International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering & Management (IJIREM)
ISSN: 2350-0557, Volume-9, Issue-1, February 2022
https://doi.org/10.55524/ijirem.2022.9.1.43
Article ID IJIR- IRP229129, Pages 225-229
www.ijirem.org

A Review on Genetically Modified Food and Their Problems

Dr. Arminder Kaur [1], and Krishna Raj Singh [2]

[1, 2] Associate Professor, School of Applied Sciences, Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. Arminder Kaur; arminder.smas@sanskriti.edu.in

ABSTRACT: The phrase "genetically modified organisms" is causing controversy since its advantages for food producers and consumers are coupled with biomedical concerns as well as severe environmental implications. The public's growing worries about GMOs, particularly genetically modified foods, are attentive on the possibility of short or long terms health consequences as a result of this sophisticated biotechnology. Complex researchers have been analyzing the benefits and drawbacks of the genetically altered crop in various places of the globe. Also, attempt to consolidate current understanding regarding the advantages and disadvantages of genetically modified crops in this page. Discuss some recent technological breakthroughs in the field of genetically engineered foods, as well as their ramifications.

KEYWORDS: DNA, Food, Golden Rice, Genetically modified organisms.

I. INTRODUCTION

In July 2011, environmentalists snuck into experimental farms sponsored by Scientific or Industrial Research Institution an Australian federal governmental organization for the scientific research, or destroyed entire crops of the genetically modified wheat. Anti-GMO protestors damaged a Golden Rice research fields administered by Philippine government International Rice Research Institute or others public sectors partner in August 2013. Because of its changed genetic features, "Golden Rice" produces a lot of the beta carotene (precursors of the vitamins A). Golden Rice, which was created as cheap or active means to distribute dietary supplies of vitamins A to underprivileged sections of the globe, has now reached the level where field testing are conceivable after 25 years of laboratory effort. Despite being similar to the 2011 CSIRO break-in in many aspects, the 2013 event drew widespread censure from the scientific community, with public opinion mixed. The failure is primarily due to a persistent lack of awareness of contemporary agricultural challenges and the nature of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). We start with the origins of GMOs and proceed on to the rationale for GMOs (including GM foods), their hazards and advantages, and the influence of current technological developments on GMO/GM foods in this overview [1].

A. GMOs (genetically modified organisms) or GM foods (genetic modification foods)

Genetically modified is a scientific technique for altering the genetic circuits of all living things. "Organisms (i.e. plants, animals, or microorganisms) whose genetic material (DNA) has been modified in a way which does not occur naturally by mating and natural recombine," rendering to the Worlds Health Organizations. The goal is to differentiate direct genetic modification from the millennia-old practice of artificial selection to enhance the genetic material of mammals and birds. Genes from one species may be transmitted to another, generally unrelated species, utilizing genetic Engineering techniques. A GMO is a product that "does not receive additional by mating or natural recombine," according to the FAO (Food but also United States department of Agriculture Nations) as well as the Eu Commission. "GM foods" are foods that are created from genetically modified plants and animals." On the other hand, Oliver, citing Triticale as an example, pointed out that the aforementioned explanations are a bit confused. Triticale is a gluten-free grain often used in the production of bread and pasta. It was made by combining wheat and rye in the nineteenth century (conventional, discerning breeding's approach). In the 1930s, a chemical colchicine was utilised to create feasible polyploidy embryo cells because the ensuing hybrid is sterile. Triticale seems to fulfill all of the GMO criteria without a doubt, despite the fact that the genetic alteration is primitive by today's molecular biology standards. As a consequence, Oliver proposes that GMOs be referred to as "biotechnologically modified organisms" [2].

B. The Evolution of Genetically Modified Foods

The first evidence of DNA modification technology dates from 1944, after scientists discovered that genetic information may be transmitted from one species to another. Many significant articles set the foundation for modern molecular biology. In 1954, Watson or Crick found the double helix. The core belief the structure of DNA, as well as the recording of DNA to the messengers RNA and translation to protein, was established. They had deciphered the genetic code, as had others. DNA recombination is a method that shows how hereditarily changed DNA molecules may be transmitted from one species to another. The ideas of Charles Darwin on species diversity and selection may be traced all the way back to the dawn of time. a chronology of important breakthroughs in genetics that have shaped the field today. The first genetic engineering plants, created by three distinct research groups in 1983, were antibacterial medications tobacco or petunias. Medical researchers were the first to market genetically modified tobacco inside the early 1990s. The Food or Drug Administration approved the first genetically engineered tomato cultivar with a delayed ripening feature for sold in the U.S. in 1994. Since then, the FDA has approved a wave of genetically modified crops, including "Canola" with different oil content, herbicide-resistant cotton and soybeans, and so on. Strawberry, potato, eggplant, and carrots are just a handful of the GMO items that are now accessible, with more on the way [3].

Do we really needs genetically modified foods?

Earlier delving into the benefits or drawbacks of the genetically modified food, it's essential to understand why they're being developed in the first place. We are confronted with three main problems that drive our reliance on modern technologies for assistance.

C. Increase in population

According to the United Nation Departments of Economic or Social Affair/Populations Department World Populations Review: The present worldwide people population is expected to be at 7.35 billion people, according to the 2015 Revisions, Important Findings, or Advance Table. Distribution of people across the world (upper panel). Despite the fact that now the rates of population increase has slowed in the recent years (1.24 percent per year compared to 1.18 percent in prior years), an annual increase of the 84 million peoples is expected. The global population is anticipated to reached 8.5 billion people in 2030, or 9.7 billion in the 2050. Populations expansion is one of the key causes of malnutrition across the world. As per the Food but also Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 795 million people globally are malnourished, with 780 million living in poor nations. As a result, politicians should make alleviating hunger a primary priority. Improving agriculture production on already cultivated land is likely the most practical way to fulfil rising demands for food. Crop yields are now rising at a rate of less than 1.7 percent per year, despite the fact that annual yield increases of 2.4 percent are necessary to meets the needs of the populations growth, enhanced nutrition requirements, or declining arability. This appears to be a challenging task that can only be accomplished by crops genetic improvement or quantitative breakthroughs in agricultural management systems [4].

D. Land available for agriculture is dwindling

According to the FAO, by 2050, the limited quantity of arable lands accessible for food production per persons would drop from 0.243 ha to 0.17 ha. This issue mixes together the issues of population increase and hunger. However, it seems that our capacity to cultivate more land is restricted. The alternatives is higher yields per acre, which requires more agricultural inputs like fertilizers, water, insect or weeds management or genetic enhancement. Several additional variables add to the complexity of this scenario:

1. a rise in the demand for biofuels and feed stocks;
2. an increase in the pace of urbanization;
3. desertification, salinization, and deterioration of the land surface;
4. Due to socioeconomic concerns, land usage has shifted from staple crops to pasture.
5. Global warming;
6. There is a scarcity of water resources.

E. Traditional and contemporary breeding have reached a stalemate:

Crossing one paternal line to the next in the hopes of showing a desired characteristic is known as conventional breeding (for examples, disease resistance). Breeders pick the best offspring, but they also cross them with one of their parents to select for desired characteristics while minimizing undesired characteristics (plant or animal). Traditional breeding takes many years (depending on generational time, for example, 15–20 years for wheat) to verify full expression of the desired characteristic and then boost it to commercially feasible levels. Traditional breeding is hampered by the following factors, in addition to the naturally large generation intervals. Genetic variety, i.e., a gene pool with the desired qualities, as well as physical proximity of organisms with all of those features, are required for breeding procedures. In reality, genetic diversity has been dropping in recent years (due to past optimization attempts), so we now have a limited improvement area to deal with. Modern approaches may be able to increase this region by boosting mutational diversity using chemicals or radiation. They are, nevertheless, fundamental tools that only happen to create superior qualities through accident or coincidence. The breeding process will very definitely be protracted due to the non-selective nature of these procedures [5]. Taking these factors into consideration, microbiological technology or the growth of the GM crops promises to not only drastically reduced the time it takes to generate diverse strains, but also to open up new avenues for assuring food security.

F. Generating genetically modified crops

Scientists must first implant genes encoding for certain traits into a plant's body, then use tissue culture to reproduce the plant. When and where the transplanted gene gets transcribed is generally a component of the company's property optimization strategy. In general, there are three methods for changing genes in cells.

G. DNA may be transferred directly

Micro particle blasting is the most common method for introducing foreign DNA. Sanford invented the approach in the late 1980s. Naked, personalized DNA is coated on gold and tungsten micro nanoparticles, which are subsequently compressed and propelled into particular tissues, such as embryonic tissues and meristems, using helium at high speeds. Microinjection, chloroplast transformation, silicon-carbide slivers, mesoporous silica nanoparticles, and other DNA delivery techniques into plant tissue are a few examples. Particle bombardment, on the other hand, is still more successful in simultaneously transferring huge DNA fragments, even whole chromosomes [6].

H. Using a bacterial vehicle in an indirect manner

The introduction of Agrobacterium tumefactions into plant cells ushered in a new age of exogenous gene delivery. Plants are infected by the soil bacteria A. tumefaciens, which causes a gall at crown. The bacteria modify the plant's DNA, permitting it to proliferate and generate different amino acids as a specialised food supply. By adding "design genes" into the Ti-T-DNA plasmid's (transfer DNA) region, scientists kidnapped a cancer plasmid (Ti-plasmid).

a. Editing genomic DNA directly

In 2013, the "CRISPR Cas 9" systems were developed. It's a game-changing genome editing method that allows scientists to modify genes in a variety of cells. The bacteria modify the plant's DNA, permitting it to proliferate and generate different amino acids as a specialised food supply. By adding "design gene" into the Ti-T-DNA plasmid's (transfer DNA) region, scientists kidnapped a tumor plasmid (Ti-plasmids). Within cells, two different techniques are used to repair newly generated DNA double-stranded breaks (DSBs): The "non-homologous end joining" (NHEJ) method can outcome in a slight deletion but also random DNA implementation, leading to an incomplete gene or knockout, whereas the "sequence homology recombination" automatic verification donor genetic information to be ingrained into the intrinsic gene at the break site, also leading to a truncated gene or knockout. The fast spread of these cutting-edge biotechnologies has put food safety standards to the test. On November 18th, 2015, the US Agriculture Department (USDA) revealed early intentions to change its Transgenic crop laws, citing the inadequacy of present constraints for several genome-edited crops. Foods containing genetic modification that are produced in the U. S. (GMO) [7].

I. The advantages of genetically modified foods

Agronomic benefits Between 1996 as well as 2012, food sources expanded by more than 370 million tonnes. Transgenic crops are accountable with one of the increased yield inside the United States. An additional 300 million hectares of traditional crops would've been required to achieve the same yield gain as Genetically engineered crops. Those 300 million acres were either fertilizer or irrigated fields, or tropical woods that required clearing. Such land conversions might put the world's ecosystem or ecology under a lot of stress. According to Graham Brookes and Peter Barefoot's research, biotechnology increased worldwide seed quality by 138 million tonnes, wheat productivity by 274 million tonnes, textile lint output by 21.7 million tonnes, and canola productivity by 8 million tonnes between 1996 and 2013. Maintaining equal output levels in the U. S. would've have demanded an extension of 11 basis points on arable land as well as 33 % of cereal land in the European Union if such biotechnologies were not available. Between 2006 and 2012, global agricultural revenue from GM food increased by $116 billion, almost double that of the preceding ten years. According to James and Brookes, increased yield owing to enhanced genetics as well as pest and weed resistance accounted for roughly 43% of the economic gain. The remaining 56 percent was attributed to lower manufacturing costs (due to reduced pesticides or herbicide use, for examples). Particular genetic modification tries to increase certain vitamins or molecules with improved therapeutic and pro-health value, such as vitamins A, C, E, unsaturated fatty acids, alimentary cellulose, and probiotics, by modifying the chemical composition of meals. A good example is the aforementioned "Golden Rice." It is a nutritional therapy that is both cost-effective and efficient. Scientists can change the protein acid content as well as the amount of carbs in proteins using biotechnology. Delicious lupine is an excellent example since it is high in methionine. The evolution of Amflora, a mutant potato variety, is an excellent example of the latter [8].

J. Foods processing improvements

GM technology has the potential to improve foods processing. The "Flavr Savr" tomatoes are remarkable accomplishment. Cal gene, California based corporation, founded them in the 1992. The genetic change involves inserting a gene that inhibits the polygalacturonate enzymes, allowing tomatoes to mature more slowly or hence live longer. Potato bulbs' genetic makeup has also changed as a result of genetic engineering. For examples, potatoes with both bacterial cyclodextrin glycosyltransferases genes have more consistent brightness characteristics and hence a more pleasing appearance. Genetic alteration of meat products is also common, and it is not limited to crops. Several scientists are researching transgenic fish in the aim of boosting body mass by increasing growth hormone balance.

K. Products with therapeutic value

Using genetic engineering techniques, bacterial and viral antigens may be produced in the edible section of plants cells. As a result, transgenic foods might hypothetically act as oral immunizations, prompting the immune systems to produce antibodies via mucosal immunity. soybeans, Rice, maize, or potatoes are some of the crops being studied as potential carriers of edible vaccines against illnesses such as E. coli toxins, Helicobacter pylori bacteria, rabies virus, but also kind B viral hepatitis.

L. GM foods' potential dangers

The debate about genetically modified crops is mostly centred just on unknowns total Team foods' potential detrimental effect on human health or environment. Questions about the incorrect dispersion of genetically modified foods, ethical standards present in traditional food preparation, and worries about the appropriateness of GM foods assessment are 4 elements of consumer worry.
Genetically modified foods have health concerns:

Three major health issues associated with GM foods include toxicity, allergenicity, and genetic risks. Disruptions of native genetics in the transformed species, the genetic code or the proteins generated by it, secondary as well as pleiotropic effects of transcriptional products, or disruptions of indigenous genetics in the converted organism are all possible reasons. The food safety risk posed by transgenic transcription might be demonstrated in "Starlink" maize. To boost resistance to insects, the transgenic plant was genetically modified using Bacillus thuringiensis genetic material. Pesticide properties and a significant allergen city are both present in the specific gene that creates the Cry9c protein. In a handful of cases, consumers have experienced negative responses after eating "Star link" maize. Allergies may be exacerbated by changes in the quantity of components of the environment expressed in the transgenic organism.

M. Genetically modified foods pose a threat to the environment

To be selected as a fighter The majority of Food products on the marketplace today are designed to confer two beneficial qualities on the transformed plant: insect resistance and herbicide tolerance. Insects resistant crops are often genetically engineered to generate insecticidal crystalline protein (CRY), which are produced naturally by the Bacillus thuringiensis soil bacteria (Bt). Herbicide-tolerant plants have had their genes altered to produce enzymes that breakdown herbicides (notably glyphosate, and Roundup TM). The method is ingenious: weeds are sprayed with a herbicide, which kills them but leaves the agricultural plants alone. Farmers' direct input costs are greatly reduced when these two tactics are implemented: weed management becomes considerably less labor-intensive, and insect control requires far less expensive and damaging pesticides. Will, on the other hand, these methods be able to halt Nature's relentless march toward the largest species in the long run? What happens when it gets more difficult to control weeds and insects? As a result of human-made stresses in their ecosystems, insects and weeds will almost surely evolve strategies to combat our clever design for genetic modified crops within several years.

N. Antibiotic resistance is a serious problem

Antimicrobial resistance is a well-known medical concern that may be linked to the misuse of medicinal antibiotics throughout medicine. Bacteria are frequently utilized in genetic modification methods as selection indicators to distinguish effective in the development microbes from those wherein transfecting gene did not takes root. Thus, attempts to genetically modify a life form run a risk of attempting to transmit resistance to antibiotics into in the benign bacteria that cause up the microbiota of animal and human gastrointestinal parcels of land, as well as, worse, harmful bacteria belief held by GM food consumers, despite the fact that microbes, good or evil, are quiets ability of the shuttling useful gene including those that safeguard us from bacteria – to bacterial infections fostered by GM food consumers [9].

II. DISCUSSION

The phrase "genetically modified organisms" has become polarizing since its advantages for both consumers and producers of food are accompanied by biomedical concerns as well as negative environmental implications. The public's growing worry over GMOs, mostly in the form of genetically modified (GM) foods, is focused on the potential for short as well as long term health issues as a result of highly sophisticated biotechnology. The question about whether people must eat food created from genetic modification and, by implication, whether they should develop as well as spread them cannot be addressed simply with a "yes" or "no" Indeed, a meaningful response requires a broad variety of scientific understanding, encompassing not only cell genetics but also farm economics, animals or microbial ecology, foods science, or immunological - a depth of understanding likely to be discovered in a single individual. The pro or con discussions reverberates throughout humans technology history, pitting the evident advantages of planned effects against the hazy potential of inadvertent damage. The immediate benefits are simply too compelling to ignore or dismiss for fear of unpredictable and undesired consequences. With single indecisiveness, they advocate analyzing, carefully, but always with acute (or communal) discernment toward the early signals of trouble.

III. CONCLUSION

The pro and con debates resound across human history, balancing the obvious benefits of deliberate effect against the nebulous risk of unintentional harm. As a strategy of addressing global warming, only fossil-fueled industry comes to mind. Or, in the case of Tokushima, the creation of nuclear electricity, a much-touted alternative to fossil fuels. Despite the fact that they are technologically possible and provided in good faith, many of the risks associated with genetically modified crops outlined here are hypothetical. It's also unethical to shun them for the sake of rapid gratification. The technical march toward genetically altered crops is unlikely to be slowed, based on past history. At least, that's how it should be. The immediate benefits are simply too compelling to ignore or dismiss for fear of unpredictable and undesired consequences. They recommend evaluating, thoroughly, but always with keen (including communal) discernment to towards the early signs of problems, with un Hamlet like indecisiveness.

REFERENCES

[1] Lemaux PG. Genetically engineered plants and foods: A scientist's analysis of the issues (part I). Annu Rev Plant Biol. 2008;59:771–812.

[2] Goodman RE, Panda R, Ariyarathna H. Evaluation of endogenous allergens for the safety evaluation of genetically engineered food crops: Review of potential risks, test methods, examples and relevance. J Agric Food Chem. 2013;61(35):8317–32.

[3] Raman R. The impact of Genetically Modified (GM) crops in modern agriculture: A review. GM Crop Food. 2017;8(4):195–208.

[4] Masip G, Sabalza M, Pérez-Massot E, Banakar R, Cebrian D, Twyman RM, et al. Paradoxical EU agricultural policies on genetically engineered crops. Trends Plant Sci. 2013;18(6):312–24.

[5] Nicolia A, Manzo A, Veronesi F, Rosellini D. An overview of the last 10 years of genetically engineered crop safety research. Crit Rev Biotechnol. 2014;34(1):77–88.

[6] Zhang C, Wohlhueter R, Zhang H. Genetically modified foods: A critical review of their promise and problems. Food Sci Hum Wellness. 2016;5(3):116–23.

[7] Nodoushani O, Sintay J, Stewart C. Genetically Engineered Food and Genetically Modified Organisms. Compet Forum. 2015;13(1):136.

[8] Admas S. Review of Biological Impacts of Genetically Engineered Crops and Neonicotinoid Treated Seed Use on Staten Island. Int J Biotechnol. 2016;5(4):62–8.

[9] Fernandez-cornejo J. The First Decade of Genetically Engineered United States Cataloging Record : Econ Inf Bull. 2006;11:36.