

GMOs food (Genetically Modified Organisms) collision on human body; pros and cons

Comment [LSM1]: Organism and food is not the same thing

Abstract:

Comment [LSM2]: It is not properly an abstract, but an introduction. It needs to be rewritten

The expression “genetic modified organisms (GMO)” has embellish a debatable matter as it is helpful for both food producers and consumers are acquaintance by prospective biomedical perils and environmental side effects [1]. Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) has been reachable for mercantile procure since 1990s license the creator to enlarge food quality and quantity through bioengineering that generates pesticides and acarid resistance variation [2]. Escalating apprehension of people about GMO, especially in the form of genetic modified (GM) foods, are intended at the short- and long-term health complications which may result from this modern biotechnology [1]. Customers globally are exhibiting inadequate comprehending, fallacy, even ignorance with GMO food products. Customer get knowledge about GMO food products from news, through internet access, and other broadcast sources. These sources may be fewer authentic than scientific experts whom customers believe more to present the reality. Customer knowledge of contemporary GMO identifying is less. A contrast must also be formed among GMO intimacy and scientific awareness, as a result of those who are more intimate with it be likely to be more unwilling to accept bioengineering, although those with advance scientific information

Comment [LSM3]: Not allowed to cite in abstract

Comment [LSM4]: Too specific to be mentioned in such manner

Comment [LSM5]: Idem

Comment [LSM6]: Idem

outcome believable to have lower negative perspective toward GMOs [2]. Intricate studies are actuality brought around the world sovereignly to estimate the pros and con of GM foods. In this article, we try to sum up the latest information about the advantages and disadvantages, potential issues and awareness of GM food [1].

Comment [LSM7]: Idem

Comment [LSM8]: Idem

Keywords: GMOs food, Awareness, Advantages and disadvantages of GMO food, Effect on human body

Comment [LSM9]: The Keywords repeat part of the title

Comment [LSM10]: It begins considering that the reader has read the abstract. Not usual

Introduction:

Genomic amendment is genetic procedure which possessions adjustments in genomic technology of entirely types of existing creatures. GMO is well-defined by WHO “Creatures (i.e. plant life, wild life or microbes) in which genomic substantial (DNA) will be transformed in a technique which is not happen obviously via breeding or else normal reunification” [3].

Comment [LSM11]: Not in the same hierarchy (there is no sense in group life in plant, wild life and microbes). Not appropriate to use microbe

Customers remain usually involved in significant concerning diet they ingest, as well as its basis beside that, stipulation handled, the materials that might adding towards. By means of new ideas arise

Comment [LSM12]: I could not access the link of the reference. The definition is correct, but its beginning seems strange to have been authored by the WHO

in nourishment creation schemes, customers could remain further apprehensive around then concerned of buying freshly technologically advanced food stuffs. Hereditarily planned or hereditarily improved diet, or else individual that comprise about hereditarily improved creatures, were represented in US market place as well as acted proceedings superstore tables popular in 1994 by Flavr Savr tomato [4]. FDA agreed to the technique through Calgene of introducing genetic material which avoids accumulation of an enzyme which will then reason of unstiffening in the fruitlet, letting them economically vended Flavr Savr tomato to have extended

service lifetime along with conservative tomatoes [5]. On the other hand, the aforementioned manufacturer terminated in 1997. Later two years, the overview of FlavrSavr, during 1996, weed killer resisting soybeans have been announced with in food stuffs scheme via agriculturalist towards procedure which is generally appropriate for weed killer Roundup surrounded by meadow directed towards destroy a wide spread variety of tidies deprived of damaging their unaffected Roundup Ready harvests [6]. During that time, GM and GMOs food stuffs during specific increase incessant community discussion by means of favor their security, hazards, regulation, tagging and limit [7-8].

➤ **History:**

Table 1. History of Genetically Modified Organisms


1944	Beginning of genetic material variation knowledge could be found proceeded in 1944, as soon as experiments revealed that genomic materials could be transmitted among various types [9].
1954	Watson and Crick exposed dual spiral construction of gene, and vital code gene recorded to encode RNA, decoded to protein have been confirmed [10].
1963	Nobel Laureate Marshall Nirenberg [10] and the rest, possess decoded genomic cypher in 1963 [11].
1973	In 1973, Cohen et al [11] developing genetic material reunification knowledge, presentation certain hereditarily bring about genetic material particles could be transported between dissimilar classes [12-13].
1983	Initial hereditarily improved plant life aseptically impervious to tobacco and petunias would produce through three self-governing investigation collections in 1983 [12-13].
1990	Researchers in China initial commercial hereditarily improved tobacco now in initial 1990s [14].

Comment [LSM13]: Necessary to enter the subject and match it in text. A table cannot replace it. Every table must be cited in the text

Comment [LSM14]: The facts between 1944 and 1963 are only indirectly related to GMOs. The history ending in 1994 is very incomplete, as technology has evolved significantly since then. If it stays the way it is, half the story is antecedent and half the beginning of technology

1994	US marketplace motto the initial hereditarily improved classes of tomato by belonging to a late maturing accepted via FDA. Meanwhile at that time, some genetically modified plants have conventional FDA agreements, as well as Canola through improved lubricant conformation, cotton and soybeans impervious towards defoliant, and others. Genetically modified food's which are available in marketplace contain vegetables, eggplants, strawberries, carrots, and several remain in pipeline [14].
-------------	--

UNDER PEER REVIEW




➤ **Generations:**

Those harvests signify each start period of biological engineering acceptance now which biotechnology harvests remain actuality developing repeatedly headed for presentation beneficial characters. Genetically modified organisms could be improved in a amount of behaviors, categorized via group.

Fig 1. Biological engineering

Comment [LSM15]: Idem mentioned in the table. The classification of the generations are also incomplete



➤ **GMO'S food collision on human body:**

The statement which was circulated during 2005, WHO identifies GMOs possess possible dangers aimed at individual well-being, development then possess not any antiquity about actuality spent as safe nourishment moreover which is substituting current genetic material towards the genetic material about nutrients value-added could be reasons for objectionable progressive also biological consequences [18]. Although whole yields profits, genetic modified food stuffs consume approximately dangers. Such foods devise approximately genetic factor which never occur originate in one's produce within wildlife, which carry approximately important in decision through them. Distant genetic factor could generate random modifications through together cumulative nutritious worth about approximately food stuffs as well as reducing worth of about additional food stuffs [19].

• **Antibacterial Confrontation:**

Over genetic material transmission, about attributes producing aversion besides illness could remain approved after additional creature also for instance a significance, here might remain danger of discovery unforeseen biological produces with genetic modified produces. Antibacterial impervious genetic material were rummage-sale such as indicators for the duration of genetic material transmission. Antibacterial confrontation arises required towards broadcast on antibacterial impervious genetic material through creature or else human-being schemes [20]. Uncertainty antibacterial impervious genetic material were transferred towards antibody microbes, that create the situation problematic facing switch slightly microbial contagions [21-22]. Adjacent transmission on antibacterial confrontation towards microbes within creature or else human-being arrangements could be a reason to numerous well-being dangers [23]. During 1985 mad cow illness arisen within USA as well as in numerous developing nations besides this persons who spent essence spoil through intellect and backbone string on diseased remains became sickening later ten years development retro also expired in around 2 months. Each transferrable means was conveyed toward livestock via generous those rida diseased lambs corpse meal timer reduced on distillate livestock calorific food for instance an inexpensive proteid source [24].

• **Aversion:**

Aversion shares on giver genetic material could remain conveyed towards receiver vegetable or else instinctive via hereditary alteration in hereditary adjustment plant life. As well, within heaps regarding hereditarily improved nourishments, giver microbe that has unidentified antigen possible could remain rummage-sale. Genetic material as well as innovative genetic material mixtures moved after inedible means could reason sensitive response otherwise create current sensitive response inferior [25]. On the report of Ozdogan and Ekmen Glycine max assumed paranut genetic material towards improve nutritious worth affected unadorned sensitive response also forbidden within 1994 [26]. Food stuffs that has 2S genetic material conveyed towards glycinemax since paranut remained deduced after market place for instance they produced aversion [27].

• **Poisonousness:**

Grassy food stuffs via hereditary alteration could practice about unforeseen changes also such changes could advance innovative as well as extraordinary amount of poisons inside food stuffs [26].

- **Malignancy:**

Several investigators specified a certain GMOs could straight or else circuitously has cancer-causing belongings. Specially, weed killer impervious substance such as brominal also glufosinate-ammonium rummage-sale aimed at filament, soya, cereal crop as well as rape were recognized towards unswervingly reason of malignant cells [28]. Hereditarily improved bovine somatotrophin was vaccinated to livestock within command headed for increases exploit making. Bovine somatotrophin reasons for increasing the somatomedin into the exploit. Somatomedin effects usual as well as malignant cell towards raise. Rise about the somatomedin proportion into the body fluid leading the way towards tumor, chest, ovarian also wombly, prone, colon, alveolus as well as mixed glands (pancreatic) malignancy [29].

- **Pros of GMO food**

- **Defoliant acceptance:**

Produce vegetation hereditarily bring about towards impervious via single actual influential defoliant might aid in avoiding ecological harm through decreasing quantity about defoliants required. For instance, Monsanto partakes produced the rinsing about glycine max hereditarily improved towards rarely pretentious via those defoliant creation Assembly [30]. Agriculturalist produces those glycine max that at that times solitary wants single request about pesticide in its place about many requests, decreasing manufacture charge then controlling hazards as concern to agrarian excess overflow [31].

- **Syndrome confrontation:**

Several infections, mycelium also germs which are the source of vegetal ailments. Vegetal naturalists remain employed towards generate vegetation by hereditarily contrived confrontation towards those ailments [32, 33].

- **Cold endurance:**

Ethylene glycol genetic material as of icy aquatic angle obsolete launch within vegetation for instance snuff weed also tuber. By such ethylene glycol genetic material, those vegetation were competent towards endure icy fevers which usually will destroy original sprouts [34].

- **Nourishment:**

Undernourishment remains mutual with developing countries needy persons depend on solitary produce for instance grains aimed at main concerns about those persons nourishment. Though, grains rarely cover suitable quantities about essential nourishments for inhibit undernourishment. Grains might remain hereditarily contrived towards comprise extra supplements as well as geologic, nutritious insufficiencies might remain eased. For instance, loss of sight owing towards

vitamin A absence was communal problematic over developing countries. Scientists on ETH Association aimed at Vegetal Knowledges devise produced straining on malusog rice covering remarkably great contented with carotenoid [35]. Scientists proceeding towards improve malusog rice which devises improved iron at ease [36, 37].

- **Drugs:**

Medications as well as inoculations frequently remain expensive towards making also occasionally need different storing settings. Scientists were employed towards progress eatable inoculations with tomato and tuber [36, 37]. Those inoculations would remain calm on vessel, stock also manage old-style insert inoculations [38].

- **Green remediation:**

Plant life for instance aspen plants remained hereditarily contrived towards sun-polluted active heavy metal contamination after dirty territory [38].

- **Cons of GMO foods**

- **Fitness dangers:**

Main fitness dangers possibly related through genetic engineered nourishments were poisonousness, mycotoxins also hereditary risks [44]. Star link corn delivers case on nourishment risk produced straight via appearance on injected genetic material [39, 40, 41, 42, 43]. Improved vegetable were contrived by hereditary during creations since *Bacillus thuringiensis* during instruction on give vegetable by confrontation towards firm pests. Injected genetic material encrypts protein, named Cry9c, by insecticide assets, however by accidental, robust mycotoxin [44].

- **Ecological risks associated with gm food:**

- **Disturbance about food cycle:**

Risk about acarid control vegetation strength growth amount on slight vermin though decreasing main sort about pest. Situation about irritant populace valor change after folk delay via improved vegetation towards further, fearless types. Such move, during try, force set free universal trouble on whole food web, by novel hunter on novel pest type, also above prosper about series [44].

- **Assortment about confrontation:**

Most about genetically engineered diets were heading for giving new vegetable double wanted assets cuss confrontation or else defoliant confrontation. Use about such double tools importantly ease instant effort prices experienced via agriculturalists, clash beside tidies develops greatly fewer work rigorous, also clash over pests needs far fewer costly also deadly insecticides [44].

- **Cost-effective Apprehensions:**

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Italic

Taking GM nourishment at shop was long also pricy procedure. Customer supporters were concerned about clear such novel vegetal changes would rise value about kernels increase which in or agriculturalists also developing countries would never capable of affording kernels for genetically modified harvests. For fighting likely obvious breach on the way to announce recklessness genetic material hooked on genetic modified vegetation. Such vegetation keen feasible for solitary single rising period then intend harvest germ-free kernels will never sprout. These striving monetarily calamitous on agriculturalists [45].

- **Ecological Risks:**

Genetic material transmission towards beside the point type was alternative apprehension for harvest vegetation contrived aimed at pesticide forbearance also tidies would intercross, causing transmission on pesticide confrontation genetic material since harvests keen on prepares. Such great prepares formerly become pesticide accepting too [46].

- **GMO food safety and consumer awareness:**

During 1963 FAO as well as WHO made food code Charge. Food code charge progresses global nutrition values, rules, also cyphers repetition towards defending fitness of customers also confirm reasonable applies into nutrition skill [47]. Category of GMOs was vital as serving customers towards making knowledgeable choices [48]. Initial category rule of GMO nutriment were enclosed via EU on 1997 [49]. Significance about nourishment as well as diet into humanoid fitness devises haggards sufficiently on care during latest centuries [50].

Conclusion:

In decisions of GMO extensively rummage-sale also spent globally, maximum interesting subject was possible fitness dangers affected via GMO that were expended such as diet. Though hereditarily improved nutriment endure towards arise, arguments almost results regarding one another about atmosphere also well-being develops rising difficulties. Usually, specialists about such issues provision educations towards enduring on the other hand customers respond in contradiction of one another at the moment those people does not having sufficient information. During these regards, GM foodstuffs must remain free towards marketplace afterward sufficient technical educations were accompanied as well as must remained patterned into lawful agenda also customers would remained knowledgeable regarding each issue. Through these educations directing towards disclose such possible dangers about hereditarily improved nourishment a imedat humanoid well-being, the thing was detected about customers receive that actuality regarding bioremediation requests on the other hand all were rarely acquainted sufficient through those produces. GMOs knowledge consume hazard about producing risky also impulsive hostile things which were never inverted. Users must learned for entirely those details. Journals, thus, has important part while basis on material also everybody would supply towards increasing consciousness into people.

Comment [LSM16]: Very vague

References:

1. Genetically modified foods: A critical review of the promise and problems Chen Zhang a,*, Robert Wolhueter b, Han Zhang c a
Department of Gene and Signaling Expression, La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology, La Jolla, CA 92037, United States b Department of Chemistry, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303, United States c Department of Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322, United States Received 11 March 2016; accepted 29 April 2016
2. Consumer Perception of Genetically Modified Organisms and Sources of Information 1–3
Shahla Wunderlich* and Kelsey A Gatto Department of Health and Nutrition Sciences, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ
3. World Health Organization, 2016, <http://www.who.int/foodsafety/areaswork/foodtechnology/faq-genetically-modified-food/en/>.
4. BiotechChronicles [Internet]. Access Excellence at The National Health Museum Resource Center; c1994–2009 [updated 1999; cited 2015 Feb 3]. Available from: <http://www.accessexcellence.org/RC/AB/BC/1977-Present.php>.
5. Bruening G, Lyons JM. The case of the flavr-savr tomato. California Agriculture [Internet]. 2000 July–Aug [cited 2015 Feb 5]; 54(4):6–7. Available from: <http://californiaagriculture.ucanr.org/landingpage.cfm?article=ca.v054n04p6>.
6. Benbrook CM. Impacts of genetically engineered crops on pesticide use in the U.S.—the first sixteen years. Environ Sci Eur [Internet]. 2012 Sept 28 [cited 2015 Feb 4]; 24(24). Available from: <http://www.enveurope.com/content/pdf/2190-4715-24-24.pdf>.
7. Burke, D. C. (2012). There's a long, long trail a-winding: the complexities of GM foods regulation, a cautionary tale from the UK. GM Crops and Food, 3, 30–39.
8. McHughen, A. (2013). GM crops and foods: what do consumers want to know? GM Crops and Food, 4, 172–182.
9. O.T. Avery, C.M. Macleod, M. McCarty, Studies on the chemical nature of the substance inducing transformation of pneumococcal types: induction of transformation by deoxyribonucleic acid fraction isolated from pneumococcus type III, J. Exp. Med. 79 (2) (1944) 137–158.
10. M.W. Nirenberg, J.H. Matthaei, O.W. Jones, R.G. Martin, S.H. Barondes, Approximation of genetic code via cell-free protein synthesis directed by template RNA, Fed. Proc. 22 (1963) 5561.
11. S.N. Cohen, A.C. Chang, H.W. Boyer, R.B. Helling, Construction of biologically functional bacterial plasmids in vitro, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 70 (11) (1973) 3240–3244.
12. M.W. Bevan, M.D. Chilton, Multiple transcripts of T-DNA detected in nopaline crown gall tumors, J. Mol. Appl. Genet. 1 (6) (1982) 539–546.
13. L. Herrera-Estrella, M.D. Block, E. Messens, J.P. Hernalsteens, M.V. Montagu, J. Schell, Chimeric genes as dominant selectable markers in plant cells, EMBO J. 2(6) (1983) 987–995.

Comment [LSM17]: References that are not acceptable or in an unusual format

14. A.S. Bawa, K.R. Anilakumar, Genetically modified foods: safety risks and public concerns-areview, *J. Food Sci. Technol.* 50 (6)(2013) 1035–1046.
15. . Fernandez-Cornejo J. Agriculture Information Bulletin 786: The seed industry in U.S.agriculture: an exploration of data and information on crop seed markets, regulation, industrystructure, and research development. Economic Research Service, United States Department ofAgriculture;2004 Feb.
16. Fernandez-Cornejo J, Wechsler S, Livingston M, Mitchell L. Economic Research ReportNumber162:GeneticallyengineeredcropsintheUnitedStates.EconomicResearchService, United States Department of Agriculture. 2014 Feb. [cited 2015 May 15]. Available from:<http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1282246/err162.pdf>.
17. InformationBiosystemsforBiotechnology[Internet].Virginia:InformationSystemsforBiot echnology; c2014 [updated 2015 Feb 4; cited 2015 Feb 4]. Available from:<http://www.isb.vt.edu/>.
18. S.G.Uzogara,“TheImpactof geneticmodificationofhumanfoodsintthe21stCentury:AReview,” *Biotechnol Adv.*, vol.18, 2000, pp. 179-206.
19. F. Cellini, A. Chesson, L. Colquhoun, A. Constable, H.V. Davies,K.H. Engel, A.M.R.Gatehouse, S. Karenlampi, E.J. Kok,J.J. Leguay, S. Lehesranta, H.P.J.M. Noteborn,J.Pedersen,M.Smith,“Unintendedeffectsandtheir detectioningeneticallymodifiedcrops,” *FoodandChemical Toxicology*,2004, 42, 1089-1125.
20. S.Kefi,“GeneticallyModifiedOrganismsand theUseinFoods,”*TMMOBFood EngineersRoomBooks Series*,2, 2003, Ankara, Turkey.
21. S.Yanaz,“ThesubjectofgeneticallymodifiedorganismsandtheCartagena BiosafetyProtocol,”*Foreign TradeMagazine*, vol. 28, 2003, pp. 116-126.
22. A.Gucukoglu,O.Kuplulu,GeneticallyModifiedFoods,”*JournalofVeterinaryMedicalAsso ciation*,2006, 77 (2): 30-38.
23. I.K. Vasil,“Biotechnologyandfoodsecurityfor21stcentury:Areal- worldPerspective,”*NatBiotechnol*,vol. 16, 1998,pp.399-400.
24. H. Yilmaz, Mad cow disease, animal products and humanhealth,<Http://www.cinetarim.com.tr/dergi/arsiv32/delidana.htm>, 2000/ Access to Date:12.12.2003.
25. M. Baran, “Genetically modified organisms and biosecurity systems,”*Turkish Agriculture*,2003,March-April, pp.12-15.
26. S.Ozdogan, Z.I.Ekmen,“Whatisgenetic engineering?”<Http://www.yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr/aacorner/GEN/02/genetik.htm/2002>,AccessstoD ate:20.12.2002.

27. N. Batalion, "50 Harmful Effects of Genetically Modified Foods," Americans for Safe Food, 2000, Oneonta, NY.
28. I. Haspolat, "Genetically modified organisms and biosecurity," Veterinary journal of Ankara Univ Vet Fak Derg, 2012, 59, 75-80.
29. Anonymous "The effect on cancer risks of genetically modified milk and milk products," 2011b, [Http://www.forum.gidagundemi.com/AccessDate:14.02.2011](http://www.forum.gidagundemi.com/AccessDate:14.02.2011).
30. Salbego J, Pretto A, Gioda C, *et al.* Herbicide formulation with glyphosate affects growth, acetylcholinesterase activity, and metabolic and hematological parameters in piava (*Leporinus obtusidens*). Arch Environ Contamin Toxicol 2010; 58(3): 740-5.
31. Ohkawa H, Tsujii H, Ohkawa Y. The use of cytochrome P450 genes to introduce herbicide.
32. Dahleen LS, Okubara PA, Blechl AE. Transgenic approaches to combat fusarium head blight in wheat and barley. Crop Sci 2001; 41(3): 628-37.
33. Scorza R, Callahan A, Levy L, Damsteegt V, Webb K, Ravelonandro M. Post-transcriptional gene silencing in plum pox virus resistant transgenic European plum containing the plum pox potyvirus coat protein gene. Transgenic Res 2001; 10(3): 201-09.
34. Kenward KD, Brandle J, Mc Pherson J, Davies PL. Type II fish antifreeze protein accumulation in transgenic tobacco does not confer frost resistance. Transgenic Res 1999; 8(2): 105-17.
35. Paine JA, Shipton CA, Chaggar S, *et al.* Improving the nutritional value of Golden Rice through increased pro-vitamin A content. Nat Biotechnol 2005; 23: 482-7.
36. Daniell H, Streatfield SJ, Wycoff K. Medical molecular farming: production of antibodies, biopharmaceuticals and edible vaccines in plants. Trends Plant Sci 2001; 6(5): 219-26.
37. Perr HA. Oral immunization with hepatitis B surface antigen expressed in transgenic plants. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2001; 98(20): 11539-544.
38. Ahmed M, Focht DD. Phytodetoxification of hazardous organomercurials by genetically engineered plants. Nat Biotechnol 2000; 18(2): 213-17.
39. B. E. Tabashnik, Evolution of resistance to *Bacillus thuringiensis*, Annu. Rev. Entomol. 39(1994) 47-79.
40. D. D. Baulcombe, J. Jones, J. Pickett, J. P. Puigdomenech, GM Science Update: A Report to the Council for Science and Technology, 2014, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/292174/cst-14-634a-gm-science-update.pdf.
41. J. Werth, L. Boucher, D. Thornby, S. Walker, G. Charles, Changes in weed species since the introduction of glyphosate-resistant cotton, Crop Pasture Sci. 64(8)(2013) 791-798.

42. A. Bravo, S.S. Gill, M. Soberon, Mode of action of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry and Cytotoxins and their potential for insect control, *Toxicon* 49(4)(2007) 423–435.
43. V. Sanchis, From microbial sprays to insect resistant transgenic plants: history of the biopesticide *Bacillus thuringiensis*. A review, *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 31(1)(2011) 217–231.
44. A.S. Bawa, K.R. Anilakumar, Genetically modified foods: safety risks and public concerns—a review, *J. Food Sci. Technol.* 50 (6)(2013) 1035–1046.
45. Naranjo S. Impacts of Bt crop on non-target invertebrates and insecticide use patterns. *CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutr Nat Resour* 2009;4: 1-11.
46. Nordlee JA, Taylor SL, Townsend JA, *et al.* Identification of a Brazil-nut allergen in transgenic soybeans. *N Engl J Med* 1996;334(11): 688-92.
47. Codex Alimentarius. Home | CODEX ALIMENTARIUS FAO-WHO. 1963. Available online: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/home/en/> (accessed on 28 January 2022).
48. Wunderlich, S.; Gatto, K. Consumer Perception of Genetically Modified Organisms and Sources of Information. *Adv. Nutr.* 2015, 6, 842–851. [CrossRef].
49. The European Parliament. Regulation EC No 258/1997 of the European Parliament and of the council of 27 January 1997 concerning novel foods and novel food ingredients. *Off. J. Eur. Communities* 1997, L043, 1–7.
50. E, S., I.; Gavahian, M.; Marti-Quijal, F.; Lorenzo, J.; Mousavi Khaneghah, A.; Tsatsanis, C.; Kampranis, S.; Barba, F.J. The application of the CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing machinery in food and agricultural science: Current status, future perspectives, and associated challenges. *Biotechnol. Adv.* 2019, 37, 410–421. [CrossRef][PubMed].