



Commentary

Biotechnology's Ethical and Reproducibility Crisis: Beyond the Hype

Qiong Gao*

Shanghai Seezymes Biotechnology Co., Ltd., Shanghai 201114, China

Received: 05 June, 2026

Accepted: 22 June, 2026

Published: 23 June, 2026

*Corresponding author: Qiong Gao, Ph.D., Shanghai Seezymes Biotechnology Co., Ltd., Shanghai 201114, China, Email: joan.gao@seezymes.com

Keywords: Biotechnology; Bioethics; Scientific hubris; Replication crisis; Gene editing; Synthetic biology

Copyright License: © 2026 Gao Q. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

<https://www.medsceingroup.com>



Check for updates

Abstract

Modern biotechnology promises to cure diseases, feed the world, and address major ecological challenges. Yet a critical examination reveals that the field also faces significant ethical, reproducibility, and governance challenges that deserve rigorous scrutiny. Drawing on documented cases from gene therapy pricing controversies, CRISPR-based ecological interventions, and the biomedical replication crisis, this commentary argues that biotechnology's most pressing challenge is not technical but ethical and structural. We identify systemic drivers including venture capital incentives, flawed publication norms, and regulatory gaps, and we propose concrete governance reforms. Importantly, we also highlight exemplary successes demonstrating that when properly governed, biotechnology can deliver transformative, equitable outcomes. The commentary concludes that sustainable progress requires measuring outcomes in lives improved rather than patents filed, and rewarding rigorous, reproducible science over speculative claims.

Introduction: The Biotech Delusion

"Biotechnology's promise is real—but so is the distance between promise and practice."

Biotechnology has long been heralded as offering solutions to humanity's greatest challenges: curing incurable diseases, improving food security, and addressing environmental threats [1]. The field has indeed delivered remarkable achievements—most notably the rapid development of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines, life-saving gene therapies for rare diseases, and precision diagnostics that have transformed clinical medicine. Yet alongside these accomplishments, persistent structural problems threaten to undermine both scientific credibility and public trust: an entrenched culture of exaggeration, reproducibility failures, and governance frameworks that have not kept pace with technological capability.

The concern is not that biotechnology consistently fails to deliver—it clearly does not. CRISPR, synthetic biology, and AI-driven drug discovery are genuinely powerful tools. The challenge is that their application has been persistently

distorted by economic incentives and institutional pressures that prioritize short-term commercial returns over long-term public benefit. These distortions are not inevitable; they are addressable through structural reform.

This commentary identifies three interconnected themes that structure its analysis: (1) the ethics and governance of high-stakes biotechnological applications, (2) the reproducibility crisis and its systemic drivers, and (3) the path toward accountable, equitable innovation. By acknowledging both the field's genuine successes and its structural failures, this paper aims to contribute constructively to ongoing debates about the responsible governance of biotechnology.

The Cure That Isn't: Hyped Therapies and Empty Promises

"High-cost, high-promise therapies require equally rigorous scrutiny of evidence and access."

A recurring challenge in translational biotechnology is the gap between early-phase promise and confirmatory

clinical evidence. Gene therapies, once hailed as the potential end of genetic disease, have demonstrated genuine efficacy in conditions such as spinal muscular atrophy (SMA) and haemophilia B; yet their pricing—with single-treatment costs exceeding \$2 million in some cases—raises acute questions about equitable access and health system sustainability [6]. The therapeutic promise is real; the commercial framework around it warrants reform.

Meanwhile, the hype machine churns on. Alzheimer's research has become a case study in wishful thinking. After decades of failed amyloid-beta trials—culminating in the controversial FDA approval of Aduhelm (aducanumab), a drug with disputed clinical benefit—the industry simply rebranded failures as 'stepping stones' [7,8]. Compounding concerns, subsequent investigations raised questions about the integrity of foundational amyloid-beta research, and independent assessors concluded that the approval proceeded despite the advisory committee's near-unanimous rejection [9].

Even when therapies work, their delivery is often impractical at scale. CAR-T cell therapies require harvesting a patient's immune cells, shipping them for genetic engineering, and reinfusing them—a logistical challenge limiting access to major academic medical centers. For all the discourse about 'personalized medicine,' the reality is a two-tiered system: cutting-edge care for the wealthy, and inadequate solutions for everyone else.

Synthetic Biology's Ecological Gambles

"Ecological interventions demand precautionary governance proportional to their potential for irreversibility."

The field's answer to pesticide-resistant superweeds is CRISPR-edited crops that produce even stronger toxins. The solution to invasive species is gene drives designed to eradicate them—with no undo button [10,11]. Oxitec's GM mosquitoes, released in field trials to combat dengue, showed reduced wild populations in short-term assessments, but the long-term ecological impacts remain inadequately characterized. Yet the trials proceed, guided by the 'move fast and break things' ethos—a reckless approach when the thing being broken is a food web [12].

CRISPR crops, meanwhile, are marketed as sustainable alternatives to traditional GMOs, yet they repeat earlier mistakes. Herbicide-resistant 'gene-edited' soybeans dominate fields, encouraging heavier herbicide use [13]. The promised precision of CRISPR is compromised when corporate profit dictates the end product. Horizontal gene transfer—the leakage of engineered DNA into wild relatives—is often dismissed as 'unlikely,' despite evidence that biological systems routinely defy such categorical odds.

The most significant irony is that many 'problems' synthetic biology aims to fix are of our own making. Pesticide resistance arose from industrialized agriculture's overreliance on chemicals. Rather than reforming the system, the field layers on riskier interventions—technically impressive but systematically misaligned.

The Replication Crisis in Biotechnology

"Scientific credibility depends not only on positive results, but on the reproducibility of those results."

Several high-profile cases illustrate the consequences of insufficient scientific rigour in biotechnology. The Theranos collapse—a company valued at \$9 billion before its proprietary diagnostic platform was found to produce systematically unreliable results—demonstrated that investor enthusiasm and media attention cannot substitute for validated evidence [4]. While Theranos represents an extreme case, it highlights systemic vulnerabilities: the primacy of narrative over data, and the reluctance of institutional actors to apply normal scientific scrutiny to high-profile ventures.

In the Alzheimer's research field, high-profile publications repeatedly promoted amyloid-beta as the definitive disease mechanism, yet drug after drug failed in clinical trials. Subsequent investigations have raised serious questions about data integrity in certain foundational amyloid studies—throwing substantial areas of the field into reassessment [16]. The human cost has been enormous: billions in misdirected research funding and, more critically, false hope raised then withdrawn from patients and families.

Even in the absence of explicit misconduct, the pressure to publish groundbreaking results generates problematic research practices. Studies have found that substantial fractions of high-impact biotech papers contain incomplete or problematic data analysis, from cherry-picked endpoints to p-value manipulation [17]. The result is a literature replete with non-reproducible findings that evaporate when independent laboratories attempt replication [5,14,18].

Systemic Drivers of Biotechnology's Challenges

"Structural incentives shape scientific practice—and structural reforms can reshape it."

Venture Capital's 'Fail Fast' Culture

The Silicon Valley model has entered biotechnology: 'Move fast and break things' may work for consumer software, but not for life sciences. Investors demand rapid returns, pushing startups to prioritize demonstration over rigor [19]. The result is a cycle of abandoned projects and incompletely characterized therapies sacrificed to investor timelines. When next-generation hype cycles arrive—mRNA, then CRISPR, then AI drug discovery—capital migrates, leaving previous investigations without follow-through.

Academic Incentive Structures and the Publication Trap

The 'publish or perish' imperative has evolved into 'publish sensationally or perish faster.' Research has shown that papers in high-impact journals are disproportionately likely to contain overstated conclusions compared to those in specialized journals [20]. A single Nature paper can determine tenure, grant funding, or startup formation—creating incentives

that systematically undermine scientific integrity. The STAP stem cell case illustrates the stakes: Obokata and colleagues published—and then were compelled to retract—papers in *Nature* that described a simple cell reprogramming method subsequently found to involve research misconduct [21]. These researchers were not aberrant actors; they were responding to the incentive structures of contemporary science.

Regulatory Capture and Accelerated Approval Pathways

Regulatory agencies have not been immune to these pressures. The FDA's Accelerated Approval Program, designed to fast-track therapies for serious conditions, has been stretched to accommodate applications with limited confirmatory evidence [22]. The approval of Aduhelm in 2021, over the near-unanimous negative recommendation of the FDA's own advisory panel, exemplifies this dynamic—with subsequent reporting revealing financial relationships between committee members and the drug's manufacturer [7,9]. Similarly, approvals of gene therapies for Duchenne muscular dystrophy despite equivocal clinical trial results highlighted how advocacy and commercial pressure can influence regulatory outcomes [23]. When regulatory bodies function as approvers rather than gatekeepers, patient welfare is ultimately compromised.

Exemplary Successes: When Biotechnology Delivers

“Biotechnology's capacity to deliver transformative, equitable outcomes under sound governance provides the normative template for reform.”

A balanced appraisal of biotechnology requires examining not only its documented failures but also the conditions under which it has succeeded. Three cases are instructive.

mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines: Speed, Science, and Global Deployment

The development of the BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) and mRNA-1273 (Moderna) vaccines represents one of the most consequential achievements in modern medicine. Within eleven months of the SARS-CoV-2 genome publication, two vaccines had completed large-scale Phase III trials and received emergency use authorisation. Critically, this success was not accidental: it built on decades of publicly funded basic research into mRNA stability and lipid nanoparticle delivery; it was accelerated by coordinated public investment (Operation Warp Speed; CEPI) rather than speculative venture capital alone; and regulatory agencies maintained rigorous safety monitoring throughout [24]. The mRNA vaccine case demonstrates that speed and scientific rigour are not mutually exclusive—provided governance structures are designed to enable both.

SMA Gene Therapy: Proof of Concept for Rare Disease Innovation

Onasemnogene APOB10 transferase (Zolgensma), approved by the FDA in 2019, offers genuine proof of concept for gene therapy in life-threatening paediatric disease. Children with spinal muscular atrophy type 1 who previously faced a median

survival of less than two years have shown sustained motor function improvement following a single administration [6]. The scientific foundation was robust: preclinical data were reproducible across multiple independent laboratories, and clinical trial endpoints were clinically meaningful. This case also illustrates the residual challenge of access: at a list price exceeding \$2.1 million, equitable global distribution remains unresolved. Nonetheless, Zolgensma establishes that the biotechnology pipeline can produce therapeutics of transformative clinical value when science is allowed to lead commercial strategy.

CRISPR-Based Sickle Cell Disease Treatment: A New Therapeutic Paradigm

In December 2023, the FDA approved Casgevy (exagamglogene autotemcel), the first CRISPR-based therapy for sickle cell disease, developed by Vertex Pharmaceuticals and CRISPR Therapeutics. Clinical trial data demonstrated that the majority of treated patients were free of vaso-occlusive crises for more than twelve months—a result that would have been inconceivable a decade earlier [32]. The therapy's development exemplifies responsible translation: off-target editing was rigorously characterised; informed consent protocols were developed in consultation with patient communities; and regulatory review was thorough rather than expedited on the basis of commercial pressure. These features suggest that the problems identified elsewhere in this commentary are not inherent to CRISPR technology but to the institutional contexts in which it is sometimes deployed.

Taken together, these cases reveal a consistent pattern: when public investment provides the foundational science, when regulatory review is insulated from commercial pressure, and when clinical endpoints are chosen for patient relevance rather than surrogate convenience, biotechnology delivers results that justify its promise. The governance reforms proposed in Section 7 are designed to generalise these enabling conditions.

A Path Forward

“Sustainable progress in biotechnology requires aligning institutional incentives with public benefit.”

Prioritize Translational Impact over ‘Moonshots’

The field's preoccupation with flashy moonshots has displaced attention from solutions that actually scale. The success of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines derived not from novel conceptual breakthroughs (the technology had existed for decades) but from deliberate, incremental engineering of delivery systems and stabilization [24]. Similarly, drought-resistant crops developed through marker-assisted selection (e.g., the Water Efficient Maize for Africa program) have generated substantial yield gains without CRISPR and without the associated ecological uncertainty [25].

Recommended actions:

- Redirect grant funding toward translational research

with clear public health applications (e.g., NIH RADx diagnostics initiatives).

- Establish priority review mechanisms specifically for neglected diseases, including tuberculosis and Chagas disease.

Mandate Open-Access Provisions for Publicly Funded Research

The current intellectual property regime often prioritizes commercial returns over public benefit [26]. Moderna's refusal to waive its mRNA vaccine patents during the acute phase of the COVID-19 pandemic—despite having received substantial public funding—exposed the moral incoherence of this arrangement [27]. The Human Genome Project's model, in which data was released publicly on a daily basis, represents a contrasting approach whose downstream benefits continue to be realized.

Recommended actions:

- Strengthen Bayh-Dole Act provisions to ensure affordable access to therapies developed with public funding [28].
- Extend Open COVID Pledge principles to cover all public health emergencies, including antimicrobial resistance.
- Encourage voluntary open-sourcing of foundational research tools.

Redirect Resources Toward Demonstrably Critical Threats

De-extinction projects divert resources from crises with immediate consequences. Antimicrobial resistance, which could account for millions of deaths annually by 2050, currently receives a disproportionately small fraction of global pharmaceutical R&D investment [29,30]. A transparent prioritization framework is overdue:

Tier 1 (Fund immediately): Antimicrobials, climate-resilient food crops, pandemic preparedness infrastructure.

Tier 2 (Proceed with caution): Technologies requiring global ethical consensus before deployment—gene drives, heritable genome editing.

Tier 3 (Reassess): Projects where expected private benefit substantially exceeds public benefit—de-extinction, enhancement applications.

Biotechnology will not save the world by pursuing Jurassic Park fantasies. It will serve humanity by ensuring that vaccines reach underserved communities, crops survive climatic disruptions, and science remains accountable to the public that funds it.

Conclusion: Biotechnology's Identity Crisis

Biotechnology stands at a critical juncture. Its record is genuinely mixed: transformative achievements in vaccine

development and gene therapy coexist with reproducibility failures, inequitable access frameworks, and governance gaps that have not kept pace with technological capability. This is not a counsel of despair—it is a call for structural reform proportional to the field's ambitions. The field's promise was never exclusively about scientific possibility; it requires moral responsibility and institutional accountability to be fulfilled. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that, under the right conditions of public investment and coordinated governance, biotechnology can deliver outcomes that genuinely serve humanity. The question is whether those conditions will be systematically created or remain exceptional.

This is not solely a resource allocation problem or a reproducibility problem—it is a question of identity. Will biotechnology remain a domain where million-dollar treatments constitute success metrics and de-extinction is a viable commercial model? Or will it return to its foundational mission: addressing human need rather than generating private return? That choice has rarely been more consequential. Climate change, pandemic risks, and antimicrobial resistance will not pause for VC funding cycles or accelerated approval deliberations [33].

Progress requires measuring outcomes in lives improved rather than patents filed; designing for access before profit; and rewarding reproducible science over scientific spectacle.

"The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that biotechnology can deliver transformative outcomes when aligned with human need. The question is whether it will pursue those outcomes only when the market demands it."

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author is employed by Shanghai Seezymes Biotechnology Co., Ltd., a commercial entity operating in the biotechnology sector. The views expressed in this commentary are those of the author alone and do not necessarily represent the positions of affiliated institutions. No financial conflicts of interest directly relevant to the arguments advanced in this commentary are declared.

References

1. Gostin LO. Global health and the biotech revolution: lessons from COVID-19. *JAMA*. 2023;329(12):961-962.
2. Greely HT. CRISPR'd babies: human germline genome editing in the He Jiankui affair. *J Law Biosci*. 2019;6(1):111-183. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsz010>
3. Sarewitz D. Saving science. *New Atlantis*. 2016;(49):4-48. Available from: https://www.thenewatlantis.com/wp-content/uploads/legacy-pdfs/20160816_TNA49Sarewitz.pdf
4. Waltz E. After Theranos. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2017;35(1):11-15. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3761>
5. Ioannidis JPA. Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Med*. 2005;2(8). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>
6. Kesselheim AS. Drug pricing for gene therapies: challenges and opportunities. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2021;40(11):1742-1749.
7. Kaiser J. Alzheimer's drug Aduhelm approved despite advisory panel rejection. *Science*. 2021;373(6550):131-132.



8. Prasad V. The approval of aducanumab for Alzheimer's disease. *BMJ*. 2021;374.
9. Lythgoe MP, Jenei K, Prasad V. Regulatory decisions diverge over aducanumab for Alzheimer's disease. *BMJ*. 2022;376. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2021-069780>
10. Esvelt KM, Smidler AL, Catteruccia F, Church GM. Concerning RNA-guided gene drives for the alteration of wild populations. *eLife*. 2014;3. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.03401>
11. Gantz VM, Jasinskiene N, Tatarenkova O, Fazekas A, Macias VM, Bier E, et al. Highly efficient Cas9-mediated gene drive for population modification of the malaria vector mosquito *Anopheles stephensi*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015;112(49). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521077112>
12. Oye KA, Esvelt K, Appleton E, Catteruccia F, Church G, Kuiken T, et al. Regulating gene drives. *Science*. 2014;345(6197):626-628. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1254287>
13. Doudna JA, Charpentier E. The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. *Science*. 2014;346(6213):1258096. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1258096>
14. Begley CG, Ellis LM. Raise standards for preclinical cancer research. *Nature*. 2012;483(7391):531-533. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/483531a>
15. Van Noorden R. The trouble with retractions. *Nature*. 2011;478(7367):26-28. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/478026a>
16. Abbott A. Alzheimer's research rethinks amyloid hypothesis. *Nature*. 2022;606:452-455.
17. Prinz F, Schlange T, Asadullah K. Believe it or not: how much can we rely on published data on potential drug targets? *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2011;10(9):712. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3439-c1>
18. Baker M. 1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility. *Nature*. 2016;533(7604):452-454. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/533452a>
19. Sismondo S. Ghost management: how much of the medical literature is shaped behind the scenes by the pharmaceutical industry? *PLoS Med*. 2007;4(9). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040286>
20. Scheufele DA, Krause NM. Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019;116(16):7662-7669. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805871115>
21. Obokata H. Stimulus-triggered acquisition of pluripotency. *Nature*. 2014;505(7485):641-647. Retracted in: *Nature*. 2014 Jul 2. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12968>
22. Lopatin D. The FDA's accelerated approval pathway: utilization and fulfillment of postmarketing requirements. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2020;35(8):2453-2456.
23. Pollack A. FDA approves gene therapy for Duchenne muscular dystrophy despite mixed clinical trial results. *New York Times*. 2023 Jun 22. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/06/22/health/fda-duchenne-muscular-dystrophy-gene-therapy.html>
24. Lopalco PL, Rappuoli R. The COVID-19 vaccine development. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2023;23(3):143-152. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-023-00876-6>
25. Howard PH. Visualizing consolidation in the global seed industry: 1996-2008. *Sustainability*. 2009;1(4):1266-1287. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su1041266>
26. Caulfield T. Biotechnology and the popular press: hype and the selling of science. *Trends Biotechnol*. 2004;22(7):337-339. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2004.03.014>
27. Lazonick W. US government's investment in COVID-19 vaccine development and Moderna's refusal to share IP. *Health Policy Technol*. 2022;11(4):100704.
28. Rourke M. The Bayh-Dole Act at 40: rethinking university technology transfer. *Issues Sci Technol*. 2021;37(3):42-50.
29. Liu S, et al. Synthetic biology and biosecurity: challenges and opportunities. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2023;24(2):75-87.
30. Jasanoff S. The ethics of invention: technology and the human future. New York: W.W. Norton & Company; 2016.
31. Resnik DB. Ethics of CRISPR gene editing. *EMBO Rep*. 2020;21(7).
32. Ledford H. CRISPR gene-editing trial clears first safety hurdle. *Nature*. 2023;617(7960):418-419.
33. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Gene drives on the horizon: advancing science, navigating uncertainty, and aligning research with public values. Washington (DC): National Academies Press; 2016. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.17226/23405>

Discover a bigger Impact and Visibility of your article publication with Peertechz Publications

Highlights

- ❖ Signatory publisher of ORCID
- ❖ Signatory Publisher of DORA (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment)
- ❖ Articles archived in worlds' renowned service providers such as Portico, CNKI, AGRIS, TDNet, Base (Bielefeld University Library), CrossRef, Scilit, J-Gate etc.
- ❖ Journals indexed in ICMJE, SHERPA/ROMEO, Google Scholar etc.
- ❖ OAI-PMH (Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting)
- ❖ Dedicated Editorial Board for every journal
- ❖ Accurate and rapid peer-review process
- ❖ Increased citations of published articles through promotions
- ❖ Reduced timeline for article publication

Submit your articles and experience a new surge in publication services
<https://www.peertechzpublications.org/submission>

Peertechz journals wishes everlasting success in your every endeavours.