

The synthetic biology future

Roy D Sleator

Department of Biological Sciences, Cork Institute of Technology

Herein, I track the evolution of synthetic biology from its earliest incarnations more than 50 years ago, through the DIYbio revolution, to the next 50 years.

On March 13, 2014, some of the world's leading biological science researchers will converge on Cork, Ireland, to discuss the synthetic biology future. Defined loosely as a trans-disciplinary field at the intersection of science and engineering,¹ the genesis of synthetic biology can be traced to two milestone papers, published back-to-back in the same January 2000 issue of *Nature*,^{2,3} detailing the design and construction of the first synthetic gene networks. The first synthetic biological oscillator (“repressilator”) and bistable gene regulatory network (“toggle switch”) demonstrated, for the first time, that engineering principles could be successfully applied to biological systems—engineering the biological equivalents of electronic memory storage and time-keeping. Over the past 14 years, this approach has been applied to the synthetic engineering of increasingly more complex genetic switches,^{4–8} memory elements,^{9,10} and oscillators,^{11–14} as well as other electronics-inspired genetic devices^{15–17} up to, and including, synthetic life itself.^{18,19}

Although arguably one of the hottest emerging areas of biological science research,²⁰ the origins of synthetic biology can be traced as far back as 1961 to a paper by Mono and Jacob²¹ on telonomic mechanisms in cellular metabolism. This seminal paper described the circuit-like connectivity of biological parts, a discussion which spawned several studies on the application of electrical circuitry analogies^{22,23} and mathematical models^{24–27} to biological systems. Indeed, from these humble beginnings, each successive decade has helped shape the evolution of the field, providing the material and tools necessary to design and assemble biomolecular parts,^{28–30} whole entities,^{19,31,32} and in some cases, entire consortia.^{33,34}

The discovery in 1970 of the first Type II restriction enzyme by Hamilton Smith³⁵ (providing the molecular scalpels necessary to cut DNA at specific sites), coupled with Herb Boyer and Stanley Cohn's experimentation on recombinant plasmids,³⁶ made it possible to clone genes from one organism (or species) and express them in another.³⁷ This marked the birth of recombinant DNA technology and with it the golden age of molecular biology. By the 1980s molecular biology had spawned the biotechnology industry, facilitated by *Diamond vs. Chakrabarty*, 447 US 303 (1980), a landmark ruling by the US Supreme Court, which, for the first time, afforded genetic engineers the same protections for their inventions enjoyed by conventional

engineers. The Supreme Court case was heard on March 17, 1980 and decided on June 16, 1980. The patent was granted by the US patent office on March 31, 1981, providing Ananda Chakrabarty (an Associate Editor of *Bioengineered*) with the first patent on a genetically engineered organism,³⁸ a *Pseudomonas* strain capable of breaking down crude oil, a biological invention with obvious applications in large scale oil spill cleanup.³⁹ The remainder of the 1980s saw the continued growth and development of the biopharmaceutical industry, punctuated with large scale heterologous production of recombinant human protein therapeutics,⁴⁰ most notably insulin—DNA technology's first drug.⁴¹ But where does our definition of biotechnology end and synthetic biology begin? For Serrano,⁴² the introduction of exogenous genes to a host organism for the production of new compounds is more synthetic biology than biotechnology. I disagree with this assertion; for me, synthetic biology involves the use of wholly synthetic constructs (not previously seen in nature). Applying this logic to the insulin example—simply expressing human insulin (e.g., Humulin) against an *Escherichia coli* background—represents classic biotechnology.⁴³ Infergin (interferon alfacon-1), on the other hand—a wholly synthetic type-I interferon generated from the consensus sequence of several natural interferon α subtypes⁴⁴—is truly a product of synthetic biology.

The 1990s marked the beginning of the “-omics” era,⁴⁵ the defining moment of which was the initiation of the human genome project^{46,47} and, laterally, the emergence of metagenomics⁴⁸—the genomic view of an entire environmental niche, e.g., the human microbiome.^{49,50} In addition to facilitating advancements in so-called wet lab technologies (e.g., large scale DNA sequence and synthesis), the resulting sequence information led to biology's “big data” revolution and with it, the era of in silico biology.⁵¹ Thus, the 2000s marked biology's silicon age, punctuated by the development of bioinformatics⁵² and systems biology.⁵³ Again, distinctions must be drawn between systems biology and synthetic biology; while both disciplines consider modeling and simulation as important tools, systems biology is focused on understanding biological systems, while synthetic biology aims to engineer new and improved functions.

Therefore, although synthetic biology truly represents a new field—officially emerging in 2004 with the appearance of its own dedicated Wikipedia page⁵⁴ and the first synthetic biology

conference⁵⁵—its origins, as I have outlined above, can be traced back more than 50 years.

So what of the next 50 years? The possibilities are endless: new pharmaceuticals, biologically produced (“green”) fuels, as well as new drugs and vaccines against emerging microbial diseases, are all in the pipeline.⁵⁶ However, while many of these high impact discoveries are likely to come from dedicated research centers, such as the J Craig Venter Institute (named for another of our Associate Editors), there exists a counter culture, a new and emerging group of independent researchers who are making synthetic biology their own. These self-styled biohackers (or biopunks) apply the computer hacker ethos to the biological sciences, advocating open access to genetic information and manipulation. This new era of DIY biology⁵⁷ originally evolved as a non-institutional pursuit with practitioners—many of whom having little or no formal training—operating out of garages or modified kitchens.^{58,59} However, increasingly more organized groups have begun to emerge, including Genspace,⁶⁰ a non-profit organization dedicated to promoting citizen science.⁶¹ In 2010, Genspace formed the world’s first community-based biotechnology laboratory, a biosafety level one facility located in Brooklyn, NY. Operating on a monthly subscription basis, the lab offers hands-on courses to the public and encourages scientific entrepreneurship, particularly in the synthetic biology arena (or SynBio in the biohacker vernacular). Although the first, the Genspace laboratory is no longer unique; in the US alone, there are dozens of community biolabs or “hackerspaces” that cooperate among themselves and a loose international confederation of biohackers called DIYBio,⁶² which at the time of writing lists 20 organized DIY groups in North America, 16 in Europe, and two each in Asia and Oceania. Many of these DIYbio practitioners actively collaborate and compete in the iGEM⁶³ (International Genetically Engineered Machine) competition, a worldwide synthetic biology competition open to undergraduate university students, high school students, and entrepreneurs.

Despite experiencing exponential growth following its earliest inception in a Cambridge, MA, pub in 2008, two of the major impediments to the continued development of the DIYbio movement are funding (more specifically, the lack thereof), and continued public fears relating to biosafety and biosecurity.⁶⁴ However, even these obstacles are being gradually eroded. Locked out of traditional funding mechanisms, many of the early adopters have turned to crowdsourcing platforms⁶⁵⁻⁶⁷ to achieve their goals. Indeed, using this approach, Biocurious, a DIYbio group based in Sunnyvale, CA, raised more than \$35 000 (from 239 Kickstarter pledges) to establish their own laboratory, or hackerspace. Other groups have progressed even further, successfully tapping conventional funding streams, including the Welcome Trust, which funds Madlab (Manchester, UK) and the FP7 EU project, StudioLab, which funds Biologigaragen (Copenhagen, Denmark).

Biosafety and/or security on the other hand remains a sticky wicket, encompassing not only the DIYbio movement but all amateur biology and the democratization of science in general.⁶⁴ By establishing hackerspaces that are properly insured and exhibiting documented adherence to safety regulations, DIYbio groups like Biocurious in the US and La Paillasse in Europe (Paris, France) are

leading the way in creating safe, secure, and regulated labs for their practitioners. Indeed, DIYbio.org co-founder Jason Bobe believes that, in addition to creating secure work spaces, the DIYbio and iGEM communities combined are best placed to establish a collective code of ethics, enabling global governance of the citizen science culture.⁶⁴ In the summer of 2011, the international DIYbio community organized congresses in the US and Europe to establish a collective code of ethics for the community. The following year, DIYbio.org established a “question and answer” platform on biosafety,⁶⁸ a free service that allows amateurs to submit questions to professional biosafety experts. While all of the above go some way toward easing public concern and facilitating social legitimacy, regulatory and safety issues still remain the most significant barrier to the continued evolution of the movement.

In addition to funding and policy issues, of most concern (at least for now) is the gap between what is possible in the average hackerspace vs. what is achievable in a typical professional or academic laboratory. With some notable exceptions—such as the La Paillasse bioink project, a non-toxic biodegradable alternative to modern ink—DIY SynBio wetware outputs fall far short of even the most pedestrian of academic labs. One obvious explanation for this is a lack of specialist equipment; while most academic labs are stocked with name brand apparatus and laboratory consumables, biohackers make do with what they have (or in most cases have not). Necessity being the mother of invention, some of these hardware innovations and inventions ironically represent the communities’ first tangible successes. The DremelFuge, for example, developed by Cork-based DIYbio practitioner Cathal Garvey, is a simple component that turns an ordinary Dremel rotary-tool into a lab-quality centrifuge.⁶⁹ More sophisticated devices include Amplino,⁷⁰ an inexpensive, portable PCR diagnostic system capable of detecting malaria in less than 40 min from a single drop of blood.

Thus, while the DIYbio movement is unlikely, at least in the short-term, to contribute significantly to our fundamental understanding of biological processes,⁷¹ disruptive technologies like Amplino have the potential to significantly impact global health improvement, particularly in developing countries where access to expensive and delicate diagnostic equipment is a significant limitation.⁷² While some use these early successes to argue that the stage is set for the “bioscience version of Apple or Google to be born in a dormitory room or garage,”⁷³ I for one feel that the DIYbio movement is unlikely to morph into a version of the establishment that it currently eschews. For me, the future is more likely to be one of cooperation rather than assimilation. To borrow from the computer jargon which has come to synonymize the field, today’s biohackers are tomorrow’s “bioApp” developers, no longer a subversive group to be feared and derided, but an essential component of biology’s future development.⁷⁴

True to this assertion, the Cork SynBio meeting aims to bring amateurs, academics, and professionals together in a spirit of collaboration—home to Ireland’s first DIYbio group,⁷⁵ two leading third-level institutions (CIT⁷⁶ and UCC⁷⁷), and playing host to 14 of the world’s top 15 pharmaceutical companies, Cork is the perfect location from which to frame The Synthetic Biology Future.

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

No potential conflict of interest was disclosed.

References

1. Peccoud J, Isalan M. The PLOS ONE synthetic biology collection: six years and counting. *PLoS One* 2012; 7:e43231; PMID:22916228; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043231>
2. Elowitz MB, Leibler S. A synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional regulators. *Nature* 2000; 403:335-8; PMID:10659856; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35002125>
3. Gardner TS, Cantor CR, Collins JJ. Construction of a genetic toggle switch in *Escherichia coli*. *Nature* 2000; 403:339-42; PMID:10659857; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35002131>
4. Atkinson MR, Savageau MA, Myers JT, Ninfa AJ. Development of genetic circuitry exhibiting toggle switch or oscillatory behavior in *Escherichia coli*. *Cell* 2003; 113:597-607; PMID:12787501; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(03\)00346-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(03)00346-5)
5. Bayer TS, Smolke CD. Programmable ligand-controlled riboregulators of eukaryotic gene expression. *Nat Biotechnol* 2005; 23:337-43; PMID:15723047; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt1069>
6. Deans TL, Cantor CR, Collins JJ. A tunable genetic switch based on RNAi and repressor proteins for regulating gene expression in mammalian cells. *Cell* 2007; 130:363-72; PMID:17662949; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2007.05.045>
7. Friedland AE, Lu TK, Wang X, Shi D, Church G, Collins JJ. Synthetic gene networks that count. *Science* 2009; 324:1199-202; PMID:19478183; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1172005>
8. Ham TS, Lee SK, Keasling JD, Arkin AP. Design and construction of a double inversion recombination switch for heritable sequential genetic memory. *PLoS One* 2008; 3:e2815; PMID:18665232; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002815>
9. Ham TS, Lee SK, Keasling JD, Arkin AP. A tightly regulated inducible expression system utilizing the fim inversion recombination switch. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 2006; 94:1-4; PMID:16534780; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bit.20916>
10. Ajo-Franklin CM, Drubin DA, Eskin JA, Gee EP, Landgraf D, Phillips I, Silver PA. Rational design of memory in eukaryotic cells. *Genes Dev* 2007; 21:2271-6; PMID:17875664; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/gad.1586107>
11. Fung E, Wong WW, Suen JK, Bulter T, Lee SG, Liao JC. A synthetic gene-metabolic oscillator. *Nature* 2005; 435:118-22; PMID:15875027; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature03508>
12. Stricker J, Cookson S, Bennett MR, Mather WH, Tsimring LS, Hasty J. A fast, robust and tunable synthetic gene oscillator. *Nature* 2008; 456:516-9; PMID:18971928; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature07389>
13. Tiggles M, Marquez-Lago TT, Stelling J, Fussenegger M. A tunable synthetic mammalian oscillator. *Nature* 2009; 457:309-12; PMID:19148099; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature07616>
14. Danino T, Mondragón-Palomino O, Tsimring L, Hasty J. A synchronized quorum of genetic clocks. *Nature* 2010; 463:326-30; PMID:20090747; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature08753>
15. Basu S, Mehreja R, Thiberge S, Chen MT, Weiss R. Spatiotemporal control of gene expression with pulse-generating networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004; 101:6355-60; PMID:15096621; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0307571101>
16. Anderson JC, Voigt CA, Arkin AP. Environmental signal integration by a modular AND gate. *Mol Syst Biol* 2007; 3:133; PMID:17700541; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/msb4100173>
17. Basu S, Gerchman Y, Collins CH, Arnold FH, Weiss R. A synthetic multicellular system for programmed pattern formation. *Nature* 2005; 434:1130-4; PMID:15858574; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature03461>
18. Sleator RD. The story of *Mycoplasma mycoides* JCVI-syn1.0: the forty million dollar microbe. *Bioeng Bugs* 2010; 1:229-30; PMID:21327053; <http://dx.doi.org/10.4161/bbug.1.4.12465>
19. Gibson DG, Glass JI, Lartigue C, Noskov VN, Chuang RY, Algire MA, Benders GA, Montague MG, Ma L, Moodie MM, et al. Creation of a bacterial cell controlled by a chemically synthesized genome. *Science* 2010; 329:52-6; PMID:20488990; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1190719>
20. Becker A. Synthetic biology changing the face of biotechnology. *J Biotechnol* 2014; 169:iii; PMID:24365016; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1656\(13\)00540-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1656(13)00540-3)
21. Monod J, Jacob F. General conclusions: teleonomic mechanisms in cellular metabolism, growth and differentiation. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* 1961; 26:386-401; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1101/SQB.1961.026.01.048>
22. McAdams HH, Arkin A. Towards a circuit engineering discipline. *Curr Biol* 2000; 10:R318-20; PMID:10801411; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822\(00\)00440-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0960-9822(00)00440-1)
23. McAdams HH, Shapiro L. Circuit simulation of genetic networks. *Science* 1995; 269:650-6; PMID:7624793; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.7624793>
24. Glass L, Kauffman SA. The logical analysis of continuous, non-linear biochemical control networks. *J Theor Biol* 1973; 39:103-29; PMID:4741704; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(73\)90208-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(73)90208-7)
25. Savageau MA. Comparison of classical and autogenous systems of regulation in inducible operons. *Nature* 1974; 252:546-9; PMID:4431516; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/252546a0>
26. Kauffman S. The large scale structure and dynamics of gene control circuits: an ensemble approach. *J Theor Biol* 1974; 44:167-90; PMID:4595774; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(74\)80037-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(74)80037-8)
27. Glass L. Classification of biological networks by their qualitative dynamics. *J Theor Biol* 1975; 54:85-107; PMID:1202295; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(75\)80056-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(75)80056-7)
28. Peccoud J, Blaiveau MF, Cai Y, Cooper KL, Crasta O, DeLalla EC, Evans C, Folkerts O, Lyons BM, Mane SP, et al. Targeted development of registries of biological parts. *PLoS One* 2008; 3:e2671; PMID:18628824; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002671>
29. Constante M, Grünberg R, Isalan M. A biobrick library for cloning custom eukaryotic plasmids. *PLoS One* 2011; 6:e23685; PMID:21901127; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023685>
30. Fisher MA, McKinley KL, Bradley LH, Viola SR, Hecht MH. De novo designed proteins from a library of artificial sequences function in *Escherichia coli* and enable cell growth. *PLoS One* 2011; 6:e15364; PMID:21245923; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0015364>
31. Gibson DG, Smith HO, Hutchison CA 3rd, Venter JC, Merryman C. Chemical synthesis of the mouse mitochondrial genome. *Nat Methods* 2010; 7:901-3; PMID:20935651; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1515>
32. Sleator RD. Digital biology: A new era has begun. *Bioengineered* 2012; 3:311-12; PMID:23099453; <http://dx.doi.org/10.4161/bioe.22367>
33. Brenner K, Arnold FH. Self-organization, layered structure, and aggregation enhance persistence of a synthetic biofilm consortium. *PLoS One* 2011; 6:e16791; PMID:21347422; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016791>
34. Hu B, Du J, Zou RY, Yuan YJ. An environment-sensitive synthetic microbial ecosystem. *PLoS One* 2010; 5:e10619; PMID:20485551; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0010619>
35. Smith HO, Wilcox KW. A restriction enzyme from *Hemophilus influenzae*. I. Purification and general properties. *J Mol Biol* 1970; 51:379-91; PMID:5312500; [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836\(70\)90149-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836(70)90149-X)
36. Cohen SN, Chang ACY, Boyer HW, Helling RB. Construction of biologically functional bacterial plasmids in vitro. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1973; 70:3240-4; PMID:4594039; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.70.11.3240>
37. Morrow JF, Cohen SN, Chang AC, Boyer HW, Goodman HM, Helling RB. Replication and transcription of eukaryotic DNA in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1974; 71:1743-7; PMID:4600264; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.71.5.1743>
38. Chakrabarty AM. Bioengineered bugs, drugs and contentious issues in patenting. *Bioeng Bugs* 2010; 1:2-8; PMID:21327122; <http://dx.doi.org/10.4161/bbug.1.1.9850>
39. Harvey S, Elashvili I, Valdes JJ, Kamely D, Chakrabarty AM. Enhanced removal of Exxon Valdez spilled oil from Alaskan gravel by a microbial surfactant. *Biotechnology (N Y)* 1990; 8:228-30; PMID:1367420; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt0390-228>
40. Aharonowitz Y, Cohen G. The microbiological production of pharmaceuticals. *Sci Am* 1981; 245:140-52; PMID:6116278; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0981-140>
41. The MJ. Human insulin: DNA technology's first drug. *Am J Hosp Pharm* 1989; 46(Suppl 2):S9-11; PMID:2690608
42. Serrano L. Synthetic biology: promises and challenges. *Mol Syst Biol* 2007; 3:158; PMID:18091727; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/msb4100202>
43. Williams DC, Van Frank RM, Muth WL, Burnett JP. Cytoplasmic inclusion bodies in *Escherichia coli* producing biosynthetic human insulin proteins. *Science* 1982; 215:687-9; PMID:7036343; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.7036343>
44. Melian EB, Plosker GL. Interferon alfacon-1: a review of its pharmacology and therapeutic efficacy in the treatment of chronic hepatitis C. *Drugs* 2001; 61:1661-91; PMID:11577799; <http://dx.doi.org/10.2165/00003495-200161110-00009>
45. Kandpal R, Saviola B, Felton J. The era of 'omics unlimited. *Biotechniques* 2009; 46:351-2, 354-5; PMID:19480630; <http://dx.doi.org/10.2144/000113137>
46. Venter JC, Adams MD, Myers EW, Li PW, Mural RJ, Sutton HG, Smith HO, Yandell M, Evans CA, Holt RA, et al. The sequence of the human genome. *Science* 2001; 291:1304-51; PMID:11181995; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1058040>
47. Lander ES, Linton LM, Birren B, Nusbaum C, Zody MC, Baldwin J, Devon K, Dewar K, Doyle M, FitzHugh W, et al. International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature* 2001; 409:860-921; PMID:11237011; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/35057062>

Acknowledgments

R.D.S. is coordinator of the EU FP7 grant ClouDx-i.

48. Sleator RD, Shortall C, Hill C. Metagenomics. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 2008; 47:361-6; PMID:19146522; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2008.02444.x>
49. Sleator RD. The human superorganism - of microbes and men. *Med Hypotheses* 2010; 74:214-5; PMID:19836146; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2009.08.047>
50. Feeney A, Sleator RD. The human gut microbiome: the ghost in the machine. *Future Microbiol* 2012; 7:1235-7; PMID:23075440; <http://dx.doi.org/10.2217/fmb.12.105>
51. O'Driscoll A, Daugeleite J, Sleator RD. 'Big data', Hadoop and cloud computing in genomics. *J Biomed Inform* 2013; 46:774-81; PMID:23872175; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2013.07.001>
52. Kelly MJ. Computers: the best friends a human genome ever had. *Genome* 1989; 31:1027-33; PMID:2698820; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1139/g89-177>
53. Ideker T, Galitski T, Hood L. A new approach to decoding life: systems biology. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet* 2001; 2:343-72; PMID:11701654; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.genom.2.1.343>
54. Synthetic Biology [Internet]. Wikipedia: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Synthetic_biology.
55. Synthetic Biology 1.0 [Internet]. Available from: http://syntheticbiology.org/Synthetic_Biology_1.0.html.
56. Khalil AS, Collins JJ. Synthetic biology: applications come of age. *Nat Rev Genet* 2010; 11:367-79; PMID:20395970; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrg2775>
57. Bennett G, Gilman N, Stavrianakis A, Rabinow P. From synthetic biology to biohacking: are we prepared? *Nat Biotechnol* 2009; 27:1109-11; PMID:20010587; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt1209-1109>
58. Alper J. Biotech in the basement. *Nat Biotechnol* 2009; 27:1077-8; PMID:20010575; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt1209-1077>
59. Wolinsky H. Kitchen biology. The rise of do-it-yourself biology democratizes science, but is it dangerous to public health and the environment? *EMBO Rep* 2009; 10:683-5; PMID:19568259; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/embor.2009.145>
60. Genspace [Internet]. Brooklyn (NY): Genspace, New York City's Community Biolab: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://genspace.org/>.
61. Hochachka WM, Fink D, Hutchinson RA, Sheldon D, Wong WK, Kelling S. Data-intensive science applied to broad-scale citizen science. *Trends Ecol Evol* 2012; 27:130-7; PMID:22192976; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.11.006>
62. DIYBio [Internet]. DIYBio: c2013 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://diybio.org/>.
63. iGEM [Internet]. Cambridge (MA): iGem Foundation: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <https://www.igem.org>.
64. Landrain T. [Do-it-yourself biology: challenges and promises]. *Med Sci (Paris)* 2013; 29:33-5; PMID:23759493; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/medsci/201329s209>
65. Weigmann K. Tapping the crowds for research funding. Crowdfunding, a common practice to support projects in the arts, music or gaming, has also attracted the attention of scientists. *EMBO Rep* 2013; 14:1043-6; PMID:24201975; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/embor.2013.180>
66. Wheat RE, Wang Y, Byrnes JE, Ranganathan J. Raising money for scientific research through crowdfunding. *Trends Ecol Evol* 2013; 28:71-2; PMID:23219380; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.11.001>
67. Orelli B. Biotech crowdfunding paves way for angels. *Nat Biotechnol* 2012; 30:1020; PMID:23138287; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt1112-1020a>
68. DIYbio.org Question and Answer platform on bio-safety [Internet]. DIYBio: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://ask.diybio.org/>.
69. DremelFuge [Internet]. Brooklyn (NY): MakerBot Industries: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://www.thingiverse.com/thing:1483>.
70. Amplino [Internet]. Den Haag, the Netherlands: Amplino: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://www.amplino.org/>.
71. Anon. Garage biology. *Nature* 2010; 467:634; PMID:20930797; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/467634a>
72. Sleator RD. Probiotics -- a viable therapeutic alternative for enteric infections especially in the developing world. *Discov Med* 2010; 10:119-24; PMID:20807472
73. Hacking goes squishy. *The Economist Technology Quarterly*, 2009.
74. Nash DB. Beware biohacking? *Biotechnol Healthc* 2010; 7:7; PMID:22478803
75. Cork's DIYbio Group [Internet]. Google: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/diybio-ireland>.
76. CIT [Internet]. Cork, Ireland: Cork Institute of Technology: c2012 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://www.cit.ie/>.
77. UCC [Internet]. Cork, Ireland: University College Cork: c2014 [cited 2014 Feb 21]. Available from: <http://www.ucc.ie/en/>.