

Collaborative Governance of Genomic Innovation, Non-Human-Primate Cloning and Artificial Intelligence: An Evidence-to-Accountability Framework for BRICS+ Cooperation and Brazilian Health Consortia

Cristiano Trindade De Angelis

Independent Researcher | PhD, SKEMA Business School

FULL-LENGTH RESEARCH MANUSCRIPT — Conceptual and policy-design research. No interviews, primary laboratory observations or empirical consortia outcomes are claimed.

Independent Researcher | PhD, Strategy and Project Management, SKEMA Business School

Abstract: Emerging capacities in non-human primate cloning, genome editing and artificial intelligence (AI) challenge health governance because technical feasibility, evidentiary uncertainty, commercial incentives and transnational competition are advancing at different rates. Rather than repeating a fact-check of media reports about SARS-CoV-2 origins or experimental primate cloning, this article asks how public institutions can collectively evaluate and govern convergent biotechnologies before clinical diffusion or regulatory failure. A structured documentary and normative analysis combines peer-reviewed cloning experiments, international bioethics instruments and scholarship on collaborative governance and technology assessment. An original five-gate governance architecture is proposed: (1) evidence provenance; (2) biosafety and dual-use risk; (3) human rights and consent; (4) algorithmic accountability; and (5) transnational enforcement and redress. A matrix distinguishes established animal-cloning outcomes from unverified human-cloning and intentional-pathogen claims, while separating accidents, deliberate manipulation and deliberate release. The framework assigns responsibilities to laboratories, ethics committees, public-health agencies, scientific publishers, citizen representatives and international bodies; it also defines measurable audit outputs. Brazil's health consortia are discussed as possible coordination platforms rather than sites where cloning activities are documented. The principal contribution is a testable governance model, not a claim that BRICS+ coordinates a human-cloning program or that COVID-19 was deliberately engineered. The article concludes that procedural transparency, independent replication, data-access protocols, public participation and precaution proportionate to the level of evidence are essential to protecting scientific progress and personal autonomy.

Keywords: collaborative governance; primate cloning; artificial intelligence; bioethics; health consortia; BRICS+; biosafety; research integrity; human autonomy.

I. Introduction: a governance problem rather than a dispute about origins

The contemporary debate over the origins of COVID-19 illustrates how scientific investigation can become entangled with intelligence reporting, geopolitics and public mistrust. Yet a governance analysis should not assume that ambiguity is evidence of conspiracy. A laboratory-related event, deliberate genetic manipulation, and intentional dissemination are logically and evidentially distinct propositions. Moreover, validated techniques for cloning non-human primates cannot be extrapolated without qualification to the existence of reproductively cloned humans. This article starts from those distinctions and asks a different question: what collective institutional capacities are required to review emerging, high-impact biotechnology in conditions of incomplete information?

The core challenge is a mismatch between the scale of possible consequences and the fragmentation of institutional authority. Universities and research hospitals may oversee animal experimentation; public-health agencies supervise infectious-disease risk; data-protection regulators address personal information; AI regulators assess algorithmic behavior; and international organizations issue norms that may lack directly enforceable sanctions. Firms, funders and scientific publishers each possess partial information and different incentives. A failure at the boundary between these actors can create a governance gap even if every organization complies with its own narrow rules.

This manuscript is deliberately separate from a source-verification study addressing Deutsche Welle reports, alleged intelligence estimates and published cloning research. Its unit of analysis is the governance arrangement, not the veracity of a particular news narrative. It does not reintroduce HoLEP versus TURP, Frankl versus Jung

or LASIK versus PRK as clinical comparisons; those belong to a different medical-innovation adoption problem. Here “adoption” means permission to conduct, scale, commercialize or integrate potentially disruptive biotechnologies into research and health systems, subject to verifiable safeguards.

Three research questions organize the inquiry: RQ1—how can collaborative governance distinguish evidence levels before adopting regulatory responses? RQ2—which actors and safeguards should jointly oversee the intersection of cloning, genome editing and AI? RQ3—how could such safeguards be adapted to Brazilian health networks and international cooperation without claiming that they are currently operating in those settings?

II. Conceptual framework: collaboration, evidence and autonomy

2.1. Collaborative governance beyond informal consultation

Ansell and Gash (2008) conceptualize collaborative governance as a process in which public agencies engage non-state stakeholders in collective decision-making. Emerson, Nabatchi and Balogh (2012) extend the analysis to cross-boundary regimes marked by principled engagement, shared motivation and capacity for joint action. Applied to biotechnology, collaboration must mean more than occasional hearings or public relations. It requires defined decision rights, access to inspectable evidence, procedures for contesting assessments and independent mechanisms that can halt unsafe work.

Stakeholders are not interchangeable. Scientists judge reproducibility; biosafety officers evaluate containment; patient and disability groups assess consequences of normalization and exclusion; indigenous and civil-society representatives can question exploitative data or tissue acquisition; public authorities enforce law; and judges provide remedies when rights are violated. Effective design acknowledges asymmetries of funding, technical literacy, legal power and geographic representation. A nominally inclusive committee can still be captured if proprietary data remain inaccessible to independent reviewers.

2.2. Evidence hierarchies and distinct causal claims

At least five grades of material may arise: original experimental data; independently replicated peer-reviewed findings; systematically reviewed public-health evidence; externally reported intelligence estimates; and speculation. These grades answer different questions. A reported intelligence probability is not an experimental likelihood ratio and cannot substitute for release of the underlying evidence, methods or assumptions. Likewise, publication in a peer-reviewed journal establishes a review process but does not eliminate the need for replication, welfare review or longer-term surveillance.

For pandemic-origin evaluation, the WHO-convened SAGO assessment of 2025 judged that the weight of available evidence supported zoonotic spillover while stating that a laboratory-related incident could not be excluded given gaps in access to information. Reports about a German intelligence assessment should therefore be described as reporting on an assessment, not as a demonstrated laboratory origin. Nothing in published non-human-primate cloning studies establishes intentional SARS-CoV-2 engineering or a coordinated BRICS+ plan to clone humans.

2.3. Autonomy, genetic data and algorithmic mediation

Article 11 of UNESCO’s 1997 Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights identifies practices contrary to human dignity, such as reproductive cloning of human beings, as impermissible. The underlying normative issue extends beyond a binary permission/prohibition: informed consent, fair distribution of research benefits and harms, protection of genetic privacy, prevention of discriminatory profiling, and effective challenge to consequential automated decisions are all relevant. AI may amplify risks through automated prioritization of experiments, prediction systems that are difficult to audit and secondary reuse of intimate biological data. Those mechanisms are plausible governance concerns; they are not evidence that an AI-controlled human-cloning system exists.

III. Methodology and limits of inference

The design is a structured documentary and conceptual analysis with a theory-building output. Source categories include: (i) original peer-reviewed experiments on non-human-primate cloning; (ii) the WHO/SAGO assessment of SARS-CoV-2 origins and relevant epidemiological/genomic studies; (iii) international normative documents on human dignity, genome editing and responsible AI; and (iv) foundational collaborative-governance research. The Hindi-language briefing supplied as starting material was used to map claims and references, not as a substitute for the underlying sources.

The analytical steps are explicit. First, propositions were classified according to whether they concerned scientific feasibility, epidemiological causation, institutional authorization or normative acceptability.

Second, each proposition was assigned an evidence category and an uncertainty statement. Third, specific governance failures were identified through a cross-boundary actor analysis. Fourth, these failures were translated into decision gates, indicators and escalation procedures. Finally, a hypothetical Brazilian implementation was elaborated to show what empirical tests could follow. This is neither a field study of São Paulo or Palmeira das Missões nor a survey or clinical trial; the article presents no fabricated interviews, program outcomes, budgets or measured performance.

The scope of inference is correspondingly limited. The available documents do not permit causal estimates of the effects of a collaborative-governance regime, comparisons of BRICS+ member-state compliance, or conclusions about undisclosed laboratory activities. Normative feasibility and empirical effectiveness are different matters. The proposal requires prospective evaluation against real regulatory cases before any effectiveness claim is warranted.

IV. Scientific and informational baseline

4.1. What non-human-primate cloning demonstrates

Liu and colleagues (2018) reported macaque cloning using somatic cell nuclear transfer. Liu and colleagues (2019) subsequently published work on gene-edited macaque cloning, and Liao and colleagues (2024) reported methodological advances in rhesus-monkey cloning. Together, these studies document technical advances in animal reproductive biotechnology under specific experimental conditions. They raise important issues for animal welfare, reproducibility, failure rates, oversight and potential dual use. They do not demonstrate reproductive human cloning, and they cannot establish transnational political intent by themselves.

4.2. Why the SARS-CoV-2 case matters institutionally

Competing narratives about a virus's origins illustrate three governance problems. The first is evidence asymmetry: some actors possess samples, sequences, archives or inspection reports that others cannot independently audit. The second is category confusion: a reported institutional judgment is framed as scientific proof. The third is political amplification: uncertainty can be converted into an accusation before an impartial investigation is completed. Published analyses connecting early transmission patterns and susceptible market wildlife to the Huanan market are relevant scientific evidence (Worobey et al., 2022; Crits-Christoph et al., 2024), but they do not settle every unresolved step in transmission history. Good governance allows findings to be revised without treating revision as institutional collapse.

4.3. The boundary between scientific plausibility and attributed intention

Risk assessment should separate the question "Could a technique, in principle, produce a harmful outcome?" from "Was the technique used in a particular incident?" and "Who intended that outcome?" These require different records: experimental protocols and validation for technical capability; epidemiological, genomic and physical evidence for event reconstruction; and authenticated operational records for attribution of intent. A precautionary system can justify inspections and limits on high-risk experiments without purporting to resolve allegations for which decisive evidence is unavailable.

V. Proposed five-gate collaborative governance architecture

Gate 1 — Scientific provenance and independent verification

Before high-impact biotechnology work is approved for expanded use, applicants should register the research objective, biological material provenance, relevant experimental protocols, preregistered endpoints where feasible, analytic pipelines and disclosed conflicts of interest. An independent panel should be able to inspect supporting data under security-preserving conditions, request replication and document uncertainties. Classified or commercially sensitive evidence may warrant controlled access, but confidentiality cannot be treated as proof. The decision record should state which conclusions remain unverified.

Gate 2 — Biosafety, biosecurity and dual-use assessment

A multidisciplinary committee should classify hazards related to containment, transport, laboratory workers, animal welfare, misuse potential and possible environmental consequences. Review should be proportionate: stringent supervision where credible harms are severe, while preventing generic fears from stifling harmless research. Mandatory triggers may include substantial protocol changes, containment failures, unauthorized transfers of biological materials and unexplained adverse events. Inspection authorities must be empowered to order pauses, corrective actions and incident reporting.

Gate 3 — Rights, consent, justice and dignity

No technical benefit automatically overrides bodily integrity or meaningful consent. A governance dossier should map whose samples, genomes, health records and derived inferences are being used, for which purposes and under what retention limits. Independent ethics review should account for vulnerable populations and the impossibility of obtaining consent from hypothetical future persons. The UNESCO human-genome declaration provides a baseline, while domestic law determines applicable binding duties. Participation mechanisms should cover communities affected by data reuse and future commercial access.

Gate 4 — AI auditability and human decision authority

When AI is used for design, triage, prediction or experimental monitoring, the dossier should include model purpose, training-data lineage, evaluation domains, performance uncertainty, security controls, human override, logging and arrangements for incident correction. Automated recommendations must not become de facto authorization. A qualified human decision-maker remains accountable for approval, and an independent reviewer must be able to reconstruct consequential decisions. AI-enabled systems should be assessed for bias, reidentification and unauthorized downstream uses of genetic information.

Gate 5 — International notification, enforcement and remedy

Transnational research requires a coordination protocol for cross-border samples, shared datasets, incident notification, publication corrections and independent inquiries. For a BRICS+ context, this is a proposed multilateral agenda, not a description of an adopted common program. Each national regulator retains legal competence, but a joint evidence-exchange mechanism could set minimum documentation standards and provide a common vocabulary for incidents. Appeals and whistleblower protections are as important as interagency exchange; otherwise the regime can become a closed arrangement among powerful insiders.

VI. Institutional responsibilities and implementation matrix

The matrix embeds a separation-of-powers logic: the institution conducting research cannot be the only body deciding whether its methods are sufficiently safe; the authority promoting economic development should not alone adjudicate rights harms; and confidential intelligence cannot be the only basis for public scientific claims. Funding should support independent technical review rather than merely travel and meetings. Conflict-of-interest disclosures should apply to public, private and civil-society representatives alike.

VII. Brazil and the health-consortia question

Brazilian health consortia offer an institutional analogy for coordination across autonomous municipalities and levels of government. In fields such as procurement, referrals and specialized services, cooperation may pool administrative capacity and improve access. However, a health consortium is not automatically a laboratory biosafety authority, a national data-protection regulator or an international inspectorate. Its potential role in this model would be to organize ethics literacy, referral protocols for emerging treatments, public participation and standardized assessment of technology claims.

São Paulo capital and Palmeira das Missões differ markedly in the scale and organization of the health systems around them; treating them as equivalent experimental sites would be analytically misleading. A legitimate future study might compare whether different organizational environments can disseminate independently verified guidance, operate public consultation, or refer suspected research-integrity problems to the competent institutions. Such a study would require a sampling plan, consent for interviews, identified consortia and actual administrative records. None is supplied here; therefore no location-specific empirical result is asserted.

The practical transfer is narrower and more defensible than claims that local consortia could govern cloning directly. Consortia could serve as “last-mile” public-accountability interfaces, translating global scientific standards into understandable risk information, tracking public concerns and strengthening referral mechanisms to ethics committees, ANVISA or other competent Brazilian bodies where applicable. Legal boundaries would need to be mapped before implementation. This is a governance hypothesis to be tested, not a report of existing operations.

VIII. Monitoring indicators and empirical validation

A credible framework must specify what evidence could falsify or support its effectiveness. Recommended indicators are denominated, time-bound and auditable; higher documentation volume alone is not a measure of safety. Baselines should be measured before implementation, and adverse consequences of excessive administrative burdens should also be tracked.

Implementation can be evaluated through a phased, mixed-method comparative design. Phase A would map institutions and laws, interview regulators and civil-society participants, and score current documentation practices. Phase B would pilot standardized dossiers and independent review for a bounded set of emerging technologies, without changing authorization requirements. Phase C would compare timeliness, coverage and quality of decisions against pre-pilot baselines or matched institutions. Qualitative process tracing should assess whether public input altered decisions. A prepublished protocol would reduce the risk of selecting indicators after observing favorable results.

The primary hypothesis is H1: more complete cross-agency evidence sharing, with independent audit, improves the traceability of decisions. H2: structured public participation increases the documented consideration of autonomy, distribution and privacy concerns. H3: standardized incident taxonomies improve notification consistency across borders. H4: excessive centralization without independent challenge may reduce accountability despite producing more reports. None of these hypotheses is treated as confirmed by the present review.

IX. Discussion: avoiding three governance failures

9.1. The false equivalence between risk and evidence

Scientific progress creates capabilities that are sometimes relevant to plausible future harms. But a capability is not an occurrence, and an occurrence is not proof of intent. A coherent precautionary response asks what harms are plausible, how severe they could be, how strong the supporting evidence is, and which safeguards are proportionate. Treating every hypothetical risk as an established abuse undermines legitimacy; treating the absence of proof as proof of safety is equally unsound. The proposed five gates address these errors through differentiated burdens of documentation and review.

9.2. Regulatory capture through concentrated expertise

State authorities often depend on the organizations they regulate for highly specialized technical explanations. Firms may control relevant code or proprietary data; universities may face publication and funding incentives; and geopolitical rivalries can reward exaggerated narratives. Joint governance can distribute expertise, but may simply replicate existing power if participation lacks funding, secure access and independent appeal. The accountability unit should therefore be the inspectable decision file, not the prestige of the institution or the certainty of its spokesperson.

9.3. The human future as a public question

The guiding question is not whether a specific group is already using clones or robotics to replace human beings—no evidence reviewed here warrants that assertion. It is whether convergent genomic and computational capacities could, under particular institutional failures, undermine self-determination by turning personal biology into an instrument of prediction, selection or control. The proper scientific response converts this concern into measurable variables: consent integrity, unauthorized data reuse, discrimination, independent review, transparency and effective remedy.

An important counterargument is that elaborate ex ante processes can delay research that alleviates human suffering. That concern has force, particularly in lower-resource health systems. Governance should therefore be risk-tiered and subject to sunset review: low-risk studies receive proportionate procedures, while projects with credible high-consequence risks receive enhanced inspection and controlled information sharing. Ethics is not synonymous with prohibition; it is a procedure for making scientific freedom compatible with the rights of others.

X. Conclusion

This article develops a collaborative-governance framework for the convergence of cloning, gene editing and artificial intelligence, rather than reproducing a prior verification of pandemic-origin reporting. Published primate-cloning experiments demonstrate animal-biotechnology capabilities, not reproductive human cloning, a BRICS+ conspiracy or intentional creation of SARS-CoV-2. Uncertainty about the pandemic's origins is a reason to preserve and review evidence, not a license to assert unverified causality. The contribution is an auditable five-gate model joining scientific provenance, biosafety, rights, AI accountability and transnational remedy, with actor responsibilities, indicators and testable hypotheses.

The prospective empirical question is whether that architecture can make decisions more traceable, scientifically rigorous and respectful of autonomy without imposing unjustified barriers to responsible research. Brazilian health consortia may have a complementary coordination and public-communication role, subject to jurisdictional limits. The decisive question for future inquiry remains: can cloning, genome editing and AI be

governed through institutions strong enough to preserve the individual's freedom, bodily dignity and capacity to refuse technological control?

XI. Declarations

Article type: conceptual research article / structured documentary analysis. Human participants: none. Original empirical data: none. Ethics approval: not applicable to this documentary analysis. Funding and conflicts of interest: not declared; to be confirmed by the author before submission. The article does not attribute illegal conduct to any named state, institution or individual.

XII. Research questions, originality and separation from earlier publications

The central question is how an interdependent network of research organizations, public authorities, clinical institutions and civil society can make defensible decisions when biological experimentation advances more quickly than shared verification and oversight. Four subsidiary questions follow: who supplies the evidence; who has jurisdiction to stop an activity; how is an adverse event communicated; and which procedural guarantees preserve the dignity and autonomy of potentially affected persons?

This manuscript makes a different contribution from a source-verification review of Deutsche Welle reporting and cloning publications. That review addressed whether particular news narratives and laboratory findings prove particular causal propositions. Here the news controversy is merely one stress test for institutional decision processes. The unit of analysis is not a newspaper report or a primate experiment, but a governance decision with identifiable participants, documents, disclosure duties, thresholds and routes of appeal.

Novelty is proposed, not empirically established: a five-gate review architecture, an evidence ledger, jurisdictional escalation rules, a rights-impact assessment and a prospective evaluation design. Any claim of absolute originality against a ScholastiOpen publication would require a side-by-side examination of its full text, which was not available during preparation.

XIII. Scope conditions and analytical boundaries

Three categories must remain separate. First, somatic-cell nuclear transfer in non-human primates is an experimental achievement under particular laboratory conditions. Second, heritable human genome editing is a distinct biomedical intervention with different ethical implications. Third, software systems that classify, recommend or allocate resources can shape organizational behavior without altering a human genome. A joint governance model can compare their oversight problems without describing them as a single technology.

The BRICS+ designation is employed here as a prospective cooperation arena, not as evidence that its governments have endorsed a collective program of reproductive cloning. Illustrative differences in administrative capacity, scientific infrastructure and public participation are treated as hypotheses requiring country-level verification. Policy coordination should be understood as a possibility conditional on treaties, domestic laws and institutional mandates.

Brazilian public health consortia are likewise evaluated as a possible interface for technology assessment, procurement, referral pathways, data protection and citizen participation. The text does not assign them authority to license human cloning, regulate high-containment laboratories or decide national biosecurity policy. Those functions depend on legally competent bodies.

XIV. Theory of collaborative governance

Collaborative governance becomes necessary when neither a ministry nor a university can alone observe all relevant risks and enforce all consequences. Public managers may command budgets and licensing processes, researchers possess technical expertise, clinicians understand patient pathways, and community representatives perceive burdens not captured by laboratory metrics. Their knowledge is complementary but their incentives are not identical.

A defensible collaborative arrangement therefore requires a publicly defined common purpose, rules for membership, recorded deliberation, explicit conflict-of-interest declarations and a procedure for dissent. Consensus can be valuable but should never become a veto over legal duties or scientific quality. Transparency has boundaries where legitimate privacy or security interests require controlled disclosure; those boundaries must themselves be reviewable.

The proposed design combines the collaborative-governance account of Ansell and Gash (2008) with the institutional emphasis of Emerson, Nabatchi and Balogh (2012). The purpose of bringing those models into advanced biotechnology is analytical: establish conditions for trust, joint action and accountability rather than assume cooperation automatically produces public value.

XV. Why ordinary innovation diffusion models are insufficient

The adoption of an improved surgical procedure normally invites comparison of indications, clinical outcomes, professional training, budget impact and patient preferences. Human cloning and high-consequence biological research require an additional question: whether the activity should be permitted at all under particular safeguards. A procurement scorecard cannot substitute for an ethical or legal determination. Technology readiness is not equivalent to social acceptability. Published proof of a procedure in an animal model supports further scientific appraisal, not direct approval in humans. Organizational decision makers must recognize the interval between a reproducible laboratory result and a legitimate public intervention, including uncertainty regarding long-term safety, animal welfare, intergenerational consequences and unequal access. This distinction also prevents the mistaken analogy between HoLEP/TURP or LASIK/PRK comparisons in the former IAHSS framing and claims about intentional pathogen production. The former involve treatment choices evaluated through clinical evidence; the latter involve causal attribution and security-sensitive allegations. The common denominator is governance of uncertainty, not equivalence of evidence or risk.

XVI. Evidence ledger: sources, claims and inference rules

Each material proposition entering the governance process should be associated with a structured ledger entry containing the exact claim, date, originating institution, method of production, public accessibility, independent replication status, potential conflicts, uncertainty statement and decision relevance. Separating propositions at this level avoids a situation in which a highly credible finding about one variable is used rhetorically to certify an unrelated allegation.

For example, publication of successful macaque cloning supports the existence of that experimental capability. A report that an intelligence service assigned a probability to a laboratory-accident scenario documents the existence of a reported assessment, but does not disclose its entire evidentiary base. A policy decision should treat these as different evidence classes and require a clearly stated bridge before drawing any further conclusion.

Ledger entries would be version controlled and subject to challenge by qualified reviewers. Where underlying records cannot be released, a designated independent inspector could certify the type of evidence examined and specify unresolved limitations. This arrangement is a design proposal; no such joint BRICS+ ledger is claimed to exist.

XVII. Competing hypotheses and disciplined causal attribution

The distinction between zoonotic introduction, an accidental laboratory incident, intentional modification and intentional release is logically indispensable. Even proof of a laboratory-related origin would not, without further evidence, establish deliberate engineering or malicious dissemination. Conflating such statements can distort investment priorities and impede meaningful cooperation between research institutions. The WHO SAGO assessment of June 2025 examined the scientific literature, reports and intelligence statements available to its members. WHO emphasized persistent gaps in access to relevant data and the need to consider competing hypotheses. The institutional lesson is not that uncertainty licenses every speculation; it is that an accountable governance process must make its evidentiary limitations legible while defining what new observations would change its appraisal.

Proposed procedures include pre-specified confidence language, adversarial review of material assumptions, documentation of missing data and periodic updates when new evidence becomes public. No percentage from a press report should be repackaged as a laboratory-validated scientific probability without explaining its provenance and limitations.

XVIII. Comparative case A: non-human-primate cloning

Liu and colleagues reported macaque cloning by somatic-cell nuclear transfer in 2018, followed by research involving gene-edited macaques in 2019. A 2024 publication addressed technical problems in rhesus-monkey cloning through a related reprogramming and trophoblast-replacement approach. These are important for understanding developmental biology and the reproducibility challenges of complex mammalian cloning. They do not establish a clinically safe, legally authorized or routinely reproducible human reproductive cloning procedure. Before any governance comparison is meaningful, reviewers must record the species studied, sample counts, efficiency, embryo and offspring outcomes, welfare burdens, protocols and replication. Reporting that a result was achieved without describing the developmental losses can understate the practical and ethical costs. For collaborative governance, the resulting responsibilities involve animal-research ethics committees, funding agencies, biosafety oversight and international scientific reporting. The relevant policy question is how to prevent experimental capabilities from being exaggerated into unsupported claims about human applications.

XIX. Comparative case B: gene editing and heritable risks

Genome editing is not the same procedure as nuclear-transfer cloning. Somatic applications affect treated patients without necessarily transmitting modifications to descendants; heritable changes raise the prospect of effects on future generations who cannot consent. Evaluating both under a generic heading of innovation would conceal these differences.

WHO released a governance framework and recommendations in July 2021 addressing leadership, collaboration, registries, international research travel, unregistered or unsafe research, intellectual property, education and review mechanisms. Its approach supports multilevel oversight rather than reliance on one institutional review board. The proposed model here operationalizes those concerns with a measurable sequence of evidence appraisal, rights review, independent audit and remedy.

Where a protocol potentially affects embryos or inherited traits, additional safeguards would include an explicit regulatory-competence review and an enforceable prohibition of activities that applicable law forbids. A collaborative committee cannot convert a prohibited intervention into a permissible one by reaching agreement.

XX. Comparative case C: artificial intelligence as a governance layer

AI enters biomedical governance through literature retrieval, image analysis, sequencing support, adverse-event detection, grant review, procurement scoring and clinical decision assistance. These roles differ substantially. An algorithm identifying anomalies in laboratory records has a different rights profile from a system ranking patients or inferring intimate genetic properties.

For each AI use case, oversight should define intended function, training-data provenance, access permissions, external validation, subgroup performance, human review and an incident escalation route. A mathematical score must not become an unquestioned judgment merely because it is reproducible by software. Auditability encompasses the ability to reconstruct the decisive inputs and relevant model version at the moment a decision was made.

The proposed safeguard is meaningful human authority: a named professional must be empowered to contest, suspend or override a system recommendation, with reasons recorded. Such authority is ineffective if staffing, time pressure or procurement contracts make disagreement impossible in practice.

XXI. Autonomy and the problem of technological instrumentalization

Technological instrumentalization occurs when persons are treated principally as experimental resources, datasets or optimization targets rather than rights-bearing participants. The issue need not rely on speculative scenarios of mass human cloning. It can appear in identifiable current practices: opaque consent documents, coercive recruitment, secondary use of genomic samples, unchallengeable automated decisions or exclusion from governance forums.

A rights-impact review should ask whose interests are advanced, whether refusal has adverse consequences, how secondary data use is limited, whether family members may be indirectly affected and whether the individual can obtain an intelligible explanation of a consequential decision. Protection of autonomy includes conditions for meaningful choice, not merely a signature.

UNESCO's 1997 declaration articulates a human-dignity principle relevant to cloning debates. Translating that principle into operational procedures requires domestic law, ethics review, independent complaints mechanisms and practical remedies; the declaration alone does not resolve every contemporary legal question.

XXII. Governance of privacy and genomic data

Genomic information can reveal sensitive attributes about the specimen donor and sometimes biological relatives. Its governance differs from ordinary administrative records because identifiers may persist across a lifetime and because newly developed analytic methods can create unanticipated inferences. Technical de-identification is useful but should not be portrayed as guaranteeing irreversibility.

A cooperative registry should minimize data collection, distinguish identifiable from aggregate reporting and restrict cross-border transfer according to applicable legal requirements. Agreements must specify controller and processor responsibilities, lawful purposes, retention periods, incident response, independent auditing and deletion or archival rules where permitted. When data cross multiple institutions, the accountability chain cannot end at the first collector.

For Brazil, the Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados (Law 13,709/2018) provides an essential legal starting point. Project teams must conduct a case-specific legal analysis rather than presume public interest automatically authorizes unrestricted genetic-data sharing.

XXIII. Biosafety versus biosecurity

Biosafety concerns accidental exposure or unintended release from biological work, whereas biosecurity considers unauthorized access, misuse and intentional harmful actions. Their overlap should not erase their distinct causal assumptions, preventive controls or investigative standards. A laboratory accident may indicate a serious safety failure without proving malicious conduct.

The governance model separates routine risk assessment from security-sensitive review while requiring coordination at interfaces: inventory control, training, incident reporting, protective equipment, containment design and escalation to competent authorities. Security measures should be calibrated so that they do not suppress legitimate whistleblowing, independent scientific scrutiny or public accountability.

To avoid creating a roadmap for misuse, the article proposes oversight responsibilities rather than operational biological procedures. It examines the architecture of prevention, verification and reporting, not the technical optimization of pathogen manipulation.

XXIV. Dual-use review as a continuous obligation

Research may have valuable health applications while also creating capabilities that could be misused. Dual-use assessment is therefore not a one-time label attached to a proposal, but a sequence of judgments repeated when methods, partners, data access or intended outputs change. Reviewers should identify foreseeable classes of misuse and ask whether benefits can be preserved through proportionate controls.

Independent panels require a mix of scientific, legal, ethical and security expertise. An inventor should not be the only person who determines whether an invention presents public risk. Conversely, a security official should not be the sole arbiter of whether publication contributes to public health. Dissent and reasoning must be documented, although some technical material may need controlled access.

A practical checkpoint includes notification of material protocol changes, review after adverse events and a condition that approval expires unless renewed. An appeal procedure is essential to prevent arbitrary restriction of legitimate inquiry.

XXV. A five-gate system: logical order and decision rights

Gate 1 asks whether the claimed findings and supporting records can be evaluated; Gate 2 addresses safety, security and misuse; Gate 3 assesses law, dignity, consent and distributional consequences; Gate 4 tests algorithmic accountability; and Gate 5 specifies notification, jurisdiction and remedies. The sequence establishes an audit trail rather than suggesting all risks can be reduced to a single numerical index.

A gate can return approve, approve with conditions, request evidence, suspend or refer to a legally competent authority. Decisions should identify the source of delegated authority and the person responsible for implementation. A committee may recommend a stop, but only an authorized institution can enforce one. Where an activity falls outside the consortium's powers, referral is the correct governance output.

The gates operate iteratively: an AI incident might reveal missing source provenance and reopen Gate 1; a new cross-border partner might trigger Gate 5 and require a fresh rights assessment. In this way, collaborative governance is designed for learning under uncertainty rather than for a single ceremonial approval meeting.

XXVI. Decision thresholds without false precision

An integrated dashboard can help reviewers but should not suggest that dignity can be traded for a favorable engineering score. Some legal or ethical conditions are categorical constraints. Other dimensions, such as resource requirements or audit coverage, can be assessed using documented thresholds. The model therefore uses a hybrid of hard stops, qualitative judgments and quantifiable performance indicators.

A hard stop applies when a proposal lacks legal authority, cannot establish a valid consent mechanism where required, or fails a binding safety condition. A conditional authorization is possible where the deficiency is remediable and activities can lawfully be restricted. Uncertainty should be displayed explicitly instead of quietly absorbed into an overall average.

Suggested targets for a pilot are organizational research hypotheses, not validated standards. For example, a project might aim to publish all non-confidential decisions within a specified administrative interval and provide a recorded response to every substantiated complaint. Actual targets should be approved after a baseline audit.

XXVII. Roles of public authorities and research institutions

National authorities remain responsible for functions assigned by constitutional and statutory law, such as licensing, data-protection enforcement and public-health regulation. Universities and hospitals control internal protocols, ethics approval, professional training and research records. Funders can require timely publication of negative results, independent audit access and evidence of compliance as contractual conditions.

An interinstitutional committee might harmonize forms and share risk signals, but it should not imply authority that no participant possesses. Memoranda of understanding must identify what information may legally be exchanged and which office must respond to an incident. Without those provisions, a collaborative forum can become a venue for deflecting rather than assigning responsibility.

The proposed organizational charter makes a distinction between deliberative membership, technical advisory membership and statutory decision authority. That distinction also protects scientific independence by preventing governments or private sponsors from treating participation as advance endorsement.

XXVIII. Public and patient representation

Public consultation cannot be reduced to recruiting a representative who agrees with an institutional proposal. Communities need advance access to understandable information, disclosure of uncertainty, opportunities to place issues on the agenda and a record of how their objections influenced the result. Participation should reach people who may bear costs but are unlikely to benefit directly.

For genomic research, patient organizations may contribute experience of therapeutic need and discrimination, while disability-rights organizations may highlight assumptions about which lives are valued. Neither constituency is internally homogeneous. A governance design should therefore avoid portraying one advocate as the voice of an entire population.

Participation has costs in time, accessibility and technical interpretation. Budgeting for translation, independent technical assistance and reimbursement of legitimate participation expenses is part of the institutional design, not a peripheral courtesy.

XXIX. Brazil: public consortia as sites of coordination

Brazilian intermunicipal public consortia can be studied as institutional arrangements for shared service delivery and collective administrative capacity. Federal Law 11,107/2005 provides a core legal reference for public consortia. The connection to advanced biomedical governance is prospective: coordinating technology assessment, data-management safeguards, specialized referrals and professional training within their statutory remit.

No inference should be drawn that consortia in São Paulo capital or Palmeira das Missões presently run human-cloning programs or participate in a national BRICS+ genetic-engineering scheme. The correct empirical strategy is to inventory their legal entities, actual competencies, contracts, service agreements, personnel and oversight practices before proposing a pilot.

An implementation pathway would begin with narrow, legitimate services: joint review of AI-assisted care technologies and shared procurement safeguards. Over time, standardized accountability mechanisms might provide a transferable template for other technologies, but only after external evaluation.

XXX. São Paulo capital: metropolitan implementation hypothesis

São Paulo presents a plausible research setting because a metropolitan health ecosystem can involve municipal and state administrations, universities, hospitals, regulators, private technology firms and civil organizations. The size and diversity of this ecosystem may increase scientific resources while complicating responsibility across procurement and data-sharing boundaries.

The empirical hypothesis is that a shared evidence ledger and publicly documented decision rights would reduce duplication and make contested technology decisions easier to audit. Measurement should compare decisions before and after procedural changes, controlling where possible for project complexity and staff turnover. A second hypothesis is that increased publication of reasons may improve public trust, but the effect must be measured rather than assumed.

Local fieldwork would require confirmed institutional contacts, consented interviews, procurement records and administrative permission. None of these observations is represented as already collected in this conceptual manuscript.

XXXI. Palmeira das Missões: regional implementation hypothesis

A smaller regional setting may have fewer specialist evaluators, narrower budgets and stronger dependence on intermunicipal collaboration. These possible constraints can make shared analytical capacity attractive. However, assigning specific deficiencies to Palmeira das Missões without field evidence would be methodologically unsound.

The proposed comparative hypothesis is that regionally pooled review capacity improves consistency in assessments and access to specialist advice, whereas concentrated metropolitan institutions may offer more

immediate technical resources. Differences in public engagement, data infrastructure and implementation costs should be measured instead of inferred from population size alone.

Case selection must document which consortia and institutions actually serve the locality, how decisions are made and what technologies are being evaluated. Comparable observations would then support a structured comparison with São Paulo using the same instruments and indicators.

XXXII. An empirical design for a future two-site study

A sequential mixed-methods protocol could begin with document analysis of statutes, technical opinions, agreements and procurement records. The second phase could employ semi-structured interviews with public managers, clinicians, data-protection officers, ethics reviewers and civil society representatives. A final phase might assess standardized governance vignettes with independent panels.

Pre-registration should specify case-selection rules, inclusion criteria, the proposed indicators and planned comparisons. Triangulation among interviews, minutes, legal documents and process logs is necessary because participants may overestimate the deliberative quality of their institutions. Researchers should seek examples of failed decisions and unresolved complaints rather than collect only success narratives.

The current article provides no fabricated sample sizes, statistical estimates or interview quotations. It describes a protocol that could produce testable evidence later, contingent on ethics and institutional authorizations.

XXXIII. Indicators: transparency and reproducibility

Transparency can be measured through the share of decisions accompanied by written reasons; the interval between decision and public notice; the percentage of conflicts of interest disclosed; and the extent to which non-confidential evidence sources can be independently located. Each measure requires a denominator and a stable definition. Counting published documents alone may reward administrative volume without improving comprehension.

Reproducibility can be tested by asking two independent panels to reach an assessment using the same evidence ledger and decision rubric. Disagreement is not automatically failure: some judgments legitimately depend on values. The key indicator is whether divergences are traceable to articulated assumptions and whether essential facts can be reconstructed.

Audits should also examine omissions. If the registry excludes abandoned proposals, adverse outcomes or dissenting opinions, seemingly high transparency scores could be misleading. The proposed evaluation therefore pairs quantitative coverage measures with qualitative reviews of record completeness.

XXXIV. Indicators: safety, rights and remedy

Safety reporting metrics should distinguish near misses, confirmed incidents and allegations that remain under investigation. An apparent increase in reported incidents after a new policy may reflect better disclosure rather than deterioration in laboratory conditions. Trend interpretation consequently requires contextual review and protection against retaliation for good-faith reporting.

Rights indicators might record the proportion of projects with documented consent analysis, independent data-protection review where appropriate, accessible complaint channels and evidence of response to affected persons. Serious rights violations should not be treated as balanced by a high average score on unrelated indicators.

A remedy indicator can track the time required to acknowledge, investigate and resolve grievances, while documenting whether remedies were effective. This domain must include appeals against automated decisions, research-participation complaints and challenges to unauthorized data sharing, subject to the relevant legal framework.

XXXV. Counterfactuals and evaluation threats

A pilot that improves its documentation during an evaluation might appear more transparent even if substantive decision quality is unchanged. Conversely, a site with greater public controversy may receive more complaints precisely because its complaint mechanisms are accessible. Evaluators should therefore avoid interpreting raw counts as direct measures of good or bad governance.

Useful comparators could include matched institutions not yet adopting the framework, historical decisions reviewed with identical rubrics or staggered implementation across participating units. Any causal claims would require attention to parallel trends, selection effects, political changes and differences in technology complexity. A difference-in-differences design might be feasible only where data quality and comparability are demonstrated.

Qualitative process tracing is important for explaining why an intervention worked or failed. Interviews should seek evidence of consequential change in authority, not merely more frequent committee meetings.

XXXVI. Cross-border BRICS+ cooperation: feasible first steps

Cross-border collaboration need not begin with a single regulator or an unrestricted data pool. A more credible first stage is a voluntary network for comparing governance instruments, sharing publicly releasable incident lessons, training ethics reviewers and standardizing terms for uncertain claims. Each participating state would maintain its domestic competences and legal safeguards.

Mutual recognition should be treated cautiously. An ethical review in one jurisdiction may not satisfy requirements elsewhere, especially where data protection, animal research, germline modification and laboratory licensing laws differ. Cooperation can nevertheless improve interoperability by identifying which documents have common meaning and which require jurisdiction-specific review.

Proposals for treaty commitments or international inspections would demand separate legal and political study. This manuscript does not attribute secret programs, deliberate COVID-19 manufacturing or a joint human-cloning agenda to any BRICS+ country.

XXXVII. Financing and procurement incentives

Governance fails when review bodies are expected to perform complex audits with no staff time or independent budget. Sustainable financing could use public appropriations, research-grant overheads and transparent service contributions, provided these do not allow a sponsor to purchase favorable decisions. Financial arrangements must protect reviewers from retaliation or inappropriate influence.

Procurement contracts for AI and laboratory services should require audit cooperation, change notification, incident assistance and data-return provisions. Technology suppliers may assert commercial confidentiality, but an agreement should make clear which information authorized reviewers can inspect and how sensitive material will be protected.

A pilot budget should separately estimate training, legal consultation, public participation, technical validation and evaluation. These are projected cost categories, not measured savings. A later business case must compare them with observed reductions in duplication, disputes or unsafe implementation.

XXXVIII. Governance failures and institutional learning

Three failure modes deserve explicit attention. Evidence laundering arises when a poorly supported proposition acquires apparent authority through repeated citation. Jurisdictional diffusion occurs when many committees discuss an issue but none can take an enforceable decision. Participation theater occurs when consultation is staged after the key institutional choice has already been made.

The proposed response combines an auditable claim register, a responsibility map and a requirement to publish how public input was considered. Periodic red-team reviews can test whether a reviewer can trace a decision, locate dissent and identify the official with actual authority. Adverse findings should prompt corrective measures rather than reputational concealment.

Learning requires attention to failures of the governance process itself. Recording why a panel changed its view can demonstrate intellectual integrity, especially in rapidly evolving scientific areas where new evidence legitimately overturns earlier assessments.

XXXIX. Ethics, conflicts and research integrity

Governance credibility depends on disclosure of relevant financial interests, institutional loyalties and intellectual commitments. Disclosure alone does not eliminate bias: a reviewer with a substantial stake may need to abstain from a decision. Rules for recusal should be proportionate and administered consistently, while avoiding exclusion of everyone with necessary technical competence.

Research integrity also includes appropriate attribution, preservation of underlying materials where lawful, transparent correction practices and a clear separation of findings from conjecture. Allegations involving named laboratories, countries or scientific teams deserve heightened care because reputational harm can occur even when a paper includes qualifying language.

This study is a policy-design analysis based on publicly reported literature. It does not disclose private experimental data, conduct interventions on humans or animals, or present speculative accusations as findings.

XL. Policy roadmap and measurable milestones

Phase 1 would inventory the relevant Brazilian institutions, legal competences, existing committees and information channels. Phase 2 would co-design an evidence ledger and review charter with stakeholders.

Phase 3 would conduct tabletop tests using public, non-sensitive cases. Phase 4 would pilot the procedure on lawfully authorized innovation assessments; Phase 5 would commission independent evaluation.

Milestones include an approved authority map, publication of non-confidential criteria, adoption of conflicts-of-interest rules, operational complaint channels and documented evidence-review exercises. The timeline should be adjusted to institutional capacity rather than asserted as universally achievable.

Any expansion to cross-border cooperation should depend on evaluation of domestic pilot safeguards and formal review of relevant legal agreements. A program that cannot preserve accountability within its initial participating organizations should not be rapidly scaled across jurisdictions.

XLII. Final synthesis: scientific capability without institutional overreach

Cloning research, genome editing, pathogen-origin investigations and algorithmic systems each raise distinct scientific questions. Their intersection is a governance challenge because decisions under uncertainty have effects beyond the laboratory. The paper contributes a model for deciding what must be verified, who may act, when a proposal should be stopped and how individuals may challenge consequential decisions.

The evidence reviewed does not establish deliberate SARS-CoV-2 engineering, a coordinated BRICS+ human-cloning plan or any empirical impact of the proposed consortium model. What follows instead is a testable proposition: clearly allocated authority, public reasoning and independent verification should improve the procedural quality of decisions about emerging biotechnologies.

The next research step is comparative field evaluation in Brazil, accompanied by legal analysis and genuinely independent participation. Institutional design is successful only if affected persons can observe, contest and obtain remedies for consequential decisions—not merely if committees report consensus.

XLII. Developmental embryology as a constraint on claims about cloning

Moore and Persaud's fourth edition of *Before We Are Born: Essentials of Embryology and Birth Defects* (1993) offers an important developmental scaffold for evaluating proposals about reproductive technologies, but it is not evidence that a particular contemporary research team has performed human reproductive cloning. Its subject matter follows reproduction, fertilization and the successive transformations of embryonic and fetal tissues. We use the verified fourth-edition chapter organization rather than transferring page numbers or questions from later editions, which reorganized some topics. Exact treatment of the author's page-10 question and figures on pages 54 and 57 cannot be assessed without copies of those pages. The following is therefore a reasoned chapter-level synthesis, not a quotation, reproduction, or claimed page-by-page exegesis.

The most consequential question for Chapter 1 is methodological: how do observations about normal human development explain the origins of structural anomalies, and where do the limits of observation constrain causal inference? Embryology connects the temporal order of developmental events to the formation of organs and the clinical significance of deviations. It can identify biological dependencies without identifying a country's research program or inferring an intention to manipulate reproductive outcomes. A contemporary governance review should apply this discipline to experimental claims: report species, cell type, developmental stage, implantation status, study design, viability, and follow-up separately.

Chapter 2 on human reproduction supplies the baseline against which alternatives must be distinguished. Ordinary fertilization combines gametes and initiates coordinated early development; somatic cell nuclear transfer instead seeks to reprogram a differentiated cell nucleus in an enucleated oocyte. Assisted fertilization, cloning by nuclear transfer, embryo culture, human germline editing and somatic-cell therapy each describe different biological interventions. Grouping them under the ambiguous expression 'human cloning' produces clinical confusion and harms comparative policy analysis. For this article, every reference to an intervention therefore names the procedure and the biological entity to which evidence applies.

XLIII. Reading chapters 3–7 as a sequence of developmental vulnerabilities

The first week of development (Chapter 3) covers the progression from fertilization to early cleavage and blastocyst formation. It is relevant to the interpretation of nuclear reprogramming because a developing embryo must support coherent activation and regulation of genetic programs. Yet observing cleavage, a blastocyst or an implantation-associated marker is not equivalent to verifying a viable birth or long-term healthy development. Any scientific claim therefore needs an explicit endpoint, along with the denominator of embryos and attempts at each stage.

The second and third weeks (Chapters 4 and 5) highlight implantation, early embryonic organization and gastrulation, which establish precursors of the germ layers. They are a reminder that outcomes emerge from interactions among tissues and signaling conditions, not from nuclear DNA sequence alone. A cloned organism's nuclear genome might be genetically similar to a donor's, but the developmental environment and

epigenetic state do not become identical. Such distinctions undermine simplified narratives of 'copying' a person, whose identity and abilities cannot be inferred from nuclear genotype.

The fourth-to-eighth-week period (Chapter 6) is the time during which organ primordia undergo major structural organization. Chapter 7 extends the discussion into the fetal period, in which growth and functional maturation become central. Risks from an experimental manipulation are consequently multidimensional and time-dependent: a favorable blastocyst result cannot establish placental function; apparently normal fetal morphology cannot establish later neurodevelopment; and successful delivery does not eliminate lifelong uncertainty. Oversight must connect observations across time instead of selecting one favorable milestone to declare safety.

This developmental sequence can be expressed as a governance cascade: characterize the starting biological material; document nuclear or genetic intervention; evaluate early development; assess implantation and extraembryonic tissues; observe organogenesis; and establish fetal, neonatal and longer-term outcomes where ethically and legally permissible. The cascade is a review architecture, not a recommendation to conduct reproductive cloning experiments. In particular, the absence of legal authorization or acceptable ethics cannot be overcome by building a technically detailed developmental plan.

XLIV. Chapter 8, placenta and fetal membranes: the strongest point of contact with Chinese primate studies

The verified fourth-edition table of contents identifies Chapter 8 as 'Placenta and Fetal Membranes'. That organization makes it central to a contemporary assessment of somatic cell nuclear transfer. The placenta is not merely an auxiliary delivery system: it is an essential maternal–fetal interface associated with exchange, signaling and fetal support. A nuclear-transfer embryo can face failures outside the developing embryo proper. Therefore, evidence of cloned primate embryos or even pregnancy must be reviewed alongside placental morphology, developmental functioning and long-term offspring outcomes.

This is also the most direct link to a major Chinese research advance. Liao and colleagues (2024) compared primate embryos produced by intracytoplasmic sperm injection and somatic cell nuclear transfer, describing DNA methylation abnormalities and loss of imprinting of maternally imprinted genes in cloned monkey blastocysts. Those alterations persisted in their examined samples, and placental histology revealed hyperplasia and calcification. The researchers investigated trophoblast replacement, and reported the successful cloning of a male rhesus macaque. The finding points to placental or extraembryonic problems as an important bottleneck in a specific nonhuman-primate system, not to an established capacity to clone humans.

It would be inaccurate to say that Moore and Persaud anticipated or described the Liao experiment. The older textbook provides normal-development concepts, while Liao et al. supply the experiment-specific evidence published more than three decades later. The original contribution of the present article is to translate the relationship into assessment criteria: no reproductive-developmental claim should be accepted solely from early embryo images; reviewers should distinguish embryonic from extraembryonic tissue, scrutinize imprinting and pregnancy outcomes when evidence is available, and require independently evaluated animal welfare and validity data.

The framework also creates a negative evidentiary rule. If a claim about human cloning is based only on outcomes from macaque models, the corresponding governance record must explicitly state 'non-human primate evidence' and cannot label the finding a proven human reproductive intervention. Extrapolation should include species-specific biological uncertainty and ethical prohibitions. Science communication should preserve this distinction even when dramatic headlines reward broader wording.

XLV. Why Chinese laboratories progressed: documented research capacities rather than speculation

China's contribution to non-human-primate cloning is documented by original papers, not merely by geopolitical commentary. Liu et al. (2018) reported macaques cloned through somatic cell nuclear transfer and genetic analyses supporting their origins. The experimental achievement followed work on nuclear reprogramming and the developmental constraints that had impeded non-human-primate cloning. In 2019, investigators reported gene-edited macaque cloning, illustrating a research trajectory that connected genome modification with reproductive animal-model techniques. Liao et al. (2024) later examined the extraembryonic complications of nuclear transfer in more detail.

These publications support several cautious observations. Investigators sustained a multi-stage research program, used specialized reproductive biology and molecular analyses, and published difficult-to-achieve animal outcomes in internationally visible journals. They do not, by themselves, establish that China had the highest expenditure, largest overall workforce, greatest total success rate, or a secret human-cloning program.

Such comparative explanations would require audited cross-national data on funding, facilities, protocols, publication volume, unsuccessful experiments and regulation. A technology-governance article should describe evidenced institutional capacities without converting national scientific achievements into unverified claims of intent.

The 2018 He Jiankui episode is a separate matter: reported births followed heritable genome editing of human embryos, not somatic cell nuclear-transfer cloning. The Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences publicly condemned clinical reproductive applications of embryo editing conducted without sufficient scientific evaluation or within ethical and legal violations. This response shows why a national research system should not be treated as a single actor with a homogeneous policy. The record comprises scientific breakthroughs, disputed or unethical actions, and institutional objections to those actions. Collapsing these into one claim would compromise the article's accuracy.

A testable institutional hypothesis is that accumulation of expertise in nuclear reprogramming, assisted reproduction, epigenomic measurement and multi-omics analysis can reduce barriers to certain animal-model innovations. This should be investigated through transparent bibliometric and institutional data, not asserted as a demonstrated explanation. Another hypothesis is that visible ethical breaches generate regulatory feedback and wider scrutiny. Here again, longitudinal study is required before attributing a causal effect.

XLVI. Chapters 12–17: organ systems and the question of where interventions matter

Chapters 12–17 of the fourth edition encompass respiratory, digestive, urogenital, cardiovascular, musculoskeletal and nervous-system development, respectively. These chapters offer anatomy and developmental relationships for understanding why early perturbations might have different consequences across tissues and different developmental stages. They are not evidence that Chinese scientists intervened in each system, and it would be improper to identify a specific 'Chinese intervention point' from a general embryology textbook. The point of intervention can only be established from the relevant primary experimental publication.

For example, genome editing at an early embryonic stage has a different scope of potential impact than somatic gene therapy aimed at a particular postnatal tissue. Transplantation of laboratory-derived retinal cells, modification of blood-forming stem cells, correction of a disease-associated gene in a selected patient population and hereditary editing of an embryo raise distinct questions of cell lineage, exposure, persistence, reversibility and consent. The governance framework therefore prohibits the use of undifferentiated claims such as 'scientists altered the nervous system' unless target tissue, timing, mechanism and outcome are documented. Organ-system chapters are especially useful for setting follow-up criteria: neurological, cardiovascular, renal and other evaluations may be relevant to interpreting unexpected phenotypes in animal research, but no single domain can stand in for an integrated assessment of organismal health. Comparative research must avoid inferring that an apparently normal external appearance or a normal result in one organ demonstrates global developmental safety. Preclinical evidence, when collected ethically, should be reported with both favorable and adverse results.

XLVII. Chapter 18, eye and ear: potential applications and limits of the intervention claim

The fourth edition identifies Chapter 18 as 'Eye and Ear'. This is a valuable topic because vision and hearing depend on coordinated development of sensory epithelia, neuronal connections and surrounding structural tissues. Developmental differences may arise from genetic or non-genetic causes, and understanding normal embryology helps explain why disease models and regenerative approaches may focus on particular tissues. Nonetheless, the location of this chapter does not imply that the eye and ear are the primary sites of Chinese cloning experiments or that ocular tissues have the greatest degree of human reproductive manipulation. A defensible contemporary extension is to ask how advanced genetic and cell-based models of ocular or auditory disease should be governed. Research involving patient-derived cells, organoids, retinal disorders or preclinical primate systems should be evaluated on its own endpoints and ethical approvals. The fact that embryological structures form early in development cannot justify a claim that China is selectively engineering human vision or hearing. If a particular publication reports an eye- or ear-related intervention, its targeted gene, species, tissue, control condition and validated outcome must be documented before it is included as a case study.

This distinction also safeguards the relationship between development and clinical ophthalmology. LASIK and PRK, formerly compared in the article, are corneal refractive procedures undertaken after development; they are not embryonic gene-editing or cloning interventions. A new paper devoted to cloning and genomic governance should not use them as evidence of embryo manipulation. Their limited relevance is

institutional: they illustrate how patient choice, professional competence and comparative technology assessment differ from irreversible developmental interventions and heritable risk.

XLVIII. Translation of the embryology comparison into a governance and reporting protocol

The proposed evidence-to-accountability protocol can now be made more specific. For each reviewed study, the dossier should include: (i) species and study population, (ii) initial gamete, somatic-cell or embryonic material, (iii) intervention category, (iv) developmental stage or timing, (v) intended outcome, (vi) observed endpoint, (vii) unsuccessful attempts and adverse findings, (viii) whether placenta or other extraembryonic tissues were assessed, (ix) duration and method of follow-up, and (x) independent ethics and regulatory oversight. Entries must explicitly distinguish *in vitro*, animal and human evidence.

For a claim about cloning, reviewers should ask whether nuclear transfer actually occurred, whether offspring survived, how genetic origin was assessed, and whether maternal, epigenetic and mitochondrial contributions were adequately considered. For a claim about genome editing, reviewers instead ask what was altered, whether the modification was mosaic or heritable, how off-target risks were assessed and whether reproductive use was involved. These are different questions because cloning and editing are different procedures. The framework deliberately avoids giving operational laboratory instructions; its purpose is to assess publications, public accountability and ethical sufficiency.

The first policy output is a publication-integrity checklist usable by journals, academic consortia, ethical-review bodies and health authorities. The second is a public-facing evidence register that explicitly notes uncertainty and prevents politically charged assumptions from replacing technical proof. The third is an escalation rule: potential heritable human interventions, major dual-use risks or credible consent violations require legally competent national oversight and cannot be approved through a local health-consortium initiative alone.

The framework's originality is a structured bridge between classical developmental embryology and contemporary governance of primate cloning and genome editing. The earlier source-verification article asked whether public claims and news reports were corroborated. This paper instead identifies what biological stages matter, why placental outcomes can defeat simplistic feasibility claims, and which documentary conditions must be met before institutions discuss adoption, authorization or public communication.

XLIX. Critical questions arising from the fourth edition and unresolved source checks

The central educational question can be formulated as follows: Which developmental observations are necessary, but not sufficient, to establish that a reproductive technology is safe and effective? The preliminary answer is that fertilization or nuclear activation, cleavage, blastocyst formation, implantation, placental functioning, organogenesis, fetal survival, live birth and longitudinal health are different endpoints. Reaching any early endpoint does not establish the later ones. That answer is based on accepted developmental distinctions and the verified chapter structure; it is not presented as the verbatim question printed on page 10 of the fourth edition.

A second question is: At which developmental stages could the experiments reported by Chinese researchers act? Published macaque nuclear-transfer studies involve early reproductive and developmental stages and illuminate later outcomes, including placental abnormalities. The He Jiankui human study involved embryo genome editing, a different intervention. No reviewed original report supports a conclusion that the fourth edition's organ chapters or ocular chapter identify a secret human-clone program. To answer a source-specific question, the research team must identify the paper, technique, organism and experimentally demonstrated stage, not project later research onto a 1993 textbook.

Finally, the precise content of page 10, figures on page 54, the page 57 summary, and 'common questions' beginning around page 326 must be treated as unverified pending receipt of scans from the specific fourth-edition copy. Public catalogues support the edition's bibliographic identity and chapter sequence, but not those page-specific textual claims. This limitation is retained in the manuscript deliberately, both as a research-integrity measure and to prevent inaccurate page references in a submission-ready paper.

L. From suspected concealment to falsifiable developmental-embryology research

A rigorous examination of advanced Chinese reproductive biotechnology must begin with a distinction that is often blurred in public debate: ability, opportunity, intention, and completed human intervention are four different propositions. An independently confirmed monkey birth establishes that a given cloning intervention can support gestation in a non-human primate. It does not establish that a cloned human being exists; it also does not exclude undisclosed experimentation. Both the claim of completed human reproductive cloning and the categorical claim that no undisclosed experiment could have occurred exceed available public evidence. The

appropriate research response is therefore neither acquittal by assumption nor conviction by technological analogy. It is specification of observations that could independently establish or refute each proposition.

The phrase 'human cloning' should be divided into nuclear-transfer research with human cells, generation of early embryonic structures, reproductive cloning intended to produce a live birth, and therapeutic or disease-model applications. Stem-cell-derived embryo models are a further category and must not be mislabeled as cloned humans. The distinction matters because governance thresholds should depend on biological developmental potential, embryo origin, intended use, implantation status and risk, not on the mere occurrence of the word 'embryo'. Studies of human embryo models provide molecular and structural analogies to development but cannot on their own demonstrate normal capacity to generate a human child.

The proposed research question is: At which documented stages of human and non-human-primate development have laboratories experimentally modified cellular identity, developmental signaling, trophoblast function or tissue specification, and what independent records would be needed to identify undisclosed clinical translation? This shifts analysis from untestable accusation to a sequence of traceable mechanisms. It also permits an explicit judgment of the adequacy of disclosure regimes without inferring guilt from economic success or advances in artificial intelligence.

LI. Experimental evidence: nuclear transfer, epigenetic reprogramming and trophoblast rescue

The strongest mechanistic paper in this comparison is Liao et al. (2024), not an opinion on biotechnology or political conduct. Through comparison of monkey embryos produced by intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI) and somatic-cell nuclear transfer (SCNT), the authors reported widespread methylation changes, disrupted maternal imprinting and placental pathology in SCNT development. They then combined epigenetic interventions with trophoblast replacement to obtain a live-born rhesus monkey that had survived more than two years when the work was prepared. Their design interrogates a concrete bottleneck: cloned embryonic lineages and their extraembryonic supporting tissues may fail in different ways. Successful transplantation of a cloned inner cell mass into an ICSI-derived blastocyst with a different trophoblast lineage supplied an alternative developmental environment.

This finding bears directly on the placenta-and-fetal-membranes material in chapter 8 of Moore and Persaud's fourth edition, provided that the exact text and images are checked against the edition before quotation or figure adaptation. It also alters the governance analysis. Oversight limited to editing the nuclear genome would overlook manipulation of placental contribution, epigenetic imprinting and developmental support. For each SCNT or embryo-model project, review should therefore record donor-cell origin, transfer method, genetic and epigenetic assays, extraembryonic cell origin, culture duration, implantation intentions, animal-welfare endpoints and any transfer into a gestational carrier. A sophisticated report must separate a healthy animal born from one experimental configuration from a claim of reliable, reproducible human reproductive cloning.

Liao et al. deposited associated sequencing and methylation datasets, enabling some external examination of methods and results (NCBI BioProject PRJNA1000900). This is meaningful evidence of disclosure; it is not evidence that all work by every Chinese institution is disclosed. The proper governance question is which materials are publicly auditable, which records require institutional or regulatory access, and how independent investigators could check consistency among protocols, approvals, sample inventories and published datasets.

LII. Human embryogenesis, stem-cell-derived models and the limits of inference

The trajectory of embryological innovation extends beyond the production of cloned primates. Ren, Jia and Yu (2025), researchers associated with institutions in Beijing and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, reviewed the construction of embryo models from embryonic and extraembryonic stem cells. Wu and Wang (2026) assessed the ability of human stem-cell-based embryo models to reproduce cellular, molecular and structural aspects of early development, while emphasizing unresolved questions of fidelity, efficiency and standardization. A 2024 Cell Stem Cell review similarly identified early embryonic lineages and the crosstalk that guides development in vivo as the essential comparators for in-vitro models. These literatures shift the inquiry from whether an organism was duplicated to whether successive transitions between cell states can be directed or simulated.

The first major question for chapters 1 and 2 of Moore and Persaud is consequently not a rhetorical claim that human life can be manufactured at will, but which embryological events depend on gamete contribution, fertilization, epigenetic reset and maternal interaction. For chapters 3–7 the proposed study should track implantation, germ-layer formation, neurulation, folding, tissue commitment and early organogenesis, marking each intervention actually demonstrated by referenced experiments. The precise fourth-edition page questions remain unverified pending the requested page scans, and should not be quoted from memory.

For chapters 12–17, an organ-system matrix would distinguish proof of lineage differentiation, proof of functional tissue, and proof of normal integrated organ development. For chapter 18, eye and ear development can form a case study in ocular and auditory cell specification, but published advances in these domains must not be extrapolated into direct experimental manipulation of human fetal sensory organs without protocol-level proof. The important contrast is between control over a stem-cell-derived organoid and control over the developing eye or ear of an implanted human embryo. These are biologically and ethically distinct achievements.

Consequently the evidence ledger should record at least six dimensions: organism or cell source; developmental stage; intervention; measured endpoint; demonstrated functional outcome; and reproductive or clinical translation. A trial showing transcriptional similarity to human gastrulation does not thereby show a viable embryo, a successful pregnancy or a cloned person. Conversely, a developmental model that never produces a child can still be scientifically consequential and ethically difficult if it modifies human embryonic structures or enables new routes to heritable intervention.

LIII. Information asymmetry, industrial capacity and the accountability hypothesis

A state's ability to commercialize advanced electronics, robotics, AI systems or medical products is not biological evidence of concealed human cloning. Commercial success can nevertheless create a legitimate institutional research question: do patenting, commercial confidentiality, public procurement, military–civil organizational structures and restricted data access make independent verification harder? These factors must be measured instead of inferred. The proposed governance hypothesis is that where research results have substantial strategic or commercial value, the incentives to disclose failures and the incentives to preserve secrecy can diverge. The direction and strength of this relationship require comparative testing across countries, not nationality-based assumptions.

A practical audit could compare published protocol registrations, institutional-ethics approval numbers, animal-care authorizations, publicly available raw-data accession codes, patent applications and official clinical-trial registrations. These records should be triangulated against independent replication and journal correction histories, with safeguards for legitimate patient confidentiality and research security. One should additionally distinguish nonpublication, delayed publication, legitimate confidentiality, regulatory noncompliance and deliberate concealment. They are not synonyms.

BRICS+ provides a comparative governance setting rather than evidence of a coordinated human-cloning project. China, Brazil, India and other participating jurisdictions can be compared on embryo-model definitions, reproductive-cloning restrictions, material-transfer standards, ethics review, transparency procedures and scientific whistleblower protection. A proposal for joint independent audits must specify who can inspect records, who can compel disclosure, how confidential material is secured and what happens when an institution does not cooperate. International coordination without enforceable access is a statement of aspiration, not an empirical guarantee.

LIV. The Deutsche Welle reporting problem: reporting provenance versus scientific validation

The user's identification of an early Deutsche Welle report featuring police-related imagery should not substitute for bibliographic identification. The 28 May 2021 article by Alexander Freund, 'O que se sabe sobre a origem do novo coronavírus?', attributes one claim regarding reportedly ill Wuhan Institute of Virology personnel to a Wall Street Journal report drawing on American intelligence. It also discusses molecular interpretation associated with Kristian Andersen and colleagues. The 12 March 2025 English-language DW account by Timothy Jones, drawing on Reuters and AFP and German newspaper reporting, presents an attributed BND assessment about a possible laboratory incident. In both cases the reporting chain must be retained: named journalist, publication date, underlying press report or intelligence attribution, and the availability of underlying scientific data. A photograph does not provide a chain of experimental custody.

Three separate scientific literatures bear on the surrounding biological questions but must not be recruited as proof of the specific BND claim. Coronavirus molecular-genetics work can demonstrate viral functions and the feasibility of experiments; phylogenetic and epidemiological studies examine emergence and early spread; laboratory-biosafety scholarship addresses pathways by which accidents might occur. A paper showing that a particular experimental method exists does not independently validate allegations that this method generated the pandemic virus, or that a leak took place. Andersen et al. (2020), Worobey et al. (2022) and Crits-Christoph et al. (2024) instead analyze genetic and epidemiological evidence bearing on origins and early transmission. They should be discussed for their actual methods, findings and limitations.

WHO/SAGO's 27 June 2025 assessment, followed by a commentary from SAGO scientists in Nature in February 2026, emphasizes that evidence currently favors zoonotic emergence but that crucial underlying information remains unavailable for conclusively resolving all hypotheses. This finding neither verifies nor definitively excludes a laboratory accident. The research article must close its discussion of DW with this explicit adjudication: DW accurately reports attributed hypotheses and intelligence assessments; its journalism is not experimental verification of the assessment's causal conclusion. The scientific papers mentioned by reporters must be identified separately and evaluated claim by claim. Crucially, no inference about human embryo research can be deduced from an unresolved argument about the coronavirus outbreak. The cases are linked by transparency and governance problems, not by an established common causal mechanism.

LV. Testable hypotheses and the evidence required before any new allegation

H1—Developmental bottlenecks: documented failures of epigenetic reprogramming and extraembryonic tissue development will predict limitations in primate SCNT reproductive efficiency. Test: cross-study comparison of implantation, miscarriage, live-birth and long-term health outcomes, correcting for species and laboratory protocols.

H2—Extraembryonic rescue: interventions that improve trophoblast or placental function will change developmental success in animal SCNT models. Test: independently replicated comparative experiments and complete denominator reporting, not selected surviving births.

H3—Human-model fidelity: better alignment of stem-cell-derived models with early human embryonic molecular references will not by itself establish viable reproductive potential. Test: prespecified structural and molecular benchmarks, explicit developmental endpoints and ethical oversight of permissible culture models.

H4—Transparency: publicly registered experiments with deposited raw data and identifiable external oversight will be easier to audit than projects documented only by press announcements. Test: cross-jurisdictional auditability index with independent double coding.

H5—Institutional concentration: arrangements combining sponsor, investigator, commercial rights holder and ethics reviewer without meaningful external challenge will show higher measured conflicts-of-interest exposure. Test: institutional disclosures, funding contracts and recusal documentation.

H6—Public accusations: scientific accusations about undisclosed human reproductive cloning should require direct documentary, laboratory or independently verified clinical evidence. Patent filings, AI leadership, animal cloning and secrecy allegations might motivate investigation but do not meet this threshold by themselves. If no such direct evidence is accessible, the manuscript should state that the allegation remains unverified rather than treating uncertainty as proof of a hidden program.

These hypotheses create an empirical research agenda that does not rely on Briscoe alone. Briscoe's work may illuminate developmental signaling, but mechanistic claims should be tested against Liao et al. (2024), embryo-model research and broader developmental-embryology literature. A journal paper gains strength when it describes how a preferred hypothesis could be falsified.

Appendix A. Evidence grading rubric

Level	Record type	Permitted inference
A	Reproduced peer-reviewed finding	Supports narrowly stated experimental or observational conclusion
B	Peer-reviewed finding awaiting replication	Supports provisional scientific inference with explicit uncertainty
C	Technical institutional assessment	Supports characterization of assessed risks subject to disclosed methods
D	News or intelligence report with inaccessible sources	Supports claim that report/assessment exists, not independently verified causation
E	Unattributed allegation	Not sufficient for consequential causal attribution

Operational use: record baseline conditions, institutional authority, exclusions, adverse effects and reasons for any override before interpreting the metrics. These instruments are proposed for empirical testing and are not validated regulatory scales.

Appendix B. Responsibility matrix

Actor	Core duty	Accountability document
Competent regulator	Exercise legal permission, restriction and enforcement	Reasoned order
Research institution	Protocol compliance and institutional safeguards	Audit and incident log
Independent ethics panel	Human and animal welfare assessment as applicable	Opinion and dissent register
Data protection authority/officer	Lawful processing and subject rights	Impact assessment
Consortium secretariat	Coordination within statutory powers	Public decision register
Civil society delegates	Identify community concerns	Consultation response record

Operational use: record baseline conditions, institutional authority, exclusions, adverse effects and reasons for any override before interpreting the metrics. These instruments are proposed for empirical testing and are not validated regulatory scales.

Appendix C. Pilot indicators

Measure	Definition	Interpretation caution
Decision traceability	Recorded source-to-decision linkage / all assessed decisions	Do not equate quantity with quality
Conflict disclosure	Relevant disclosures / eligible reviewers	Undisclosed conflicts may remain
Rights review coverage	Eligible projects independently evaluated / eligible projects	No aggregate score excuses grave violations
Complaint responsiveness	Complaints receiving a documented response / valid complaints	Must review remedy adequacy
Audit reproducibility	Independent reconstructions reaching consistent factual findings	Values-based divergences must be reported

Operational use: record baseline conditions, institutional authority, exclusions, adverse effects and reasons for any override before interpreting the metrics. These instruments are proposed for empirical testing and are not validated regulatory scales.

References

- [1] Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- [2] Crits-Christoph, A., et al. (2024). Genetic tracing of market wildlife and viruses at the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Cell*, 187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2024.08.010>
- [3] Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- [4] Liao, Z., et al. (2024). Reprogramming mechanism dissection and trophoblast replacement application in monkey somatic cell nuclear transfer. *Nature Communications*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-43985-7>
- [5] Liu, Z., et al. (2018). Cloning of macaque monkeys by somatic cell nuclear transfer. *Cell*, 172(4), 881–887.e7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.01.020>
- [6] Liu, Z., et al. (2019). Cloning of a gene-edited macaque monkey by somatic cell nuclear transfer. *National Science Review*, 6(1), 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwz003>
- [7] UNESCO. (1997). Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, Article 11. <https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/universal-declaration-human-genome-and-human-rights>
- [8] WHO Scientific Advisory Group for the Origins of Novel Pathogens (SAGO). (2025). Independent assessment of the origins of SARS-CoV-2. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/>
- [9] Worobey, M., et al. (2022). The Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market in Wuhan was the early epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Science*, 377, 951–959. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abp8715>

- [10] World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: recommendations. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240030381>
- [11] UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>
- [12] Jones, T. (2025, March 12). COVID pandemic likely unleashed by lab mishap: Germany's BND. Deutsche Welle. (Media report; not independently verified scientific proof.)
- [13] Burger, L., & Rinke, A. (2025, March 12). German spy agency concluded COVID virus likely leaked from lab, papers say. Reuters. (Media reporting on an intelligence assessment.)
- [14] Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- [15] Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29.
- [16] World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: A framework for governance. <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240030060>
- [17] World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: Recommendations. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240030381>
- [18] World Health Organization, SAGO. (2025). Independent assessment of the origins of SARS-CoV-2. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/independent-assessment-of-the-origins-of-sars-cov-2-from-the-scientific-advisory-group-for-the-origins-of-novel-pathogens>
- [19] Brazil. Lei nº 11.107, de 6 de abril de 2005. Normas gerais de contratação de consórcios públicos.
- [20] Brazil. Lei nº 11.105, de 24 de março de 2005. Biossegurança.
- [21] Brazil. Lei nº 13.709, de 14 de agosto de 2018. Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados Pessoais.
- [22] UNESCO. (1997). Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, Article 11.
- [23] Moore, K. L., & Persaud, T. V. N. (1993). *Before We Are Born: Essentials of Embryology and Birth Defects* (4th ed.). W. B. Saunders. Fourth-edition chapter structure verified against institutional library catalog; cited page excerpts not available.
- [24] Liu, Z., et al. (2018). Cloning of macaque monkeys by somatic cell nuclear transfer. *Cell*, 172(4), 881–887.e7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.01.020>
- [25] Liao, Z., et al. (2024). Reprogramming mechanism dissection and trophoblast replacement application in monkey somatic cell nuclear transfer. *Nature Communications*, 15, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-43985-7>
- [26] Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences. (2018). Gene-edited babies: Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences response and action. https://en.nhc.gov.cn/2018-12/01/c_74013.htm
- [27] World Health Organization. (2021). Human genome editing: A framework for governance. <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240030060>
- [28] **Additional verified references for Sections 49–54**
- [29] Freund, A. (2021, May 28). O que se sabe sobre a origem do novo coronavírus? Deutsche Welle. <https://amp.dw.com/pt-br/o-que-se-sabe-sobre-a-origem-do-novo-coronav%C3%ADrus/a-57703087>
- [30] Jones, T. (2025, March 12). COVID pandemic likely unleashed by lab mishap: Germany's BND. Deutsche Welle (with Reuters and AFP). <https://amp.dw.com/en/covid-pandemic-likely-unleashed-by-lab-mishap-germanys-bnd/a-71897701>
- [31] Liao, Z., Zhang, J., Sun, S., et al. (2024). Reprogramming mechanism dissection and trophoblast replacement application in monkey somatic cell nuclear transfer. *Nature Communications*, 15, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-43985-7>
- [32] Ren, H., Jia, X., & Yu, L. (2025). The building blocks of embryo models: embryonic and extraembryonic stem cells. *Cell Discovery*, 11, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41421-025-00780-6>
- [33] Wu, H., & Wang, H. (2026). Progress in stem cell-based embryo models and their applications in developmental biology and biomedicine. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 27, 178–193. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-025-00942-0>
- [34] WHO/SAGO. (2025, June 27). Independent assessment of the origins of SARS-CoV-2. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/independent-assessment-of-the-origins-of-sars-cov-2-from-the-scientific-advisory-group-for-the-origins-of-novel-pathogens>
- [35] Venter, M., et al. (2026, February 24). COVID's origins: what we do and don't know. *Nature*. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-026-00530-y>
- [36] NIH/NCBI. (2023). A somatic cell cloned rhesus monkey obtained by trophoblast replacement (BioProject PRJNA1000900). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/1000900>

- [37] Worobey, M., et al. (2022). The Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market in Wuhan was the early epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Science*.
- [38] Crits-Christoph, A., et al. (2024). Genetic tracing of market wildlife and viruses at the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Cell*.