

## Viewpoint: Don't expect the first CRISPR baby to be born in the US

The media well and truly pricked up its collective ears when US geneticist Shoukhrat Mitalipov [last month](#) showed that he could use the CRISPR gene-editing system in a very early human embryo to correct a mutation that can cause heart defects.

...

But where might the first gene-edited baby be born? There are reasons to doubt it will be in the US. In February, the National Academies of Sciences published a report, [Human Genome Editing: Science, ethics, and governance](#), that gives support for gene editing for human reproductive purposes, but only in cases where no safer, existing options are available.

Crucially, the existing method of [screening unedited IVF embryos before implantation](#) can usually generate one without a heritable mutation because there is a 50 per cent chance of not passing on a disease causing gene in almost all instances.

...

What's more, US medical insurance coverage is unlikely to deem prophylactic gene-modification techniques "medically necessary"...

In addition, the US Food and Drug Administration regards CRISPR as a drug...As a result, CRISPR has to go through a regulatory pathway...and approval could take a decade or more. The FDA might raid any clinic trying to use unlicensed CRISPR to engineer a baby.

**The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion, and analysis. Read full, original post: [This is why the first CRISPR baby won't be born in the US](#)**