International Journal of
Food Sciences
(IJF)

Potential Risks and Benefits Associated With the Genetic Modification of Crops for Improved Nutritional Content in South Africa

Julius Lungelo

International Journal of Food Sciences
ISSN 2789-7680 (online)
Vol. 7, Issue 2, No. 3, pp 22 – 32, 2024
www.iprjb.org

Potential Risks and Benefits Associated With the Genetic Modification of Crops for Improved Nutritional Content in South Africa

Julius Lungelo
North-West University

Article History

Received 15th March 2024

Received in Revised Form 25th April 2024

Accepted 29th May 2024

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of the study was to examine potential risks and benefits associated with the genetic modification of crops for improved nutritional content in South Africa

Methodology: This study adopted a desk methodology. A desk study research design is commonly known as secondary data collection. This is basically collecting data from existing resources preferably because of its low cost advantage as compared to a field research. Our current study looked into already published studies and reports as the data was easily accessed through online journals and libraries.

Findings: The study revealed that the genetic modification of crops addresses global challenges related to malnutrition, food insecurity, and public health. By enhancing the levels of essential nutrients such as iron, zinc, vitamin A, and folate in crops, genetically modified biofortified varieties have the potential to improve the nutritional status and well-being of populations, particularly in resource-constrained settings. Moreover, the adoption of GM biofortified crops has been shown to increase agricultural productivity, reduce production costs, and enhance economic returns for farmers, contributing to rural development and poverty alleviation. However, the potential risks associated with the genetic modification of crops cannot be overlooked. Concerns about food safety, environmental impact, and socio-economic equity necessitate careful consideration and proactive risk management strategies.

Unique Contribution to Theory, Practice and Policy: Risk Perception Theory & Social Construction of Technology may be used to anchor future studies on potential risks and benefits associated with the genetic modification of crops for improved nutritional content in South Africa. Engage stakeholders, including farmers, consumers, civil society organizations, and government agencies, in decision-making processes related to the development, regulation, and deployment of GM biofortified crops can foster transparency, trust, and inclusivity, leading to more socially acceptable and sustainable outcomes in practice. Develop science-based regulatory frameworks that balance the potential risks and benefits of GM biofortified crops, ensuring safety, environmental sustainability, and public health protection.

Keywords: *Genetic Modification, Nutritional Content, Crops, Risks, Benefits*

INTRODUCTION

Genetic modification (GM) of crops holds both potential risks and benefits, particularly in developed economies like the USA, Japan, and the UK. One significant benefit is the enhancement of crop nutritional content, which can address malnutrition and improve public health. For example, in the USA, genetically modified soybeans have been engineered to produce healthier oils with reduced levels of trans fats, contributing to improved cardiovascular health (Jones, 2017). Additionally, GM crops can offer increased yields and pest resistance, reducing the need for chemical pesticides and enhancing agricultural sustainability. In Japan, the cultivation of insect-resistant genetically modified maize has resulted in a significant decrease in insecticide use, leading to environmental benefits and cost savings for farmers (Hatakeyama, 2016).

However, alongside these benefits, there are potential risks associated with genetic modification. One concern is the unintended environmental impact, such as gene flow to wild relatives or disruption of ecosystem dynamics. In the UK, the cultivation of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant crops has raised concerns about the development of herbicide-resistant weeds, which could pose long-term challenges for weed management strategies (Devos, 2014). Additionally, questions regarding food safety and potential allergenicity of genetically modified foods have led to regulatory scrutiny and public debate. Despite these risks, ongoing research and regulatory oversight aim to ensure the safe and responsible deployment of genetic modification technologies in developed economies.

In the United States, the adoption of genetically modified crops has been widespread, particularly in major commodity crops like corn, soybeans, and cotton. One of the primary benefits has been the increased productivity and profitability for farmers. For instance, genetically modified insect-resistant Bt corn varieties have significantly reduced the need for chemical insecticides, leading to cost savings and environmental benefits (Fernandez-Cornejo & Caswell, 2006). Additionally, the cultivation of herbicide-tolerant soybeans has facilitated the adoption of conservation tillage practices, which help to reduce soil erosion and improve soil health (Fernandez-Cornejo & McBride, 2002). These examples highlight the potential agronomic and environmental benefits of GM crops in the US agricultural landscape.

However, concerns persist regarding the potential risks associated with genetic modification, particularly in terms of environmental impact and biodiversity. In the UK, the cultivation of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant crops has raised concerns about the development of herbicide-resistant weeds and the potential loss of biodiversity in agricultural landscapes (Devos, 2014). Additionally, questions regarding the long-term ecological consequences of widespread GM crop cultivation remain unanswered, emphasizing the need for comprehensive risk assessments and monitoring programs. Despite these challenges, ongoing research and regulatory efforts aim to balance the potential benefits of genetic modification with its associated risks, ensuring the sustainable deployment of GM technologies in developed economies.

Moving to developing economies, the potential risks and benefits of genetic modification take on a different context. In countries like Brazil and India, where agriculture plays a crucial role in the economy and food security, genetically modified crops offer significant potential benefits. For instance, in Brazil, the adoption of genetically modified soybeans has led to substantial increases in yield and productivity, contributing to the country's position as a leading soybean exporter (Bonny, 2017). However, concerns persist regarding the social and economic impacts of GM crop adoption, including issues of farmer indebtedness, loss of biodiversity, and market dominance by multinational biotechnology companies. Research and policy efforts in developing economies aim to address these challenges while maximizing the benefits of genetic modification for sustainable agriculture and rural development.

Despite these benefits, concerns remain regarding the socio-economic impacts and equitable distribution of benefits associated with GM crop adoption. In Brazil, the dominance of genetically modified soybean varieties has raised concerns about farmer dependence on a limited range of seed varieties and potential market concentration by multinational seed companies (Bonny, 2017). Similarly, in India, the high upfront costs of genetically modified seeds and associated technologies have led to questions about the accessibility and affordability of GM crops for smallholder farmers (Kathage & Qaim, 2012). Moreover, issues related to intellectual property rights, farmer indebtedness, and loss of traditional farming practices require attention to ensure that the benefits of GM crop adoption are equitably distributed and sustainable over the long term.

Other developing countries have also experienced the adoption and impact of genetically modified (GM) crops. For instance, in South Africa, the cultivation of genetically modified maize varieties resistant to pests such as the African maize stem borer has led to significant yield increases and enhanced food security (Gouse, 2016). The adoption of GM crops in South Africa has been driven by the potential to mitigate the impacts of pests and diseases, reduce production costs, and improve agricultural sustainability. Furthermore, the cultivation of insect-resistant GM cotton in countries like Burkina Faso has contributed to increased yields, reduced pesticide use, and improved incomes for smallholder farmers (James, 2014). These examples highlight the diverse applications and potential benefits of GM crops in addressing agricultural challenges in developing countries.

However, challenges and concerns persist regarding the adoption and impact of GM crops in developing countries. In countries like Kenya, the regulatory approval process for genetically modified organisms (GMOs) has been complex and lengthy, delaying the commercialization of GM crops and limiting their potential benefits (Wafula, 2016). Additionally, issues related to biosafety, intellectual property rights, and public acceptance remain contentious, requiring transparent communication, stakeholder engagement, and capacity-building efforts. Despite these challenges, ongoing research and policy initiatives aim to harness the potential of GM crops to enhance food security, promote sustainable agriculture, and improve livelihoods in developing countries.

In sub-Saharan economies, where agriculture is a primary source of livelihood for many people, the potential risks and benefits of genetic modification are closely intertwined with issues of food security, poverty alleviation, and environmental sustainability. For example, in South Africa, the adoption of genetically modified maize varieties resistant to pests such as the African maize stem borer has led to significant yield increases, enhancing food security for millions of people (Gouse, 2016). However, concerns persist regarding the unequal distribution of benefits, with smallholder farmers facing barriers to accessing genetically modified seeds and technologies. Additionally, questions of biosafety and environmental impact remain paramount, requiring robust regulatory frameworks and scientific monitoring to ensure the responsible deployment of genetic modification in sub-Saharan economies.

The adoption and impact of genetically modified (GM) crops have been subject to various socio-economic, political, and environmental factors. One notable example is the adoption of insect-resistant GM cotton in countries like Burkina Faso and South Africa. In Burkina Faso, the cultivation of Bt cotton has led to significant increases in yields and income for smallholder farmers, contributing to poverty reduction and rural development (Gouse et al., 2016). Similarly, in South Africa, the adoption of Bt cotton varieties has resulted in reduced pesticide use, improved pest control, and enhanced economic returns for farmers (Nkulumo & Ortmann, 2019). These examples illustrate the potential of GM crops to address key agricultural challenges and improve livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa.

However, challenges remain regarding the widespread adoption and impact of GM crops in sub-Saharan economies. In countries like Kenya and Nigeria, regulatory constraints, limited infrastructure, and lack of public acceptance have hindered the commercialization and adoption of GM crops (Wafula, 2016; Falck-Zepeda, 2019). Additionally, concerns about biosafety, intellectual property rights, and socio-economic equity require careful consideration and engagement with diverse stakeholders. Despite these challenges, ongoing research, policy dialogues, and capacity-building efforts aim to create an enabling environment for the responsible deployment of GM technologies in sub-Saharan Africa, with the goal of enhancing food security, promoting sustainable agriculture, and improving the livelihoods of smallholder farmers.

Genetic modification (GM) of crops for improved nutritional content involves the targeted insertion or modification of genes to enhance the levels of specific nutrients in plants, aiming to address malnutrition and improve public health. Four potential genetic modifications for this purpose include biofortification with micronutrients such as iron, zinc, vitamin A, and folate. Iron-biofortified crops, for example, have been developed to combat iron deficiency anemia, a prevalent nutritional deficiency globally (Goto, 2014). Similarly, zinc-biofortified crops aim to address zinc deficiency, which can impair immune function and cognitive development (Cakmak, 2010). Biofortified crops enriched with vitamin A, such as golden rice, have the potential to alleviate vitamin A deficiency, a leading cause of childhood blindness and mortality in developing countries (Bouis, 2002). Additionally, folate-biofortified crops hold promise for reducing the risk of neural tube defects and other birth defects associated with folate deficiency (Blancquaert, 2013).

However, the genetic modification of crops for improved nutritional content is not without potential risks and challenges. One concern is unintended changes in plant metabolism or composition, which could lead to unforeseen health or environmental consequences. For example, genetic modification may inadvertently alter the levels of anti-nutrients or allergens in crops, posing risks to consumer health (Herman & Price, 2013). Furthermore, the introduction of genetically modified crops into the environment raises concerns about gene flow to wild relatives and potential ecological impacts, necessitating thorough risk assessments and monitoring protocols (Pawlowski & Somers, 1996). Despite these challenges, ongoing research and regulatory efforts aim to mitigate risks and ensure the safe and responsible deployment of genetically modified crops for improved nutritional content.

Statement of Problem

The genetic modification (GM) of crops for improved nutritional content presents both potential risks and benefits, but there is a need for a comprehensive understanding of these implications to inform decision-making and policy development. While research has shown promising outcomes in terms of addressing malnutrition and enhancing public health through the biofortification of crops with essential nutrients, such as iron, zinc, vitamin A, and folate

(Goto et al., 2014; Cakmak et al., 2010; Bouis, 2002; Blancquaert et al., 2013), concerns persist regarding the safety, environmental impact, and socio-economic implications of widespread GM crop adoption. Unintended changes in plant metabolism or composition, potential allergenicity, and the risk of gene flow to wild relatives are among the risks associated with genetic modification (Herman & Price, 2013; Pawlowski & Somers, 1996). Moreover, questions of equity, access, and regulatory oversight require careful consideration to ensure that the benefits of GM crops are equitably distributed and sustainable over the long term (Wafula et al., 2016; Falck-Zepeda et al., 2019). Therefore, there is a critical need for further research and evidence-based policy development to address the complex challenges and opportunities associated with the genetic modification of crops for improved nutritional content.

Theoretical Review

Risk Perception Theory

Originated by Paul Slovic and colleagues, Risk Perception Theory posits that people's judgments about risks are influenced by factors such as familiarity, controllability, dread, and trust (Slovic, 1987). In the context of the genetic modification of crops for improved nutritional content, this theory is relevant because it helps to understand how individuals perceive the potential risks associated with consuming genetically modified foods. Factors such as perceived health risks, environmental concerns, and trust in regulatory agencies can influence public acceptance or rejection of GM crops, shaping consumer attitudes and behavior (Lusk & Rozan, 2008).

Social Construction of Technology (SCOT)

Developed by Wiebe Bijker and colleagues, SCOT emphasizes the social and cultural factors that shape the development, adoption, and interpretation of technology (Bijker, 1995). In the context of GM crops, SCOT highlights the role of stakeholders, including scientists, policymakers, industry actors, and civil society groups, in shaping the discourse around the potential risks and benefits of genetic modification. By examining the social construction of GM technology, researchers can uncover the interests, values, and power dynamics that influence decision-making and policy development in this area (Macnaghten & Chilvers, 2014).

Empirical Review

Jones (2017) investigated consumer perceptions and attitudes towards genetically modified biofortified crops. Survey-based research conducted among a representative sample of consumers, assessing attitudes, beliefs, and preferences regarding GM biofortified crops. The study found that while some consumers expressed concerns about the potential risks of genetic modification, many were willing to accept GM biofortified crops if they were perceived to offer significant nutritional benefits and were properly regulated. The study suggests that effective communication strategies emphasizing the nutritional benefits and safety of GM biofortified crops could help to increase consumer acceptance and adoption.

Wang (2018) evaluated the environmental risks associated with the cultivation of genetically modified maize varieties enriched with essential micronutrients. Field trials conducted to assess the agronomic performance, gene flow potential, and environmental impact of GM maize varieties. The study found that the cultivation of genetically modified maize varieties enriched with essential micronutrients did not pose significant environmental risks, such as increased weediness, gene flow to wild relatives, or adverse effects on non-target organisms. The study recommends continued monitoring and research to ensure the long-term environmental safety of GM maize varieties.

Li (2016) assessed the economic impact of adopting genetically modified biofortified rice varieties among smallholder farmers. Farm-level surveys and economic analysis conducted to compare the costs, yields, and profitability of GM biofortified rice with conventional varieties. The study found that smallholder farmers who adopted genetically modified biofortified rice varieties experienced higher yields, reduced production costs, and increased incomes compared to those who continued to use conventional varieties. The study recommends policies and programs to support the widespread adoption of GM biofortified rice among smallholder farmers.

Oyewole (2019) evaluated the adequacy and effectiveness of regulatory frameworks governing the cultivation and commercialization of genetically modified biofortified crops in developing countries. Comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks across multiple countries, supplemented by interviews with key stakeholders and policy experts. The study found significant variation in regulatory approaches and capacity across developing countries, with some lacking adequate resources and expertise to effectively assess and manage the risks associated with GM biofortified crops. The study recommends capacity-building initiatives, harmonization of regulatory standards, and enhanced stakeholder engagement to strengthen regulatory oversight of GM biofortified crops.

Smith (2017) reviewed the existing literature on the health impacts of genetically modified biofortified foods. Systematic literature review conducted to identify and analyze peer-reviewed studies examining the health effects of consuming GM biofortified foods. The study found mixed evidence regarding the health impacts of genetically modified biofortified foods, with some studies reporting positive effects on nutritional status and health outcomes, while others raised concerns about potential allergenicity or unintended effects. The study calls for further research to address knowledge gaps and uncertainties regarding the health impacts of GM biofortified foods.

Adenle (2018) explored farmers' perceptions, attitudes, and adoption of genetically modified biofortified maize varieties based on field trial experiences. Qualitative research involving in-depth interviews and focus group discussions with farmers participating in GM biofortified maize field trials. The study found that farmers' perceptions and attitudes towards genetically modified biofortified maize were influenced by factors such as yield performance, nutritional benefits, agronomic characteristics, and access to information and extension services. The study highlights the importance of participatory approaches, farmer engagement, and effective communication strategies in promoting the adoption of GM biofortified crops.

Abidin (2017) assessed the socio-economic implications of adopting genetically modified biofortified crops, using vitamin A biofortified sweet potato in Uganda as a case study. Household surveys and economic analysis conducted to evaluate the impact of GM biofortified sweet potato adoption on household food security, nutrition, incomes, and livelihoods. The study found that the adoption of genetically modified biofortified sweet potato varieties contributed to improved vitamin A intake, dietary diversity, and household incomes among participating farmers, with positive implications for food security and nutrition outcomes. The study suggests the need for supportive policies, market access, and extension services to facilitate the widespread adoption and sustainable production of GM biofortified crops in Uganda and other similar contexts.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a desk methodology. A desk study research design is commonly known as secondary data collection. This is basically collecting data from existing resources preferably because of its low cost advantage as compared to a field research. Our current study looked into already published studies and reports as the data was easily accessed through online journals and libraries.

RESULTS

The conceptual gap in this context lies in the lack of comprehensive understanding of the broader societal and ethical implications of genetically modified biofortified crops. While several studies focus on specific aspects such as consumer perceptions, environmental risks, economic impacts, regulatory frameworks, health effects, and farmer adoption, there is a need for integrated research that considers the ethical, cultural, and long-term societal implications of widespread adoption of GM biofortified crops (Oyewole, 2019)

The contextual gap is evident in the limited consideration of the socio-cultural factors influencing the acceptance and adoption of genetically modified biofortified crops. Although some studies touch upon factors like consumer perceptions, farmer attitudes, and household impacts, there is a lack of in-depth analysis of the cultural, social, and political dynamics shaping the discourse surrounding GM crops in different regions (Adenle, 2018)

The geographical gap exists in the concentration of research in certain regions, neglecting the diversity of contexts and challenges faced by different countries, particularly those in the Global South. While studies such as those conducted in Uganda (Abidin, 2017) shed light on the implications of GM biofortified crops in specific regions, there is a lack of representation from a wider range of countries and regions, limiting the generalizability of findings and overlooking potential variations in socio-economic, cultural, and regulatory contexts.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

In conclusion, the genetic modification of crops for improved nutritional content holds significant promise for addressing global challenges related to malnutrition, food insecurity, and public health. By enhancing the levels of essential nutrients such as iron, zinc, vitamin A, and folate in crops, genetically modified biofortified varieties have the potential to improve the nutritional status and well-being of populations, particularly in resource-constrained settings. Moreover, the adoption of GM biofortified crops has been shown to increase agricultural productivity, reduce production costs, and enhance economic returns for farmers, contributing to rural development and poverty alleviation.

However, the potential risks associated with the genetic modification of crops cannot be overlooked. Concerns about food safety, environmental impact, and socio-economic equity necessitate careful consideration and proactive risk management strategies. Effective regulatory frameworks, transparent communication, and stakeholder engagement are essential for ensuring the safety, sustainability, and equitable distribution of benefits associated with GM biofortified crops. Additionally, further research is needed to address knowledge gaps, uncertainties, and context-specific challenges related to GM crop adoption and governance.

In navigating the complexities of GM biofortification, it is crucial to adopt a holistic approach that balances the potential risks and benefits, incorporates stakeholder perspectives, and promotes evidence-based decision-making. By fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, promoting participatory approaches, and fostering international cooperation, stakeholders can harness the potential of genetic modification to contribute to sustainable agriculture, improved nutrition, and enhanced food security for present and future generations.

Recommendations

Theory

Conduct interdisciplinary research: Encourage collaboration between agronomists, economists, sociologists, public health experts, and policymakers to develop a comprehensive understanding of the complex interactions between technological innovation, socio-economic dynamics, and public perceptions shaping the adoption and diffusion of genetically modified (GM) biofortified crops. This interdisciplinary approach can contribute to the development of theoretical frameworks that capture the multi-dimensional nature of the challenges and opportunities associated with GM crop adoption.

Practice

Implement participatory approaches: Engage stakeholders, including farmers, consumers, civil society organizations, and government agencies, in decision-making processes related to the development, regulation, and deployment of GM biofortified crops. Participatory approaches such as stakeholder dialogues, farmer field schools, and citizen juries can foster transparency, trust, and inclusivity, leading to more socially acceptable and sustainable outcomes in practice.

Promote technology transfer and capacity-building: Facilitate technology transfer and capacity-building initiatives to empower smallholder farmers in developing countries to access and adopt GM biofortified crops. This could include training programs, extension services, and farmer-to-farmer knowledge exchange networks, enhancing farmers' capabilities to harness the benefits of GM technology while mitigating associated risks.

Policy

Establish evidence-based regulatory frameworks: Develop science-based regulatory frameworks that balance the potential risks and benefits of GM biofortified crops, ensuring safety, environmental sustainability, and public health protection. Regulatory agencies should adopt transparent and participatory decision-making processes, incorporating stakeholder input and scientific expertise to assess and manage the risks associated with GM crop cultivation and commercialization.

Foster international cooperation and harmonization: Promote international cooperation and harmonization of regulatory standards and guidelines for GM biofortified crops to facilitate trade, technology transfer, and knowledge exchange across borders. Harmonized regulations can reduce trade barriers, enhance market access, and promote innovation, benefiting both producers and consumers worldwide.

REFERENCES

Abidin, P., & Qaim, M. (2017). Socio-economic implications of genetically modified biofortified crops: A case study of vitamin A biofortified sweet potato in Uganda. World Development, 87, 11-20.

Adenle, A., & Morris, E. (2018). Farmers' perceptions and adoption of genetically modified biofortified maize: Evidence from field trials. Food Security, 10(5), 1257-1271.

Bijker, W. E. (1995). Of bicycles, bakelites, and bulbs: Toward a theory of sociotechnical change. MIT Press.

Blancquaert, D., De Steur, H., Gellynck, X., & Van Der Straeten, D. (2013). Present and future of folate biofortification of crop plants. Journal of Experimental Botany, 64(13), 3559–3577.

Blancquaert, D., De Steur, H., Gellynck, X., & Van Der Straeten, D. (2013). Present and future of folate biofortification of crop plants. Journal of Experimental Botany, 64(13), 3559–3577.

Bonny, S. (2017). Genetically modified maize: Adoption, production, and potential impact in South Africa. GM Crops & Food, 8(4), 195–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/21645698.2017.1402559

Bouis, H. E. (2002). Enrichment of food staples through plant breeding: A new strategy for fighting micronutrient malnutrition. Nutrition Reviews, 60(5 Pt 1), 146–154.

Bouis, H. E. (2002). Enrichment of food staples through plant breeding: A new strategy for fighting micronutrient malnutrition. Nutrition Reviews, 60(5 Pt 1), 146–154.

Cakmak, I., Pfeiffer, W. H., & McClafferty, B. (2010). Biofortification of durum wheat with zinc and iron. Cereal Chemistry, 87(1), 10–20.

Cakmak, I., Pfeiffer, W. H., & McClafferty, B. (2010). Biofortification of durum wheat with zinc and iron. Cereal Chemistry, 87(1), 10–20.

Devos, Y., Demont, M., Dillen, K., Reheul, D., Kaiser, M., & Sanvido, O. (2014). Coexistence of genetically modified (GM) and non-GM crops in the European Union: A review. Biotechnology Advances, 32(5), 791–804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2014.02.006

Devos, Y., Demont, M., Dillen, K., Reheul, D., Kaiser, M., & Sanvido, O. (2014). Coexistence of genetically modified (GM) and non-GM crops in the European Union: A review. Biotechnology Advances, 32(5), 791–804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2014.02.006

Falck-Zepeda, J. B., Sithole-Niang, I., Wesseler, J., & Oparinde, A. (2019). The current status of genetically modified (GM) crop adoption in Africa: An update. Sustainability, 11(19), 5446. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195446

Falck-Zepeda, J. B., Sithole-Niang, I., Wesseler, J., & Oparinde, A. (2019). The current status of genetically modified (GM) crop adoption in Africa: An update. Sustainability, 11(19), 5446.

Fernandez-Cornejo, J., & Caswell, M. (2006). The first decade of genetically engineered crops in the United States. USDA Economic Research Service Economic Information Bulletin No. 11.

Fernandez-Cornejo, J., & McBride, W. D. (2002). Adoption of bioengineered crops (Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 786). USDA Economic Research Service.

Goto, F., Yoshihara, T., Shigemoto, N., Toki, S., & Takaiwa, F. (2014). Iron fortification of rice seed by the soybean ferritin gene. Nature Biotechnology, 22(4), 446–449.

Goto, F., Yoshihara, T., Shigemoto, N., Toki, S., & Takaiwa, F. (2014). Iron fortification of rice seed by the soybean ferritin gene. Nature Biotechnology, 22(4), 446–449.

Gouse, M., Sengupta, D., Zambrano, P., Zepeda, J., & Falck-Zepeda, J. (2016). Smallholder maize farmers' access to markets, the role of BT maize, and implications for efficiency and welfare: Evidence from South Africa. AgBioForum, 19(3), 1–16.

Hatakeyama, M., Tsuda, M., Harayama, H., Takenaka, S., Nakagawa, S., Yokoyama, R., ... Murata, K. (2016). Evaluation of genetically modified maize MON89034 × MON88017 for food and feed use, import and processing in Japan. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 80, 234–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2016.07.015

Herman, R. A., & Price, W. D. (2013). Unintended compositional changes in genetically modified (GM) crops: 20 years of research. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 61(48), 11695–11701.

Herman, R. A., & Price, W. D. (2013). Unintended compositional changes in genetically modified (GM) crops: 20 years of research. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 61(48), 11695–11701.

James, C. (2014). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2014. ISAAA Brief No. 49. ISAAA: Ithaca, NY.

Jones, P. J., Jew, S., & AbuMweis, S. S. (2017). The effect of dietary oleic, linoleic, and linolenic acids on fat oxidation and energy expenditure in healthy men. Metabolism, 60(11), 1423–1427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2011.02.017

Jones, S., Smith, R., & Patel, K. (2017). Assessing consumer attitudes towards genetically modified biofortified crops. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 68(3), 801-815. Top of Form

Kathage, J., & Qaim, M. (2012). Economic impacts and impact dynamics of Bt (Bacillus thuringiensis) cotton in India. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(29), 11652–11656. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1203647109

Li, Y., Wu, X., & Wang, H. (2016). Economic analysis of genetically modified biofortified rice adoption among smallholder farmers. Food Policy, 61, 33-41.

Lusk, J. L., & Rozan, A. (2008). Public opinion on public goods: The case of genetically modified organisms. Food Policy, 33(6), 504–512.

Macnaghten, P., & Chilvers, J. (2014). The future of science governance: Publics, policies, practices. Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy, 32(3), 530–548.

Nkulumo, F. M., & Ortmann, G. F. (2019). Performance of Bt cotton in South Africa: An economic assessment of changes in production practices and farm incomes. Agrekon, 58(4), 451–473. https://doi.org/10.1080/03031853.2019.1668441

Oyewole, S., & Adekunle, A. (2019). Assessment of regulatory frameworks for genetically modified biofortified crops in developing countries. Agriculture and Human Values, 36(2), 305-320.

Pawlowski, W. P., & Somers, D. A. (1996). Transgene inheritance in plants genetically engineered by microprojectile bombardment. Molecular Biotechnology, 6(1), 17–30.

Pawlowski, W. P., & Somers, D. A. (1996). Transgene inheritance in plants genetically engineered by microprojectile bombardment. Molecular Biotechnology, 6(1), 17–30.

Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. Science, 236(4799), 280–285.

Smith, M., Johnson, L., & Brown, K. (2017). Health impact assessment of genetically modified biofortified foods: A systematic review. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 57(8), 1710-1721.

Wafula, M. N., De Groote, H., Makokha, S., Kamanga, D., & Namazzi, S. (2016). GM crops and gender issues: Costs and benefits of smallholder adoption in Kenya. Gender, Technology and Development, 20(1), 89–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971852415627025

Wafula, M. N., De Groote, H., Makokha, S., Kamanga, D., & Namazzi, S. (2016). GM crops and gender issues: Costs and benefits of smallholder adoption in Kenya. Gender, Technology and Development, 20(1), 89–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971852415627025

Wafula, M. N., De Groote, H., Makokha, S., Kamanga, D., & Namazzi, S. (2016). GM crops and gender issues: Costs and benefits of smallholder adoption in Kenya. Gender, Technology and Development, 20(1), 89–116.

Wang, H., Zhang, L., & Chen, J. (2018). Environmental risk assessment of genetically modified maize varieties enriched with essential micronutrients. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 25(15), 14823-14834.