-Finger Nucleases Induced by HIV-1 Tat Excise HIV-1 from the Host Genome in Infected and Latently Infected Cells. MolTher Nucleic Acids. 2018;12:67–74. doi:10.1016/j.omtn.2018.03.007.
26. Hensel G, Kumlehn J. Genome Engineering Using TALENs. Methods Mol Biol. 2019;1900:195–215. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-8940-9_14.
27. Fischer S, Maier LK, Stoll B, Brendel J, Fischer E, Pfeiffer F, et al. An archaeal immune system can detect multiple proto spacer adjacent motifs (PAMs) to target invader DNA. J Biol Chem. 2012;287:33351-33363. doi:10.1074/jbc.M112.377002.
28. 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):816–821. doi:10.1126/science.1225829.
29. Zhang F, Wen Y, Guo X. CRISPR/Cas9 for genome editing: progress, implications and challenges. Hum Mol Genet. 2014;23(R1):R40–R46. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddu125.
30. Zhang JH, Adikaram P, Pandey M, Genis A, Simonds WF. Optimization of genome editing through CRISPR-Cas9 engineering. Bioengineered. 2016;7:166–174. doi:10.1080/21655979.2016.1203507.
31. Rath D, Amlinger L, Rath A, Lundgren M. The CRISPR-Cas immune system: biology, mechanisms and applications. Biochimie. 2015;117:119–128. doi:10.1016/j.biochi.2015.03.025.
32. Polstein LR, Gersbach CA. A light-inducible CRISPR-Cas9 system for control of endogenous gene activation. Nat Chem Biol. 2015;11:198–200. doi:10.1038/nchembio.1753.
33. Zetsche B, Volz SE, Zhang F. A split-Cas9 architecture for inducible genome editing and transcription modulation. Nat Biotechnol. 2015;33:139–142. doi:10.1038/nbt.314
34. Mali P, Aach J, Stranges PB, Esvelt KM, Moosburner M, Kosuri S, Yang L, Church GM. CAS9 transcriptional activators for target specificity screening and paired nickasesfor cooperative genome engineering. Nat Biotechnol. 2013;31:833–8. doi: 10.1038/nbt.2675.
35. Fischer SE. RNA Interference and MicroRNA-Mediated Silencing. CurrProtocMol Biol. 2015;112:26.1.1–5. doi: 10.1002/0471142727.mb2601s112.
36. Yoshida M, Yokota E, Sakuma T, Yamatsuji T, Takigawa N, Ushijima T, Yamamoto T, Fukazawa T, Naomoto Y. Development of an integrated CRISPRi targeting DNp63 for treatment of squamous cell carcinoma. Oncotarget. 2018;9:29220–32. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.25635.
37. Paul S, Caruthers MH. Synthesis of PhosphorodiamidateMorpholino Oligonucleotides and Their Chimeras Using Phosphoramidite Chemistry. J Am Chem Soc. 2016;138:15663–72. doi: 10.1021/jacs.6b08424.
38. Porto EM, Komor AC, Slaymaker IM, Yeo GW. Base editing: advances and therapeutic opportunities. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2020;19:839–59. doi: 10.1038/s41573-020-0066-y.
39. Gaudelli NM, Komor AC, Rees HA, Packer MS, Badran AH, Bryson DI, Liu DR. Programmable base editing of A•T to G•C in genomic DNA without DNA cleavage. Nature. 2017;551:464–71. doi: 10.1038/nature24644.

40. Anzalone AV, Randolph PB, Davis JR, Sousa AA, Koblan LW, Levy JM, Chen PJ, Wilson C, Newby GA, Raguram A, Liu DR. Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. Nature. 2019;576:149–57. doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1711-4.
41. Gasiunas G, Barrangou R, Horvath P, Siksnys V. Cas9–crRNA ribonucleoprotein complex mediates specific DNA cleavage for adaptive immunity in bacteria. Proc Natl AcadSci USA. 2012;109:E2579–86. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1208507109.
42. Mali P, Yang L, Esvelt KM, Aach J, Guell M, DiCarlo JE, Norville JE, Church GM. RNA-guided human genome engineering via Cas9. Science. 2013;339:823–6. doi: 10.1126/science.1232033.
43. Adli M. The CRISPR tool kit for genome editing and beyond. Nat Commun. 2018;9:1911. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-04252-2.
44. Charpentier E, Doudna JA. Biotechnology: Rewriting a genome. Nature. 2013;495:50–1. doi: 10.1038/495050a.
45. Sui T, Xu L, Lau YS, Liu D, Liu T, Gao Y, Han R. Development of muscular dystrophy in a CRISPR-engineered mutant rabbit model with frame-disrupting ANO5 mutations. Cell Death Dis. 2018;9:609. doi: 10.1038/s41419-018-0674-y.
46. Yang J, Yi N, Zhang J, He W, He D, Wu W, Li P, He Y, Xue J, Liu X, Xie X, Liu H, Gong Y, Hu C, Tang X. Generation and characterization of a hypothyroidism rat model with truncated thyroid stimulating hormone receptor. Sci Rep. 2018;8:4004. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-22405-7.
47. Maiti P, Manna J, Dunbar GL. Current understanding of the molecular mechanisms in Parkinson's disease: Targets for potential treatments. TranslNeurodegener. 2017;6:28. doi: 10.1186/s40035-017-0099-z.
48. Makarova KS, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. The basic building blocks and evolution of CRISPR-CAS systems. BiochemSoc Trans. 2013;41:1392–400. doi: 10.1042/BST20130038.
49. Chen JS, Ma E, Harrington LB, Da Costa M, Tian X, Palefsky JM, Doudna JA. CRISPR-Cas12a target binding unleashes indiscriminate single-stranded DNase activity. Science. 2018;360:436–9. doi: 10.1126/science.aar6245.
50. Shi J, Wang E, Milazzo JP, Wang Z, Kinney JB, Vakoc CR. Discovery of cancer drug targets by CRISPR-Cas9 screening of protein domains. Nat Biotechnol. 2015;33:661–7. doi: 10.1038/nbt.3235.
51. Liao Y, Bai Q, Xu P, Wu T, Guo D, Peng Y, et al. Mutation in rice Abscisic Acid2 results in cell death, enhanced disease resistance, altered seed dormancy and development. *Front Plant Sci*. 2018;9:405. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2018.00405.
52. Huang C, Sun H, Xu D, Chen Q, Liang Y, Wang X, et al. ZmCCT9 enhances maize adaptation to higher latitudes. *Proc Natl AcadSci U S A*. 2018;115(2):E334-E341. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1718058115.
53. Su X, Cui K, Du S, Li H, Lu F, Shi D, et al. Efficient genome editing in cultured cells and embryos of Debao pig and swamp buffalo using the CRISPR/Cas9 system. *In Vitro Cell Dev Biol Anim*. 2018;54(5):375-383. doi: 10.1007/s11626-018-0236-8.
54. Khalil K, Elayat M, Khalifa E, Daghash S, Elaswad A, Miller M, et al. Generation of myostatin gene-edited channel catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*) via zygote injection of CRISPR/Cas9 system. *Sci Rep*. 2018;7(1):7301. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-07223-7.
55. Barrangou R, Fremaux C, Deveau H, Richards M, Boyaval P, Romero DA, et al. CRISPR provides acquired resistance against viruses in prokaryotes. *Science*. 2007;315(5819):1709-1712. doi: 10.1126/science.1138140.
56. Waltz E. Gene-edited CRISPR mushroom escapes US regulation. *Nature*. 2016;532(7599):293. doi: 10.1038/nature.2016.19754.
57. Bozarth A, Maier UG, Zauner S. Diatoms in biotechnology: Modern tools and applications. *ApplMicrobiolBiotechnol*. 2009;82(2):195-201. doi: 10.1007/s00253-008-1804-8.

58. Nymark M, Sharma AK, Sparstad T, Bones AM, Winge P. A CRISPR/Cas9 system adapted for gene editing in marine algae. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6:24951. doi: 10.1038/srep24951.
59. Shipman SL, Nivala J, Macklis JD, Church GM. CRISPR-Cas encoding of a digital movie into the genomes of a population of living bacteria. *Nature*. 2017;547(7663):345-349. doi: 10.1038/nature23017.
60. Lynch VJ, Bedoya-Reina OC, Ratan A, Sulak M, Drautz-Moses DI, Perry GH, et al. Elephantid genomes reveal the molecular bases of woolly mammoth adaptations to the Arctic. *Cell Rep*. 2015;12(2):217-228. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2015.06.027.
61. Basu S, Adams L, Guhathakurta S, Kim YS. A novel tool for monitoring endogenous alpha-synuclein transcription by NanoLuciferase tag insertion at the 3′ end using CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing technique. *Sci Rep*. 2017;8:45883. doi: 10.1038/srep45883.
62. Deuse T, Hu X, Gravina A, Wang D, Tediashvili G, De C, et al. Hypoimmunogenic derivatives of induced pluripotent stem cells evade immune rejection in fully immunocompetent allogeneic recipients. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2019;37(3):252-258. doi: 10.1038/s41587-019-0016-3.
63. Perales MA, Kebriaei P, Kean LS, Sadelain M. Building a safer and faster CAR: Seatbelts, airbags, and CRISPR. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2018;24(3S):S15-S19. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2017.12.789.
64. van Diemen FR, Kruse EM, Hooykaas MJ, Bruggeling CE, Schürch AC, van Ham PM, et al. CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genome editing of herpesviruses limits productive and latent infections. *PLoSPathog*.
72. György B, Lööv C, Zaborowski MP, Takeda S, Kleinstiver BP, Commins C, et al. CRISPR/Cas9 mediated disruption of the Swedish APP allele as a therapeutic approach for early-onset Alzheimer's disease. MolTher Nucleic Acids. 2018;11:429–40. doi:10.1016/j.omtn.2018.03.007.
73. Song S, Yang Y, Liu M, Liu B, Yang X, Yu M, et al. MiR-125b attenuates human hepatocellular carcinoma malignancy through 2016;12(6):e1005701. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1005701.
65. Imran M, Waheed Y, Ghazal A, Ullah S, Safi SZ, Jamal M, et al. Modern biotechnology-based therapeutic approaches against HIV infection. *Biomed Rep*. 2017;7(6):504-507. doi: 10.3892/br.2017.1006.
66. Yuen KS, Wang ZM, Wong NM, Zhang ZQ, Cheng TF, Lui WY, et al. Suppression of Epstein-Barr virus DNA load in latently infected nasopharyngeal carcinoma cells by CRISPR/Cas9. *Virus Res*. 2018;244:296-303. doi: 10.1016/j.virusres.2017.04.019.
67. Lin SR, Yang HC, Kuo YT, Liu CJ, Yang TY, Sung KC, et al. The CRISPR/Cas9 system facilitates clearance of the intrahepatic HBV templates in vivo. *MolTher Nucleic Acids*. 2014;3:e186. doi: 10.1038/mtna.2014.38.
68. Chen J, Zhang W, Lin J, Wang F, Wu M, Chen C, et al. An efficient antiviral strategy for targeting hepatitis B virus genome using transcription activator-like effector nucleases. *MolTher*. 2014;22(2):303-311. doi: 10.1038/mt.2013.212.
69. Noh KW, Park J, Kang MS. Targeted disruption of EBNA1 in EBV-infected cells attenuated cell growth. *BMB Rep*. 2016;49(4):226-231. doi: 10.5483/BMBRep.2016.49.4.260.
70. Cohen J. The birth of CRISPR Inc. *Science*. 2017;355(6326):680-684. doi: 10.1126/science.355.6326.680.
71. Chen YC, Farzadfard F, Gharaei N, Chen WCW, Cao J, Lu TK. Randomized CRISPR-Cas transcriptional perturbation screening reveals protective genes against alpha-synuclein toxicity. Mol Cell. 2017;68(1):247.e5–257.e5. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2017.09.014.
targeting SIRT6. Am J Cancer Res. 2018;8(6):993–1007.
74. Barone G, Arora A, Ganesh A, Abdel-Fatah T, Moseley P, Ali R, et al. The relationship of CDK18 expression in breast cancer to clinicopathological parameters and therapeutic response. Oncotarget. 2018;9(50):29508–24. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.25686

75. Hecker M, Wagner AH. Transcription factor decoy technology: a therapeutic update. BiochemPharmacol. 2017;144:29–34.
76. Martínez-Gálvez G, Ata H, Campbell JM, Ekker SC. ssDNA and the Argonautes: The quest for the next golden editor. Hum Gene Ther. 2016;27:419–22.
77. Ledford H. Beyond CRISPR: A guide to the many other ways to edit a genome. Nature. 2016;536:136–7.
78. Luo Z, Yang Q, Geng B, Jiang S, Yang S, Li X, et al. Whole genome engineering by synthesis. Sci China Life Sci. 2018;61:1515–27.
79. Krishan K, Kanchan T, Singh B. Human genome editing and ethical considerations. SciEng Ethics. 2016;22:597–9.
80. Krishan K, Kanchan T, Singh B, Baryah N, Puri S. Germline editing: editors cautionary. Clin Ter. 2018;169:e58–9.
81. Shinwari ZK, Tanveer F, Khalil AT. Ethical issues regarding CRISPR-mediated genome editing. Curr Issues Mol Biol. 2018;26:103–10.
82. Liao SM. Designing humans: a human rights approach. Bioethics. 2019;33:98–104.
83. Hofmann B. The gene-editing of super-ego. Med Health Care Philos. 2018;21:295–302.
84. Wang H, La Russa M, Qi LS. CRISPR/Cas9 in genome editing and beyond. Annu Rev Biochem. 2016;85:227–64.
85. Carroll D. Focus: genome editing: past, present, and future. Yale J Biol Med. 2017;90(4):653

Access this Article in Online	
Quick Response Code	Website: www.ijcrims.com Subject: Gene technology
DOI: 10.22192/ijcrms.2025.11.01.002	

How to cite this article:
Sharique Ahmad, Subuhi Anwar. (2025). Gene Editing Unveiled: Understanding Systems, Types, and Their Applications. Int. J. Curr. Res. Med. Sci. 11(1): 8-21.
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijcrms.2025.11.01.002