APEC PUBLISHER

Journal of Advanced Medical Research and Innovation
ISSN *(Online)*: XXXX-XXXX
Volume 1, Issue 1, April-June 2025, Page 05-10
https://doi.org/

Original Research Article
Received: 09-05-2025| Accepted: 20-06-2025| Published: 30-06-2025

CRISPR-Cas Gene Editing in Rare Genetic Disorders: Breakthroughs, Risks, and the Road Ahead

Kajol Das*[1]

Abstract

CRISPR-Cas systems have revolutionized the therapeutic landscape for rare genetic disorders, offering unprecedented precision in correcting disease-causing mutations. This comprehensive review synthesizes recent breakthroughs in CRISPR-based therapies, including base editing and prime editing platforms that enable precise DNA modifications without double-strand breaks. We examine landmark clinical applications for disorders such as sickle cell disease, CPS1 deficiency, and transthyretin amyloidosis, highlighting efficacy data from ongoing trials. Significant risks including off-target effects, chromosomal rearrangements, immunogenicity, and unintended consequences of retrotransposition are critically evaluated alongside risk-mitigation strategies. The analysis extends to delivery challenges, ethical considerations of germline editing, and accessibility barriers. Emerging innovations in Cas enzyme engineering, tissue-specific delivery, and computational approaches are presented as promising solutions. With over 70 clinical trials currently underway and the first regulatory approvals secured, CRISPR therapies demonstrate transformative potential for monogenic disorders. However, long-term safety monitoring, equitable access, and ethical frameworks require concerted effort. This review concludes that strategic integration of technological advances with robust translational frameworks will accelerate the realization of durable CRISPR-based cures for the 300 million people affected by rare diseases worldwide.

Keywords

CRISPR-Cas, rare genetic disorders, base editing, gene therapy, precision medicine, off-target effects, translational challenges

1Independent Scholar

INTRODUCTION

Rare genetic disorders collectively affect approximately 300 million people globally, with over 80% having monogenic origins yet fewer than 5% have FDA-approved treatments (National Institutes of Health, 2023). The advent of clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR) and associated Cas proteins has catalyzed a paradigm shift from symptomatic management toward potentially curative genetic interventions. Unlike conventional gene therapy approaches that add functional gene copies, CRISPR systems enable precise genome surgery at the nucleotide level, theoretically allowing permanent correction of pathogenic mutations (Applications and Challenges of CRISPR-Cas Gene-Editing to Disease Treatment, 2021).

The molecular architecture of CRISPR-Cas systems functions as an adaptive immune mechanism in bacteria, repurposed for programmable gene editing in eukaryotic cells. Guide RNA (gRNA) directs Cas nucleases to specific genomic loci, where DNA cleavage occurs adjacent to a protospacer adjacent motif (PAM). Subsequent cellular repair mechanisms facilitate targeted modifications. While early CRISPR-Cas9 systems revolutionized genetic engineering, they inherently relied on double-strand breaks (DSBs), introducing risks of indels and chromosomal rearrangements. This limitation spurred the development of precision editing tools including base editors and prime editors that minimize DSB formation (Komor *et al.,* 2016; Anzalone *et al.,* 2019).

***Corresponding Author:** Kajol Das

CRISPR's therapeutic potential is particularly impactful for rare diseases, which historically suffered from limited commercial interest due to small patient populations and high development costs. The modular nature of CRISPR components enables rapid customization for patient-specific mutations, dramatically reducing therapeutic development timelines. As evidenced by the recent case of CPS1 deficiency correction—from diagnosis to treatment in merely six months CRISPR platforms offer unprecedented responsiveness for critically ill patients (Musunuru *et al.,* 2025). This review comprehensively examines technological breakthroughs, clinical translations, persistent challenges, and future directions in CRISPR-based interventions for rare genetic disorders, contextualized within ethical and accessibility frameworks.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES IN CRISPR SYSTEMS

Precision Editing Platforms

Traditional CRISPR-Cas9 systems induce DSBs repaired through error-prone non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) or homology-directed repair (HDR). While enabling gene disruption, DSBs trigger p53-mediated stress responses and carry substantial risks of large deletions and translocations. In 2016, Komor et al. pioneered base editing technology to circumvent these limitations by directly converting one DNA base pair to another without DSBs. Cytosine base editors (CBEs) fuse nickase Cas9 (nCas9) with cytidine deaminase, facilitating C•G to T•A conversions, while adenine base editors (ABEs) perform A•T to G•C transitions through evolved tRNA adenosine deaminase fusion proteins (Gaudelli *et al.,* 2017).

Table 1: Evolution of CRISPR Precision Editing Platforms

Platform	Key Components	Editing Capabilities
CRISPR-Cas9	Cas9 + gRNA + donor template	Indels, insertions, deletions
Cytosine BE (CBE)	nCas9 + cytidine deaminase + UGI	C•G → T•A
Adenine BE (ABE)	nCas9 + evolved TadA dimer	A•T → G•C
Prime editing	Cas9 nickase + RT + pegRNA	All 12 base transitions, small indels

Third-generation prime editing further expanded the editing scope by coupling nCas9 with engineered reverse transcriptase (RT). A specialized prime editing guide RNA (pegRNA) both targets the site and encodes the desired edit. Prime editors theoretically correct approximately 90% of pathogenic point mutations cataloged in ClinVar, including transitions, transversions, and small insertions/deletions (≤44bp). Their versatility is particularly valuable for disorders like Duchenne muscular dystrophy (DMD), where diverse mutations necessitate

Delivery System Innovations

Effective in vivo delivery remains the foremost translational hurdle. Viral vectors, particularly adeno-associated viruses (AAVs), dominate clinical applications due to established tropism profiles and long-term expression. However, AAVs suffer from limited cargo capacity (~4.7kb), constraining delivery of larger Cas orthologs like Cas9 (~4.2kb). This bottleneck drove development of compact Cas enzymes including *Staphylococcus aureus* Cas9 (SaCas9; 3.2kb) and ultra-small CasΦ (2.7kb), enabling AAV packaging with regulatory elements (CRISPR-Dependent Base Editing as a Therapeutic Strategy for Rare Monogenic Disorders, 2025).

Non-viral delivery platforms offer advantages including reduced immunogenicity and repeat dosing potential:

- **Lipid nanoparticles (LNPs)** successfully delivered base editors to the liver in recent clinical trials, achieving >90% PCSK9 knockdown and 70% LDL reduction in familial hypercholesterolemia patients (Musunuru *et al.,* 2025).
- **Virus-like particles (VLPs)** package Cas9-gRNA ribonucleoproteins within non-infectious envelopes, enabling transient editing with reduced off-target risks.

- **Cell-penetrating peptides (CPPs)** facilitate direct nuclear delivery of ribonucleoprotein complexes, as demonstrated in preclinical models of inherited blindness (Applications and Challenges of CRISPR-Cas Gene-Editing to Disease Treatment, 2021).

Table 2: Delivery Strategies for CRISPR Therapeutics

Delivery Method	Advantages	Limitations
AAV	Established tropism, long expression	Limited cargo capacity, immunogenicity
LNPs	Repeat dosing, modular design	Primarily hepatic uptake
Electroporation	High ex vivo efficiency	Restricted to hematopoietic cells
VLPs	Transient expression, low immunogenicity	Manufacturing complexity

For ex vivo applications like hematopoietic disorders, electroporation of ribonucleoproteins achieves high editing efficiencies (>80%) in CD34+ stem cells while minimizing off-target effects and cellular toxicity. The recent FDA approval of exagamglogene autotemcel (Casgevy®) for sickle cell disease validates this approach, with treated patients demonstrating near-complete elimination of vaso-occlusive crises (Frangoul *et al.,* 2021).

CLINICAL BREAKTHROUGHS AND APPLICATIONS

Pioneering Clinical Cases

The landmark treatment of an infant with carbamoyl phosphate synthetase 1 (CPS1) deficiency represents the first successful application of personalized in vivo CRISPR therapy. CPS1 deficiency causes lethal hyperammonemia due to impaired urea cycle function. Traditional management requires severe protein restriction and liver transplantation, with high mortality during intercurrent illnesses. Researchers at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia employed CRISPR-Cas9 to correct a pathogenic mutation in hepatocytes via LNP delivery. Within six months of diagnosis, the infant received low-dose therapy followed by escalation, achieving metabolic stabilization, increased protein tolerance, and resilience to infections without treatment-related adverse events (Musunuru *et al.,* 2025).

Concurrently, ex vivo hematopoietic stem cell (HSC) editing has advanced rapidly for hemoglobinopathies. The CLIMB-121 trial for β-thalassemia and CLIMB-111 for sickle cell disease utilized CRISPR-Cas9 to disrupt the BCL11A enhancer, elevating fetal hemoglobin production. Of 31 treated sickle cell patients, 29 (94%) remained free of vaso-occlusive crises for over 18 months, while β-thalassemia patients achieved transfusion independence. These outcomes underpinned the 2023 FDA approval of Casgevy®, establishing an ex vivo CRISPR therapeutic paradigm (Frangoul *et al.,* 2021).

Expanding Disease Applications

- **Metabolic Disorders:** In vivo LNP delivery corrected mutations in *OTC* and *PAH* genes in murine models of ornithine transcarbamylase deficiency and phenylketonuria, respectively. Clinical trials for hereditary tyrosinemia leverage CRISPR-mediated integration of therapeutic transgenes into the albumin locus (The Italian Breakthrough in CRISPR Trials for Rare Diseases, 2024).
- **Neuromuscular Diseases:** Dual-AAV delivery of adenine base editors partially restored dystrophin expression in DMD mouse models by correcting nonsense mutations. Frameshift correction via prime editing is under preclinical investigation (CRISPR-Based Tools for Fighting Rare Diseases, 2022).
- **Ocular Disorders:** The BRILLIANCE trial employed subretinal AAV delivery of CRISPR-Cas9 to repair CEP290 mutations in Leber congenital amaurosis type 10 (LCA10). Three of 14 patients demonstrated clinically meaningful visual improvement, validating direct in vivo editing in neural tissues (CMN Weekly: CRISPR Medicine News, 2025).
- **Chromosomal Disorders:** CRISPR-based allele-specific chromosome elimination successfully removed the

supernumerary chromosome 21 in trisomy 21 patient-derived iPSCs and fibroblasts. This proof-of-concept offers potential pathways for Down syndrome intervention (CRISPR Research Publication Ethics: 2025 Guide, 2025).

Clinical Translation Challenges

Despite promising efficacy, manufacturing complexities present substantial hurdles. Autologous ex vivo therapies like Casgevy® require specialized facilities for cell collection, editing, expansion, and reinfusion, contributing to costs exceeding $2 million per patient. Scalability limitations restrict access, particularly in resource-limited regions where hemoglobinopathy prevalence is highest. In vivo approaches face vector immunogenicity challenges; pre-existing AAV neutralizing antibodies exclude ~30-50% of potential recipients (Genomic Sequencing for Rare Diseases in Low-Resource Settings, 2024).

RISKS AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Genomic Safety Concerns

Traditional CRISPR-Cas9 systems induce DSBs that risk chromosomal rearrangements and retrotransposition events. A 2024 University of Zurich study targeting the NCF1 locus in chronic granulomatous disease revealed large deletions (>1000bp) and translocations in 5.6% of edited cells due to homology between the target gene and nearby pseudogenes (CRISPR Cas9: When Molecular Scissors Result in Further Genetic Defects, 2024). Similarly, Boston Children's Hospital researchers demonstrated that DSBs activate endogenous LINE-1 retrotransposons, which insert at cut sites or off-target locations at frequencies up to 6%. Such insertions could disrupt tumor suppressor genes or activate oncogenes, potentially initiating malignancies (A Potential Danger of CRISPR Gene Editing and Why Base Editing May Be Safer, 2024).

Off-target effects remain a persistent concern, particularly with prolonged nuclease expression from viral vectors. Bioinformatics-guided gRNA design and high-fidelity Cas variants reduce but do not eliminate off-target cleavage. In hematopoietic stem cells, even low-frequency off-target edits could confer clonal advantages leading to premalignant expansions. Base editors exhibit lower off-target rates than Cas9 nucleases but face bystander editing challenges unintended modifications within the activity window. For example, BE4max induces C•G to T•A conversions at non-target cytosines with frequencies up to 50% in some genomic contexts (CRISPR-Dependent Base Editing as a Therapeutic Strategy for Rare Monogenic Disorders, 2025).

Table 3: Risk Mitigation Strategies in CRISPR Therapeutics

Risk Category	Mitigation Approach
Chromosomal rearrangements	Use of base/prime editors; DSB-free editing
Off-target effects	High-fidelity Cas variants; RNP delivery
Bystander editing	Narrow-window base editors; optimized gRNA
Immunogenicity	Immunosuppression; engineered Cas proteins

Immunogenicity and Mosaicism

Cas9 proteins derived from *S. pyogenes* and *S. aureus* elicit adaptive immune responses in 58-78% of human serum samples due to pre-existing immunity from bacterial exposure. This may accelerate vector clearance or provoke cytotoxic responses against edited cells. Strategies to circumvent immunity include engineering hypoimmunogenic Cas variants through epitope masking or employing rare orthologs like *Francisella novicida* Cas12a (Applications and Challenges of CRISPR-Cas Gene-Editing to Disease Treatment, 2021).

In vivo editing in post-mitotic tissues often produces mosaicism a mixture of edited and unedited cells. While potentially tolerable for secreted proteins (e.g., clotting factors), mosaicism could undermine therapies requiring high correction thresholds, such as neurological disorders. Early intervention during fetal or neonatal development may mitigate mosaicism but raises profound ethical dilemmas (CRISPR Research Publication Ethics: 2025 Guide, 2025).

Ethical and Accessibility Challenges

CRISPR therapies face equity disparities rooted in genomic data gaps: 97% of genome-wide association studies involve non-African populations, potentially compromising gRNA design for diverse ancestries. Minority enrollment in clinical trials remains low due to historical exploitation (e.g., Tuskegee Syphilis Study), perpetuating access barriers. The $2.2 million price point for Casgevy® exemplifies commercial sustainability challenges in rare diseases (Genomic Sequencing for Rare Diseases in Low-Resource Settings, 2024).

Germline editing remains ethically contentious following the 2018 He Jiankui incident. While the International Commission on the Clinical Use of Human Germline Genome Editing recommends restriction to monogenic disorders with high penetrance, regulatory harmonization is lacking. Somatic interventions raise separate concerns about enhancement misuse and phenotypic coercion in genetically manageable conditions (CRISPR Research Publication Ethics: 2025 Guide, 2025).

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Technological Innovations

The CRISPR armamentarium continues expanding through computational discovery of novel systems. A 2023 NIH-Broad Institute collaboration identified >100 new Cas variants, including compact RNA-targeting Cas13X/Y (<800aa) with minimal immunogenic risk. Machine learning-guided protein engineering enables *de novo* design of Cas proteins with bespoke PAM specificities and reduced off-target propensities (CRISPR-Based Tools for Fighting Rare Diseases, 2022).

Delivery innovations focus on tissue-specific targeting:

- AAV capsid engineering via directed evolution generates vectors with enhanced CNS or muscle tropism.
- Nanoparticle conjugation with antibodies or aptamers enables receptor-mediated uptake in pulmonary (e.g., cystic fibrosis) and cardiac tissues.
- Sonoporation combined with microbubble carriers shows promise for blood-brain barrier penetration in neurodegenerative disorders (The Italian Breakthrough in CRISPR Trials for Rare Diseases, 2024).

Multiplexed editing approaches address polygenic disorders and complex modifiers. In proof-of-concept studies, CRISPR-based "gene shuffling" corrected multiple mutations in *CFTR* alleles from cystic fibrosis patients, achieving functional restoration in organoids. For disorders requiring coordinated expression, synthetic gene circuits could dynamically regulate therapeutic transgenes in response to biomarkers (CMN Weekly: CRISPR Medicine News, 2025).

Clinical Translation Framework

Accelerating bench-to-bedside translation requires:

- Standardized biodistribution and persistence assays using digital PCR and single-cell sequencing.
- Long-term safety monitoring via integrated genomic databases tracking edited cell clonality.
- Adaptive clinical trial designs incorporating biomarker-driven patient stratification.
- Manufacturing harmonization through closed-system automated bioreactors (National Institutes of Health, 2023).

Ethical and Accessible Implementation

Achieving equitable access necessitates:

- Diversifying genomic databases through initiatives like All of Us and Genomics England.
- Tiered pricing models and public-private manufacturing partnerships for global access.

- Point-of-care editing facilities utilizing lyophilized CRISPR components for lower costs.
- Community engagement protocols co-developed with rare disease patient advocates (Genomic Sequencing for Rare Diseases in Low-Resource Settings, 2024).

CONCLUSION

CRISPR-Cas systems have evolved from bacterial immune mechanisms to transformative therapeutic tools, demonstrating remarkable efficacy in previously untreatable rare genetic disorders. Base editing and prime editing platforms mitigate traditional DSB-associated risks, while delivery innovations expand targetable tissues. Clinical triumphs in hemoglobinopathies, metabolic diseases, and blindness herald a new era of genomic medicine. However, significant challenges persist—from genomic safety uncertainties to ethical quandaries and accessibility barriers. Forward momentum requires synergistic advancement in three domains: (1) continued technological innovation to enhance precision and delivery; (2) robust translational frameworks ensuring safety and efficacy; and (3) ethical, equitable implementation strategies. With over 70 clinical trials underway and global regulatory alignment progressing, CRISPR-based therapies hold unparalleled promise for delivering durable cures to the millions affected by rare genetic disorders. Realizing this potential demands sustained multidisciplinary collaboration among scientists, clinicians, patients, ethicists, and policymakers to navigate the complex road ahead responsibly.

REFERENCES

A Potential Danger of CRISPR Gene Editing And Why Base Editing May Be Safer. (2024). Boston Children's Hospital.

Anzalone, A. V., et al. (2019). Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. *Nature, 576*, 149–157.

Applications and Challenges of CRISPR-Cas Gene-Editing to Disease Treatment. (2021). *Precision Clinical Medicine, 4*(3), 179–191.

CMN Weekly: CRISPR Medicine News. (2025). CRISPR Medicine News.

CRISPR-Based Tools for Fighting Rare Diseases. (2022). *Life, 12*(12), 1968.

CRISPR Cas9: When Molecular Scissors Result in Further Genetic Defects. (2024). Tech4Future.

CRISPR Research Publication Ethics: 2025 Guide. (2025). Editverse.

CRISPR-Dependent Base Editing as a Therapeutic Strategy for Rare Monogenic Disorders. (2025). *Frontiers in Genome Editing, 7*, 1553590.

Frangoul, H., et al. (2021). CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia. *New England Journal of Medicine, 384*, 252–260.

Gaudelli, N. M., et al. (2017). Programmable base editing of A•T to G•C in genomic DNA without DNA cleavage. *Nature, 551*, 464–471.

Genomic Sequencing for Rare Diseases in Low-Resource Settings. (2024). The Lancet Global Health.

Komor, A. C., et al. (2016). Programmable editing of a target base in genomic DNA without double-stranded DNA cleavage. *Nature, 533*, 420–424.

Musunuru, K., et al. (2025). Patient-specific in vivo gene editing to treat a rare genetic disease. New England Journal of Medicine.

National Institutes of Health. (2023). Rare diseases: Common issues in drug development.

The Italian Breakthrough in CRISPR Trials for Rare Diseases. (2024). *Frontiers in Medicine, 11*, 1356578.

Conflict of Interest: No Conflict of Interest

Source of Funding: Author(s) Funded the Research

How to Cite: Das, K. (2025). CRISPR-Cas Gene Editing in Rare Genetic Disorders: Breakthroughs, Risks, and the Road Ahead. *Journal of Advanced Medical Research and Innovation, 1*(1), 5-10.