International Journal of Medical Toxicology & Legal Medicine **Volume 27, No. 4S, 2024**
e-ISSN: 0974-4614
p-ISSN: 0972-0448
https://doi.org/10.47059/ijmtlm/V27I4S/073

Biosafety in Modern Laboratories: Standards and Challenges

Mansour Tayeh Maslet Ashammari[1], Turky Saud Saad Altamimi[2], Khalil Awadh Khalil Alshammari[2], Fahad Mohammed Ibrahim Alateeq[3], Faris Zamel Saleh Alserheed[2], Saleh Mohammed Ibrahim Alateeq[4], Munif Hamood al shammary[5], Naif Abdulmohsen Mubarak Alsaifi[6]

[1]Technician – Laboratory, PHC-Alwiday
[2]Technician-Laboratory, Eradah complex and mental health in hail
[3]Technician-Laboratory, King Khalid hospital in hail
[4]Specialist –Laboratory, King Khalid hospital in hail
[5]Technician-Laboratory, King Salman Specialist Hospital
[6]Technician – Laboratory, Maternity Pediatric Hospital In Hail

Received: 18.09.2024 Revised: 14.10.2024 Accepted: 12.11.2024

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Biosafety in the modern laboratories is an important concept developed to guide handling, storage, and management of biological materials that can cause harm to people or the environment or the researchers. Due to advancement in technology, enhanced biotechnology, improved microbiology and molecular biology laboratories are now involved in research with more advanced topics involving pathogens and new biohazards. These anti-social relations of production mean that biosafety must be maintained to manage risks whilst accommodating research.

Aim of work: To explore the significance of biosafety in modern laboratories by examining established standards, identifying the challenges in their implementation, and analyzing the impact of emerging technologies and ethical considerations.

Methods: We conducted a comprehensive search in the MEDLINE database's electronic literature using the following search terms: Biosafety, Modern, Laboratories, Standards and Challenges. The search was restricted to publications from 2016to 2024 in order to locate relevant content. We performed a search on Google Scholar to locate and examine academic papers that pertain to my subject matter. The selection of articles was impacted by certain criteria for inclusion.

Results: The publications analyzed in this study encompassed from 2016 to 2024. The study was structured into various sections with specific headings in the discussion section.

Conclusion: Biosafety in modern laboratories is a cornerstone of scientific research, ensuring that the pursuit of knowledge does not come at the cost of human health or environmental safety. While significant progress has been made in developing biosafety standards and protocols, challenges persist in their implementation. Financial constraints, human behavior, evolving threats, and ethical dilemmas require continuous efforts to improve safety practices. Emerging technologies and the increasing complexity of biological research demand adaptive and forward-looking approaches to biosafety. By fostering a culture of safety, investing in infrastructure, and enhancing global collaboration, the scientific community can mitigate risks while advancing the frontiers of knowledge. Biosafety is not just a regulatory requirement—it is a shared responsibility that underpins the integrity and sustainability of modern science.

Keywords: Biosafety, Modern, Laboratories, Standards and Challenges

INTRODUCTION

Biosafety in current working laboratories is a crucial precautionary measures meant to avoid cardinal risks associated with biohazards that may negatively impact humanity or the ecosystem, or affect the laboratory staff. In the context of present developmental expeditions of biotechnology, microbiology, molecular biology laboratories are exposed to highly sophisticated activates dealing with pathogen, genetically modified organisms, new biohazards. This fluidity requires higher levels of biosafety than might be expected to reduce certain dangers while advancing science (Peters, 2018).

The idea of biosafety was developed to achieve two goals, to protect the researchers and to avoid accidental dispersion of dangerous agents both in the environment and in other population groups (Fazail, 2023). Crucial in

this endeavour, are international biosafety norms and protocols, the WHO, CDC and the NIH or any other standard setting bodies (Bayot&Limaiem, 2019). These frameworks partition laboratory settings into biosafety levels or BSL one to four and are based on the levels of danger from the biological agents under operation. While BSL-IV institutions work with potential agents of Level 1 diseases, BSL-IV laboratories work with extremely infectious and potentially lethal disease agents such as viruses that cause the Ebola and Marburg diseases in addition to advanced protective measures like higher protective equipment (PPE) and air-handling systems (Bismarck, 2019).

However, regardless of these outlined protocols, the real world experience of biosafety measures experiences some difficulties (Aspland et al., 2021). Another concern is the versatility of pathogens and approaches under the contemporary research, which change constantly, as well as could be adjusted faster than necessary legislation. New disease threats like COVID-19 pose a major challenge to laboratories to continuously learn and adapt to new challenges due to dynamic risk environment. Further, the potentials enable by synthetic biology and gene editing technology has given rise to new types of biological threats, the issue of dual use research, science with potentially evil intent (Sun et al., 2022).

The other equally important part of biosafety is the human factor. Protocols must be implemented and strictly followed, PPE always worn and safety trainings are mandatory, however violations happen because of the lack of adequate resources, supervision or knowledge of staff. For example, in the environment with few resources, laboratories cannot provide necessary infrastructure corresponding to biosafety levels thus the potential exposures or environmental contamination can be expected. In addition, psychological factors that include risk perception and overconfidence may also have a role to play in safety, and therefore for safety, a strong safety culture is important in research institutions as has been discovered by Callihan et al., 2021).

The increases in biosafety measures have been boosted through the years by the development of technology. Technological advancements including automated sample handling, Real Time Monitoring Systems accompanied by HEPA filtrations systems have greatly minimized the probability of exposure to the dangerous agents. But they have their own problems associated with their use such as high costs, another issue on maintenance and the need to have the staff trained on a certain technology. Also, biosafety in the contemporary world targets the international level as cooperation is essential in the vein of modern research, though such collaboration can hinder efforts because of the different laws and norms of various states (Bommu, 2020).

AIM OF WORK

The purpose of this review is to determine what biosafety means in the current context of new technologies and the ethical questions in the society by investigating existing guidelines, discussing their application difficulties, and evaluating the new tendencies. In the following discussion, the review aims at underlining the importance of biosafety in safe biological research and its relation to health security.

METHODS

A thorough search was carried out on well-known scientific platforms like Google Scholar and Pubmed, utilizing targeted keywords such as Biosafety, Modern, Laboratories, Standards and Challenges. The goal was to collect all pertinent research papers. Articles were chosen according to certain criteria. Upon conducting a comprehensive analysis of the abstracts and notable titles of each publication, we eliminated case reports, duplicate articles, and publications without full information. The reviews included in this research were published from 2016 to 2024.

RESULTS

The current investigation concentrated on the significance of biosafety in modern laboratories between 2016 and 2024. As a result, the review was published under many headlines in the discussion area, including:Understanding Biosafety: Definitions and Scope, Biosafety Standards and Protocols, Challenges in Implementing Biosafety Standards, Case Studies: Lessons from Past Incidents, Emerging Technologies and Their Impact on Biosafety, The Role of Biosafety in Pandemic Preparedness and Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

DISCUSSION

It has been noted that biosafety is now an important consideration for laboratories, especially in the field of biotechnology, genetic engineering and infectiology (Sasani, 2024). On the one hand, laboratories are an important fundamental for the study of biological entities and the creation of medical solutions, but on the other hand, the accidental use or release of potentially dangerous biological agents. Contemporary biosafety measures are intended to protect lab employees, the population, and the environment but also to advance scientific research (Cornish et al., 2021). It is an evaluation of the guidelines used in biosafety in laboratories, the difficulties encountered in applying the standards, and the effect of new innovations in biosafety.

Understanding Biosafety: Definitions and Scope

Biosafety can be defined as the containment through use of principles, technologies and or practices to avoid the release or contact of risky biological agents. These agents are bacteria, viruses, fungi and other genetically engineered microorganisms that are potentially deleterious to human being or the environment in which we live. Laboratories that deal with such agents are categorized into biosafety levels (BSLs); from BSL 1 which has least level of risk to BSL 4, which is most risky with certain levels of containment (Beeckman, &Rüdelsheim, 2020). Biosafety is broadly categorized into physical structures and equipment including Biosafety level three and four facilities and equipment, Biosafety administrative controls, universal precautions including Standard operating procedures and Personal Protective Equipment. However, biosafety extends to tray experiences, risk and risk control, staff training and the moral/ legal management of biological agents. In the recent years due to the enlargement of cutting edge areas of research including synthetic biology and the employment of bio safety level three and four research facilities for pathogen investigations biosafety has become overwhelmingly critical (Maehira, & Spencer, 2019).

Biosafety Standards and Protocols

To coordinate the operational procedures within laboratories, biosafety rules have been developed by such global and national agencies. The World Health Organization (WHO) offers a Laboratory Biosafety Manual, and it is a massive guideline with suggested approaches to safety and containment in laboratories (World Health Organization, 2024). In the same vein, the CDC and NIH jointly put out the Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories (BMBL) manual (Callihan et al., 2021).

Key aspects of these standards include (Beeckman&Rüdelsheim, 2020):

1. **Risk Assessment:** Establishing which biosafety level is acceptable in relation to the pathogenicity of the agent, route of transmission, and scope for aerosol production.
2. **Laboratory Design and Engineering Controls:** Measures like the negative pressure system, HEPA filtration and the presence of airlocks facilitate certainments and safeguard the rest of the environment.
3. **Work Practices:** SOPs and protocols describe how to work with any biological agents, biohazardous waste disposal and decontaminations.
4. **Training and Competency:** Recurrent meetings guarantee that the laboratory staff know the hazards and follow the protection measures.
5. **Emergency Response Plans:** Since there could be some harm in case of accidental spills or exposures or containment failure having some protocol in place is highly important.

Challenges in Implementing Biosafety Standards

On the one hand, the adoption of the standards is quite helpful since it creates a sound foundation; on the other hand, the practical application of these standards is rather difficult to accomplish. All these difficulties are due to many factors among them fiscal issues, human conduct, technology, and new biological risks (Zhiming, 2019).

1. **Financial Constraints:** BSL-3 & BSL-4 laboratories in particular, necessitate a significant expense in terms of facility construction, upkeep and personnel education and training. Unfortunately, many institutions particularly in the developing world are able to allocate adequate resources hence limited biosafety across the globe (Peters, 2018).
2. **Human Behavior and Compliance:** Each process, no matter how refined, is susceptible to human mistakes, recklessness and carelessness in the line of duty. Working procedures can become streamline over time to forget about the small details in that process, leading to disasters (Siengsanan-Lamont et al., 2019).
3. **Technological Limitations:** There is still a situation when not all laboratories are equipped with best containment technologies available today. Furthermore, one gets to implement complicated elements such as HEPA filters and airflow, which present maintenance issues (Sun et al., 2022).
4. **Evolving Threats:** New diseases and new possibilities provided by biotechnology bring new hazards the requirements of which are not always reflected in standards. For instance, some investigations in viral gain-of-function have raised concerns over current measures of controlling the virus (Wang & Zhang, 2019).
5. **Dual-Use Dilemma:** Stem research aimed at developing treatments – including a vaccine that could stop the spread of Covid-19 – could also be used to develop potential bioterrorism weapons. Overcoming this duality issue, it is necessary to strengthen control, including combating propaganda and at the same time, do not hinder scientific activity (Danelyan&Gulyaeva, 2022).

Case Studies: Lessons from Past Incidents

Past events amplify a need to come up with proper biosafety precautions. For example, the letter attacks with anthrax in the United States in 2001 brought understanding for the risk of utilization of pathogens for terrorism while stressing problems of containment and control of dangerous materials (Ogunleye et al., 2024). As for the same, nosocomial transmission or laboratory-acquired infections (LAIs) depict the same outcome of ineffective biosafety measures.•In 2003, the SARS virus was accidentally released from a laboratory in Singapore because

of certain violations of containment procedures and this led to a global change of laboratory exposure practices (Ranjan et al., 2022). In 2014, the CDC released information concerning mishandling of anthrax samples that led to exposure of many of its employees to the pathogen.2001 anthrax attacks in the United States raised awareness about the potential misuse of biological agents, emphasizing the need for secure storage and monitoring of hazardous materials (Ogunleye et al., 2024). Similarly, outbreaks of laboratory-acquired infections (LAIs) underscore the consequences of inadequate biosafety practices. For example:

- In 2003, the SARS virus escaped from a laboratory in Singapore due to lapses in containment protocols, prompting a global reassessment of laboratory safety standards (Ranjan et al., 2022).
- In 2014, the CDC reported mishandling of anthrax samples, exposing employees to the pathogen. This led to an evaluation on biosafety procedures the high containments used in laboratories (Cornish et al., 2021).

These cases show that, including biosafety violations, even fully developed laboratories may encounter them and need constant enhancement of safety procedures.

Emerging Technologies and Their Impact on Biosafety

New developments in the field of biotechnology and synthetic biology have potential of positive influence towards biosafety risk but these are also associated with some negative implications (Zhou et al., 2019). Since the arrival of new genetic technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 and the rise of synthetic biology, new possibilities have opened up in the lab but new problems also. These changes force laboratories to evolve by modifying the containment strategies and risk evaluation plans biosecurity (FatollahiArani&Zeinoddini, 2023). Furthermore, synthetic biology allow for creating organisms with specific characteristics, and thus having potentially undesired behaviors in the environment. Second, democratization of biotechnology for instance by DIY bio-labs-linking biosafety oversight outside traditional institutional risks (Sundaram 2021.

The Role of Biosafety in Pandemic Preparedness

The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the importance of biosafety in response to and mitigation of pandemic threats. The labs across the globe provided critical support in terms of both diagnosing people with the Covid-19 disease and studying the SARS-CoV-2 virus that causes this disease, and creating vaccines to prevent its spread. However, the pandemic also exposed faults in biosafety structures especially in low income countries (Dittrich et al., 2021).

This, according to the present study, is a critical aspect of biosafety and a crucial component in the preparedness for pandemics. This implies putting standards on surveillance in different countries, making the protocols of laboratories around the world and increasing the cooperation between the countries and sharing of experiences and resources. Hence, the funding made to biosafety is the funding made to future of global health (Davwar et al., 2023).

Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

Main Biosafety is not only the issue of technique but also the problem of ethic. Experiments with some microbes or experiments that some people may consider as sensitive, for instance the gain-of-function studies, increases concerns about the extent some people may be allowed to conduct their experiments. Reducing risk to consumers means that regulatory frameworks have to balance on transparency, accountability, and ethical standards while not drowning innovation (Gupta et al., 2017).

There is a multiple number of treaties and conventions that exist for this purpose, including the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). Nevertheless, the requirement to ensure compliance remains difficult, especially when technologies are already available and advanced (Novossiolova et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION

Biosafety in modern laboratories is therefore an important element in the practice of the sciences especially in biotechnology, microbiology, and genetic engineering so as not to endanger the lives of the people involved in the research or those in surrounding communities and the environment at large. Based on the analysis in this essay, it is clear that various organizations including the WHO and the CDC have set critical policies for biosafety, which are crucial when dealing with risky biological entities. These standards assist in safeguarding the lab personnel, the public, and the environment from the risks of limited knowledge and experience in handling infectious agents.

However, these are the important standards in ASEAN while their adoption is beset by some challenges. Resources, the lack of better technology, human factors and violations of laid down protocols are some of the factors that may affect biosafety. The interdependence between research progress and protective measures means that solutions must be worked out anew if there are new threats, such as new pathogens or new technologies like CRISPR-Cas9. Sustained by historical accidents and current global pandemics, we show that biosafety vulnerabilities can cause significant harm, stressing the importance of increased supervision and ongoing enhancement.

Moreover, biosafety issues, such as the susepicion and restrictive regulation of the so-called dual-use research and new technologies, raise questions about the interaction between scientific innovation and society safety. This work affirms that as the biological studies progress in sophistication, so must the level of biosafety such that the systems are able to overcome the barriers that lead to the use of the biological agents for malevolent purposes.

To sum up, biosafety is not only a technical issue but an essential problem of the entire scientific community, and the state to protect the potential of further research. With each progressive advancement in science, biosafety will necessarily remain one of the highest priorities to increase public confidence and ensure that continued research will not inadvertently bring about negative influence on society.

REFERENCES

1. Aspland, A. M., Douagi, I., Filby, A., Jellison, E. R., Martinez, L., Shinko, D., ...& Thornton, S. (2021). Biosafety during a pandemic: shared resource laboratories rise to the challenge. Cytometry Part A, 99(1), 68-80.
2. Bayot, M. L., &Limaiem, F. (2019).Biosafety guidelines.
3. Beeckman, D. S., &Rüdelsheim, P. (2020). Biosafety and biosecurity in containment: a regulatory overview. Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology, 8, 650.
4. Bismarck, N. D. (2019). Interim Clinical Laboratory Guideline for Biological Safety.
5. Bommu, D. (2020). Comparative Study on High-Efficiency Particulate Air (Hepa) Filters for Enhancing Hospital Indoor Air Quality (Doctoral dissertation, BLDE (DU)).
6. Callihan, D. R., Downing, M., Meyer, E., Ochoa, L. A., Petuch, B., Tranchell, P., & White, D. (2021). Considerations for laboratory biosafety and biosecurity during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic: applying the ISO 35001: 2019 standard and high-reliability organizations principles. Applied Biosafety, 26(3), 113-122.
7. Cornish, N. E., Anderson, N. L., Arambula, D. G., Arduino, M. J., Bryan, A., Burton, N. C., ... & Campbell, S. (2021). Clinical laboratory biosafety gaps: lessons learned from past outbreaks reveal a path to a safer future. Clinical microbiology reviews, 34(3), 10-1128.
8. Danelyan, A. A., &Gulyaeva, E. E. (2022).Problems of biosafety in current international law. Moscow Journal of International Law, 2, 66-84.
9. Davwar, P. M., Luka, D. P., Dami, D. F., Pam, D. D., Weldon, C. T., Brocard, A. S., ...&Shehu, N. Y. (2023). One Health epidemic preparedness: Biosafety quality improvement training in Nigeria. International journal of one health, 9(1), 10.
10. Dittrich, S., Richardson, L., &Burnette, R. N. (2021).Applied Biosecurity in the Face of Epidemics and Pandemics: The COVID-19 Pandemic. In Applied Biosecurity: Global Health, Biodefense, and Developing Technologies (pp. 73-88). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
11. FatollahiArani, S., &Zeinoddini, M. (2023). Gene editing: biosecurity challenges and risks. Journal of Police Medicine, 12(1), 1-19.
12. Fazail, I. P. (2023). ETHICAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS IN NATIONAL BIOSAFETY: ADDRESSING THE SPREAD OF SOCIALLY DANGEROUS DISEASES. BBC, 21, 22.
13. Gupta, V., Sengupta, M., Prakash, J., Tripathy, B. C., Gupta, V., Sengupta, M., ...&Tripathy, B. C. (2017). Biosafety and bioethics. Basic and Applied Aspects of Biotechnology, 503-520.
14. Maehira, Y., & Spencer, R. C. (2019). Harmonization of biosafety and biosecurity standards for high-containment facilities in low-and middle-income countries: an approach from the perspective of occupational safety and health. Frontiers in Public Health, 7, 249.
15. Novossiolova, T., Whitby, S. M., Dando, M., & Pearson, G. S. (2019). Strengthening the biological and toxin weapons convention: the vital importance of a web of prevention for effective biosafety and biosecurity in the 21st century. Biological Weapons Convention.
16. Ogunleye, S. C., Olorunshola, M. M., Fasina, K. A., Aborode, A. T., Akinsulie, O. C., Amoo, A., ... &Chinyere, E. C. (2024). Anthrax outbreak: exploring its biological agents and public health implications. Frontiers in Tropical Diseases, 4, 1297896.
17. Peters, A. (2018). The global proliferation of high-containment biological laboratories: understanding the phenomenon and its implications. Rev Sci Tech, 37(3), 857-883.
18. Peters, A. (2018). The global proliferation of high-containment biological laboratories: understanding the phenomenon and its implications. Rev Sci Tech, 37(3), 857-883.
19. Ranjan, R., Biswal, J. K., Mohapatra, J. K., Singh, S., Dahiya, S. M., &Sahoo, N. R. (2022). Biosafety Measures for the Laboratories Engaged in the Diagnosis/Research of SARS-CoV-2. Acta Scientific Veterinary Sciences (ISSN: 2582-3183), 4(8).
20. Sasani, M. S. (2024). The Importance of Biosecurity in Emerging Biotechnologies and Synthetic Biology. Avicenna Journal of Medical Biotechnology, 16(4), 223.

21. Siengsanan-Lamont, J., Kamolsiripichaiporn, S., Ruanchaimun, S., Patchimasiri, T., Jongrakwattana, B., &Blacksell, S. D. (2019). Biosafety and biosecurity challenges facing veterinary diagnostic laboratories in lower-middle income countries in Southeast Asia: A case study of Thailand. Applied Biosafety, 24(4), 220-230.
22. Subasinghe, R., Alday-Sanz, V., Bondad-Reantaso, M. G., Jie, H., Shinn, A. P., &Sorgeloos, P. (2023). Biosecurity: Reducing the burden of disease. Journal of the World Aquaculture Society, 54(2), 397-426.
23. Sun, T., Song, J., Wang, M., Zhao, C., & Zhang, W. (2022).Challenges and recent progress in the governance of biosecurity risks in the era of synthetic biology. Journal of Biosafety and Biosecurity, 4(1), 59-67.
24. Sundaram, L. S. (2021). Biosafety in DIY-bio laboratories: from hype to policy: Discussions about regulating DIY biology tend to ignore the extent of self-regulation and oversight of DIY laboratories. EMBO reports, 22(4), e52506.
25. Tang, Q., Yan, F., Yuan, L., Tang, Y., Chen, H., Sun, Y., ...& Song, G. (2024). Enhancing laboratory biosafety management: a comprehensive strategy from theory to practice. Frontiers in Public Health, 12, 1439051.
26. Wang, F., & Zhang, W. (2019). Synthetic biology: recent progress, biosafety and biosecurity concerns, and possible solutions. Journal of Biosafety and Biosecurity, 1(1), 22-30.
27. World Health Organization.(2024). Laboratory biosecurity guidance.World Health Organization.
28. Zhiming, Y. (2019). Current status and future challenges of high-level biosafety laboratories in China. Journal of Biosafety and Biosecurity, 1(2), 123-127.
29. Zhou, D., Song, H., Wang, J., Li, Z., Xu, S., Ji, X., ...&Xu, J. (2019). Biosafety and biosecurity. Journal of biosafety and biosecurity, 1(1), 15-18.