Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) collision on human body: pros and cons

Abstract:

Genomic amendment is genetic procedure which possessions adjustments in genomic technology of entirely types of existing creatures. GMO is well-defined as Organisms in which genomic substantial (DNA) will be transformed in a technique which is not happen obviously via breeding or else normal reunification. 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 in nourishment creation schemes, customers could remain further apprehensive around then concerned of buying freshly technologically advanced foodstuffs. Hereditarily planned or hereditarily improved diets, or else individuals that comprise about hereditarily improved creatures, were presented in US marketplace as well as acted proceeding superstore tables popularin 1994 by Flavr Savr tomato .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 . On the other hand, the aforementioned manufactureterminated in 1997. Later two years, the overview of Flavr Savr, during 1996, weed killer resistingsoybeans have being announced within foodstuff scheme via let agriculturalists towards procedure which is generally appropriate for weed killer Roundup surrounded by meadow directed towards destroy a widespread variety of tidies deprived of damaging their unaffected Roundup Ready Harvests. During that time, GM and GMOs foodstuffs during specific increase incessant community discussion by means of favors their security, hazards, regulation, tagging and limit.

Keywords: Biotechnology, Scientific awareness, Health, Identifying problems

Introduction:

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 [2]. Escalating apprehension from 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 belief more to present the reality. Customer knowledge of contemporary GMO identifying is less. A contrast must also be formed among GMO intimacy andscientific 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 outcome be liable to have

UNDER PEER REVIEW

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

➢ History:

Beginning of genetic material variation knowledge could be found proceed in 1944, as soon as experts revealed that genomic materials could be transmitted among various types [3]. Some hall mark papers cover ways to current knowledge of molecular biology. Watson and Crick exposed dual spiral construction of gene, and vital creed gene recorded to envoy RNA, decoded to protein have being confirmed. Nobel Laureate Marshall Nirenberg [4] and the rest, possess decoded genomic cypher in 1963. In 1973, Cohen et al [5] developing genetic material reunification knowledge, presentationa certain hereditarily bring about genetic material particles could be transported between dissimilar classes. Initial hereditarily improved plant life aseptic impervious tobacco and petunias would produce through three self-governing investigation collections in 1983 [6-7].Researchers in China initial commercial hereditarily improved tobacco now initial1990s. US marketplace motto the initial hereditarily improved classes of tomato by belongings of late maturing accepted via FDA. Meanwhile atthat time, some genetically modified plants has conventional FDA agreements, as well as Canola through improved lubricant conformation, cotton and soybeans imperviousstowards defoliant, and others. Genetically modified food's which are available in marketplace contain vegetables, eggplants, strawberries, carrots, and several remain in pipeline [8].These harvests signify start the period of biotechnology acceptance in which bioengineered harvests were existence established frequently to show beneficial characters. Genetically modified organisms could be improved in many ways, categorized by groups [9].

➢ 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 amount of behaviors, categorized via group [11].

Fig 1. Biological engineering

UNDER PEER REVIEW



UNDER PEER REVIEW

➢ GMO'S food collision on human body:

The statement which was circulated during 2005, WHO identifies GMOs possess possible dangers aimed at individuals 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 [22]. Although wholly its profits, genetic modified foodstuffs consume approximately dangers. Such foods devise approximately genetic factor which never occur originate in one's produce within wildlife, which carry approximately important indecision through them. Distant genetic factor could generate random modifications through together cumulative nutritious worth about approximately foodstuffs as well as reducing worth of about additional foodstuffs [23].

• 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 within 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 [24]. Uncertainty antibacterial impervious genetic material were transferred towards antibody microbes, that creates the situation problematic facing switch slightly microbial contagions [25-26]. Adjacent transmission on antibacterial confrontation towards microbes within creature or else human-being arrangements could be a reason to numerous well-being dangers [27].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 mealtime reduced on distillate livestock calorific food for instance an inexpensive proteid source [28].

• 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 microbes 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 [29]. On the report of Ozdogan and Ekmen Glycine max assumed para nut genetic material towards improve nutritious worth affected unadorned sensitive response also forbidden within 1994 [30]. Foodstuffs that has 2S genetic material conveyed towards glycine max since para nut remained educed after marketplace for instance they produced aversion [31].

• Poisonousness:

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Grassy foodstuffs via hereditary alteration could practice about unforeseen changes also such changes could advance innovative as well as extraordinary amount of poisons inside foodstuffs [30].

- **Malignancy:**

Several investigators specified a certain GMOs could straight or else circuitously has cancer-causing belongings. Specially, weed killer impervious substances such as brominal also glufonsinate-ammonium rummage-sale aimed at filament, soya, cereal crop as well as rape were recognized towards unswervingly reason of malignant cells [32].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 cells 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 [33].

- **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 [34]. Agriculturalist produces those glycine max that at that time solitary want single request about pesticide in its place about many requests, decreasing manufacture charge then controlling hazards as concern to agrarian excess overflow [35].

- **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 [36, 37].

- **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 [38].

- **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

UNDER PEER REVIEW

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 [39]. Scientists proceeding towards improve malusog rice which devises improved iron at ease [40, 41].

- **Drugs:**

Medications as well as inoculations frequently remain expensive towards making also occasionally need different storing settings. Scientists were employed towards progress eatable inoculations within tomatoes also tuber [40, 41]. Those inoculations would remain calmer on vessel, stock also manage old-style insert inoculations [42].

- **Green remediation:**

Plant life for instance aspen plants remained hereditarily contrived towards unpolluted active hefty metallic contamination after dirty territory [42].

- **Cons of GMO foods**
- **Fitness dangers:**

Main fitness dangers possibly related through genetic engineered nourishments were poisonousness, mycotoxins also hereditary risks [43]. Star link corn delivers case on nourishment risk produced straight via appearance on injected genetic *material [44, 45, 46, 47,48]*. *Improved* vegetal were contrived by hereditary during creation since Bacillus thuringiensis during instruction on give vegetable by confrontation towards firm pests. Injected genetic material encrypts proteid, named Cry9c, by insecticide assets, however by accidental, robust mycotoxin [43].

- **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 hunters on novel pest type, also above prosper about series [43].

  - **Assortment about confrontation:**

Most about genetically engineered diets were heading for giving new vegetal double wanted assets cuss confrontation or else defoliant confrontation. Use about such double tools importantly eases 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 [43].

- **Cost-effective Apprehensions:**

UNDER PEER REVIEW

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 minor 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 [49].

- **Environmental hazards:**

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 [50].

- **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 [51]. Category of GMOs was vital as serving customers towards making knowledgeable choices [52]. Initial category rule of GMOs nutriments were enclosed via EU on 1997 [53]. Significance about nourishment as well as diet into humanoid fitness devises haggard sufficiently on care during latest centuries [54].

Conclusion:

Indecisions of GMOs 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 nutriments 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 nourishments aimed at 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 knowledges 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.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

References:

1.Genetically modified foods: A critical review of their promise and problems Chen Zhang a,∗, Robert Wohlhueter b, HanZhang c a Department of Gene and Signaling Expression, La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology, LaJolla,CA92037, United States b Department of Chemistry, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA30303, United States . c Department of Microbiology andImmunology, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA30322, United States Received 11 March 2016; accepted 29 April 2016 Available online 3 June 2016. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com Science Direct Food Science and Human Wellness 5 (2016) 116–123

2. Consumer Perception of Genetically Modified Organisms and Sources of Information1–3 Shahla Wunderlich* and Kelsey A Gatto Department of Health and Nutrition Sciences, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ. Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/advances/article/6/6/842/4555145 by guest on 12 May 2023

3. O.T. Avery, C.M. Macleod, M. McCarty, Studies on the chemical nature of the substance inducing transformation of pneumococcal types: induc- tion of transformation by a deoxyribonucleic acid fraction isolated from pneumococcus type III, J. Exp. Med. 79 (2) (1944)137–158.

4. 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) 55 61.

5. S.N. Cohen, A.C. Chang, H.W. Boyer, R.B. Helling, Construction of bio- logically functional bacterial plasmids in vitro, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 70 (11) (1973) 3240–3244**.**

6. 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.

7. L. Herrera-Estrella, M.D. Block, E. Messens, J.P. Hernalsteens, M.V. Mon- tagu, J. Schell, Chimeric genes as dominant selectable markers in plant cells, EMBO J. 2 (6) (1983) 987–995

8. A.S. Bawa, K.R. Anilakumar, Genetically modified foods: safety risks and puSblic concerns-a review, J. Food Sci. Technol. 50 (6) (2013) 1035–1046

9. 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, industry structure, and research development.Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture; 2004 Feb.

10. Hemmer W. Foods derived from genetically modified organisms and detection methods. BATS, Basel, Switzerland. Report: BATS-Report 2/97. ISSN 1420-228X; 1997

11. 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, industry structure, and research development. Economic Research Service, United States Department ofAgriculture; 2004 Feb.

12. Fernandez-Cornejo J, Wechsler S, Livingston M, Mitchell L. Economic Research Report Number 162: Genetically engineered crops in the United States. Economic Research

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Service,United States Department of Agriculture. 2014 Feb. [cited 2015 May 15]. Available from: http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/1282246/err162.pdf.

13. Information Biosystems for Biotechnology [Internet]. Virginia: Information Systems for Biotechnology; c2014 [updated 2015 Feb 4; cited 2015 Feb 4]. Available from: http://www.isb.vt.edu/.

14. Akiyama H, Watanabe T, Wakabayashi K, Nakade S, Yasui S, Sakata K, et al. Quantitative detection system for maize sample containing combined-trait genetically modified maize. Anal Chem 2005;77:7421–8.

15. Holst-Jensen A, De Loose M, Van den Eede G. Coherence between legal requirements and approaches for detection of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and their derived products. J Agric Food Chem 2006;54:2799–809.

16. Taverniers I, Papazova N, Bertheau Y, De Loose M, Holst-Jensen A. Gene stacking in transgenic plants: towards compliance between definitions, terminology, and detection within the EU regulatory framework. Environ Biosafety Res 2008;7: 197–218.

17. AVEBE. Part II: Summary application for amylopectin potato event AV43-6-G7 according to regulation (EC) no. 1829/2003. http://www.gmo-compass.org/pdf/ regulation/potato/AV43-6-G7_application_food_feed_cultivation.pdf 2009. Accessed:Aug. 19, 2011.

18. Lusser M, Parisi C, Plan D, Rodriguez-Cerezo E. New plant breeding techniques.State-of-the-art and prospects for commercial development. European Commission.Report: EUR 24760 EN; 2011.

19. BCH. Living Modified (LMO) Organism Registry—Biosafety Clearing-House. http://bch.cbd.int/database/lmo-registry/2011.

20. CERA. GM crop database. CERA—Center for Environmental Risk Assessment. http://www.cera-gmc.org/?action=gm_crop_database& 2011.

21. GMO Compass. GMO Compass. http://www.gmo-compass.org 2011.

22. S.G. Uzogara, "The Impact of genetic modification of human foods in the 21st Century: A Review," Biotechnol Adv., vol.18, 2000, pp. 179-206

23. 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, "Unintended effects and their detection in genetically modified crops," Food and Chemical Toxicology, 2004, 42, 1089-1125

24. S. Kefi, "Genetically Modified Organisms and the Use in Foods," TMMOB Food Engineers Room Books Series, 2, 2003, Ankara, Turkey.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

25. S. Yanaz, "The subject of genetically modified organisms and the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol," Foreign Trade Magazine, vol. 28, 2003, pp. 116-126.

26. A. Gucukoglu, O. Kuplulu, Genetically Modified Foods,"Journal of Veterinary Medical Association, 2006, 77 (2): 30-38.

27. I.K. Vasil, "Biotechnology and food security for 21st century:A real-world Perspective," Nat Biotechnol, vol. 16, 1998,pp.399-400.

28. H. Yilmaz, Mad cow disease, animal products and human health,Http://www.cinetarim.com.tr/dergi/arsiv32/delidana.htm, 2000/ Access to Date:12.12.2003.

29. M. Baran, "Genetically modified organisms and biosecurity systems,"Turkish Agriculture, 2003, March-April, pp.12-15.

30. S.Ozdogan, Z.I. Ekmen, "What is genetic engineering?"Http://www.yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr/aacorner/GEN/02/genetik.htm/2002, Access toDate: 20.12.2002

31. N. Batalion, "50 Harmful Effects of Genetically Modified Foods," Americans for Safe Food, 2000, Oneonta, NY.

32. I. Haspolat, "Genetically modified organisms and biosecurity,"Veterinary journal of Ankara Univ Vet FakDerg, 2012, 59, 75-80.

33. Anonymous "The effect on cancer risks of genetically modified milk and milk products," 2011b, Http://www.forum.gidagundemi.com/ Access to Date:14.02.2011.

34. 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.

35. Ohkawa H, Tsujii H, Ohkawa Y. The use of cytochrome P450 genes to introduce herbicide.

36. Dahleen LS, Okubara PA, Blechl AE. Transgenic approaches to combat fusarium head blight in wheat and barley. Crop Sci 2001; 41(3): 628-37.

37. 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

38. 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.

39. 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.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

.

40. 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.

41. Perr HA. Oral immunization with hepatitis B surface antigen expressed in transgenic plants. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2001;98(20): 11539544.

42. Ahmed M, Focht DD. Phytodetoxification of hazardous organomercurials by genetically engineered plants. Nat Biotechnol 2000;18(2): 213-17.

43. B.E.Tabashnik,Evolutionofresistanceto *Bacillus thuringiensis*, Annu. Rev.Entomol.39(1994)47–79.

44. D.D. Baulcombe, J. Jones, J. Pickett, J.P. Puigdomenech, GM Science Update: A Report tothe Council for Science and Technology, 2014, https://wwwgovuk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/ file/292174/cst-14-634a-gm-science-updatepdf.

45. 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**.**

46. A.Bravo,S.S.Gill,M.Soberon,Modeofactionof Bacillus thuringiensis Cry andCyttoxinsandtheirpotentialforinsectcontrol,Toxicon49(4) (2007) 423–435.

47. V.Sanchis,Frommicrobialspraystoinsect resistanttransgenicplants: history ofthebiopesticide Bacillus thuringiensis.Areview,Agron.Sustain. Dev.31(1)(2011)217–231.

48. 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.

49. Naranjo S. Impacts of Bt crops on non-target invertebrates and insecticide use patterns. CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutr Nat Resour 2009; 4: 1-11.

50. 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.

51. Codex Alimentarius. Home | CODEXALIMENTARIUS FAO-WHO. 1963. Available online: http://www.fao.org/fao-who-code xalimentarius/home/en/ (accessed on 28 January 2022).

52. Wunderlich, S.; Gatto, K. Consumer Perception of Genetically Modified Organis.ms and Sources of Information. Adv. Nutr. 2015, 6, 842–851. [CrossRef].

53. 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.

54. 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].

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW