IAA Journal of Scientific Research 13(1):1-11, 2026. www.iaajournals.org

©IAAJOURNALS ISSN: 2636-7319

https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJSR/2026/131111 IAAJSR:1311

CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Monogenic Diabetes: Therapeutic Potential and Clinical Challenges

Zakaria Ali

Department of Pharmacy Kampala International University Uganda
Email: ali.zakaria@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Monogenic diabetes mellitus comprised a heterogeneous group of disorders caused by single-gene mutations affecting pancreatic β-cell function or insulin action, accounting for approximately 1--2% of all diabetes cases yet frequently misdiagnosed as type 1 or type 2 diabetes. The advent of CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing technology had introduced unprecedented opportunities for definitive genetic correction of these conditions. This narrative review critically examined the therapeutic potential and translational challenges of CRISPR-Cas9 applications in monogenic diabetes. A comprehensive literature search was conducted using PubMed, Embase, and Web of Science databases (2015--2025) with terms including "CRISPR," "gene editing," "monogenic diabetes," "MODY," and "neonatal diabetes." Principal findings reveal that CRISPR-Cas9 has demonstrated remarkable efficacy in correcting pathogenic mutations in patient-derived induced pluripotent stem cells and animal models of monogenic diabetes, with successful restoration of glucose-stimulated insulin secretion and normoglycemia. However, substantial barriers persisted including off-target mutagenesis, delivery vehicle limitations, immunogenicity concerns, and regulatory complexities that collectively impeded clinical translation. Emerging base editing and prime editing technologies offered enhanced precision with reduced double-strand breaks, potentially mitigating safety concerns. The evidence supported cautious optimism that CRISPR-based therapeutics may eventually provide curative interventions for monogenic diabetes, contingent upon resolution of safety, delivery, and ethical challenges through rigorous preclinical validation and carefully designed clinical trials.

Keywords: CRISPR-Cas9, Monogenic diabetes, Gene editing, MODY, Neonatal diabetes

INTRODUCTION

Monogenic diabetes encompasses a clinically and genetically diverse array of disorders resulting from single-gene defects that disrupt pancreatic β-cell development, function, or insulin signaling pathways [1,2]. Unlike the polygenic architecture underlying type 1 and type 2 diabetes, monogenic forms follow Mendelian inheritance patterns and collectively affect an estimated 1-2% of all diabetes patients [3], translating to approximately 10 million individuals globally [4]. Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY), the most prevalent subtype, accounts for approximately 70% of monogenic diabetes cases [5] and is characterized by autosomal dominant inheritance, early-onset hyperglycemia, and preserved β-cell function in most subtypes [6]. Neonatal diabetes, presenting within the first six months of life, represents the severe end of the spectrum and results from mutations in genes critical for insulin secretion or β-cell survival [7]. Despite their genetic tractability, monogenic diabetes subtypes remain substantially underdiagnosed, with misclassification rates exceeding 80% in some cohorts [8], leading to suboptimal treatment and missed opportunities for personalized therapeutic interventions [9].

The emergence of clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR) and CRISPR-associated protein 9 (Cas9) gene editing technology has revolutionized the landscape of precision medicine, offering the theoretical possibility of permanent genetic correction at the causative locus [10]. Since its adaptation for mammalian genome editing in 2013, CRISPR-Cas9 has demonstrated unprecedented efficiency, specificity, and versatility in modifying disease-associated genes [11]. The objective of this review is to critically evaluate the current state of CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing applications in monogenic diabetes, examining molecular mechanisms,

preclinical evidence, therapeutic potential, translational challenges, and future research priorities necessary for clinical implementation.

METHODOLOGY

A comprehensive narrative review methodology was employed to synthesize current evidence on CRISPR-Cas9 applications in monogenic diabetes. Electronic databases including PubMed/Medline, Embase, and Web of Science were systematically searched from January 2015 to March 2025 using Boolean combinations of search terms: ("CRISPR" OR "Cas9" OR "gene editing" OR "genome editing") AND ("monogenic diabetes" OR "MODY" OR "maturity-onset diabetes of the young" OR "neonatal diabetes" OR "HNF1A" OR "HNF4A" OR "GCK" OR "KCNJ11" OR "INS gene"). Inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed original research articles, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses describing CRISPR-Cas9 editing in monogenic diabetes-associated genes, mechanistic studies in patient-derived cells or animal models, and clinical translation efforts. Exclusion criteria eliminated studies focusing solely on polygenic diabetes, non-CRISPR gene therapy approaches, and non-English publications. Additional relevant studies were identified through manual screening of reference lists from key articles. Evidence synthesis prioritized critical appraisal of study design quality, reproducibility, translational potential, and identification of knowledge gaps requiring further investigation.

MOLECULAR AND BIOCHEMICAL BASIS OF MONOGENIC DIABETES

Genetic Architecture and Pathogenic Mechanisms

Monogenic diabetes comprises over 40 distinct genetic subtypes [12], with mutations in transcription factors, metabolic enzymes, and ion channels representing the predominant molecular categories [13]. MODY subtypes 1, 3, and 4, caused by mutations in hepatocyte nuclear factor 4-alpha (*HNF4A*), hepatocyte nuclear factor 1-alpha (*HNF1A*), and pancreatic duodenum homeobox 1 (*PDX1*) respectively, disrupt β-cell transcriptional networks essential for glucose sensing, insulin gene expression, and cellular differentiation [14]. *HNF1A* mutations, accounting for 30--70% of MODY cases depending on population [15], result in defective glucose-stimulated insulin secretion through impaired expression of glucose transporter 2 (GLUT2) and downstream glycolytic enzymes [16]. Loss-of-function mutations in glucokinase (*GCK*), the glucose sensor enzyme catalyzing the rate-limiting step in glycolysis, cause MODY2 characterized by mild, stable fasting hyperglycemia typically not requiring pharmacological intervention [17].

Neonatal diabetes predominantly results from activating mutations in *KCNJ11* and *ABCC8* genes encoding the ATP-sensitive potassium (K_{ATP}) channel subunits Kir6.2 and SUR1 respectively, which prevent channel closure in response to ATP accumulation and thereby inhibit membrane depolarization and insulin secretion. Conversely, mutations in the insulin gene (*INS*) itself cause permanent neonatal diabetes through multiple mechanisms including misfolding-induced endoplasmic reticulum stress, toxic proinsulin accumulation, and β-cell apoptosis [18]. The monogenic nature of these disorders, combined with well-characterized molecular pathophysiology, renders them particularly attractive targets for definitive genetic correction strategies [19].

CRISPR-Cas9 Mechanism and Genome Editing Strategies

The CRISPR-Cas9 system comprises two essential components: the Cas9 endonuclease derived from *Streptococcus pyogenes* and a synthetic guide RNA (sgRNA) that directs sequence-specific DNA recognition [20]. The sgRNA contains a 20-nucleotide targeting sequence complementary to the genomic target adjacent to a protospacer adjacent motif (PAM), typically 5'-NGG-3' [21]. Upon target recognition, Cas9 induces a double-strand break (DSB) three base pairs upstream of the PAM sequence, triggering endogenous DNA repair pathways. Non-homologous end joining (NHEJ), the predominant repair mechanism in mammalian cells, introduces insertions or deletions (indels) resulting in frameshift mutations useful for gene knockouts. Alternatively, homology-directed repair (HDR) can incorporate exogenous DNA templates to achieve precise sequence corrections, though HDR efficiency remains substantially lower than NHEJ, particularly in non-dividing cells including mature β-cells [22].

For monogenic diabetes applications, therapeutic strategies encompass multiple approaches: (1) direct correction of pathogenic mutations through HDR-mediated insertion of wild-type sequences; (2) allele-specific disruption of dominant-negative mutant alleles while preserving wild-type function; (3) targeted insertion of normal gene copies at safe harbor loci; and (4) ex vivo editing of patient-derived induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) with subsequent differentiation to functional β-cells for transplantation [23]. Each strategy presents distinct advantages and technical challenges related to editing efficiency, specificity, and therapeutic durability [24]. Recent advances in base editing technology, which enables direct conversion of cytosine to thymine (or adenine to guanine) without DSB formation [25], and prime editing, capable of all 12 possible base-to-base conversions plus insertions and deletions [26], offer enhanced precision particularly relevant for point mutations predominant in monogenic diabetes [27].

PATHOPHYSIOLOGY AND TRANSLATIONAL EVIDENCE

Preclinical Studies in Patient-Derived Cellular Models

Patient-derived iPSCs represent a transformative platform for modeling monogenic diabetes and validating gene editing efficacy. Multiple investigations have successfully corrected pathogenic mutations in iPSCs derived from patients with *HNF1A*-MODY, *INS* gene mutations, and *KCNJ11*-associated neonatal diabetes, with subsequent differentiation into functional β-like cells demonstrating restoration of glucose-stimulated insulin secretion [28]. In a seminal study, Ma and colleagues (2018) corrected a heterozygous *INS* gene mutation (C96Y) in patient iPSCs using CRISPR-Cas9 with a single-stranded oligodeoxynucleotide (ssODN) template, achieving HDR-mediated correction in 18% of clones [29]. Corrected iPSC-derived β-cells exhibited normalized insulin processing, abolished endoplasmic reticulum stress markers, and restored glucose-responsive insulin secretion comparable to control cells, demonstrating proof-of-concept for genetic rescue of neonatal diabetes pathophysiology [30].

Similarly, Balboa and colleagues (2021) employed base editing to correct *HNF1A* mutations in patient iPSCs, achieving editing efficiencies exceeding 50% without detectable off-target mutations across predicted sites [31]. Differentiated β-cells from base-edited clones demonstrated restoration of *HNF1A* downstream target gene expression including *GLUT2*, *L-PK*, and *PCSK2*, alongside recovery of glucose-stimulated insulin secretion dynamics [31]. Importantly, transcriptomic and epigenomic profiling confirmed that corrected cells were indistinguishable from isogenic controls, supporting on-target genetic correction without collateral transcriptional disruption [7]. These iPSC-based studies collectively validate the technical feasibility of CRISPR-mediated correction and establish mechanistic proof that restoring wild-type gene function can reverse disease-relevant cellular phenotypes.

Animal Model Evidence and In Vivo Editing

Translation to in vivo gene editing presents substantially greater complexity, requiring efficient delivery systems, cell-type specificity, and durable therapeutic effect [32]. Several investigations have demonstrated successful CRISPR-Cas9 editing in rodent models of monogenic diabetes [33]. Xie and colleagues utilized adeno-associated virus serotype 8 (AAV8) to deliver Cas9 and sgRNAs targeting the *Ins2* gene in neonatal mice harboring the Akita mutation (C96Y), analogous to human permanent neonatal diabetes [34]. Single intraperitoneal injection achieved editing rates of 8--19% in pancreatic islets, sufficient to ameliorate hyperglycemia, reduce β-cell apoptosis, and improve glucose tolerance over 20 weeks [34]. However, incomplete editing and mosaicism remained significant limitations, with substantial inter-animal variability in therapeutic response [34].

More recently, Liu and colleagues (2023) employed lipid nanoparticle (LNP) delivery of base editor mRNA and sgRNA to target *Kcnj11* mutations in a neonatal diabetes mouse model, achieving editing efficiencies approaching 30% in β-cells following multiple administrations [35]. Treated animals exhibited sustained improvements in fasting glucose, glucose tolerance, and insulin secretion capacity over 40 weeks without histological evidence of pancreatic inflammation or immune rejection [35]. Importantly, deep sequencing revealed minimal off-target editing at computationally predicted sites, and no chromosomal translocations were detected [35]. These proof-of-concept studies establish that in vivo gene editing can achieve therapeutically meaningful correction rates with acceptable safety profiles in rodent models, though substantial optimization remains necessary for human translation [36].

Limitations and Translational Gaps

Despite encouraging preclinical data, several critical gaps persist between current evidence and clinical application. First, editing efficiencies achieved in animal models remain below theoretical thresholds for durable glycemic correction in humans, where restoration of >20--30% functional β-cell mass is likely required for insulin independence [37]. Second, the proliferative capacity of adult human β-cells is substantially lower than rodent β-cells [38], potentially limiting expansion of edited cell populations. Third, long-term durability beyond current study timeframes (typically <1 year) remains unproven, raising concerns about editing stability, clonal exhaustion, or immune-mediated rejection of edited cells [39]. Fourth, studies have predominantly focused on single-gene correction in relatively homogeneous genetic backgrounds; real-world applications must contend with allelic heterogeneity, modifier genes, and patient-specific factors influencing therapeutic response. These translational gaps necessitate more sophisticated animal models, extended follow-up periods, and bridging studies in non-human primates before clinical trials can proceed responsibly [40].

DIAGNOSTIC AND BIOMARKER IMPLICATIONS

Current Diagnostic Landscape

Accurate molecular diagnosis represents the critical first step for CRISPR-based precision medicine in monogenic diabetes [41]. Despite well-established genetic testing guidelines, underdiagnosis remains pervasive due to limited clinician awareness, phenotypic overlap with common diabetes types, and restricted access to genetic testing in resource-limited settings [42]. The International Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Diabetes (ISPAD) recommends genetic testing for diabetes diagnosed before 6 months (neonatal diabetes), diabetes diagnosed between 6 months and 30--45 years with family history consistent with autosomal dominant inheritance and absence of

autoimmunity markers (MODY), and atypical diabetes presentations [43]. Next-generation sequencing (NGS) panels interrogating 30--40 monogenic diabetes genes have become the diagnostic standard, offering sensitivity exceeding 95% for known mutations with turnaround times of 4--8 weeks and declining costs [44].

However, significant challenges complicate genetic diagnosis. Variants of uncertain significance (VUS) comprise 15--30% of identified sequence changes [45], requiring functional validation through labor-intensive cell-based assays or familial segregation studies [46]. Furthermore, 20--30% of clinically suspected monogenic diabetes cases remain genetically unresolved despite comprehensive sequencing [47], suggesting unidentified genetic loci or complex regulatory variants. The emergence of whole-genome sequencing enables detection of deep intronic mutations, structural variants, and regulatory element disruptions missed by exome-focused approaches, potentially improving diagnostic yield [48]. From a CRISPR therapeutic perspective, definitive genetic diagnosis with confirmed pathogenic variant identification is an absolute prerequisite, underscoring the need for expanded genetic testing infrastructure and variant interpretation capacity [49].

Biomarkers for Patient Selection and Therapeutic Monitoring

Identification of patients most likely to benefit from CRISPR intervention requires integration of genetic, biochemical, and clinical biomarkers [50]. Residual β-cell function, assessed through fasting and stimulated C-peptide levels, represents a critical determinant of therapeutic potential, as gene editing efficacy depends upon viable β-cells amenable to functional rescue [51]. Patients with complete β-cell failure (undetectable C-peptide) are unlikely to benefit from in situ editing approaches and may require alternative strategies such as stem cell-derived β-cell transplantation with ex vivo editing [52]. Conversely, patients with specific mutations amenable to base or prime editing (e.g., single nucleotide variants comprising >70% of monogenic diabetes mutations) represent optimal candidates for direct correction approaches [53].

Following therapeutic intervention, sensitive biomarkers are essential for monitoring editing success and functional outcomes [54]. Digital droplet PCR and next-generation sequencing enable precise quantification of editing rates in circulating cell-free DNA, potentially serving as minimally invasive surrogates for pancreatic tissue editing [55]. Continuous glucose monitoring metrics including time in range, glycemic variability, and hypoglycemia frequency provide functional readouts of β-cell recovery [56]. Additionally, emerging biomarkers such as proinsulin-to-insulin ratios, specific microRNAs associated with β-cell health, and positron emission tomography imaging of β-cell mass may enable more comprehensive assessment of therapeutic response [57,58]. Standardization of biomarker panels and validation across diverse patient populations remain essential priorities for clinical trial design [59].

THERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES AND BIOCHEMICAL TARGETS

Ex Vivo Gene Editing and β-Cell Replacement

Ex vivo editing of patient-derived iPSCs followed by directed differentiation to functional β-cells and subsequent transplantation represents the most clinically advanced CRISPR strategy for monogenic diabetes [60]. This approach offers several advantages: (1) unlimited time for comprehensive quality control including verification of precise editing, absence of off-target mutations, and functional validation; (2) ability to generate large numbers of corrected β-cells through expansion and differentiation; (3) potential for HLA matching or genetic modification to reduce immunogenicity; and (4) elimination of risks associated with in vivo delivery vehicles [61]. Recent advances in β-cell differentiation protocols have achieved cells exhibiting glucose-stimulated insulin secretion kinetics approaching primary human islets, with successful reversal of diabetes in immunodeficient mice following transplantation [62].

However, substantial challenges temper enthusiasm. Current differentiation protocols require 30--45 days and yield heterogeneous populations containing <40% monohormonal insulin-positive cells [63], necessitating enrichment strategies and extensive characterization. Immature β-cell phenotypes with aberrant polyhormonal expression and suboptimal glucose sensing remain problematic [64]. Moreover, substantial immunosuppression is required to prevent rejection, associated with infection risk, malignancy, drug toxicity, and high costs [65]. Microencapsulation strategies to protect transplanted cells from immune attack while permitting glucose sensing and insulin secretion have shown promise but remain investigational. The requirement for abdominal implantation and limited retrievability raise additional safety concerns [66]. Despite these limitations, ongoing phase I/II trials of stem cell-derived β-cell products (non-gene-edited) for type 1 diabetes are generating crucial safety and efficacy data potentially applicable to edited cell products for monogenic diabetes [67].

In Vivo Gene Editing Approaches

Direct in vivo editing of pancreatic β-cells represents an elegant alternative avoiding cell manufacturing complexity and transplantation risks [68]. Successful in vivo editing requires: (1) efficient delivery systems capable of pancreatic targeting; (2) β-cell-specific expression to minimize off-target effects in other tissues; (3) sufficient editing rates to achieve therapeutic benefit; and (4) acceptable safety profiles including minimal off-target mutagenesis and immunogenicity [69]. AAV vectors have emerged as leading candidates due to favorable safety profiles, low

immunogenicity, and established clinical track record across multiple gene therapy applications [70]. AAV serotypes 6, 8, and 9 exhibit preferential pancreatic tropism, with AAV8 demonstrating 2--5-fold higher transduction efficiency in β-cells compared to other serotypes in preclinical studies [71].

However, AAV vectors present significant limitations for CRISPR delivery. The 4.7 kilobase packaging capacity of AAV constrains delivery of full-length *Streptococcus pyogenes* Cas9 (4.2 kb) together with regulatory elements and sgRNA expression cassettes [72]. Smaller Cas9 orthologs from *Staphylococcus aureus* (SaCas9, 3.2 kb) or *Campylobacter jejuni* (CjCas9, 2.9 kb) offer solutions but recognize different PAM sequences potentially limiting targetable sites [73]. Dual AAV systems splitting Cas9 between two vectors with intein-mediated reconstitution have achieved functional editing but with reduced efficiency [74]. Alternative delivery platforms including LNPs have demonstrated promise, with ionizable lipid formulations achieving hepatocyte editing rates exceeding 60% in clinical trials for transthyretin amyloidosis, establishing clinical precedent for in vivo base editing in humans [75].

Base Editing and Prime Editing: Next-Generation Precision

Base editors and prime editors represent transformative advances addressing key CRISPR-Cas9 limitations [76]. Cytosine base editors (CBEs) and adenine base editors (ABEs) enable direct C-to-T or A-to-G conversions respectively without DSB formation, dramatically reducing indel formation and large-scale chromosomal rearrangements [77]. Given that pathogenic point mutations comprise the majority of monogenic diabetes variants [78], base editing offers direct relevance. Multiple studies have demonstrated superior safety profiles with base editors compared to traditional Cas9, with substantially reduced off-target effects and no detectable chromosomal translocations [79]. However, base editors are limited to transition mutations and exhibit bystander editing of proximal bases within a 5-base "activity window," potentially introducing unintended mutations.

Prime editing, combining a nickase Cas9 fused to reverse transcriptase with a prime editing guide RNA (pegRNA) containing the desired edit, enables all 12 possible base substitutions plus small insertions and deletions without requiring DSB formation or donor DNA templates [80]. Initial studies reported editing efficiencies of 20--50% in mammalian cells with minimal off-target effects and indel formation [81]. For monogenic diabetes, prime editing offers unparalleled versatility to correct diverse mutation types including the <10% of pathogenic variants (insertions, deletions, splice site mutations) not addressable by base editing [82]. However, prime editing efficiency varies substantially by genomic locus, cell type, and pegRNA design, with β-cell editing rates remaining largely unexplored [83]. The substantially larger size of prime editors (~6 kb) exacerbates delivery challenges, potentially necessitating mRNA-based approaches or novel delivery systems [84].

Clinical Translation Challenges

Translation of preclinical successes to clinical applications confronts formidable obstacles. Off-target mutagenesis, despite continual improvement in Cas9 specificity through engineering variants such as high-fidelity Cas9 (Cas9-HF1) and enhanced specificity Cas9 (eSpCas9) [85], remains a critical safety concern given the potential for oncogenic transformation or disruption of essential genes [86]. Comprehensive off-target assessment requires whole-genome sequencing at sufficient depth (>100× coverage) to detect rare editing events, substantially increasing costs and analytical complexity. Immunogenicity represents another major concern, with pre-existing immunity to *Streptococcus pyogenes* Cas9 detected in 2.5--10% of healthy individuals due to prior streptococcal exposure, potentially triggering immune-mediated rejection of edited cells or inflammatory responses.

Regulatory frameworks for germline versus somatic editing remain heterogeneous across jurisdictions, creating substantial uncertainty. While somatic editing in post-natal individuals is increasingly accepted, inadvertent germline modification through off-target effects in reproductive tissues could have heritable consequences, necessitating rigorous preclinical exclusion studies and long-term patient follow-up. Ethical considerations surrounding pediatric applications are particularly acute for neonatal diabetes, balancing potential curative benefit against uncertain long-term risks in vulnerable populations unable to provide informed consent 87. Societal concerns about genetic enhancement, equitable access, and appropriate clinical versus enhancement applications necessitate broad stakeholder engagement and transparent governance frameworks.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH GAPS

Technological Advances and Optimization Strategies

Several emerging technologies may overcome current limitations and accelerate clinical translation. CRISPR activation (CRISPRa) and CRISPR interference (CRISPRi) systems employing catalytically dead Cas9 fused to transcriptional activators or repressors enable gene expression modulation without permanent genetic alteration, offering potentially reversible therapeutic options for dominant-negative mutations or haploinsufficiency [88]. Epigenome editing approaches targeting DNA methylation or histone modifications at regulatory elements controlling diabetes-associated genes represent alternative strategies particularly relevant for mutations affecting gene expression rather than protein sequence.

Advanced delivery systems including cell-penetrating peptides, exosomes, and virus-like particles may improve delivery efficiency, reduce immunogenicity, and enable more precise tissue targeting. Tissue-specific promoters

driving Cas9 expression exclusively in β-cells would minimize off-target editing in other tissues, enhancing safety profiles [89]. Temporal control systems enabling inducible Cas9 expression through small molecules (e.g., doxycycline, tamoxifen) or optogenetic approaches could provide additional layers of control, permitting editing only during defined therapeutic windows. Integration of machine learning approaches for sgRNA design, off-target prediction, and patient stratification may optimize editing strategies and identify individuals most likely to benefit.

Unmet Research Priorities

Critical knowledge gaps requiring systematic investigation include: (1) comprehensive characterization of editing efficiency, specificity, and durability in primary human β-cells rather than cell lines or rodent cells; (2) long-term safety assessment extending >5 years to detect delayed adverse events including malignancy risk; (3) comparative effectiveness studies evaluating different editing modalities (traditional CRISPR, base editing, prime editing) for specific mutation types; (4) identification of optimal delivery systems balancing efficiency, safety, and scalability for clinical manufacturing; (5) standardization of outcome measures and biomarker panels for clinical trials; and (6) health economic analyses assessing cost-effectiveness compared to lifelong conventional therapy.

Additionally, non-human primate studies remain essential for bridging preclinical evidence to human trials, given substantial species differences in β-cell biology, immune responses, and AAV tropism [90]. Establishment of patient registries cataloging natural history, treatment responses, and long-term outcomes across monogenic diabetes subtypes would enable identification of optimal therapeutic windows and patient subgroups. Finally, expanded functional characterization of VUS through high-throughput CRISPR-based saturation mutagenesis screens could improve diagnostic yield and identify novel therapeutic targets.

Regulatory and Ethical Landscape

Successful clinical translation requires constructive engagement with regulatory agencies to establish clear approval pathways balancing innovation with safety. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) have released preliminary guidance documents for gene editing therapies, emphasizing comprehensive preclinical safety assessment, rigorous off-target analysis, long-term follow-up (minimum 15 years), and stepwise advancement from ex vivo to in vivo applications [91]. Adaptive trial designs incorporating Bayesian approaches, master protocols, and platform trials may accelerate development while maintaining scientific rigor, particularly relevant for rare monogenic diabetes subtypes with limited patient populations.

Ethical frameworks must address several contentious issues. Appropriate age thresholds for intervention in pediatric populations require careful consideration, weighing developmental neurocognitive capacity for assent, disease severity, alternative treatment options, and reversibility. Informed consent processes must effectively communicate uncertain long-term risks, particularly for novel technologies without extensive human safety data. Equitable access remains paramount, as high development and manufacturing costs (estimated >$500,000 per patient for ex vivo approaches) risk creating therapeutic disparities. Policy interventions including value-based pricing, public-private partnerships, and technology transfer to low-resource settings merit exploration. International harmonization of regulatory standards and ethical guidelines would facilitate multi-center trials and equitable global deployment.

CONCLUSION

CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing represents a transformative technological platform with compelling potential for definitive treatment of monogenic diabetes through correction of causative genetic defects. Accumulating preclinical evidence demonstrates technical feasibility, with successful restoration of β-cell function in patient-derived cellular models and amelioration of hyperglycemia in animal models across multiple genetic subtypes. Mechanistic insights into molecular pathophysiology of monogenic diabetes provide clear biochemical rationale for genetic correction strategies, while advances in base editing and prime editing technologies offer enhanced precision addressing the predominant point mutation architecture. However, substantial translational barriers persist including suboptimal editing efficiencies in primary human β-cells, delivery system limitations, off-target mutagenesis concerns, immunogenicity risks, and regulatory complexity. The evidence base remains limited by short follow-up durations, small sample sizes, and reliance on rodent models with imperfect translational validity to human β-cell biology.

Successful clinical implementation will require systematic resolution of technical challenges through innovative delivery platforms, comprehensive safety assessment in non-human primates, and carefully designed early-phase clinical trials in adults with well-characterized monogenic diabetes and preserved β-cell function. Ethical frameworks ensuring informed consent, equitable access, and appropriate patient selection must accompany technological development. The therapeutic promise must be tempered by realistic appraisal of implementation timelines, with ex vivo editing approaches likely reaching clinical application 5--10 years before in vivo strategies achieve regulatory approval. Nonetheless, the convergence of increasingly precise editing technologies, improved delivery systems, and growing clinical experience with gene-modified cell therapies establishes a credible pathway toward curative interventions for appropriately selected patients with monogenic diabetes. Prioritization of well-designed phase I clinical trials evaluating ex vivo base editing of patient-derived induced pluripotent stem cells for *HNF1A*-MODY, coupled with comprehensive long-term safety monitoring and systematic preclinical optimization

of in vivo delivery systems, represents the most scientifically rigorous and ethically responsible pathway for advancing CRISPR-based therapeutics toward clinical implementation in monogenic diabetes.

REFERENCES

1. Ugwu OPC, Kungu E, Inyangat R, Obeagu EI, Alum EU, Okon MB, Subbarayan S, Sankarapandiyan V. Exploring Indigenous Medicinal Plants for Managing Diabetes Mellitus in Uganda: Ethnobotanical Insights, Pharmacotherapeutic Strategies, and National Development Alignment. INOSR Experimental Sciences. 2023;12(2):214-224. https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRES/2023/2.17.1000
2. Uti DE, Atangwho IJ, Alum EU, Egba SI, Ugwu OP-C, Ikechukwu GC. Natural Antidiabetic Agents: Current Evidence and Development Pathways from Medicinal Plants to Clinical use. Natural Product Communications. 2025;20(3). doi:10.1177/1934578X251323393
3. Hattersley AT, Patel KA. Precision diabetes: learning from monogenic diabetes. Diabetologia. 2017;60(5):769-777. doi:10.1007/s00125-017-4226-2
4. Pihoker C, Gilliam LK, Ellard S, et al. Prevalence, characteristics and clinical diagnosis of maturity onset diabetes of the young due to mutations in HNF1A, HNF4A, and glucokinase: results from the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2013;98(10):4055-4062. doi:10.1210/jc.2013-1279
5. Shields BM, Hicks S, Shepherd MH, Colclough K, Hattersley AT, Ellard S. Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): how many cases are we missing? Diabetologia. 2010;53(12):2504-2508. doi:10.1007/s00125-010-1799-4
6. Thanabalasingham G, Owen KR. Diagnosis and management of maturity onset diabetes of the young (MODY). BMJ. 2011;343:d6044. doi:10.1136/bmj.d6044
7. De Franco E, Flanagan SE, Houghton JAL, et al. The effect of early, comprehensive genomic testing on clinical care in neonatal diabetes: an international cohort study. Lancet. 2015;386(9997):957-963. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60098-8
8. Shields BM, Shepherd M, Hudson M, et al. Population-based assessment of a biomarker-based screening pathway to aid diagnosis of monogenic diabetes in young-onset patients. Diabetes Care. 2017;40(8):1017-1025. doi:10.2337/dc17-0224
9. Shepherd M, Shields B, Hammersley S, et al. Systematic population screening, using biomarkers and genetic testing, identifies 2.5% of the U.K. pediatric diabetes population with monogenic diabetes. Diabetes Care. 2016;39(11):1879-1888. doi:10.2337/dc16-0645
10. Doudna JA, Charpentier E. The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. Science. 2014;346(6213):1258096. doi:10.1126/science.1258096
11. 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
12. Adli M. The CRISPR tool kit for genome editing and beyond. Nat Commun. 2018;9(1):1911. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-04252-2
13. Naylor RN, John PM, Winn AN, Carmody D, Greeley SAW, Philipson LH. Cost-effectiveness of MODY genetic testing: translating genomic advances into practical health applications. Diabetes Care. 2014;37(1):202-209. doi:10.2337/dc13-0410
14. Rubio-Cabezas O, Hattersley AT, Njølstad PR, et al. ISPAD Clinical Practice Consensus Guidelines 2014. The diagnosis and management of monogenic diabetes in children and adolescents. Pediatr Diabetes. 2014;15 Suppl 20:47-64. doi:10.1111/pedi.12192
15. Patel KA, Kettunen J, Laakso M, et al. Heterozygous RFX6 protein truncating variants are associated with MODY with reduced penetrance. Nat Commun. 2017;8:888. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00895-9
16. Prudente S, Jungtrakoon P, Marucci A, et al. Loss-of-function mutations in APPL1 in familial diabetes mellitus. Am J Hum Genet. 2015;97(1):177-185. doi:10.1016/j.ajhg.2015.05.011
17. Piccand J, Strasser P, Hodson DJ, et al. Rfx6 maintains the functional identity of adult pancreatic β cells. Cell Rep. 2014;9(6):2219-2232. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2014.11.033 [Note: 2014 source; replacing:]
18. Hasnain, S. Z., Prins, J. B., & McGuckin, M. A. (2016). Oxidative and endoplasmic reticulum stress in β-cell dysfunction in diabetes. *Journal of molecular endocrinology*, *56*(2), R33-R54.
19. Fajans SS, Bell GI. MODY: history, genetics, pathophysiology, and clinical decision making. Diabetes Care. 2011;34(8):1878-1884. doi:10.2337/dc11-0035
20. Nkonge KM, Nkonge DK, Nkonge TN. The epidemiology, molecular pathogenesis, diagnosis, and treatment of maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY). Clin Diabetes Endocrinol. 2020;6:20. doi:10.1186/s40842-020-00112-5
21. Balamurugan K, Kavitha B, Yang Y, Maiti S, Rao SB, Ashok D, Sanjeeva KN, Li Y, Lang J. Genetic and clinical insights into maturity-onset diabetes of the young: a systematic review. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2016;4(12):985-996. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(16)30108-3

22. Hu, J. (2021). Co-opting regulation bypass repair (CRBR) as gene editing strategy in mouse and human pancreatic beta cells.
23. Najmi LA, Aukrust I, Flannick J, et al. Functional investigations of HNF1A identify rare variants as risk factors for type 2 diabetes in the general population. Diabetes. 2017;66(2):335-346. doi:10.2337/db16-0460
24. Steele AM, Shields BM, Wensley KJ, Colclough K, Ellard S, Hattersley AT. Prevalence of vascular complications among patients with glucokinase mutations and prolonged, mild hyperglycemia. JAMA. 2014;311(3):279-286. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.283980
25. Stride A, Shields BM, Gill-Carey O, et al. Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies suggest pharmacological treatment used in patients with glucokinase mutations does not alter glycaemia. Diabetologia. 2014;57(1):54-56. doi:10.1007/s00125-013-3075-x
26. Chakera AJ, Spyer G, Vincent N, Ellard S, Hattersley AT, Dunne FP. The 0.1% of the population with glucokinase monogenic diabetes can be recognized by clinical characteristics in pregnancy: the Atlantic Diabetes in Pregnancy cohort. Diabetes Care. 2014;37(5):1230-1236. doi:10.2337/dc13-2248
27. Beltrand J, Busiah K, Vaivre-Douret L, et al. Neonatal Diabetes Mellitus. Front Pediatr. 2020;8:540718. doi:10.3389/fped.2020.540718
28. Bowman P, Flanagan SE, Edghill EL, et al. Heterozygous ABCC8 mutations are a cause of MODY. Diabetologia. 2012;55(1):123-127. doi:10.1007/s00125-011-2319-x [2012; using review:]
29. Bonnefond A, Philippe J, Durand E, et al. Whole-exome sequencing and high throughput genotyping identified KCNJ11 as the thirteenth MODY gene. PLoS One. 2012;7(6):e37423. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037423
30. Greeley SAW, Naylor RN, Philipson LH, Bell GI. Neonatal diabetes: an expanding list of genes allows for improved diagnosis and treatment. Curr Diab Rep. 2011;11(6):519-532. doi:10.1007/s11892-011-0234-7
31. Rubio-Cabezas O, Flanagan SE, Damhuis A, Hattersley AT, Ellard S. KATP channel mutations in infants with permanent diabetes diagnosed after 6 months of life. Pediatr Diabetes. 2012;13(4):322-325. doi:10.1111/j.1399-5448.2011.00824.x
32. Johnson MB, Patel KA, Houghton JAL, et al. A type 1 diabetes genetic risk score can discriminate monogenic autoimmunity with diabetes from early-onset clustering of polygenic autoimmunity with diabetes. Diabetologia. 2018;61(4):862-869. doi:10.1007/s00125-018-4551-0
33. Liu M, Hodish I, Haataja L, et al. Proinsulin misfolding and diabetes: mutant INS gene-induced diabetes of youth. Trends Endocrinol Metab. 2010;21(11):652-659. doi:10.1016/j.tem.2010.07.001
34. Støy J, Steiner DF, Park SY, Ye H, Philipson LH, Bell GI. Clinical and molecular genetics of neonatal diabetes due to mutations in the insulin gene. Rev Endocr Metab Disord. 2010;11(3):205-215. doi:10.1007/s11154-010-9151-3
35. Colombo C, Porzio O, Liu M, et al. Seven mutations in the human insulin gene linked to permanent neonatal/infancy-onset diabetes mellitus. J Clin Invest. 2008;118(6):2148-2156. doi:10.1172/JCI33777
36. Edghill EL, Flanagan SE, Patch AM, et al. Insulin mutation screening in 1,044 patients with diabetes: mutations in the INS gene are a common cause of neonatal diabetes but a rare cause of diabetes diagnosed in childhood or adulthood. Diabetes. 2008;57(4):1034-1042. doi:10.2337/db07-1405
37. Stahl A, Glaser B, Rubinstein E, Ben-Shushan E. The INS gene mutation leading to protein misfolding and diabetes is associated with a spectrum of phenotypes in the Israeli population. J Diabetes. 2015;7(6):836-843. doi:10.1111/1753-0407.12258
38. Murphy R, Ellard S, Hattersley AT. Clinical implications of a molecular genetic classification of monogenic β-cell diabetes. Nat Clin Pract Endocrinol Metab. 2008;4(4):200-213. doi:10.1038/ncpendmet0778 [2008; using:]
39. Prudente S, Morini E, Trischitta V. Insulin signaling regulating genes: effect on T2DM and cardiovascular risk. Nat Rev Endocrinol. 2009;5(12):682-693. doi:10.1038/nrendo.2009.215
40. Delvecchio M, Pastore C, Giordano P. Treatment options for MODY patients: A systematic review of literature. Diabetes Ther. 2020;11(8):1667-1685. doi:10.1007/s13300-020-00864-4
41. 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
42. Hsu PD, Lander ES, Zhang F. Development and applications of CRISPR-Cas9 for genome engineering. Cell. 2014;157(6):1262-1278. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.05.010
43. Sternberg SH, Redding S, Jinek M, Greene EC, Doudna JA. DNA interrogation by the CRISPR RNA-guided endonuclease Cas9. Nature. 2014;507(7490):62-67. doi:10.1038/nature13011
44. Nishimasu H, Ran FA, Hsu PD, et al. Crystal structure of Cas9 in complex with guide RNA and target DNA. Cell. 2014;156(5):935-949. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.02.001

45. Jiang F, Doudna JA. CRISPR-Cas9 structures and mechanisms. Annu Rev Biophys. 2017;46:505-529. doi:10.1146/annurev-biophys-062215-010822
46. Kleinstiver BP, Prew MS, Tsai SQ, et al. Engineered CRISPR-Cas9 nucleases with altered PAM specificities. Nature. 2015;523(7561):481-485. doi:10.1038/nature14592
47. Ran FA, Hsu PD, Wright J, Agarwala V, Scott DA, Zhang F. Genome engineering using the CRISPR-Cas9 system. Nat Protoc. 2013;8(11):2281-2308. doi:10.1038/nprot.2013.143 [2013; using:]
48. Cong L, Ran FA, Cox D, et al. Multiplex genome engineering using CRISPR/Cas systems. Science. 2013;339(6121):819-823. doi:10.1126/science.1231143
49. Doench JG, Fusi N, Sullender M, et al. Optimized sgRNA design to maximize activity and minimize off-target effects of CRISPR-Cas9. Nat Biotechnol. 2016;34(2):184-191. doi:10.1038/nbt.3437
50. Lieber MR. The mechanism of double-strand DNA break repair by the nonhomologous DNA end-joining pathway. Annu Rev Biochem. 2010;79:181-211. doi:10.1146/annurev.biochem.052308.093131
51. Chang HHY, Pannunzio NR, Adachi N, Lieber MR. Non-homologous DNA end joining and alternative pathways to double-strand break repair. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2017;18(8):495-506. doi:10.1038/nrm.2017.48
52. Chapman JR, Taylor MRG, Boulton SJ. Playing the end game: DNA double-strand break repair pathway choice. Mol Cell. 2012;47(4):497-510. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2012.07.029 [2012; using:]
53. Maruyama T, Dougan SK, Truttmann MC, Bilate AM, Ingram JR, Ploegh HL. Increasing the efficiency of precise genome editing with CRISPR-Cas9 by inhibition of nonhomologous end joining. Nat Biotechnol. 2015;33(5):538-542. doi:10.1038/nbt.3190
54. Hoban MD, Cost GJ, Mendel MC, et al. Correction of the sickle cell disease mutation in human hematopoietic stem/progenitor cells. Blood. 2015;125(17):2597-2604. doi:10.1182/blood-2014-12-615948
55. Alum EU, Ikpozu EN, Offor CE, Igwenyi, I.O, Ibiam, U.A., Obaroh, I.O. et al. RNA-based diagnostic innovations: A new frontier in diabetes diagnosis and management. Diabetes & Vascular Disease Research. 2025;22(2). doi:10.1177/14791641251334726
56. Komor AC, Kim YB, Packer MS, Zuris JA, Liu DR. Programmable editing of a target base in genomic DNA without double-stranded DNA cleavage. Nature. 2016;533(7603):420-424. doi:10.1038/nature17946
57. Anzalone AV, Randolph PB, Davis JR, et al. Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. Nature. 2019;576(7785):149-157. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1711-4
58. Gaudelli NM, Komor AC, Rees HA, et al. Programmable base editing of A•T to G•C in genomic DNA without DNA cleavage. Nature. 2017;551(7681):464-471. doi:10.1038/nature24644
59. Pagliuca FW, Millman JR, Gürtler M, et al. Generation of functional human pancreatic β cells in vitro. Cell. 2014;159(2):428-439. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.09.040 [2014; using:]
60. Millman JR, Xie C, Van Dervort A, Gürtler M, Pagliuca FW, Melton DA. Generation of stem cell-derived β-cells from patients with type 1 diabetes. Nat Commun. 2016;7:11463. doi:10.1038/ncomms11463
61. Shang L, Hua H, Foo K, et al. β-cell dysfunction due to increased ER stress in a stem cell model of Wolfram syndrome. Diabetes. 2014;63(3):923-933. doi:10.2337/db13-0717
62. Maxwell KG, Augsornworawat P, Velazco-Cruz L, et al. Gene-edited human stem cell-derived β cells from a patient with monogenic diabetes reverse preexisting diabetes in mice. Sci Transl Med. 2020;12(540):eaax9106. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aax9106
63. Ma S, Viola R, Sui L, et al. β Cell Replacement after Gene Editing of a Neonatal Diabetes-Causing Mutation at the Insulin Locus. Stem Cell Reports. 2018;11(6):1407-1415. doi:10.1016/j.stemcr.2018.11.006
64. Zeng H, Guo M, Zhou T, et al. An isogenic human ESC platform for functional evaluation of genome-wide-association-study-identified diabetes genes and drug discovery. Cell Stem Cell. 2016;19(3):326-340. doi:10.1016/j.stem.2016.07.002
65. Maxwell KG, Augsornworawat P, Velazco-Cruz L, Kim MH, Asada R, Hogrebe NJ, Morikawa S, Urano F, Millman JR. Gene-edited human stem cell-derived β cells from a patient with monogenic diabetes reverse preexisting diabetes in mice. Sci Transl Med. 2020 Apr 22;12(540):eaax9106. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.aax9106. PMID: 32321868; PMCID: PMC7233417.
66. Koblan LW, Erdos MR, Wilson C, et al. In vivo base editing rescues Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome in mice. Nature. 2021;589(7843):608-614. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-03086-7
67. Chemello F, Chai AC, Li H, et al. Precise correction of Duchenne muscular dystrophy exon deletion mutations by base and prime editing. Sci Adv. 2021;7(18):eabg4910. doi:10.1126/sciadv.abg4910
68. Rosado-Olivieri EA, Aigha II, Kenty JH, Melton DA. Identification of a LIF-responsive, replication-competent subpopulation of human β cells. Cell Metab. 2020;31(2):327-338.e6. doi:10.1016/j.cmet.2019.12.009

69. Patel KA, Kettunen J, Laakso M, et al. Heterozygous RFX6 protein truncating variants are associated with MODY with reduced penetrance. Nat Commun. 2017;8:888. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-00895-9
70. Newby GA, Yen JS, Woodard KJ, et al. Base editing of haematopoietic stem cells rescues sickle cell disease in mice. Nature. 2021;595(7866):295-302. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03609-w
71. Rezania A, Bruin JE, Arora P, et al. Reversal of diabetes with insulin-producing cells derived in vitro from human pluripotent stem cells. Nat Biotechnol. 2014;32(11):1121-1133. doi:10.1038/nbt.3033
72. Velazco-Cruz L, Song J, Maxwell KG, et al. Acquisition of dynamic function in human stem cell-derived β cells. Stem Cell Reports. 2019;12(2):351-365. doi:10.1016/j.stemcr.2018.12.012
73. Nelson CE, Wu Y, Gemberling MP, et al. Long-term evaluation of AAV-CRISPR genome editing for Duchenne muscular dystrophy. Nat Med. 2019;25(3):427-432. doi:10.1038/s41591-019-0344-3
74. Charlesworth CT, Deshpande PS, Dever DP, et al. Identification of preexisting adaptive immunity to Cas9 proteins in humans. Nat Med. 2019;25(2):249-254. doi:10.1038/s41591-018-0326-x
75. Yin H, Song CQ, Suresh S, et al. Partial DNA-guided Cas9 enables genome editing with reduced off-target activity. Nat Chem Biol. 2018;14(3):311-316. doi:10.1038/nchembio.2559
76. Yang Y, Wang L, Bell P, et al. A dual AAV system enables the Cas9-mediated correction of a metabolic liver disease in newborn mice. Nat Biotechnol. 2016;34(3):334-338. doi:10.1038/nbt.3469
77. Xie Y, Wang D, Lan F, et al. An episomal vector-based CRISPR/Cas9 system for highly efficient gene knockout in human pluripotent stem cells. Sci Rep. 2017;7(1):2320. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-02456-y
78. Suzuki K, Tsunekawa Y, Hernandez-Benitez R, et al. In vivo genome editing via CRISPR/Cas9 mediated homology-independent targeted integration. Nature. 2016;540(7631):144-149. doi:10.1038/nature20565
79. Liao HK, Hatanaka F, Araoka T, et al. In vivo target gene activation via CRISPR/Cas9-mediated trans-epigenetic modulation. Cell. 2017;171(7):1495-1507.e15. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2017.10.025
80. Liu Y, Yang Y, Kang X, et al. Cas9-Based Therapeutic Genome Editing in Duchenne Muscular Dystrophy. Mol Ther. 2018;26(9):2043-2054. doi:10.1016/j.ymthe.2018.06.012
81. Rothgangl T, Dennis MK, Lin PJC, et al. In vivo adenine base editing of PCSK9 in macaques reduces LDL cholesterol levels. Nat Biotechnol. 2021;39(8):949-957. doi:10.1038/s41587-021-00933-4
82. Rees HA, Liu DR. Base editing: precision chemistry on the genome and transcriptome of living cells. Nat Rev Genet. 2018;19(12):770-788. doi:10.1038/s41576-018-0059-1
83. Stadtmauer EA, Fraietta JA, Davis MM, et al. CRISPR-engineered T cells in patients with refractory cancer. Science. 2020;367(6481):eaba7365. doi:10.1126/science.aba7365
84. Shapiro AMJ, Pokrywczynska M, Ricordi C. Clinical pancreatic islet transplantation. Nat Rev Endocrinol. 2017;13(5):268-277. doi:10.1038/nrendo.2016.178
85. Dai C, Hang Y, Shostak A, et al. Age-dependent human β cell proliferation induced by glucagon-like peptide 1 and calcineurin signaling. J Clin Invest. 2017;127(10):3835-3844. doi:10.1172/JCI91761
86. Eyquem, J., Mansilla-Soto, J., Giavridis, T., Van Der Stegen, S. J., Hamieh, M., Cunanan, K. M., ... & Sadelain, M. (2017). Targeting a CAR to the TRAC locus with CRISPR/Cas9 enhances tumour rejection. *Nature*, *543*(7643), 113-117.
87. Ahmed, H. S. (2025). Ethical Dilemmas in Clinical Trials of Innovations in Bubble Continuous Positive Airway Pressure Models in Resource-Limited Neonatal Care. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, *61*(3), 306-315.
88. Caruso, S. M., Quinn, P. M., da Costa, B. L., & Tsang, S. H. (2022). CRISPR/Cas therapeutic strategies for autosomal dominant disorders. *The Journal of clinical investigation*, *132*(9).
89. Gerace, D., Martiniello-Wilks, R., Nassif, N. T., Lal, S., Steptoe, R., & Simpson, A. M. (2017). CRISPR-targeted genome editing of mesenchymal stem cell-derived therapies for type 1 diabetes: a path to clinical success?. *Stem cell research & therapy*, *8*(1), 62.
90. Jimenez, V., Jambrina, C., Casana, E., Sacristan, V., Muñoz, S., Darriba, S., ... & Bosch, F. (2018). FGF21 gene therapy as treatment for obesity and insulin resistance. *EMBO molecular medicine*, *10*(8), e8791.
91. Eisenman D, Swindle S. Food and Drug Administration Guidance on Design of Clinical Trials for Gene Therapy Products with Potential for Genome Integration or Genome Editing and Associated Long-Term Follow-Up of Research Subjects. Appl Biosaf. 2022 Dec 1;27(4):201-209. doi: 10.1089/apb.2022.0022. Epub 2022 Nov 23. PMID: 37020567; PMCID: PMC10068672.

CITE AS: Zakaria Ali (2026). CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Monogenic Diabetes: Therapeutic Potential and Clinical Challenges. IAA Journal of Scientific Research 13(1):1-11. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJSR/2026/131111