



From Gene to Plate: Food Safety and Risk Assessment of Transgenic Crops

*Vipin Purohit¹, Vinod Kumar Singh² and Vikas Tiwari¹

¹Ph.D. Research Scholar (Genetics and Plant Breeding), Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, U.P., India

²Associate Professor (Genetics and Plant Breeding), Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, U.P., India

*Corresponding Author's email: vipinpurohitnduat@gmail.com

The rapid development of agricultural biotechnology has created new opportunities for improving crop productivity, nutritional quality and resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses. Transgenic or genetically modified (GM) crops have consequently become an important component of modern agriculture. At the same time, their use has generated continuing questions about food safety, particularly concerning allergenicity, toxicity, nutritional changes, unintended effects and long-term health implications. This article provides a concise overview of the scientific principles used to assess the safety of transgenic food crops. The assessment includes molecular characterization, comparative compositional analysis, evaluation of newly expressed proteins, allergenicity and toxicity assessment, nutritional evaluation and consideration of dietary exposure. International guidance developed through the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius framework emphasizes a case-by-case, pre-market assessment of foods derived from recombinant-DNA plants. Current scientific evidence indicates that approved GM foods subjected to appropriate safety assessment have not been demonstrated to pose additional health risks compared with their conventional counterparts. However, continued scientific evaluation, transparent regulation, post-market surveillance and effective communication remain important as increasingly complex genetic technologies enter agriculture. The future of food biotechnology will depend not only on technological innovation but also on evidence-based risk assessment and public trust.

Keywords: Transgenic crops; Genetically modified foods; Food safety; Risk assessment; Allergenicity; Toxicity; Nutritional assessment; Biosafety; Genetic engineering; Agricultural biotechnology; Genome editing.

Introduction

In the face of climate change, diminishing natural resources, new pests and illnesses, and a shortage of arable land, agriculture is under growing pressure to produce more food. Crop development has benefited greatly from conventional plant breeding, but its efficacy is occasionally limited by the amount of genetic variety available and the time needed to combine desired traits. Therefore, new methods for creating crops with certain traits, such as insect resistance, disease resistance, herbicide tolerance, enhanced nutritional quality, and tolerance to environmental challenges, have been made possible by developments in molecular biology and biotechnology. Transgenic crops are plants whose genetic makeup has been purposefully altered using contemporary biotechnology to add or change a certain feature. In contrast to traditional crossing, genetic engineering does not require sexual compatibility between the donor and recipient species in order to introduce certain genetic

sequences. Both the traits brought about by the genetic manipulation and any potential unwanted modifications are assessed in the final crop.

Genetically modified soybean, maize, cotton, canola, papaya, and other crops have been grown all over the world since the commercialization of key GM crops in the 1990s. In certain production systems, its adoption has resulted in significant agricultural gains, but it has also sparked discussion about the effects on the environment, socioeconomic difficulties, regulations, and food safety. Therefore, whether a crop is "GM" or "non-GM" is not the only crucial question regarding food safety. Proteins and metabolic traits can vary greatly depending on the genetic alteration. As a result, rather than presuming that all GM foods have the same dangers, international scientific frameworks promote a case-by-case review. In a similar vein, the World Health Organization (WHO) acknowledges the significance of evaluating each genetically modified food based on the features of the particular modification and final product [1].

The development of a transgenic crop generally begins with the identification of a gene or genetic sequence associated with a desirable characteristic. The selected sequence may then be introduced into plant cells using approaches such as *Agrobacterium*-mediated transformation or particle bombardment. Transformed cells are regenerated through tissue culture and subsequently evaluated for genetic stability, expression of the intended trait and agronomic performance.

However, the development process does not end with successful transformation. A candidate crop may undergo molecular characterization, greenhouse evaluation, confined field trials, compositional analysis, food and feed safety assessment and environmental evaluation before regulatory decisions are made. The exact requirements differ between countries and depend on the crop, introduced trait and intended use.

The traits introduced through genetic engineering are diverse. Bt crops produce insecticidal proteins derived from *Bacillus thuringiensis*, while virus-resistant papaya was developed to protect papaya production from papaya ringspot virus. Nutritionally enhanced crops such as Golden Rice represent another approach in which biotechnology is used to modify the nutritional characteristics of a staple food.

These examples demonstrate why GM crops should not be treated as one homogeneous category. The biological consequences of introducing an insect-resistance trait may be very different from those associated with altering a metabolic pathway involved in nutrient biosynthesis.

Food Safety: What Are the Major Concerns?

Food safety assessment asks whether the genetic modification has introduced a new hazard or altered the food in a manner that could adversely affect consumers. The major areas of attention include allergenicity, toxicity, nutritional composition, unintended effects and dietary exposure.

Allergenicity

The possibility that a newly expressed protein could cause an allergic reaction is one of the most carefully examined issues. Assessment considers the source of the introduced gene, the biological function of the resulting protein, similarity to known allergens and characteristics such as digestibility and stability. Modern allergenicity assessment uses a weight-of-evidence approach rather than relying on a single test. Sequence comparison with known allergens, physicochemical characteristics and immunological evidence can all contribute to the assessment. The European Food Safety Authority has emphasized the continuing need to improve approaches for evaluating the allergenicity and safety of newly expressed proteins in biotechnology-derived foods [2].

Toxicity

Toxicological assessment focuses on the biological properties of newly expressed proteins and any significant changes in endogenous plant constituents. Researchers may investigate sequence similarity with known toxins, protein stability, digestibility, biological function and expected dietary exposure. The presence of a novel protein does not by itself demonstrate

toxicity. Risk depends on the characteristics of the protein, its concentration in the food, the amount consumed and the biological response expected at realistic exposure levels.

Nutritional Composition

Genetic modification may intentionally change the nutritional composition of a crop, but scientists also need to determine whether other nutritionally important components have changed unexpectedly. GM crops may therefore be compared with appropriate conventional counterparts for characteristics such as protein, carbohydrate, lipid, amino acid, fatty-acid, vitamin, mineral, fibre and anti-nutritional-factor composition. The purpose of this comparison is to identify meaningful differences that require further investigation. The comparative approach remains an important component of international safety assessment. Recent research has also emphasized the importance of interpreting compositional differences in the context of the natural variation observed among conventional crop varieties [3].

Unintended Effects

No biological system is completely predictable. Genetic modification may produce intended changes as well as changes that were not specifically targeted. However, unintended variation is not unique to genetic engineering; conventional breeding can also produce unexpected genetic and biochemical changes. Modern analytical approaches, including transcriptomics, proteomics and metabolomics, can provide additional information when conventional compositional analysis identifies a potentially relevant difference. The scientific objective is not to demonstrate that a GM crop is absolutely identical to its conventional counterpart, but to determine whether any meaningful difference could affect food safety or nutritional quality.

Understanding Risk: Hazard Is Not the Same as Risk

One of the most important concepts in food-safety science is the distinction between **hazard and risk**. A hazard is something capable of causing harm. Risk considers the likelihood and significance of that harm under actual conditions of exposure. For example, identifying a novel protein with a biological activity does not automatically mean that consuming the crop will create a health risk. Scientists need to consider how much of the protein is present, how it behaves during digestion and processing, how much food consumers are likely to consume and whether a biologically relevant adverse effect is plausible. This principle explains why GM food safety assessment is based on several complementary lines of evidence rather than a single experiment. The FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius framework recommends a structured assessment of foods derived from recombinant-DNA plants. It considers the genetic modification, characteristics of the introduced material, composition of the resulting food, potential toxicity and allergenicity, nutritional characteristics and other relevant information [4]. The concept of **substantial equivalence** has historically played an important role in this comparative framework. It should not, however, be interpreted as a conclusion that a food is automatically safe. Rather, comparison with an appropriate conventional counterpart helps identify similarities and differences that may require further investigation [5].

What Does the Scientific Evidence Say?

The evidence accumulated from decades of research and regulatory assessment does not support a general conclusion that approved GM foods are inherently more hazardous than conventional foods. WHO states that GM foods currently available on the international market have passed safety assessments and that no adverse effects on human health have been demonstrated from their consumption in populations where they have been approved [1]. A systematic review published in *Environmental Sciences Europe* evaluated evidence concerning adverse effects associated with consumption of GM foods and highlighted the importance of evaluating evidence across both animal and human studies rather than relying on individual reports [6]. This does not mean that every future genetically modified food should automatically be considered safe. Each new product may involve a different gene, protein, metabolic pathway or combination of traits. Safety therefore depends on the characteristics of the final product and the evidence generated for that particular product. It is

also important to distinguish food-safety concerns from broader environmental and socioeconomic questions. Gene flow, development of resistant pests or weeds, effects on biodiversity, intellectual-property issues and consumer acceptance are important topics, but they are not identical to the question of whether a particular GM food is toxic or allergenic.

Selected Examples and Their Lessons

The history of transgenic crops provides several examples of how biotechnology can address specific agricultural problems. Virus-resistant papaya is a notable example of genetic engineering helping to protect a crop from a serious viral disease. The technology provided effective protection against papaya ringspot virus and became an important example of biotechnology responding to a major agricultural challenge. Golden Rice represents a different objective: nutritional improvement. By increasing provitamin A carotenoid production in rice grains, the technology illustrates how biotechnology can be directed toward nutritional rather than purely agronomic traits. Bt crops provide another major example. Their insect-resistance traits can reduce damage caused by specific insect pests and, under appropriate management, may reduce reliance on some conventional insecticide applications. However, continued selection pressure can contribute to pest resistance, emphasizing the importance of integrated pest-management strategies.

Bt cotton is particularly important in the Indian context. Although cotton is primarily a fibre crop rather than a food crop, its regulatory history provides a useful example of how molecular characterization, food/feed safety and environmental assessments can be integrated into a biosafety framework. Bt brinjal is more directly relevant to food crops in India. Its development and regulatory history illustrate the complexity of biotechnology decision-making, where scientific safety assessment exists alongside environmental considerations, agricultural priorities, policy decisions and public concerns.

India: Biosafety and Regulatory Perspective

India has developed a biosafety framework for genetically engineered organisms involving several institutions. The Review Committee on Genetic Manipulation (RCGM), under the Department of Biotechnology, has responsibilities related to research and biosafety oversight, while the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) plays an important role in environmental appraisal and approval of genetically engineered organisms [7,8]. India's biosafety framework includes guidelines covering recombinant-DNA research, containment, genetically engineered plants and environmental risk assessment. The regulatory process involves assessment of the characteristics of the genetically modified organism and the potential risks associated with its intended use. Food safety represents an additional regulatory dimension. The Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) published the **Draft Food Safety and Standards (Genetically Modified Foods) Regulations, 2022**, proposing provisions for genetically modified foods and food ingredients [9]. Because this document is a draft notification, it should not be described as a final notified GM-food regulation without checking the latest official regulatory status before publication. This distinction is important in scientific writing because biosafety policies and regulatory requirements can evolve. Accurate identification of guidelines, draft regulations and final regulations is therefore essential.

Benefits and Remaining Challenges

Transgenic crops can provide useful traits that contribute to agricultural productivity and crop protection. Insect-resistant crops can reduce losses caused by target pests, while disease-resistant crops can protect production from specific pathogens. Some biotechnology-derived crops have also been developed with improved nutritional characteristics. However, benefits should not be generalized to every GM crop. Outcomes depend on the crop, trait, farming system, environmental conditions and management practices. Important challenges include evolution of pest resistance, herbicide-resistant weeds, potential gene flow, ecological effects, regulatory costs and public acceptance. These concerns emphasize the need for responsible

deployment and integrated agricultural management rather than either unconditional promotion or blanket rejection of biotechnology.

The Future: From Transgenics to Precision Biotechnology

Agricultural biotechnology is now moving beyond first-generation transgenic approaches. Genome-editing technologies such as CRISPR-Cas, together with molecular breeding and other precision technologies, are expanding the possibilities for crop improvement. These approaches are being investigated for improving nutritional characteristics, disease resistance and tolerance to drought, heat and salinity. At the same time, technological precision does not eliminate the need for appropriate safety evaluation. The biological characteristics of the resulting crop and its intended use remain central to determining the appropriate assessment. Future food-safety evaluation will also need to accommodate increasingly complex products, including crops containing multiple introduced traits and novel proteins. Improved bioinformatic tools, protein-allergenicity prediction, compositional profiling and omics-based approaches may strengthen the scientific evidence used in future assessments.

Conclusion

Transgenic crops have become an important component of modern agricultural biotechnology and have demonstrated potential for improving crop protection, productivity and nutritional quality. At the same time, questions concerning food safety, environmental effects, resistance development and public acceptance deserve careful scientific consideration. The most appropriate scientific approach is neither to assume that all GM foods are dangerous nor to declare every genetically modified crop automatically safe. **Each genetically modified crop should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis according to the characteristics of the genetic modification and the resulting food.** Current international food-safety frameworks emphasize molecular characterization, comparative composition, assessment of newly expressed proteins, allergenicity, toxicity, nutritional characteristics and dietary exposure. Available evidence indicates that approved GM foods subjected to appropriate safety evaluation have not been shown to cause additional human-health risks compared with their conventional counterparts [1,4,6]. The future of agricultural biotechnology should therefore be guided by **scientific evidence, transparent regulation and responsible innovation.** The more meaningful question is not whether GM technology is universally good or bad, but whether a particular genetic modification provides a meaningful benefit while maintaining an acceptable level of risk for consumers, farmers and the environment. In this sense, the journey from **gene to plate** should not be viewed as a leap of faith. It should be viewed as a chain of scientific evaluation in which each important step—from molecular design to food consumption—is examined through evidence, transparency and appropriate regulatory oversight.

References

1. World Health Organization (WHO). Food, genetically modified: Questions and answers. WHO.
2. EFSA GMO Panel. Scientific Opinion on development needs for the allergenicity and protein safety assessment of food and feed products derived from biotechnology. *EFSA Journal*. 2022.
3. Kleter GA, et al. Comparative safety assessment of genetically modified crops: focus on equivalence with reference varieties could contribute to more efficient and effective field trials. *Frontiers in Plant Science*. 2023.
4. Codex Alimentarius Commission. Guideline for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant-DNA Plants (CAC/GL 45-2003).
5. FAO/WHO. Safety aspects of genetically modified foods of plant origin. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation. 2000.

6. Shen C, Yin X-C, Jiao B-Y, et al. Evaluation of adverse effects/events of genetically modified food consumption: a systematic review of animal and human studies. *Environmental Sciences Europe*. 2022;34:8.
7. Department of Biotechnology, Government of India. Regulations and Guidelines on Biosafety of Recombinant DNA Research & Biocontainment. Government of India. 2017.
8. Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC), Government of India. Biosafety data of approved GM crops. Available from: GEAC — Biosafety Data of Approved GM Crops
9. Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI). Draft Food Safety and Standards (Genetically Modified Foods) Regulations, 2022.