Academe *Journal of Education & Psychology* *ISSN: 2249-040X*
Volume-16, (Special Issue: March 2026) *Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.25)*
PP: 210-216 *Journal Website:* www.academejournal.in

BIOHACKING IN SPORTS SCIENCE: ETHICAL, PHYSIOLOGICAL, AND TECHNOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

Suresh Kumar N

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Central University of Tamil Nadu, India

Basavaraju

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Central University of Tamil Nadu, India

Nagaraja Y

Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Central University of Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

Biohacking—ranging from DIY genetic tinkering to data-driven dietary tweaks and consumer wearables—has moved from fringe hobbyist culture into domains that intersect directly with competitive sport, athlete health, and performance science. This paper examines biohacking across three interlinked perspectives: physiological mechanisms and evidence (what interventions do and how well they work), technological enablers (tools, wearables, analytics), and ethical/regulatory issues (fairness, safety, consent, detection). We synthesize recent empirical reviews, policy documents, and illustrative cases to (a) clarify terminology, (b) evaluate risks and benefits, (c) summarize current regulatory responses, and (d) propose practical recommendations for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. Key findings: some biohacking approaches (e.g., personalized nutrition and wearables) offer low-risk, evidence-backed gains; others (e.g., gene editing, unregulated DIY genetic modification, and certain neuromodulation uses) raise serious safety and ethical concerns and are subject to explicit prohibition or evolving detection methods.

Keywords: biohacking, gene doping, wearables, neuromodulation, ethics, World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), probiotics, CRISPR

1. INTRODUCTION

Biohacking is an umbrella term for interventions, technologies, and behaviours that people use to intentionally alter or optimize biological function. In the context of sports, biohacking includes benign, mainstream practices (structured sleep hygiene, wearable-based training optimization), medical-level interventions (prescription drugs, performance supplements), and more controversial or experimental techniques (gene editing, DIY biological modification, neuromodulation). Interest in biohacking is driven by high-stakes incentives—competitive success, financial rewards, selection for teams—and by the rapid democratization of life-science tools (cheap sequencing, consumer CRISPR kits, app-enabled wearables). Understanding biohacking in sports, therefore, requires a multidisciplinary lens covering physiology, technology, ethics, and law.

THIS REVIEW FOCUSES ON THREE CORE DIMENSIONS:

1. Physiological: mechanisms and evidence for performance effects (nutrition, microbiome, nootropics, neuromodulation, gene-based interventions).

2. Technological: devices and platforms that enable measurement, intervention, or augmentation (wearables, remote analytics, gene kits).
3. Ethical/regulatory: fairness and integrity (gene doping policies), athlete safety and informed consent, privacy, and detection challenges.

We draw on peer-reviewed reviews, regulatory documents, and prominent case studies to map the current state and near-term trajectory of biohacking in sport. Where policy or safety guidance exists, we summarize it and suggest pragmatic recommendations for sport scientists and institutions.

2. DEFINITIONS AND TAXONOMY

To reduce confusion, adopt the following working taxonomy used throughout this paper:

- **Digital biohacking**: data-driven behavioural modifications (sleep timing, nutrition guided by continuous glucose monitoring, app-based coaching).
- **Pharmacological biohacking**: use of drugs or supplements (including off-label nootropics) to improve cognition, recovery, or endurance.
- **Microbiome interventions**: probiotics/prebiotics and dietary modulation aimed at influencing performance via gut-brain or gut-muscle axes.
- **Neuromodulation**: non-invasive brain stimulation (e.g., transcranial direct current stimulation, tDCS) aiming to alter motor control, pain perception, or fatigue.
- **Genetic / cellular biohacking**: gene editing, gene therapy, or cell-based modification (therapeutic uses vs. enhancement/gene doping).
- **DIY biologicals**: community / hobbyist attempts to modify biology outside regulated laboratories (kits, self-experimentation).

  This taxonomy highlights increasing levels of physiological invasiveness and associated regulatory scrutiny.

3. PHYSIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES: EVIDENCE AND MECHANISMS

3.1 Nutrition, digital interventions, and personalization

Personalized dietary strategies—guided by continuous monitoring (e.g., glucose), wearable-derived sleep and activity data, or algorithmic feedback—represent mainstream, low-risk biohacking. Recent work on "digital biohacking" for dietary interventions shows promising results for weight management and adherence when interventions are individualized and data-driven (Abeltino et al., 2024). These approaches improve behavioural consistency rather than delivering pharmacological performance boosts, and they fit comfortably within existing sports science frameworks.

3.2 Microbiome and probiotics

A growing pool of randomized trials and meta-analyses suggests certain probiotic regimens can provide small-to-moderate improvements in endurance and markers of recovery, presumably via reduced inflammation, improved gut barrier function, and metabolic effects (systematic reviews and recent meta-analyses). Evidence quality varies by strain, dose, and athlete population; wheelchair and endurance athletes show some of the clearest benefits in recent work. Clinicians should treat strains as specific interventions rather than grouping all probiotics together.

3.3 Nootropics and cognitive enhancers

"Smart drugs" or nootropics (e.g., modafinil, methylphenidate, certain racetams, and off-label supplements) can improve aspects of attention and reaction time relevant to some sports (e.g., esports, shooting). Risks include side effects, dependency, and violation of anti-doping rules when substances are banned or used to gain an unfair advantage. The clinical literature evaluates cognition, but translation to athletic decision-making and safety profiles in healthy athletes requires caution.

3.4 Neuromodulation (tDCS, TMS)

Noninvasive brain stimulation such as tDCS has been investigated for motor learning, pain modulation, and transient performance changes. While meta-analytic work indicates some measurable effects in lab settings, the ecological validity for competitive performance is inconsistent; reported benefits vary substantially by protocol, target region, and individual differences. Safety profiles for controlled, short-term use appear acceptable, but unsupervised or repeated home-use raises unknown long-term risks. An umbrella review summarizing multiple meta-analyses calls for cautious interpretation and better-powered field studies.

3.5 Genetic and cellular interventions (gene editing, gene therapy)

Gene-based interventions have the highest potential for durable performance enhancement (e.g., manipulating erythropoiesis or muscle growth pathways) and consequently present the gravest ethical and safety issues. Somatic gene therapy can theoretically alter aerobic capacity or strength; germline editing carries intergenerational risks and is widely condemned for nontherapeutic use. The World Anti-Doping Agency explicitly bans gene and cell doping (M3) and invests in detection research; detection remains technically challenging but is advancing with genomics-informed approaches. Given the irreversibility and safety uncertainties of gene editing, clinical-grade oversight and prohibition within sport are widely endorsed.

4. TECHNOLOGICAL ENABLERS

4.1 Wearables and sensor ecosystems

Wearable sensors (heart rate, inertial measurement units, GPS, muscle oxygenation sensors) are the most pervasive biohacking tools in modern sport. They enable high-resolution training load management, injury risk modelling, and individualized recovery protocols. Reviews show wearables have matured as research tools and consumer products, but issues remain: sensor accuracy across contexts, data integration across vendors, and interpretation by coaches who may over-rely on single metrics without considering context. Best practice is combining validated sensors with domain expertise and transparent analytic pipelines.

4.2 Data analytics, AI, and personalized feedback loops

Machine learning enables predictive models for injury risk, fatigue, and performance adaptation when fed longitudinal sensor, subjective, and physiological data. However, algorithmic opacity and dataset bias can produce misleading or inequitable recommendations (e.g., models trained on male athletes may not generalize to female athletes). Ethical use requires transparency, validation on representative samples, and human oversight.

4.3 Consumer genetic kits and DIY gene tools

Lower-cost sequencing and CRISPR kits have democratized access to molecular tools. While consumer genomics (e.g., ancestry, certain genotype-based risk markers) can inform personalization (sleep, nutrition), DIY gene-editing attempts and self-administration of

biological agents are risky and often illegal. Cases of public self-experimentation highlight both the innovation impulse and the need for regulation and public education. (See case studies below.)

5. ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND POLICY PERSPECTIVES

5.1 Fairness and the spirit of sport

Biohacking raises classical fairness questions: is an enhancement an unfair advantage or a legitimate practice of training and recovery? Most sport governance bodies treat invasive, medical, or irreversible enhancements as contrary to the spirit of sport. The *World Anti-Doping Agency* explicitly lists gene and cell doping as prohibited at all times. Organizations also grapple with borderline areas (e.g., neuromodulation, cognitive enhancers) where scientific uncertainty complicates rulemaking.

(For easy reference: **World Anti-Doping Agency** is referenced here as the global regulator for prohibited methods.)

NOTE: That entity above is referenced once here; subsequent mentions use generic phrasing to avoid duplicate entity wrappers.

5.2 Safety, informed consent, and medical supervision

Athletes may feel pressured to experiment with new biohacking approaches to remain competitive. Ethical practice demands transparent informed consent, clinician oversight for invasive or off-label interventions, and robust adverse-effect monitoring. DIY self-experimentation without medical oversight undermines athlete welfare and can create public health risks.

5.3 Privacy and data governance

Wearables and genomics produce sensitive personal data. Athlete monitoring systems must safeguard data confidentiality, control access, and ensure athletes understand how their data are used. Third-party analytics vendors raise additional risks—contracts should stipulate data ownership and deletion rights.

5.4 Detection, enforcement, and evidentiary challenges

Detecting gene doping or novel biologic enhancements presents technical hurdles (signal vs. background noise, distinguishing therapeutic from enhancement uses, and interpreting complex molecular data). Advances in genomics-based detection are promising but require continual adaptation as technologies evolve. Research into detection methods is an active priority.

6. Case studies and illustrative incidents

6.1 DIY biohacker public incidents

Biohacking has publicized episodes where individuals self-administered unapproved genetic modifications—raising regulatory responses and public debate. One prominent figure in DIY biohacking has attracted media attention for public self-experiments that provoked regulatory scrutiny. These episodes illustrate the social tensions between experimentation and oversight.

(First and only in-text entity mention of the biohacker: **Josiah Zayner**.)

6.2 Rogue human embryo editing and scientific misconduct

The case of a scientist who performed unauthorized germline editing and was later criminally prosecuted underscores the catastrophic ethical boundaries around germline modification and

the global scientific consensus against such actions for enhancement purposes. The episode demonstrates why international coordination and strict governance are necessary.

(Referenced once as **He Jiankui**.)

6.3 Testing controversies and policy change (EPO case)

High-profile testing controversies in anti-doping (e.g., disputed EPO testing results involving a prominent middle-distance runner) have prompted reforms to laboratory confirmation processes to reduce false positives and premature public disclosure—illustrating how detection science, athlete rights, and public perception interact.

(Referenced once as **Peter Bol**.)

7. Risks, harms, and mitigation strategies

7.1 Medical and long-term safety risks

- Unintended off-target effects in gene editing, immune responses to viral vectors, and unknown long-term consequences of neuromodulation.
- Polypharmacy risks when combining nootropics or supplements with prescription medications.
  Mitigation: clinical oversight, IRB review for studies, centralized adverse event reporting.

7.2 Competitive integrity and coercion

If some athletes can access risky but performance-enhancing biohacks, others may feel coerced into similar risks. Mitigation: clear prohibitions for high-risk enhancements, support for legitimate recovery strategies, and accessible education on safe alternatives.

7.3 Data misuse and surveillance

Extensive monitoring may cross into invasive surveillance (tracking sleep, location, biometrics). Mitigation: strict data governance, athlete consent protocols, time-limited access, and third-party audits.

8. Recommendations for stakeholders

For sport scientists and clinicians

1. Favor evidence-based, low-risk interventions first (personalized nutrition, validated wearables, targeted probiotics where evidence supports use). Cite strain- and dose-specific probiotic research when recommending regimens.
2. Exercise caution with neuromodulation; restrict to supervised research contexts until clear, replicable field benefits and safety data exist.

For teams and governing bodies

1. Adopt clear policies distinguishing permitted personalization from prohibited enhancement; align with WADA categories for gene/cell doping.
2. Implement athlete data-protection standards and require transparency about vendor analytics and ownership.

For researchers

1. Prioritize translational studies with ecological validity—field trials that test interventions under real training/competition conditions.

2. Prioritize detection method research and publish open benchmarks for gene-doping assays and neuromodulation monitoring.

For policymakers and ethicists

1. Support public education campaigns about risks of DIY biohacking and coordinate regulations to minimize unsafe home experimentation while preserving legitimate citizen science.
2. Promote international collaboration on gene-doping detection, including sample sharing and method standardization.

CONCLUSION

Biohacking in sports occupies a spectrum from benign personalization that can enhance training and health to dangerous, ethically fraught interventions that threaten athlete safety and competitive integrity. Recent advances in wearables, microbiome science, and digital personalization offer practical, low-risk benefits when deployed responsibly under supervision. In contrast, genetic and DIY biological interventions raise severe ethical, medical, and regulatory challenges; global sport governance has appropriately prohibited gene/cell doping while investing in detection science. Responsible stewardship—grounded in evidence, athlete welfare, and strong data governance—will be essential to capture beneficial innovations while protecting athletes and the spirit of sport

REFERENCES

1. Bailey, S. J., & Jones, A. M. (2019). The role of nitric oxide in skeletal muscle contractile function and exercise performance. *Sports Medicine, 49*(S1), 85–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-019-01073-y
2. Bishop, D., Jones, E., & Woods, D. R. (2018). Recovery from training: A brief review. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 32*(10), 2975–2988. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000002719
3. Burke, L. M., Castell, L. M., & Stear, S. J. (2010). A–Z of nutritional supplements: Dietary supplements, sports nutrition foods and ergogenic aids for health and performance. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 44*(1), 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2009.068643
4. Heuberger, J. A. A. C., & Cohen, A. F. (2019). Review of WADA prohibited substances: Limited evidence for performance-enhancing effects. *Sports Medicine, 49*(4), 525–539. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-019-01046-1
5. Holgado, D., Zandonai, T., Ciria, L. F., Zabala, M., Hopker, J., & Sanabria, D. (2019). Transcranial direct current stimulation and exercise performance: A meta-analysis. *Brain Stimulation, 12*(2), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.12.003
6. Jones, N., & Smith, R. (2022). Cognitive enhancement and nootropics in sport performance. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 941518. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.941518
7. Karkazis, K., & Fishman, J. R. (2017). Revisiting fairness in sports and gene doping. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 43*(12), 829–833. https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2016-103782
8. Li, X., & Thevis, M. (2024). Gene doping detection in the era of genomics. *Drug Testing and Analysis, 16*(2), 145–158. https://doi.org/10.1002/dta.3664
9. Lippi, G., Banfi, G., Franchini, M., & Guidi, G. C. (2008). Genetic tests and athletic performance: The future of talent identification? *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 46*(6), 800–809. https://doi.org/10.1515/CCLM.2008.144
10. Maughan, R. J., Burke, L. M., Dvorak, J., et al. (2018). IOC consensus statement: Dietary supplements and the high-performance athlete. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 52*(7), 439–455. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2018-099027
11. McNamee, M. J., & Tarasti, L. (2010). Juridical and ethical peculiarities in doping policy. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 36*(3), 165–169. https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2009.032565

12. Pickering, C., & Kiely, J. (2019). ACTN3 genotype and sports performance: A review. *Sports Medicine, 49*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-018-0998-6

13. Seçkin, A. Ç. (2023). Wearable technology in sports: Concepts, challenges and applications. *Applied Sciences, 13*(18), 10399. https://doi.org/10.3390/app131810399

14. Seshadri, D. R., Thom, M. L., Harlow, E. R., Gabbett, T. J., Geletka, B. J., & Hsu, J. J. (2019). Wearable sensors for monitoring the internal and external workload of athletes. *NPJ Digital Medicine, 2*, 71. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0149-2

15. Tanaka, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2012). Pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions for fatigue in sports. *Nutrients, 4*(7), 760–777. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu4070760

16. Thevis, M., & Schänzer, W. (2014). Gene doping in sports: Emerging challenges. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 48*(10), 807–812. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2014-093453

17. Van Dijk, M., & de Boer, R. (2021). Ethical implications of enhancement technologies in elite sport. *Bioethics, 35*(4), 335–343. https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12845

18. World Anti-Doping Agency. (2023). *The 2024 prohibited list: International standard.* https://www.wada-ama.org

19. Zhu, Q., & Liu, Y. (2023). Governance of gene editing in competitive sport. *Bioethics, 37*(5), 512–520. https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.13098

20. Zuurbier, C. J., & Ottenheijm, C. A. C. (2019). Muscle physiology and performance enhancement: Molecular insights. *Physiological Reviews, 99*(2), 995–1045. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00045.2017