International Journal of Trendy Research in Engineering and Technology
Volume 10 Issue 3 June 2026
ISSN No. 2582-0958

BRIDGING BIOSAFETY LEVELS AND BUSINESS MODELS: A FRAMEWORK FOR COMMERCIALIZING SYNTHETIC BIOLOGY INNOVATIONS

[1]Ibrahim Umar, [2]Idris Mohammed Jika
[1]Department of Primary Education, Umaru Sanda Ahmadu College of Education, Niger State Minna, Nigeria
[2]Department of Physical and Health Education Studies, Umaru Sanda Ahmadu College of Education, Niger State Minna, Nigeria
Corresponding Author: abdulsamad2028@gmail.com

Received 05 July 2026 Received in revised form 12 July 2026 Accepted 14 July 2026
Available Online 17 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Synthetic biology is revolutionizing medicine, agriculture, and industrial production, yet many innovations fail to reach the market due to safety concerns, unclear regulations, and inadequate business strategies. This study examines how biosafety levels (BSL-1 to BSL-4) can be integrated with business models to enhance commercialization outcomes. Employing a mixed-method approach, the research analyzes the impact of biosafety compliance, regulatory frameworks, investment, and innovation on business performance. Findings indicate that incorporating biosafety into business planning attracts investors, accelerates regulatory approval, and improves market success. The study proposes a Biosafety–Business Integration Model (BBIM) to guide entrepreneurs, researchers, and policymakers. Practical recommendations include strengthening biosafety systems, aligning business strategies with safety protocols, and fostering innovation-friendly policies, particularly in developing countries like Nigeria. The model demonstrates that safe, well-planned, and regulated innovations have a higher likelihood of successful commercialization.

Keywords: Synthetic biology, biosafety, commercialization, innovation, Nigeria, bioeconomy

1. INTRODUCTION

Synthetic biology is an interdisciplinary field that integrates biology, engineering, and computational science to design and construct novel biological systems for diverse applications. These applications cut across healthcare, agriculture, environmental management, and industrial production, positioning the field as a significant driver of the global bioeconomy [1, 2]. Despite its transformative potential, synthetic biology raises important biosafety and biosecurity concerns. Biosafety involves the containment principles and practices used to prevent unintentional exposure to biological agents, while biosecurity addresses the risks associated with the misuse of biological technologies [3]. These concerns are heightened by the dual-use nature of synthetic biology, where innovations intended for beneficial purposes may also pose potential risks [4].

To manage these risks, biosafety levels (BSL-1 to BSL-4) have been established to regulate laboratory practices based on the degree of hazard involved [5]. Although these frameworks are effective in controlled research environments, their application becomes more complex when innovations are scaled for commercial production. This gap between laboratory biosafety systems and commercial deployment underscores the need for an integrated framework that aligns biosafety requirements with viable business models. Such alignment is essential for ensuring the safe, sustainable, and scalable commercialization of synthetic biology innovations [6].

1.1 Problem Statement

Despite significant advances in synthetic biology, a critical disconnect persists between biosafety frameworks and commercialization strategies. Existing biosafety regulations are largely designed for laboratory environments and often fail to address the complexities of industrial-scale production and market integration [7]. This disconnect creates several challenges:

- Stringent biosafety requirements can increase operational costs and prolong product development timelines, thereby discouraging private sector investment [8].
- Regulatory inconsistencies across national contexts limit international collaboration and constrain market expansion, particularly for emerging economies like Nigeria [9].
- The absence of integrated frameworks that align biosafety compliance with business model development results in inefficiencies in translating research outputs into commercially viable products [10].

Consequently, many synthetic biology innovations remain confined to research settings, limiting their potential contributions to economic growth and sustainable development. Addressing this gap requires the development of a systematic framework that bridges biosafety requirements with scalable and adaptive business models.

1.2 Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it addresses a key barrier to the commercialization of synthetic biology innovations: the lack of integration between biosafety requirements and business model development. By proposing a framework that bridges these domains, the study contributes to both scientific advancement and economic transformation. From a regulatory perspective, the study offers insights into how biosafety frameworks can be adapted to support innovation without compromising safety [3]. From a business standpoint, aligning biosafety with commercialization strategies can reduce uncertainty, attract investment, and enhance the scalability of synthetic biology enterprises [2].
Furthermore, the study is particularly relevant to developing countries such as Nigeria, where there is growing interest in leveraging biotechnology for industrialization but limited integration between policy, science, and business [9]. The findings can inform policymakers, researchers, and entrepreneurs on how to foster a sustainable and safe bioeconomy.

1.3 Research Gap

Current literature treats biosafety, innovation, and business models separately [6, 10]. Few studies integrate these dimensions, particularly in developing countries like Nigeria, creating a need for a context-specific, interdisciplinary framework that addresses the practical integration of these domains.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on three key theoretical perspectives: Innovation Systems Theory, Risk Governance Theory, and Business Model Innovation Theory. Innovation Systems Theory emphasizes the role of institutions, policies, and interactions among stakeholders in driving technological advancement. Within the context of synthetic biology, innovation does not occur in isolation but depends on collaboration between research institutions, regulatory bodies, and industry actors. This theory highlights the importance of creating an enabling environment for translating laboratory discoveries into marketable products.
Risk Governance Theory provides a framework for understanding how risks associated with emerging technologies are assessed, managed, and communicated. Biosafety levels (BSL-1 to BSL-4) are practical applications of this theory, ensuring that biological risks are minimized during research and commercialization processes. The theory is particularly relevant in addressing the dual-use nature of synthetic biology.
Business Model Innovation Theory focuses on how firms create, deliver, and capture value. In biotechnology, business models must account for regulatory compliance, high research costs, and long development cycles. Integrating biosafety considerations into business models is essential for achieving both safety and profitability. Together, these theories provide a multidisciplinary foundation for analyzing how biosafety requirements can be effectively aligned with commercialization strategies.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

The study links biosafety levels (independent variable) → business model design (mediating variable) → commercialization outcomes (dependent variable), moderated by regulatory and institutional factors.

2.3 Empirical Review

Existing literature highlights the transformative potential of synthetic biology while emphasizing the necessity for robust safety frameworks. [1, 2] stress synthetic biology's transformative potential and the need for safety. [7] highlights regulatory inadequacy for commercialization, while [9] identifies Nigerian barriers including weak regulation, limited funding, and low private-sector involvement. [10] emphasizes sustainable business models but overlooks biosafety integration. [6] advocate for standardized frameworks but focus primarily on technical compliance.

2.4 Identified Research Gaps

- Lack of integrated biosafety–business frameworks.
- Limited focus on commercialization under safety constraints.
- Absence of Nigeria-specific studies.
- Few practical models for stakeholders.
- Policy–industry disconnects limiting innovation adoption.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

General Objective

To develop an integrated framework that aligns biosafety levels with sustainable business models for the safe and scalable commercialization of synthetic biology innovations.

Specific Objectives

- Examine biosafety level (BSL-1 to BSL-4) classifications and their implications for commercialization.
- Analyze the relationship between biosafety requirements and business model design.
- Identify key regulatory, economic, and technological barriers within the Nigerian context.
- Evaluate existing business model frameworks relevant to synthetic biology.
- Develop a conceptual framework integrating biosafety and business model innovation.
- Propose policy and strategic recommendations for safe and sustainable commercialization.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How do biosafety levels influence the commercialization of synthetic biology innovations?
- What challenges arise in aligning biosafety requirements with business model development?
- How do regulatory frameworks affect commercialization in Nigeria?
- Which business models are most suitable under biosafety constraints?
- How can an integrated framework effectively bridge biosafety and business strategies?
- What policy measures can support sustainable growth in the synthetic biology sector?

5. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Null Hypotheses (H_0)

- H_{01}: Biosafety level requirements do not significantly affect the commercialization of synthetic biology innovations.
- H_{02}: Biosafety compliance has no significant relationship with business model performance.
- H_{03}: Regulatory factors do not significantly influence scalability in Nigeria.
- H_{04}: Integration of biosafety and business models does not significantly improve commercialization outcomes.

Alternative Hypotheses (H_1)

- H_{11}: Biosafety level requirements significantly affect the commercialization of synthetic biology innovations.
- H_{12}: Biosafety compliance significantly influences business model performance.
- H_{13}: Regulatory factors significantly affect scalability in Nigeria.
- H_{14}: Integration of biosafety and business models significantly improves commercialization outcomes.

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1 Research Design

A mixed-method approach combining surveys (quantitative) and interviews/document analysis (qualitative) was employed to triangulate insights and provide a comprehensive understanding [11].

6.2 Study Area

The study focused on Nigeria, including biotechnology hubs, research institutions, and regulatory agencies.

6.3 Population and Sample

Stakeholders included researchers, regulators, entrepreneurs, and policymakers. A sample size of 150–250 was selected using stratified random sampling to ensure representation across stakeholder groups.

6.4 Data Collection

- Questionnaires using Likert-scale items for perceptions on biosafety and business models.
- Semi-structured interviews with policymakers, researchers, and industry leaders.
- Document analysis reviewing policies, regulations, and industry reports.

6.5 Validity and Reliability

- Expert review and factor analysis for construct validity.
- Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.70 for reliability.
- Pilot study conducted prior to full data collection.

6.6 Data Analysis

- Descriptive statistics: frequencies, means, standard deviations.
- Inferential statistics: multiple regressions, ANOVA, VIF for multicollinearity, Hausman test for panel data suitability.
- Qualitative analysis: thematic analysis of interview data.
- Statistical tools: SPSS, STATA, and R for comprehensive analysis.

7. RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	95	63.3
Female	55	36.7
Researcher	60	40.0
Regulator	30	20.0
Entrepreneur	40	26.7
Policymaker	20	13.3

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Biosafety Compliance	4.12	0.65	2.5	5.0
Business Model Effectiveness	3.87	0.72	2.0	5.0
Regulatory Support	3.45	0.88	1.5	5.0
Commercialization Performance	3.95	0.70	2.0	5.0

Note. SD = Standard Deviation; Min = Minimum; Max = Maximum.

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis Results

Predictor	β	Std. Error	t	p	VIF
Constant	0.512	0.210	2.44	0.016*	–
Biosafety Compliance	0.341	0.085	4.01	0.000*	1.12
Business Model Design	0.289	0.097	2.98	0.003*	1.08
Regulatory Environment	0.212	0.090	2.36	0.019*	1.15

*Note. $R^2 = 0.62$, $F = 42.7$, $p < 0.001$. * Significant at 5% level. β = standardized coefficient; VIF = Variance Inflation Factor.*

8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The regression analysis revealed significant positive relationships between biosafety compliance, business model innovation, regulatory support, and commercialization outcomes. Biosafety compliance emerged as a particularly strong predictor ($\beta = 0.341$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that investments in robust safety systems significantly enhance the likelihood of successful market entry. Business model design also demonstrated substantial influence on commercialization performance ($\beta = 0.289$, $p = 0.003$), suggesting that adaptive business strategies are essential for navigating the complex landscape of regulatory and safety requirements.

The positive effect of regulatory support ($\beta = 0.212$, $p = 0.019$) underscores the critical role of government and institutional frameworks in facilitating commercialization. The integrated Biosafety–Business Integration Model (BBIM) validates that strategic alignment between safety, business, and regulation predicts commercialization success. These findings demonstrate that safe, well-structured, and strategically managed innovations are significantly more likely to succeed commercially, offering a practical pathway for advancing Nigeria's bioeconomy and supporting similar efforts in other developing nations.

This research contributes to the understanding of how biosafety frameworks can be effectively integrated into commercialization strategies without compromising either safety or economic viability. The findings have implications for policymakers seeking to establish innovation-friendly regulatory environments and for entrepreneurs developing business models that adequately address safety requirements.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

For Industry:

*Embed biosafety considerations into business strategy from the inception of product Development

*Adopt flexible business models that can adapt to evolving biosafety requirements across markets.

*Engage actively with regulatory bodies and stakeholders to navigate compliance requirements efficiently.

For Policymakers:

*Strengthen regulatory frameworks that balance biosafety requirements with innovation incentives.
*Provide financial and technical incentives to support compliance with safety standards.
*Harmonize biosafety standards internationally to facilitate market expansion and reduce compliance burden.

For Academia:

*Promote interdisciplinary research integrating biosafety, business strategy, and innovation management.
*Enhance capacity building for researchers and entrepreneurs in biosafety-aware business development.
*Conduct empirical studies addressing context-specific challenges in developing economies.

For Society:

*Raise public awareness of the importance of biosafety in biotechnology innovations.
*Support bioeconomic initiatives that demonstrate transparent and ethical commercialization practices.
*Ensure equitable access to innovations that result from successful commercialization efforts.

REFERENCES

[1]. Cameron, D. E., Bashor, C. J., & Collins, J. J. (2014). A brief history of synthetic biology. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 12(5), 381–390. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3239

[2]. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM). (2020). Safeguarding the bioeconomy. National Academies Press.

[3]. World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Laboratory biosafety manual (4th ed.). World Health Organization.

[4]. Kelle, A. (2013). Synthetic biology and biosecurity: Challenging the "myths". Frontiers in Public Health, 1, 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2013.00015

[5]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2020). Biosafety in microbiological and biomedical laboratories (6th ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

[6]. de Lorenzo, V., & Schmidt, M. (2018). Biological standards for the knowledge-based bioeconomy: What is at stake. New Biotechnology, 40, 170–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nbt.2017.05.001

[7]. Schmidt, M. (2008). Diffusion of synthetic biology: A challenge to biosafety. Systems and Synthetic Biology, 2(1–2), 1–6.

[8]. Agapakis, C. M. (2014). Designing synthetic biology. ACS Synthetic Biology, 3(3), 121–128.

[9]. Adenle, A. A. (2017). Governance of biotechnology in Africa: Challenges and opportunities. New Biotechnology, 36, 1–6.

[10]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2018). Developing a framework for responsible innovation in synthetic biology. OECD Publishing.

[11]. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage.