https://rijournals.com/biological-and-applied-science/

RESEARCH INVENTION JOURNAL OF BIOLOGICAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES 4(2):32-36, 2024

©RIJBAS Publications ISSN: 1597-2879

https://doi.org/10.59298/RIJBAS/2024/423236

Biohacking: The Intersection of Medicine and DIY Biology

Asiimawe Masika Agnovia

Department of Clinical Medicine and Dentistry Kampala International University Uganda
agnovia.asiimawe@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Biohacking, an emerging movement at the intersection of biotechnology and DIY culture, represents a new frontier in healthcare and self-optimization. This paper examines biohacking's diverse practices, from genetic modification to health monitoring via wearable technology, and explores the ethical, legal, and medical implications of this democratized approach to bioscience. The movement's "DIY" ethos allows individuals to experiment with and transform biological processes outside traditional labs, raising questions about safety, regulatory oversight, and the broader societal impact. The paper analyzes the growing accessibility of biohacking tools and techniques and discusses the transformative potential these have on personalized medicine and public health. As biohacking's popularity rises, it necessitates a dialogue among bioethicists, policymakers, and technologists to balance innovation with public welfare.

Keywords: Biohacking, DIY biology, biotechnology, genetic modification, wearable technology.

INTRODUCTION

Biohacking is perhaps the most nebulous, and yet most intriguing, concept to emerge from the intersection of biology and the tech sector. Often described as the joining of biological experimentation with technology hacking, the term biohacking is used to describe a motley collection of practices and methods engaging with health, life, technology, do-it-yourself bioscience, and entrepreneurship. In recent years, a veritable United Nations of publications, public figures, and policymakers have declared that we are living in the age of the end of the beginning of innovation in life sciences, a correction to the field's origins in the 20th century. This assertion pegs the rise of biohacking to the life sciences' own transition from an elite pastime in the 20th century to a newly democratized field of lay experimentation. As philosopher and biohacker Dominic Berry writes, in the future, if humans have something better than themselves in their body, we can suspect that it will be the result of one or the other of these two motives: the will to progress, or the desire for self-transformation for any reason at all [1, 2]. It is meaningful, then, that biohacking kicked off under the banner of DIY biology. First appearing online in January 2006, the term DIYbio describes a community of tens of thousands of people, from professionals to the merely professionally interested, who engage in biotech experimentation outside of traditional, professional spaces of science. DIY is a term synonymous with craft, homebrewing, and punk and feminist zine making, locatable at the nexus of anti-corporate activism and digital production. As such, it marries a commitment to basic survival with a utopian-immediatist vision of communities made by and through individual action. This unique blend makes DIY a particularly meaningful descriptor for life scientists looking to transform their field. Engaging in loose networks of globetrotting denizens of biohacker spaces who build lab-in-a-box toolkits for anyone with burning questions or a pet project, today's biohackers engage in the gamut of scientific innovation, building protocols for dietary interventions, biomarker measurement, and genetic engineering of yeast and other organisms [3, 4].

Ethical and Legal Implications of Biohacking

Biohacking intersects with a number of pressing ethical and legal issues. While health interventions may have potential benefits, do-it-yourself projects with living organisms can pose a wide range of risks. Lack of scientific expertise and proper facilities could lead to accidental exposure to infectious bacteria, plant, or animal cells. Natural genetic differences might also produce side effects from genetic manipulation. Left

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

unregulated, biohacking procedures in human experimentation would violate conventions concerning informed consent. The spread of biohacking should concern governments as well, who should ensure both biosecurity and the beneficial exploitation of biotechnology. Should responsibility be given to the biohackers themselves? Indeed, individuals or small groups could use a technique in a way that society at large could realistically consider misuse. This section considers both sensationalized and reasoned examples to justify concerns over risks associated with biohacking [5, 6]. Most biotechnology is regulated, and biosecurity experts agree that those prohibitions can be applied to biohacking, as biohacking often happens through existing techniques and because biosecurity criteria mostly overlap with safety ones. Fifty-nine countries prohibit human germline genetic modifications, while 29 ban cloning for reproduction. Technology laws protect intellectual property on findings. Critics of current bans on human germline genetic modifications posit that as long as procedures pass safety tests and are affordable, citizens should be free to genetically improve their offspring. Debatably, these arguments are formally correct since the precautionary principle does not forbid benefit, but rather commands those risks to be managed or minimized through biosafety and other forms of regulation. Finally, ethics prohibits potentially harmful behavior. Whether deep societal consensus would permit the procedures is an open question, as human germline genetic modification is banned in 59 countries. Reinforcing the call for a public discussion of the ethics of human embryo editing, the conclusion suggests that natural evolution has produced progeny that can be psychologically defective and will never have happier lives. Just as important as defiance suppression are societies' efforts to make the programs obsolete and to advocate better possibilities [7, 8].

Applications Of Biohacking in Medicine and Healthcare

Overall, biohacking approaches have led to impressive results across a variety of biomedical areas. The majority of these approaches fall within the domain of personalized medicine, prognosis, and diagnosis, as well as patient self-management, and many are currently in development. When biohackers discovered a way to modify a tumor patient's CAR T cells to improve the targeting of a tumor-associated antigen, the patient showed increased signs of recovery within eight months. Although not observed in this benchmark, promising results were found in concurrent animal testing. To avoid rejection and allow regrowth, the biohacker's combination of genetic modification and dosage tracking implemented a personalized treatment [9, 5]. Biohacking tools are also useful to measure and help patients prevent diseases. Health wearables provide novel opportunities for early disease detection. They used data to identify individuals with obstructive sleep apnea before their diagnosis and body scanners to quantitatively estimate fat loss after clinical weight loss programs. In another example in which health tools reveal states of vulnerability, a platform based on genetic risk stratification combined with a wearable detects when heat stress reaches the critical stage during dehydration, and days of rest provide a tool to reduce the risk of heat-related disorders. In radiation, personalized measurements reveal that individuals at risk, including astronauts, are more accurately split into groups with higher or lower levels of radiation damage. Even so, while some of these technologies are ready for use, the transition into practice may take five years, with a total duration of ten years or even longer. The effects and implications of these approaches on healthcare may not yet be entirely clear. Their use is restricted due to privacy concerns and access issues. Ethical worries about justice and trust in practitioners exist in all these examples. A discussion is needed to prepare for the use of these resources for both individuals and federal entities. As biohacking continues to be incorporated into treatment plans, a dialogue about the value of therapies is critical [10, 11].

Tools and Techniques in Biohacking

In this period, citizen biologists and DIY biotech enthusiasts have access to an increasing array of low-cost equipment to do increasingly complex work. The range of tools and technologies has evolved from simple DIY kits with few moving parts to related but more complex terrarium-sized 'lab in a box' devices, which are being used on-site for local diagnostics. More advanced, typically DIY micro labs have increasingly integrated a range of electronics and software, which include optics, stereomicroscopes, PCR machines, centrifuges, 3D printers, incubators, electrophoresis boxes, and chemical hoods. Biohackers use advanced laboratory equipment like fermenters, scalpel sets, and flow cytometers. Most excitingly, off-the-shelf technologies that are typically first used in professional research settings for genetic sequencing and focused DNA investigations are also being used [12, 13]. Such tools are used in personal settings, labs, and clinics, by oneself or in collaborative contexts. Technological innovation shapes and is shaped by the biohacker community. In recent years, platforms have been used to crowdsource investments for biotech experimental kits. Additional maker kits, including those featuring electronic and hardware

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

components, enable biohacking. Electric eel painkiller research is novel, but researchers attempting self-experimentation have long been stymied by a ban from regulatory authorities. Like academia, biohacker labs use personal safety equipment. This includes gloves, goggles, and lab coats. Biohackers and meet-up groups run workshops and online forums that teach interested members of the public about the skills required to engage in at-home biotechnology. Some biohackers actively agitate for political and legal changes. Local community benches partner with professional and amateur researchers who want to cheaply pilot certain lab protocols. Biohackers also share their DIY DNA sequences and assist in deciphering them using other low-cost techniques. Biohackers in New York are working on a cure for hearing loss. These are some of the reasons I'll be biohacking. What kind of kernel I'll uncover won't be publicly discussed, but it will have to remain the most guarded secret until it is ready for a larger audience [14, 15]. The biohacker philosophy appears to be a medley style. Some desire to produce niche lab equipment to suit the DIY market. Others are invested in regulatory interpretations. Perhaps the beginnings of a political lobbying outlet? Biohacker preparedness to engage with the public can be seen as akin sometimes to patient or consumer group activism. Sometimes, the biohacker community can be a source of safety concerns. It's not all easy over there on the biohacking or the do-it-yourself biology front [16, 17].

Future Trends and Challenges in Biohacking

In recent years, progress has been made in cutting-edge fields of biotechnology, computational biology, and nanotechnology such as synthetic biology, gene editing, optogenetics, and biocompatible materials. This is expected to bring major advances in the health industry as well as for biohackers and the DIYBio community. Additionally, future developments in biotechnology are expected to significantly decrease costs, making access to advanced tools, reagents, and techniques much more accessible, and consequently lowering the barriers to biohacking [18, 19]. Futurists have also speculated about the democratization of biotechnology and how increasingly more people will be able to do engineering tasks with biology, integrating work on computers, hardware, and biotech seamlessly. A wide array of highly accurate, personalized diagnostics and treatments are usually predicted, together with new forms of sophisticated cybernetics, synthetic biology drugs, and metabolic engineering approaches. The dystopian perspective points towards the genetic engineering of embryos and designer babies carrying synthetic genes, creating widely distributed products from biobased 3D printers that become 'evil' matter. Biohackers could get involved in scenarios where, for example, the poor inadvertently use 3D printers employing engineered viral vectors for 'backyard' production of bioweapons. The promise of liberating biology from corporate control, regulating the products of biotechnology created by major transnational entities, as well as allowing people to take charge of and better our own bodies, is considered, but it must also be useful and beneficial. This clearly presents strategic challenges and real concerns about the biosecurity risks resulting from dual-use dilemmas. These scenarios are increasingly similar to fiction and harder to predict. They are used here to help think critically about the present and future trajectories of the biohacker movement. Ultimately, given how fast biotechnological development progresses, we hope we can nourish productive, relevant discussions among the biohacking and DIYBio communities. Additionally, we encourage stakeholders with the duty of addressing the ethical impacts of innovation, as well as discussing the responsibility of bioethicists, sociologists, and policymakers in this regard, to contribute critical perspectives that can be generalized and distributed, either in future workshops or through thoughtful comments or directly in responses to emerging proposals. We also invite any set designers, filmmakers, ethicists, policy, and technology entrepreneurs to work with us to share their stories, or people in engineering or physics who can help to inform and ground them in real-world, cutting-edge knowledge [20, 21].

CONCLUSION

Biohacking has emerged as a significant cultural and scientific phenomenon with the potential to revolutionize medicine, wellness, and self-optimization. However, as individuals increasingly engage in biotechnological experimentation, ethical, legal, and regulatory considerations must evolve to manage associated risks responsibly. With advanced biohacking tools becoming more accessible, society must balance innovation with public safety, bioethics, and equitable access. The promise of biohacking lies in its potential for empowering individuals and advancing healthcare, but realizing this potential requires coordinated oversight and informed public dialogue. As we move forward, interdisciplinary collaboration will be essential to ensure that biohacking contributes to human well-being without compromising ethical standards or societal safety.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

REFERENCES

1. Gallistl V, von Laufenberg R, Lehner K. Vulnerability assemblages: Situating vulnerability in the political economy of artificial intelligence. Socius. 2024 Jul;10:23780231241266514.
2. Gangadharbatla H. Biohacking: An exploratory study to understand the factors influencing the adoption of embedded technologies within the human body. Heliyon. 2020 May 1;6(5).
3. Fernandez I, Kyosovska N, Luong J, Mukobi G. AI Consciousness and Public Perceptions: Four Futures. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04771. 2024 Aug 8.
4. Liscum M, Garcia ML. You can't keep a bad idea down: Dark history, death, and potential rebirth of eugenics. The Anatomical Record. 2022 Apr;305(4):902-37.
5. Cozza M, Ellison KL, Katz S. Hacking age. Sociology Compass. 2022 Oct;16(10):e13034.
6. Zhang JY. Commoning genomic solidarity to improve global health equality. Cell Genomics. 2023 Oct 11;3(10).
7. Van Eenennaam AL. New Genomic Techniques (NGT) in animals and their agri/food/feed products. EFSA Supporting Publications. 2023 Sep;20(9):8311E.
8. Schumacher AE, Kyu HH, Aali A, Abbafati C, Abbas J, Abbasgholizadeh R, Abbasi MA, Abbasian M, Abd ElHafeez S, Abdelmasseh M, Abd-Elsalam S. Global age-sex-specific mortality, life expectancy, and population estimates in 204 countries and territories and 811 subnational locations, 1950–2021, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic: a comprehensive demographic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. The Lancet. 2024 May 18;403(10440):1989-2056.
9. Pagel JF, Pagel JF. Complementary Approaches to Healing PTSD: Art, Body, and Mind Awareness. Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder: A Guide for Primary Care Clinicians and Therapists. 2021:133-41.
10. Anikwe CV, Nweke HF, Ikegwu AC, Egwuonwu CA, Onu FU, Alo UR, Teh YW. Mobile and wearable sensors for data-driven health monitoring system: State-of-the-art and future prospect. Expert Systems with Applications. 2022 Sep 15;202:117362. um.edu.my
11. Xie Y, Lu L, Gao F, He SJ, Zhao HJ, Fang Y, Yang JM, An Y, Ye ZW, Dong Z. Integration of artificial intelligence, blockchain, and wearable technology for chronic disease management: a new paradigm in smart healthcare. Current Medical Science. 2021 Dec;41(6):1123-33. springer.com
12. Stephenson PJ. Technological advances in biodiversity monitoring: Applicability, opportunities and challenges. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability. 2020 Aug 1;45:36-41.
13. Zipf L, Primack RB, Rothendler M. Citizen scientists and university students monitor noise pollution in cities and protected areas with smartphones. PloS one. 2020 Sep 11;15(9):e0236785.
14. Manero A, Rivera V, Fu Q, Schwartzman JD, Prock-Gibbs H, Shah N, Gandhi D, White E, Crawford KE, Coathup MJ. Emerging Medical Technologies and Their Use in Bionic Repair and Human Augmentation. Bioengineering. 2024 Jul 9;11(7):695. mdpi.com
15. Carver LF. Biohacking and Aging Technology–A Primer. InAn Interdisciplinary Approach to Aging, Biohacking and Technology 2024 (pp. 6-23). Routledge. [HTML]
16. Elgabry M, Camilleri J. Conducting hidden populations research: A reflective case study on researching the biohacking community. Futures. 2021 Sep 1;132:102769.
17. Swanson G. Hack Your Biology: Unlock Your Potential, Optimize Health, and Achieve Peak Performance Through Science-Based Strategies and Cutting-Edge Technologies. Zee Publishing; 2024 May 26.
18. Patel N. Science fiction twenty years ago, a nanotechnology reality today: human microchip implants. UC Merced Undergraduate Research Journal. 2018;10(2).
19. Lima VM, Pessoa LA, Belk RW. The Promethean biohacker: on consumer biohacking as a labour of love. InTranshumanisms and Biotechnologies in Consumer Society 2022 Nov 28 (pp. 85-116). Routledge. hal.science
20. Lima VM, Pessoa LA, Belk RW. The Promethean biohacker: on consumer biohacking as a labour of love. InTranshumanisms and Biotechnologies in Consumer Society 2022 Nov 28 (pp. 85-116). Routledge. hal.science
21. Tsirel SV. Technological Achievements of the Future as the Path of Destruction of Habitual Human Society?. HISTORY & MATHEMATICS: Investigating Past and Future. 2020:152.
22. Rawat R, Sharma M, Singh P. Biotechnology and Its Position in the Mitigation of Microbial Problems in the Food Industry. InMicrobial Biotechnology in the Food Industry: Advances,

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Challenges, and Potential Solutions 2024 Mar 1 (pp. 103-127). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

CITE AS: Asiimawe Masika Agnovia. (2024). Biohacking: The Intersection of Medicine and DIY Biology. RESEARCH INVENTION JOURNAL OF BIOLOGICAL AND APPLIED SCIENCES 4(2):32-36. https://doi.org/10.59298/RIJBAS/2024/423236

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.