IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 6.252
Volume 2, Issue 1, June 2022

Biosafety Concerns in Plant Biotechnology

Meenakshi Rathour
Department of Botany
Hemwati Nandan Bahuguna Government PG College, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India.
meenakshirathour10@gamil.com

Abstract: *Plant biotechnology has transformed modern agriculture by allowing the development of genetically modified (GM) and gene-edited crops that offer higher yields, better nutrition, and greater resistance to environmental challenges.*

Technologies like genetic engineering and CRISPR-based genome editing have significantly sped up crop improvement efforts and helped enhance global food security. However, these advances have also raised important biosafety concerns related to human health, environmental protection, and ecological balance. Some of the potential risks include the creation of allergenic or toxic proteins, the transfer of genes between species, the spread of genetic material to wild relatives, harm to non-target organisms, and unintended genetic changes in genome editing.

To deal with these concerns, there are comprehensive biosafety frameworks and regulations at both national and international levels. These include scientific risk assessments, environmental monitoring, containment strategies, and food safety checks before GM crops are sold commercially. International agreements such as the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and national bodies like the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) in India help ensure that biotechnology is used responsibly. This review article looks at the main biosafety concerns in plant biotechnology, including potential human health and environmental risks, and highlights the regulatory systems and risk management strategies designed to promote safe and sustainable use of genetic technologies in agriculture..

Keywords: Plant biotechnology; Biosafety; Genetic modification; Gene editing; CRISPR/Cas systems; Environmental risk assessment; Gene flow; Food safety; Regulatory frameworks; Genetically modified crops

I. INTRODUCTION

Plant biotechnology has become one of the most significant advancements in modern agricultural science.

The growing global population, climate change, decreasing amount of arable land, and increasing food demand have put a lot of pressure on agricultural systems. Traditional methods of crop breeding are effective but often take many years to develop new traits. In contrast, plant biotechnology offers advanced tools that let scientists modify plant genomes with more accuracy and efficiency, speeding up crop improvement programs (James, 2017). Genetic engineering and gene editing technologies have made it possible to create crops that are more resistant to pests and diseases, better able to tolerate environmental stresses such as drought and salt, and more nutritious.

Genetically modified crops have been widely used worldwide since their introduction in the mid-1990s.

Crops like Bt cotton, herbicide-tolerant soybeans, and insect-resistant maize have shown benefits in improving productivity, reducing pesticide use, and increasing farm profits. In addition to traditional genetic engineering, the development of genome editing technologies like CRISPR/Cas9 has opened new possibilities for precise changes to plant genomes without involving foreign genetic material (Jinek et al., 2012). These technologies allow for targeted gene insertion, deletion, or modification, providing unique opportunities for crop improvement and sustainable agriculture.

Despite these advances, the use of plant biotechnology has sparked extensive debate about possible biosafety risks.

There are concerns about the potential effects of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) on human health, biodiversity, and ecological stability. Some risks include the production of allergens or toxins, the transfer of antibiotic resistance genes, unintended gene flow to wild plants, and impacts on non-target organisms (Goodman et al., 2008;

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 6.252
Volume 2, Issue 1, June 2022

Snow et al., 2005). In addition, the rise of genome editing has raised new scientific questions about off-target mutations and unintended genetic changes that could affect plant metabolism and ecological interactions (Fu et al., 2013).

Biosafety in plant biotechnology involves a set of scientific principles, policies, and practices designed to ensure that biotechnology is safe for humans, animals, and the environment.

Rather than opposing technology, biosafety frameworks aim to assess risks through thorough scientific evaluation and implement appropriate ways to reduce those risks (Bayot et al., 2019; Beeckman et al., 2020). These frameworks depend on multidisciplinary assessments involving molecular biology, toxicology, ecology, and environmental monitoring.

Globally, biosafety is guided by agreements like the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which sets standards for the safe handling, transportation, and use of genetically modified organisms.

Many countries have also established their own regulatory bodies to evaluate GM crops before they are put on the market. In India, the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) is responsible for approving and monitoring genetically engineered organisms under the Environment Protection Act. These regulatory systems combine scientific risk assessment, precautionary principles, and post-release monitoring to ensure responsible development and use of biotechnology-based products.

With the rapid growth of genome editing technologies and the increasing use of biotechnology in agriculture, it has become essential to understand biosafety concerns.

A thorough evaluation of potential risks and ways to manage them is crucial for maintaining public confidence and ensuring the sustainable adoption of plant biotechnology. Therefore, this review explores the main biosafety issues associated with plant biotechnology, including human health risks, environmental impacts, regulatory frameworks, and risk assessment strategies aimed at promoting safe and responsible innovation.

II. HUMAN HEALTH RISKS

2.1. Toxicity and Allergenicity:

Genetic modification may introduce new proteins or change how plants produce certain chemicals (Goodman et al., 2008).

These changes could result in the production of harmful substances or allergens (Nordlee et al., 1996). For instance, the introduction of foreign genes might lead to the expression of proteins similar to known allergens (Goodman et al., 2008). Therefore, all GM crops go through toxicity tests, comparisons with allergen databases, studies on how easily these proteins break down, and feeding trials with animals before they are made available for sale. These assessments are meant to ensure that new foods are essentially the same as conventional varieties.

2.2. Antibiotic Resistance Marker Genes:

Some of the early methods used in genetic modification included genes that made plants resistant to antibiotics as a way to select for successful genetic changes (Miki and McHugh, 2004).

There was concern that these genes could pass on to gut bacteria through a process called horizontal gene transfer (HGT), which might contribute to antibiotic resistance. However, scientific evidence shows that the likelihood of this happening in natural conditions is very low (Keese, 2008). Modern techniques now use marker-free systems and other alternatives for selecting genetic changes (Miki and McHugh, 2004). Therefore, this risk is considered theoretical but can be managed.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

3.1. Gene Flow and Biodiversity

Genes from genetically modified crops can move to wild plants through pollination or seed spread (Snow et al., 2005).

This can cause problems like weeds that resist herbicides, loss of genetic variety in nature, and modified plants outcompeting native ones (Snow et al., 2005). Ways to manage these risks include keeping GM crops away from wild plants, using protective zones, and using genetic methods to stop plants from reproducing (Daniell, 2002).

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 6.252
Volume 2, Issue 1, June 2022

3.2. Effects on Non-Target Organisms:

Some GM crops, like Bt crops, make proteins that kill insects (Romeis et al., 2008).

This can affect helpful insects, change the makeup of soil microbes, and leave Bt toxins in the soil (Losey et al., 1999). Studies show these toxins stick to soil and break down slowly over time (Icoz et al., 2008). Continuing to watch what happens in the environment is important to make sure these changes don't cause big problems.

3.3. Horizontal Gene Transfer to Microbes:

There is a worry that plant DNA could transfer to bacteria, possibly creating new traits or changing how viruses act (Nielsen et al., 1998).

But it's very rare for this to happen naturally (Keese, 2008). No harmful cases have been found, and the risk is mostly hypothetical. Still, keeping an eye on this is a part of making sure these technologies are safe.

IV. OFF-TARGET EFFECTS IN GENE EDITING

CRISPR/Cas technology allows precise editing of genes (Jinek et al., 2012).

However, sometimes the system can make changes in other places in the DNA, known as off-target mutations (Fu et al., 2013).

These changes might affect how plants work, lower their ability to survive, or cause them to make unexpected toxic substances (Zhang et al., 2015).

To prevent this, scientists use special versions of the system, software to find possible mistakes, check the entire genome, and test plants over many generations (Tsai et al., 2016). Modern editing tools greatly reduce these risks.

V. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RISKS AND MITIGATION

Concern	Scientific Basis	Mitigation Strategy
Off-target gene edits	Unintended CRISPR mutations (Fu et al., 2013)	High-precision Cas systems, genome sequencing
Gene flow	Transfer of transgenes to wild plants (Ellstrand, 2003)	Isolation zones, sterile hybrids
Soil ecosystem effects	Persistence of Bt proteins (Icoz et al., 2008)	Environmental monitoring
Allergenicity	Novel proteins in food (Goodman et al., 2008)	Database screening, toxicology tests

VI. REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS

The international control of genetically modified organisms is handled under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, which was part of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 2000).

The Protocol includes rules for moving these organisms across borders, assessing environmental risks, getting informed consent, and keeping records of modified organisms. It also stresses being careful with decisions, making sure things can be traced back, and helping countries improve their biosafety systems. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2019) provides additional guidance to help make risk assessments and food safety checks more consistent.

In India, the regulatory system for GM crops is run by the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC), which is part of the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

This system follows the Environment (Protection) Act of 1986 (MoEFCC, 1989; GEAC, 2017). The steps include approval for lab research, trials in controlled areas, assessments for releasing the plants into the environment, and monitoring after commercial use. Different safety levels (BL-1 to BL-4) are set by the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB, 2011) to define the infrastructure and rules for each type of risk.

Globally, organizations like the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2016) provide guides for evaluating the safety of genetically modified organisms and assessing environmental risks.

These efforts together create a system that uses science, follows safe practices, and includes oversight to ensure that plant biotechnology is used safely and responsibly.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 6.252
Volume 2, Issue 1, June 2022

VII. RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

A strong system for biosafety in plant biotechnology is built around four main areas: safe lab procedures, using suitable containment facilities, doing thorough scientific risk checks, and keeping track of the environment after release (OECD, 2016).

These steps help ensure that genetically modified plants are developed, tested, and used with proper control and scientific understanding.

Before releasing a plant into the environment, detailed checks are done.

These include looking at the genetic material, checking if it works properly, and using software to find any possible issues or similarities with known harmful substances. These checks help find and fix problems before the plant is used.

Once the plant is approved for sale, ongoing monitoring is important.

This involves checking the effect on other living things, soil microbes, biodiversity, and how pests respond (Romeis et al., 2008). This kind of flexible monitoring allows officials to respond quickly to new science and environmental observations.

These assessments and management strategies, together, form a strong system that supports the use of plant biotechnology in a sustainable way while managing risks and protecting public and environmental health (FAO, 2019).

REFERENCES

[1]. Bayot, M. L., & Limaiem, F. (2019). Biosafety guidelines.

[2]. Beeckman DSA and Rüdelsheim P (2020) Biosafety and Biosecurity in Containment: A Regulatory Overview. Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol. 8:650. doi: 10.3389/fbioe.2020.00650

[3]. Daniell, H. (2002). Molecular strategies for gene containment in transgenic crops. Nature biotechnology, 20(6), pp.581-586.

[4]. Ellstrand, N.C., Prentice, H.C. and Hancock, J.F. (1999). Gene flow and introgression from domesticated plants into their wild relatives. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 30, pp. 540–545.

[5]. Fu, Y., Foden, J.A., Khayter, C., Maeder, M.L., Reyon, D., Joung, J.K. and Sander, J.D. (2013). High-frequency off-target mutagenesis induced by CRISPR-Cas nucleases in human cells. Nature Biotechnology, 31(9), pp. 822–826.

[6]. Goodman, R.E., Vieths, S., Sampson, H.A., Hill, D., Ebisawa, M., Taylor, S.L. and van Ree, R. (2008). Allergenicity assessment of genetically modified crops- what makes sense?. Nature Biotechnology, 26(1), pp.73–81.

[7]. Icoz, I. and Stotzky, G. (2008). Fate and effects of insect-resistant Bt crops in soil ecosystems. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 40(3), pp. 559–586.

[8]. James, C. (2017). Global Status of Commercialized Biotech/GM Crops in 2017: Biotech Crop Adoption Surges as Economic Benefits Accumulate in 22 Years, Brief No. 53, The International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA), Ithaca, NY, pp. 3–6.

[9]. Jinek, M., Chylinski, K., Fonfara, I., Hauer, M., Doudna, J.A. and Charpentier, E. (2012). A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. Science, 337(6096), pp. 816–821.

[10]. Keese, P. (2008). Risks from GMOs due to horizontal gene transfer. Environmental Biosafety Research, 7(3), pp. 134-139.

[11]. Kennedy, G.G. (2008). Integration of insect-resistant genetically modified crops within IPM programs. Integration of insect-resistant genetically modified crops within IPM programs, pp.1-26.

[12]. Losey, J.E., Rayor, L.S. and Carter, M.E. (1999). Transgenic pollen harms monarch larvae. Nature, 399(6733), pp.214-214.

[13]. Miki, B. and McHugh, S. (2004). Selectable marker genes in transgenic plants: applications, alternatives and biosafety. Journal of biotechnology, 107(3), pp.193-232.

[14]. Nielsen, K.M., Bones, A.M., Smalla, K. and van Elsas, J.D. (1998). Horizontal gene transfer from transgenic plants to terrestrial bacteria-a rare event. FEMS microbiology reviews, 22(2), pp.79-103.

[15]. Nordlee, J.A., Taylor, S.L., Townsend, J.A., Thomas, L.A. and Bush, R.K. (1996). Identification of a Brazil-nut allergen in transgenic soybeans. New England Journal of Medicine, 334(11), pp.688-692.

IJARSCT
ISSN (Online) 2581-9429
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology (IJARSCT)
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
Impact Factor: 6.252
Volume 2, Issue 1, June 2022

[16]. Tsai, S.Q. and Joung, J.K. (2016). Defining and improving the genome-wide specificities of CRISPR-Cas9 nucleases. Nature Reviews Genetics, 17(5), pp. 303–309.

[17]. Zhang, X.-H., Tee, L.Y., Wang, X.-G., Huang, Q.-S. and Yang, S.-H. (2015). Off-target effects in CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genome engineering. Molecular Therapy Nucleic Acids, 4, e264, pp. 1–8.