RESEARCH PAPER

Biotechnology's Role in Global Health and Food Security: A Management Perspective

Arpita Roy[1#*], Soumya Pandit[1#], Abhinanda Bhattacharya[1*], T Srinivasan[2], Saravanan Devadoss[1], Ravi Kant[3]

[1] Sharda School of Business Studies, plot no 32, 34, Knowledge Park III, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh 201310

[2] Department of Microbiology, Hindustan College of Arts & Science, Rajiv Gandhi Salai, Padur, Kelambakkam, Chennai-603103

[3] Dean, Research and Development, Mangalayatan University, 33 Milestone, Aligarh - Mathura Highway, Beswan, Aligarh, 202146, Uttar Pradesh

[*] Correspondence: 2024511007.arpita@pg.sharda.ac.in; abhinanda.bhattacharya@sharda.ac.in

[#] Equal first authors

Received: 12th Mar, 2026 | **Revised:** 24th Mar, 2026 | **Accepted:** 14th Apr, 2026 | **Available Online:** 30th Apr, 2026

ABSTRACT

This review shows the strategic approach towards integrating innovations in the biotechnological aspects as a decisive framework when dealing with the increasing demands of food production and provision of medical services in the world. This review assesses the ability of management-centered, systemic solutions to overcome the socioeconomic challenges of technology adoption through synthesizing the developments in genomics and agricultural science. It is assumed that comprehensive efficacy requires the transition to non-linear, socio-technical models where scientific feasibility is balanced with the recognition of multi-stakeholders.

Keywords: Biotechnology, Global Health, Food Security, Management Perspective, Genomics, Socio-technical models

How to cite this article: Roy A, Pandit S, Bhattacharya A, Srinivasan T, Devadoss S, Kant R. Biotechnology's Role in Global Health and Food Security: A Management Perspective. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(39s): 569-595. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.39s.77

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

Introduction

This review presents the strategic approach towards integrating biotechnological innovations as a decisive framework when dealing with the increasing demands of food production and provision of medical services in the world. This review assesses the ability of management-centered, systemic solutions to overcome the socioeconomic challenges of technology adoption through synthesizing the developments in genomics and agricultural science (Beckmann, 2021; Marcone et al., 2020). In addition, the discussion is about the critical point at the intersection of regulatory frameworks and social interactions that define the scalability of high-impact biotechnologies, including genome editing and synthetic food production, in various socioeconomic settings (Anyshchenko, 2022; Emelogu et al., 2025). In the study, it is assumed that comprehensive efficacy requires the transition to non-linear, socio-technical models where scientific feasibility is balanced with the recognition of multi-stakeholders (Anyshchenko, 2022). In particular, this entails counteracting specialization adoption uncertainty and overcoming the intricate product-market fit through focusing on organizational legitimacy and open innovation activities (Dahabieh et al., 2018). In addition to these organizational approaches, the adoption of genome editing technologies into sustainable agricultural systems must be coupled with the policy designs that will focus on social inclusion and stakeholder interactions to capture the synergetic impacts of socio-technical transitions (Anyshchenko, 2022). In addition, the solution to these issues must include a critical critique of intellectual property obstacles, which tend to hinder the provision of specialized-biotechnological solutions to smallholder farmers in the developing world (Lundgren et al., 2025). To fill this gap, management policies should transform to include transformative innovation policies that clearly streamline technological rebirths with regional food security agendas, and even-handed nutritional access (Anyshchenko, 2022). The necessary reaction to such strategic alignment is the embrace of better agricultural extension services that can convert the complex, high-technology interventions into reachable practices to align local food systems (Adenle et al., 2020).

Global Problems: Food and Health security

The overlap of the increasing population growth and the growing pace of climate change effects highlights the sense of urgent necessity to switch to more resilient agricultural frameworks (Rusmayadi et al., 2023). Precision agriculture and genetic engineering of crops are some of the technological innovations that are necessary to reduce environmental degradation as well as resource optimization in the face of these changing climatic conditions (Oriekhoe et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the actualization of these innovations still depends on the ability to overcome the widespread regulatory inconsistencies and the acute sociopolitical obstacles that still stand in the way of technology implementation in the risk areas (Akinbo et al., 2025). As a result, the industry needs to focus on the assessment of open innovation policies, such as the establishment of strong industry partnerships and the establishment of responsive customer relationships at an early stage of development (Dahabieh et al., 2018). More so, it is imperative to form the working ecosystems that would incorporate various stakeholders, including not only small-scale farmers in specific areas but the global regulatory agencies, to surmount financial and structural limitations that restrict the usability of modern biotechnological solutions (Agarwala et al., 2022; Dabić et al., 2022). Such initiatives would also need to consider non-linear interactions of socio-technical systems, in which justice-based structures would be needed to avoid the further marginalization of the developing regions (Moritz et al., 2024). In this respect, it is essential to deal with the intellectual property rights, especially in regards to the acknowledgement of indigenous knowledge and the fair management of landraces grown through centuries (Anyshchenko, 2022).

The Biotechnology Promissory Note

The opportunities presented by new biotechnological tools, especially genome editing and sophisticated molecular breeding, offer a revolutionary potential to improve the nutritional content of crops and their resistance to climatic variations, both of which will help combat undernutrition and increase obesity (Pehlivan et al., 2025; Whulanza et al., 2025). Moreover, the high amount of capital that is entering the food and agricultural biotechnology sector is an indication of the transition to focusing on food quality as a cornerstone of the population health (Dahabieh et al., 2018). Regardless of this possibility, the effective implementation of these innovations seems to be a complicated issue concerning significant ethical debates and intrinsic risks in order to make sure that yield stabilization practices are available (Pehlivan et al., 2025). The focus of strategic management, then, should be on creating innovative types of public-private partnerships that will clearly address the needs of small and marginal farmers (Gall, 2016). These partnerships can help to transfer pest-resistant and high-yield traits to the areas that experience extreme environmental instability, as the priority of investing in technical infrastructure and aligning international regulatory frameworks will support such transfer (Fahrudin & Fahrudin, 2024; Kong, 2025).

Biotechnology Applications Management Perspective

Here, the authors discuss the need of companies in the food and agricultural biotechnology industry to address the uncertainty of specialized adoption which, in many instances, is caused by social and organizational opposition to innovative, biotechnology-based products (Dahabieh et al., 2018). As a way of eliminating these challenges, the ventures need to be able to negotiate through industry convergence-affected value chains by encouraging consistency in specialized technology drivers and traditional consumer preferences (Dahabieh et al., 2018). Companies can re-optimize their innovation pipelines to make sure that technological innovations appeal to the sustainable consumption trends by making use of the digital channels to get a more timely understanding of the changes in the market demands (Rushchitskaya et al., 2024). What is more, companies need to strike a balance between the fastening of the aforementioned innovation pipelines and stringent safety measurements to manage their ongoing ethical issues related to the environment and health since one of the essential preconditions of the successful long-term implementation of these innovative biotechnological applications is the preservation of social trust (Agarwala et al., 2022; Grote et al., 2021). In addition, the dilemma of expedited technological change and the need of geotemporal monitoring of the environment should be resolved by strategic management, so that the implementation of genetically modified or gene-edited organisms serves the interests of preserving biodiversity (Pehlivan et al., 2025). Additionally, companies are encouraged to work on multi-stakeholder relationships in order to narrow the divide between the innovation of the private sector and the actual needs of the smallholder farmers so that the technological application might help create climate-resilient and socially equitable food systems (Gall, 2016). The efficient use of these models means that regional bioscience platforms should be established that will transfer the technology and at the same time empower local research capacity (Gall, 2016). Moreover, these platforms need to be supported on the long-term basis of investments in human capital and infrastructure of the countries because biotechnologies cannot function in the vacuum of the overall socio-economic framework in the context of which they are implemented (Gall, 2016). Moreover, the management team should understand that the assimilation of these technologies in various geographical environments requires a significant level of absorptive capacity because the firms are often constrained by the excessive cost of internalization of compound, localized market knowledge. In turn, the managers will have to move beyond the strict, one-size-fits-all models of adoption and move to the case-based approach that would take into consideration the uncertainty in application and regional regulatory environment (Dahabieh et al., 2018). Through the creation of this organizational agility, companies will be able to more effectively mediate sustainable technological innovation, with all resources being strategically invested into green projects that meet both high-environmental requirements and regional societal expectations (何, 2025). Finally, these strategic changes require the capture of the environmental externalities, and they proactively encourage the innovation diffusion instead of consolidation to gain a social license to operate in the global agricultural markets (May et al., 2023) (Sharma D et al, 2011).

Scope and Objectives of the Review

This review examines the latest studies to examine the role of management practices, rules, and sustainability objectives in the agricultural biotechnology sector (Rushchitskaya et al., 2024). In particular, it verifies how cooperation between industries and the flexibility of management can more effectively use the available natural resources and generate equitable social and economic outcomes (Khoruzhy et al., 2022). It is also analyzed how the structure of companies can be used to combine the new technology with social ideas to minimize the risk of excessive control over intellectual property and distribute benefits based on biotech to a fair distribution (Adisa et al., 2024; Ingrao et al., 2018). It subsequently examines why companies should ensure that their innovation strategies are consistent with bigger bio-economic systems, such as the UN Sustainable Development Goals, in an attempt to create more resilient systems (Dorrego-Viera et al., 2025; Meléndez, 2023). Lastly, this summary demonstrates the significance of establishing national research systems that are geared towards innovation, imported ideas, and bioeconomic solutions to manage the fast changing information and technology (Ingrao et al., 2018). According to the analysis, there is a necessity to have fast, innovation-oriented management paradigms that can tear down the financial and technical obstacles that frequently prevent the expansion of sustainable biotech initiatives (Dahabieh et al., 2018; Doda et al., 2025). Addressing such issues requires high coordination of policy makers and the business world to bridge gaps of knowledge and enhance the utility of green farming technologies (Yuan et al., 2025). Such coordination should unite life sciences and other forms of knowledge, which should be needed to cross the difficult, knowledge-laden barriers in sustainable innovation transitions (Ayoub, 2022). It is important to shift the governance systems to be more responsible and transparent to take up the issue of genome tools beyond the technical safety to the intellectual property and monopoly challenges (Hartley et al., 2016). The means of a broad spectrum of specialists will allow the regulators to step out of the shut-down mode toward the flexible management based on the continuous feedback and interdisciplinary dialogue (Barry et al., 2025) (Sharma DK et al, 2013). Such approach assists in developing a specific commitment to innovation in which the identification of multifaceted social issues will be at the core of the development of equitable and sustainable bio-economic trajectories. These adaptable forms of governance combined with social innovations in land management enable companies to manage the challenges of regional integration in a better way (Friedrich et al., 2021; Li et al., 2024). It is also necessary to match such company plans with well-established bio-economic models, which will require the development of an effective evidence base that can direct policy makers and farm businesses to make decisions that fit the context and are sustainable (Doda et al., 2025). In this summary, it is demonstrated that the international cooperation in future is quite vital, and such collaboration will enable small economies to spread their technical assets, which will provide them with a competitive advantage in the regional markets (Lutta et al., 2024). Research also indicates that firms should employ more powerful analysis instruments to discern the impacts of market interaction on pricing as well as extensive accessibility of these innovations (Gall, 2016). In particular, the establishment of intellectual property regulations that would encourage the sharing of knowledge and prevent monopolies will still be essential to the minimization of transaction costs and equitable distribution of technology (Yuan et al., 2025). To achieve this, the flexible governance models should have numerous stakeholders such as farmers, ethicists and so on as they will be able to engage in formulating goals through which success in innovation can be achieved in a way that is socially and ecologically fair. Such an interactive approach will substitute limited risk plans with comprehensive models that mirror the current knowledge and ongoing information changes (Barry et al., 2025) (Husain A, et al, 2022). In order to have a really inclusive bioeconomy, it is essential to promote open access to techs (such as preventing heavy corporate consolidation under tough antitrust laws and eliminating restrictive patents on genetic variations) (Hackfort, 2024). The establishment of such regulations must be supported by the public-private collaboration, which focuses on the open research so that small, resource-intensive firms will not be left behind in biotech (Bulut and Filik, 2024). Inclusion of these tactics moves organizations off the straightforward models of innovation to multi-stakeholder research frameworks transformative of long-term social-ecological resilience and not market control (Friedrich et al., 2021). Finally, addressing these structural deficiencies will lead to the mission-oriented governance where state funds go to the development of valuable, non-commercial agricultural characteristics that suit the context of various socio-ecological environments (Gerullis et al., 2023).

Biotechnology in Global Health: Applications and Management

The healthcare delivery system is now integrated whereby such improvements will require us to shift to models that are not only strictly commercial, but being able to address everyone as a priority to global health security (Anyanwu et al., 2024). Teamwork and open science is accelerating the discovery of novel medicines, as well as ensuring that discoveries are delivered to more individuals (Anyanwu et al., 2024). These partnerships can only be successful in case organizations develop a science-literate employee base and maintain the necessary infrastructure to utilize the new tools widely. We have to amend the unevenness in the spread of biotechnological tools in order to make people at par. The developed countries possess more infrastructure and resources as compared to the developing ones (Anyanwu et al., 2024). The solution to this gap should involve international organizations and technology-transfer initiatives that can provide access to important biologics to everyone (Anyanwu et al., 2024). Such programs should disseminate genomic information and professional experience to establish a universal scientific community which accelerates discovery as well as equitable health outcomes. Besides, we should pay attention to the influence of culture and social issues on medicine. Local ideology and practices should be considered in designing and dispensing cures (Niazi, 2023). The achievement of global health efforts relies on the existence of public-business collaboration that aligns business interests with the pressing humanitarian demands of the underserved populations (Anyanwu et al., 2024). High costs and low education are the two areas that need to be addressed by policymakers in order to access advanced diagnostics and treatment in the impoverished regions (Anyanwu et al., 2024). It is also necessary to add training and equipment in order to make these areas act and support the complex diagnostic systems independently (Nizamani et al., 2023). Standardization of clinical trial regulations underpins long-term infrastructure projects to enable the regions to expand their own capabilities and lessen the involvement of externalities (Srivastava, 2024). These activities also minimize brain drain as local researchers are able to apply their skills locally and the knowledge is translated into sustainable local health care (Kesande et al., 2024). We require robust regulatory systems which are technology sensitive and culturally conscious and ensure that new medical innovations align with the local culture and promote global health equity (Srivastava, 2024).

Vaccine Development and Infectious Disease Control

The technology of messenger RNA is developing rapidly and demonstrates that we require production centers in our location. Such hubs allow countries with low to middle income to address pandemics independently (Gostin et al., 2023). They are not limited to donating help. They leave countries to make their tests and medicines (Gostin et al., 2023). They also engage other companies, where small biotech companies and large multinational companies collaborate in enhancing local disease monitoring and response (Torreele et al., 2023). To guarantee that medicines remain functional even in regions with ineffective cold-chain storage, they can use heat-stable and convenient designs (Torreele et al., 2023). Decentralized production, such as the mRNA transfer program of WHO, develops long-term research and manufacturing groups in partner nations, which connects universities to the industry (Pyone

& Swaminathan, 2024). We also require borderless labs that know how to share genome information and expertise, in order to prevent the dissemination of new germs (Mfuh et al., 2023). However, local control must cease depending on the short-term grants and invest long-term in research that the nation decides (Bayoumi et al., 2025; Haque et al., 2026).

Diagnostic Tools and Personalized Medicine

This is because diagnosing diseases is more accurate when the detailed biological tests are done with information on the number of people having the disease in the local area. This can be used to generate specific responses to neglected tropical illnesses and fresh outbreaks (Silva, 2024). Governments can make decisions based on technology review on the priority of where to start such tools to ensure that they address the largest health needs of each community (Adenle et al., 2020). The joint and transparent purchase of the tools will help reduce patent issues and enhance the disclosure of data that values human health over commercial gains (Saxena et al., 2023; Torreele et al., 2023). Such plans require legal commitments that the government R&D funds should be provided only in case there is the sharing of data and fair licenses (Torreele et al., 2023). Reducing reliance on external suppliers by constructing local research centers where current vaccine and diagnostic systems are available can reduce tightness of patents and allow the local team to operate (Saxena et al., 2023). This encourages the researchers to work towards the common good, and in this regard, they collaborate to produce and apply medical devices that suit the local health requirements in a short period (Torreele et al., 2023) (Gupta A, et al, 2011).

Therapeutic Interventions and Drug Discovery

Quick discovery of new drugs in resource-constrained locations entails relocation to open science communities where chemical data and information on drugs is shared. Collaboration in the absence of competition between the public, the private, and the academic groups facilitates the discovery of the most promising molecules more quickly and simplifies the process of achieving the regulations required to run the findings in the clinic (Gostin et al., 2016). Purchasing medicines collectively gives suppliers an impression that it has a continuous demand, a factor that assists in attracting better prices on necessary medicines (Mazzucato, 2023). Simultaneously, such an approach based on the implementation science ensures that these new drugs can be easily integrated into the routine of local doctors, considering the disease environment and the work of the doctors (Hotez et al., 2016). This plan necessitates that there is a rethinking of who is a powerful country as opposed to the poor country. It needs to stop relying on a one-way assistance framework and instead develop a world-wide consensus on where the local areas have a greater say over inventions of drugs (Adeyi et al., 2024). The transformation requires large institutional changes, in particular, the solution of the governance and management issues that do not allow the R&D investments to be successful in the low- and middle-income countries (Amimo, 2024). Moreover, having more reliable long-term funds to R&D and unbiased, independent oversight is crucial in establishing a good list of new antibiotics that would fight emerging health threats (Ren et al., 2022) (Shukla S, et al, 2017). To enable these pipelines, adopt the concept of public-private partnerships to mobilise the small and medium companies, which are the primary sources of novel antibiotic ideas (Mudenda et al., 2023; Ren et al., 2022). To make these innovations not become useless, the management needs to create a balance between the pressing necessity of new treatments and a robust stewardship program that would slow the development of new resistance (Baker, 2021). The stakeholders ought to shift to subscription-based forms of payments that do not tie the earnings to the number of drugs being sold. It creates a consistent market of new antibiotics and restricts their excess (Mudenda et al., 2023). By incorporating these concepts into an effective international law, one will be able to align national funding with an international fund to promote innovation (Caceres et al., 2022). Accountability should also be incorporated in these frameworks such as monitoring milestones and open oversight to ensure that global money is realistically reaching patients in a fair manner (Hoffman, 2016).

Regulatory Frameworks and Ethical Considerations

The alignment of these standards in various jurisdictions is crucial in enhancing the transfer of clinical trial data and speedy cross-border approvals of necessary medicines. Moreover, the inclusion of antimicrobial resistance in a global pandemic tool will also act as a distinctive chance to institutionalise these governance frameworks, so that the innovation ecosystems will be inclusive and able to mitigate global health disparities (Caceres et al., 2022). The implementation of such instrument involves setting up of international operating principles that equitable access is a primary responsibility, and scientific innovations are not confined to the high-income markets only (Ren et al., 2022). Based on this, stakeholders are encouraged to pursue other models, like the "Innovative Medicines Initiative," to encourage cross-sectoral collaboration and the adoption of the "Health Impact Fund," to balance financial incentives with patient affordability and a fair outcome (Caceres et al., 2022; Shevade & Naik, 2023). Besides, incorporating stringent quality control measures by implementing international trade laws can concurrently reduce the spread of low-quality and counterfeited drugs that negate such international endeavors (Katwyk et al., 2020). Lastly, creating centralized monitoring processes regarding antimicrobial use will give the real-time information that will help streamline these regulatory mechanisms, so the pharmaceutical management remains dynamic enough to address the new resistance trends (Ren et al., 2022). Through these multi-level systems of governance, policy makers will be able to combine push incentives and institutional control to establish a resilient, internationally coordinated antimicrobial regime (Hoffman, 2016; Outterson and Rex, 2023). To establish this balance, balancing between the ideas of centralization and localized flexibility would be needed, which would be based on the principles of institutional design, similar to those employed in the Paris Agreement to resolve the common pool resource problem of antimicrobial effectiveness (Weldon, Liddell, et al., 2022; Weldon, Yaseen, et al., 2022). In addition to these structural changes, to encourage international collaboration, it is crucial to simplify regulatory procedures that will expedite the acceptance of new antimicrobials and at the same time eradicate the distribution of substandard drugs (Mudenda et al., 2023). Moreover, by forming multi-stakeholder forums, systematic mobilization and maintenance of focus on these priorities can be realized so that governance structures are not exclusive to various regional cultural views (Weldon et al., 2022). In order to successfully operationalize these frameworks, there is a dire need to unite behavioral science and context-specific interventions that acknowledge the unique socioeconomic conditions that inform the operations of antimicrobial stewardship within the various health systems (James et al., 2025). In particular, by encouraging South-South collaboration to share patent reforms and capacity-building, including in the form of a Medicines Patent Pool, it will be possible to further guarantee that technological innovation can be converted into localized and affordable access in the low- and middle-income nations (Shevade & Naik, 2023). Moreover, to promote such fair systems, it is necessary to create antimicrobial R&D systems that are based on sustainable shared value models where the emphasis on diagnostic technology and point-of-care testing is accompanied by emphasis on conventional therapeutic discovery (Birgand et al., 2018).

Health Biotechnology Initiatives Strategic Management

This sector requires effective management and this requires the establishment of strategic goals as a point of measurement to determine the long-term effectiveness of biotechnological investments (Cong et al., 2023). Such goals are supposed to be supported by multi-level governance systems that help in coordination of collective action in both the government and non-government sectors thus ensuring that global funding mechanisms are effective in providing the necessary health technologies in development and distribution (Tomson and Vlad, 2014). In addition, a portfolio-based management approach enables organizations to balance strand-on-high-risk exploration research with the level of incremental development and thereby diversify the innovation pipeline in relation to the inherent uncertainties of biological opposition (Weldon and Hoffman, 2024). Moreover, through the use of sophisticated valuation frameworks to take into account the health and economic aspects of the population, the management will be in a position to align these disparate biotechnological effectivenesses to global equity and sustainability objectives (McWhorter et al., 2024). To make these management frameworks a part of larger policy concerns, these scientific stock-takes will need to be strengthened by adopting an independent scientific method to inform evidence-based decision-making and hold others responsible in the multilateral institutions (Katwyk et al., 2019). In addition, an Asia-Pacific AMR Governance Taskforce would be capable of supplying a scalable approach to standardizing surveillance guidelines and implementing progress by peer-reviewed dashboards, which would successfully bridge the difference between policy pledges at the top and minor regional implementation (Yu et al., 2026). Also, using the multiplication of pre-clinical analytics through the use of omics technologies, it is possible to compress development times by far, which is an effective solution to keeping smaller biotechnology firms afloat within the high-cost innovation ecosystem (Yam et al., 2019).

Food Security: Biotechnology in the Applications and Management

To curb the increasing demands of nutritional security, it is necessary to integrate the new biotechnological platforms into the new perspective, where the emphasis is not on the optimization of yields but on the development of bio-fortified crop varieties resistant to climate change. These inventions enable the system change to sustainable agricultural productiveness, especially to the smallholder farmers who are still exposed to climatic changes and market shocks. In order to make this transition, research interests should be focused on identifying particular barriers that traditional breeding is not capable of addressing, including creating crops with a higher resistance to abiotic stresses and a better nutritional value. This institutional R&D prioritization should be enabled in tandem with the whole agenda of technology transfer programs which should see proprietary biotechnologies available and managed well within the varying agricultural contexts (Sebastian & Payumo, 2006). Such a management is such that it requires a multi-dimensional analysis of the social, economic, and environmental effects to make sure that the implementation of such biotechnologies is consistent with local ecological conditions and long-term objectives towards food sovereignty (Gall, 2016). Additionally, the application of microbial amendments of soil and these genetic progressions can also be used to improve the ecosystem services and soil fertility, but only under the strict regulatory systems, which address the environmental hazards of introducing them (Malkawi & Kapiel, 2024). Also, policymakers and other stakeholders should consider the functional complexity of these biotechnological interventions in order to match the regional-level strategies with the dynamics of households and larger food protection goals (Arun et al., 2024).

Genetic Modification and Improvement of crops

Gene editing with CRISPR methods is being used more frequently to create drought-resistant types of crops that can survive unpredictable changes in the climate. These advancements can positively impact water-use efficiency up to 30 percent by controlling particular genetic expressions, in which case, rice in the case of OsNAC9 or maize using ZmPYL in the case of ZmPYL (Xie, 2025). In addition to these genetic interventions, the installed usage of smart irrigation systems based on the principle of IoT-based sensors present a complementary solution to increase the efficiency of the use of water at the field level (Xie, 2025). They can use precision tools of agriculture and markers-assisted breeding and genomic selection to facilitate the rapid introgression of genes that are stress-tolerant in local germplasm (Dhawi and Aleidan, 2024). Also, the extensive use of these molecular tools is conditional on the interventions of the public sector that will help to bring the proprietary technologies to the regions, where the investment by the private business will be limited by the small market incentives (Rosegrant and Cline, 2003). Besides, these genomic improvements, combined with regenerative soil management, can reduce the degradative effects of conventional agriculture practices that are water-intensive (Ngongolo et al., 2024; Rosegrant et al., 2013).

Livestock Enhancement and Aquaculture Innovations

Genetic manipulations like CRISPR-based disease resistance and integration of heat-tolerance characters are now being exploited to counteract the effects of climate-induced pathology among the livestock (Xie, 2025). At the same time, nutritional biotechnological innovations, such as the creation of methane-reducing and high-quality feed additives, are needed to reduce enteric fermentation and decrease the environmental impact of the animal production system worldwide (Knorr and Augustin, 2023). Simultaneously, the use of genomic selection on aquaculture species is allowing the rapid derivation of resistant stocks that can survive in warming water conditions and minimize the use of wild-caught feed stocks. Moreover, the compatibility of these genomic markers by international breeding programs can facilitate scaling sustainable aquaculture regimes that can deal with two-fold agendas of protein provision and conservation of biodiversity. In order to see these advances have systemic effects, the management practices should combine these biological breakthroughs and decentralized infrastructure with local value-chain building in empowering rural communities. Combining insect protein sources and hydroponics feed strategies can offer a feasible solution to ease the demands of land-use along with amplifying the nutritional freedom of livestock production systems (Roy, 2024). The implementation of data-driven, precision breeding programs based on the use of marker-assisted selection to realize real genetic productivity and climate adaptation gains is ultimately the key to the success of such integrated livestock systems (Hallerman, 2019; Zefreh et al., 2025). Besides, the implementation of One Health surveillance systems and probiotic-based disease prevention plans additionally ensures these resources by minimizing the risks of antimicrobial resistance in ever-increasing dense production settings (Roy, 2024). Also, the integration of blockchain technology will enable more transparency in these complicated supply chains and make the authenticity of sustainable farming certifications as well as encourage customer trust in high-tech protein production (Roy, 2024).

Sustainable Agriculture Practices

To realize sustainable agricultural paradigms, one must make the shift towards resource management that is circular and an example of such is closed-loop waste valorization that will lessen the nutrient runoff and ammonia emission (Zenda, 2025). Such tactics usually involve accuracy animal feeding and more efficient nutrient stewardship in order to reduce externalities in the environment, as a part of an ever-increasing nexus between field-scale resource management and systems biology (AUTHOR_ID, 2023; Haq et al., 2024). Biofloc technology integration, in this sense, is a rather prominent development, as it utilizes the microbial activities to improve nutrient recycling and reduce the use of external inputs (Dheeran et al., 2025). In the same way, recirculating aquaculture technology and Integrated Multi-Trophic Aquaculture promotes the transformation of aquaculture waste into high-value protein feed, therefore, supporting its resource optimization and environmental sustainability in a wide variety of ecological contexts (Khanjani et al., 2023; Ranjan et al., 2026). Moreover, use of the principles of circular economy (like using agro-industrial by-products and crop residues) also maximizes feed efficiency and, at the same time, minimizes the overall environmental impact of agricultural supply chains (AUTHOR_ID, 2023). In addition to valorizing waste, the implementation of satellite-based surveillance and autonomous sensors allows controlling these decentralized systems in real-time, which means that the practices aimed at their management could be adaptable to the changes in the ecosystem and comply with regulatory requirements (AUTHOR_ID, 2023). Moreover, the implementation of artificial intelligence and cloud-based alert-networks offers a powerful framework of disaster risk reduction, which would allow producers to predict and avert the effects of extreme weather on agricultural infrastructure (Roy, 2024). These analytical frameworks also align with the idea of decentralized supply chain management, in which blockchain-based authentication confirms the truthfulness of environmental arguments and market accessibility to the smallholder producers (Bunge et al., 2022; Doda et al., 2025).

Food Processing and Safety Technologies

Food processing innovation is now taking place on a more targeted basis, preservation and extension of shelf life without the use of synthetic additives or refrigeration that consumes energy. As an example, high-pressure processing and cold plasma treatment are non-thermal processing methods that have been successfully used to inactivate pathogens without damaging the organoleptic properties and nutritional value of raw commodities. Moreover, smart packaging material, which incorporates biosensors to measure the presence of spoilage-related microbial metabolic activities, will offer real-time quality assurance to all the stakeholders of the supply chain and the consumer as well. At the same time, the shift towards the use of augmented reality on food labels will enable consumers to have real-time, data-driven information regarding the nutritional provenance and ethical footprint of their choices (Oriekhoe et al., 2024).

Economic and Societal Impacts of Food Biotechnology

The multidimensional evaluation of the regulatory frameworks and consumer perception would be required due to the need to consider the influence of the public trust on the long-term sustainability of genetically modified and lab-grown alternatives where strategic adoption of these innovations is necessary (Ceylani and Akçay, 2024). The governments should, therefore, promote open communication and stringent safety evaluations to deal with public fear and develop incentives to research on climate-smart solutions (Agarwala et al., 2022). Moreover, the intersectoral partnerships among the business, educational establishments, and local agrifamily groups are required to break the current obstacles and transfer these technological opportunities into outcome-contained, resilient, and site-based agriculture (Rushchitskaya et al., 2024). To accommodate the socioeconomic intricacies of these developments, it is important to reduce possible disparities in access to technology, which means that small-scale producers will be able to use and enjoy the advantages of these global innovations (Pehlivan et al., 2025). The frameworks of the policy should focus on models of inclusive capacity building and intellectual property sharing in the manner to avoid the marginalization of the traditional knowledge holders during the transition (Ceylani and Akcay, 2024; Mešic et al., 2024). Lastly, to make the technological environment more fair, there is a need to engage in a constructive dialogue regarding the ethical, legal, and social implications of such biotechnological interventions to strike the right balance between innovation and the overall safety of the population or cultural heritage (Pehlivan et al., 2025). In the future, the effective implementation of these biotechnological innovations will be determined by the globalization of the set of standards that must compromise regulatory strictness with the adaptability to ensure that food security issues in the region are dealt with (Habib et al., 2025). In the end, such a claim will be essential in uniting the current need of the world to be calorically secure with the need to preserve environmental stability in the era of a high rate of environmental transformation (Pehlivan et al., 2025). It is further required to overcome these issues by shifting to market-distorting subsidies that currently support industrial agriculture at the expense of scaling more sustainable, biotech-based alternatives (Tubb and Seba, 2019). Policymakers can also considerably lower the obstacles to entry of new technologies in the agricultural sector by simplifying the bureaucratic procedures of approving the new technology, and aligning the international biosafety standards (Herrero et al., 2020; Kong, 2025). Besides, the development of science-based decision-making models continues to be the priority to reduce consumer distrust and respond to the challenges of the market introduction of genetically engineered items (Dutia, 2014; Gall, 2016). It is also crucial to develop new financing schemes which will reduce the prohibitive capital requirements among the smallholder farmers, since the existing cost structure does not always allow adoption of precision agriculture or automated monitoring (Xie, 2025). To solve this, the South-South cooperation and creative public-private collaboration can offer the technical and financial framework that is needed to ensure that those tools are applied to marginalized producers (Gall, 2016). Moreover, it is essential to address rural education and regional knowledge sharing networks to enable small-scale farmers to make a sound decision about the application and the management of these agricultural biotechnologies in the long run (Gall, 2016; Rusmayadi et al., 2023).

Intersections of Health and Food Security Biotechnology

Such a point of intersection involves the utilization of biofortified crops for alleviating micronutrient deficiencies that are widespread in a number of countries. It creates a direct correlation between agricultural productivity and the improvement of public health outcomes in food-insecure countries. Moreover, the integration of molecular breeding techniques with nutritional pharmacology creates a platform for the improvement of the profile of crops that can be utilized for alleviating the effects of a number of metabolic disorders that are widespread in resource-constrained countries (The Water, Energy and Food Security Nexus, 2014). Such a platform creates a synergetic relationship between alleviating socio-economic issues that affect a number of countries and improving agricultural productivity that alleviates a systemic public health crisis ("International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation," 2021). Such a systemic platform is further created by the utilization of insect pest microbiomes that improve immunity in plants while simultaneously reducing the usage of chemical pesticides (Arun et al., 2024).

Nutritional Enhancement for Public Health

Among the key methods to address the issue of hidden hunger in vulnerable populations, biofortification, including creation of crops with increased levels of essential vitamins and mineral compounds like beta - carotene, should be highlighted (Adisa et al., 2024). However, the effectiveness of such interventions also requires the combination of the metabolic engineering and independent science-based public communication to ensure a wide acceptance and comprehensive safety validation (Straeten et al., 2020). Moreover, open dissemination of research information and laboratory functions as a public good should be facilitated to overcome limitations of niche sources of publication and speed up cross-disciplinary innovation (Xiao et al., 2023). The international research organisations and regional bodies also need strategic partnerships, which are particularly important to match the technological outputs to the needs of the small-scale farmers in terms of agriculture and diet (Akinbo et al., 2025; The Water, Energy and Food Security Nexus, 2014). Additionally, those collaborative structures should combine the local ecological expertise with the latest biotechnological tools to guarantee that not only such superior and improved crop varieties will be better nutritionally but also robust enough to endure the region-specific climatic stressors (Gall, 2016; Straeten et al., 2020). The stakeholders can reduce the time taken to apply these solutions and ensure that global malnutrition challenge is better tackled by closing the gap between metabolic engineering and traditional methods of breeding (Straeten et al., 2020). Here, it is again important to expand the germplasm collections to typify the natural micronutrient diversity because it is the source of necessary genetic material in conventional breeding and optimization of vitamin biosynthesis pathways (Straeten et al., 2020). Also, the introduction of strong measures of control that motivate the accumulation of several positive features will improve the agronomic and nutritional characteristics of these biofortified crops (Straeten et al., 2020). At the same time, it can be ensured that the humanitarian licences of these types of innovations can be obtained, which will allow the introduction to the areas of their greatest need more products with high concentrations of nutrients. In addition to such strategic measures, to maintain the bioavailability of these increased nutrients in the post-harvest storage and distribution, the integration of the non-thermal processing methods, including high-pressure microfluidization, is crucial (Anal et al., 2025).

Biofortification Strategies

To achieve lasting sustainability, they will have to go beyond initial pilot interventions to full-scale, long-lasting interventions, in which biofortified traits are integrated into the formal systems of national breeding priorities (Bouis, 2017). Furthermore, the activity of capacity-building in developing countries should be placed on a higher priority so that local scientists would create genetically engineered, acceptable, and commercially viable types of crops (Straeten et al., 2020). Intersectoral cooperation of governments, non-governmental organizations, and the business world is also necessary to overcome regulatory barriers and support the expansion of production and distribution channels (Naik et al., 2024). The combination of traditional breeding and metabolic engineering, such as the use of genome-editing technologies, including CRISPR/Cas, is necessary to overcome the physiological limitations of accumulating micronutrients in certain tissues of the plant (Straeten et al., 2020; Strobbe et al., 2018). It is also paramount to have an explicit performance indicator and uniformed quality-assurance procedures that would evaluate the programme efficacy and avoid possible toxicological hazards of consuming nutrients excessively (Wakeel et al., 2018). To meet the grandiose goal of targeting one billion people by 2030, incentive mechanisms that may involve segregated procurement systems that will reimburse farmers every time they deliver biofortified crops will have to be developed (Bouis and Saltzman, 2017; Gaikwad et al., 2020). The strategy of micronutrient density as a fundamental requirement, which is embedded in breeding pipelines, is critical to institutionalizing such nutritional characteristics in a global system of germplasm distribution (Virk et al., 2021). It is also of utmost importance that seed-system regulations are harmonised across the borders to ensure that bureaucratic hurdles do not stall the swift introduction of better varieties to various agricultural eco systems (Bouis, 2017). Lastly, novel evidence-based context-specific delivery models are considered the key to the successful implementation of biofortified food in the local food systems and its successful acceptance by the target populations (Foley et al., 2021).

One Health Approach: Bridging Human, Animal, and Environmental Health

In this framework, it is proposed to have a comprehensive evaluation of the agricultural value chain in which metabolic optimization of staple crops is aligned with ecological sustainability and livestock health. Using nutritional quality as a baseline to assess the quality of animal feed will allow researchers to reduce the risk of zoonotic diseases and improve micronutrient bioavailability through the food system as a whole (Straeten et al., 2020). The combination approach also requires mass human and animal testing to prove empirically the health effects of biofortified wheat and other staples, and thus assure that the nutritional benefits can be translated into clinical ones (Gupta et al., 2024). This type of longitudinal evaluation is necessary to improve the existing models, especially since the data standardisation gaps in the past have been limiting the meta-analytical authority of the existing nutritional trials (Gupta et al., 2024). Achieving agricultural output in line with the broader One Health agenda will require the policymakers to manage the potential trade-off between crop yields and nutritional density, and thus production incentives should not adversely affect the environmental sustainability (Lakshmanan et al., 2025; Straeten et al., 2020). Furthermore, the addition of agro-ecological surveillance into these systems may provide the information needed to optimise the nutrient cycling and soil health and strengthen the resilience of the food value chain as a whole (Gupta et al., 2024). This multidisciplinary integration, in turn, requires a triple emphasis in improving the consumer demand, developing facilitative government policies, and institutionalisation of high-nutrition content as a goal target of plant-breeding programs (Bouis, 2017). The strategy also meets the five key scientific feasibility questions, yield stability, palatability of consumers, bioavailability, and cost-effectiveness-areas that are at the heart of the mass utilization of bio fortified varieties (Arimond et al., 2010). Based on these background requirements, future efforts need to focus on the multidisciplinary collaboration that will integrate the knowledge of food technology, economics, and sociology to make biofortification scalable and culturally sensitive (Mutuku et al., 2020). Lastly, to mitigate the threat of nutritional myopia, it is important to note that animal-based food must be used in combination with biofortified plant product to avoid local shortages in the population, where the so-called one-size-fits-all agricultural systems are ineffective (Dougherty et al., 2023).

Opportunities and Challenges of Biotechnology Management

In biotechnology management, the key to successful scaling of biotechnological interventions is in balance of the socio-economic complexity of adoption versus the logistical requirements of global food supply chains (Birol and Bouis, 2023). In particular, to combat the epidemic of the so-called hidden hunger, it is necessary to change the paradigm and involve more than just technical and constructive crop development, but elaborate marketing and educational initiatives that will allow people to accept transgenic and bio-enriched products (Ofori et al., 2022). Successful management should also be able to work through the long fifteen to twenty-year innovation-to-impact cycle, which requires multi-stakeholder alliances to continue work despite initial funding (Gall, 2016). Moreover, it is necessary to incorporate such efforts into the overall agricultural policy so that biofortification will not be seen as a solution in isolation but as a part of a larger, more diversified change of food systems around the world (Malézieux et al., 2023). In this regard, subsequent plans will need to clearly focus on the customization of biotechnologies to meet certain regional nutritional deficiencies and environmental pressure on local regions (Aryee and English, 2022). Also, it is crucial to address the existing regulatory heterogeneity on genome-edited crops to align international trade and be sure that institutional development will not fail due to conflicting intellectual property laws (Ofori et al., 2022). Furthermore, the discipline experiences considerable challenges in terms of the agronomy of these varieties in the long run; to keep being competitive to farmers, biofortified crops have to retain high productivity levels irrespective of unstable environmental factors like drought or pests (Avnee et al., 2023).

Finance and Investment Policies

Investment systems should be restructured to establish long-term sustainability by shifting away short-term project development to lasting institutional investment that can help bridge the gap between agricultural research in labs and commercial application (VijayaKumar et al., 2025). Such financial tools must take advantage of the public-private alliances to de-risk technology implementation as well as offer the required funding to enhance infrastructure enhancement in regional supply chains. In addition, such financial models should be flexible enough to suit local socio-political dynamics, so that funding mechanisms put vulnerable populations first instead of any strictly market-driven outputs (Birol and Bouis, 2023; Das et al., 2023). Moreover, application of strict ex-ante cost-benefit studies can be used to detect and harness niche markets in rural areas in order to match investments and actual socio-economic benefits (Adenle et al., 2012). Also, to avoid poor consistency of micronutrient levels, thereby compromising consumer confidence and the sustainability of investment in the long-term, the stakeholders should develop enforceable quality standards, including those specified in the Codex Alimentarius (Covic, 2017). Lastly, the demand in institutional dependency can be reduced through the diversification of sources of funding to incorporate capacity building of the local actors, which will help create more resilient and equitable agricultural value chains (Bouis, 2017; Okoye et al., 2025).

The Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer

The main challenge is still negotiating the intricate environment of proprietary rights because limiting licensing platforms have the potential to hinder the transfer of the necessary genomic tools to the scientists who need them in resource-limited environments. In order to prevent these obstacles, advocates of biofortification need to take an active approach to humanitarian licensing models, as with Golden Rice, allowing unrestricted distribution to smallholder farmers without triggering the negative effect of restrictive patent rights (Strobbe et al., 2018). Also, to enhance genetic benefits, we can create open access platforms to develop molecular markers to hasten the process of breeding technology by democratization access to breeding technology, which will decrease the reliance of national research programs on private seed conglomerates (Andersson, 2017). Moreover, germplasm exchange agreements should be fostered in such a way that they will encourage the privates to disclose proprietary resources to the humanitarian use without compromising on their intellectual property motivation (Malhotra, 2025). Besides, value-chain research must incorporate the use of functional economic models to measure the business case in nutrition to overcome the chronic mistrust between the business and the government in health promotion (Morgan et al., 2018). Lastly, the policymakers need to encourage the consideration of sensory assessment and consumer preference assay in the breeding programs at the early stage to design the ultimate cultivars that resonate with the local market and the gender-specific consumption behaviour (Hamid et al., 2025).

Public Perception and Acceptance

Addressing the issue of scientific innovation and public trust requires a clear explanation of the safety and nutritional effectiveness of the biofortified varieties, especially to eliminate the myths about transgenic technologies (Covic, 2017). The engagement with the local stakeholders is an essential step that has to be proactive to discuss the cultural nuances according to which the dietary habits are formed (Rodas-Moya et al., 2022). Moreover, the sensory characteristics of these crops, including the characteristic color alterations of the biofortified grains, should be considered as well, because in this way, consumers might be unable to accept the products, which do not look as usual (Das et al., 2023). In this respect, applying tasting fairs and opinion-leader advocacy has been effective in generating curiosity and in normalising the use of nutritionally enhanced varieties across the various cultural setups (Bouis, 2017). Also, this can be achieved by directly adding rapid sensory screening procedures to early-generation breeding pipelines in order to prevent the risk of mainstream rejection by filtering out lines with low organoleptic effectiveness prior to their market success (Hamid et al., 2025). In addition to the acceptance of the consumers, the successful scaling of these programs involves the establishment of strategic cross-sectoral partnerships that will offer the technical support and supply-chain infrastructure needed to deliver reliable and last-mile distribution (Das et al., 2023). Moreover, their incorporation into official institutions, like school lunch schemes and humanitarian crises responses, is one of the drivers of long-term penetration of these crops into the market (Rodas -Moya et al., 2022). Lastly, systemic establishment of strong governmental led sensitization should be undertaken to enlighten both farmers and consumers with the aim of resolving the issues that concern the effectiveness and safety of bio fortified food prior to its widespread use (Temple, 2012).

Workforce Development and Skill Gaps

However, addressing all these systemic barriers would require a multi-tiered approach to human capital, focusing on training extension agents and agro-entrepreneurs on the technical intricacies of biofortified crop cultivation and value-added processing (Institute, 2016). Additionally, the establishment of certification mechanisms for agro-entrepreneurs would be instrumental in improving the legitimacy of value-added products while ensuring that they meet the minimum nutritional requirements while also promoting business opportunities for agro-entrepreneurs (Bouis, 2017). However, addressing the endemic human resource challenges would require public-private investments in agricultural extension services to ensure that farmers receive consistent technical support. Additionally, the establishment of communities of practice through the development of training materials and investment guides would be essential in avoiding the redundant reinvention of dissemination strategies while improving the capacity of regional institutional partners (Bouis, 2017). Finally, the adoption of digital knowledge management tools would be instrumental in the transfer of expertise between public sector partners and private sector multipliers while also ensuring the coherent transfer of knowledge between international health agencies (Birol & Bouis, 2023).

Policy and Governance for Sustainable Biotechnology Development

Good governance systems have to focus on aligning the regulatory policy in the different jurisdictions to facilitate the easy passage of bio fortified products and at the same time maintain high standards of quality control (Bouis, 2017). Long-term and predictable financing must support such institutional approaches in order to overcome systemic underfunding and administrative understaffing that obstruct the execution of national nutrition agendas in the present (Huey et al., 2024). Besides, the introduction of the complete food certification and clear labeling programs will provide the necessary confidence-building systems, which will also support consumer confidence and help to ensure the wider acceptance of biotechnological innovations in the market. The empirical development of these regulatory systems, however, depends on active implementation; the governments need to put the policies to the test to ensure they do not remain the lifeless institutional formations (Ochieng & Ananga, 2019). At the same time, regional biosafety testing facilities, especially those at the point of entry, are essential in enhancing safe international trade of biotechnological innovation and implementing the observation of harmonized standards of safety (Zawedde et al., 2025). Lastly, to help the paramount shift in the in-laboratory research to commercial-scale production, the establishment of specific translational centres in collaboration with state university and the commercial world can be considered (Payumo et al., 2018). The main focus of these centres is to create adaptive regulatory instruments that will strike a balance between stringent biosafety policies and the flexibility needed to respond in quick time to technology use (Akinbo et al., 2025; Gall, 2016). Using this base, the policymakers should be provided with the information that is grounded on science so that they can make the decisions on biosafety, with the national regulations being congruent to the sovereign policies so that a safe use of the developments in genome-edited and transgenic crops can be made. These regulatory initiatives can be better aligned with wider development agendas by countries determining common regional priorities and creating special cross-border networks to fight poverty and food insecurity, e.g., the African Union Agenda 2063 (Akinbo et al., 2025; Masehela and Barros, 2023). To accomplish these goals, there is an urgent necessity to work towards ensuring the deficiency in institutional and human capability that often makes nations unable to enforce extensive regulatory frameworks that would be able to deliver science-based risk assessment (Ríos et al., 2018).

Future Directions and Strategic Implications

With the world agricultural environment changing to more advanced biotechnologies, countries should focus on the modernization of the monitoring and traceability services to make sure that they comply with the changes in the international standards of biosafety (Zawedde et al., 2025). Moreover, this modernization should be accompanied by prolonged investment in national skills and specific institutional facilities to cope with the intricacies of next-generation breeding of plants (Zawedde et al., 2025). In this regard, the proactive inclusion of horizon-scanning initiatives will be essential to forecast potential new technical issues and predict possible regulatory gaps to prevent them by hindering the implementation of new genomic innovations (Masehela & Barros, 2023). Also, the shift towards a product-based regulation paradigm, which is evident in other countries, such as Argentina and Japan, can help alleviate bureaucratic constraints that are currently hindering the implementation of precision breeding technology, such as CRISPR/Cas9 (Masehela and Barros, 2023). At the same time, regulatory frameworks within regional blocs need to be standardized to close the gap between restraining process based systems and more innovation friendly systems, and thus create a harmonious global bioengineering environment (Domingo, 2025; Wilcks and Quemada, 2023). Moreover, policymakers should be critical in their re-consideration of the precautionary principle implementation to make sure that the strictness of regulations does not unintentionally hinder agricultural innovation or contribute to the disequilibrium of regional trade (Fears et al., 2020).

Emerging Biotechnologies and Their Potential

Combining gene-editing methods, like CRISPR-mediated mutagenesis provides a strong technical basis of advanced plant breeding, which offers a possibility to change agricultural productivity drastically (Atia et al., 2024). These genomic tools are now being supplemented with collaborative developments in high-throughput phenotyping and synthetic biology that can be seen as having a synergetic effect to redefine the scope of sustainable germplasm improvement (Dong and Fan, 2024). These improvements can be successfully implemented into commercial pipelines without neglecting strict safety regulations by replacing process-based measurements with a product-based oversight (Keiper & Atanassova, 2022). However, the stakeholders have to be aware of the fact that disparate legislative interpretations on new breeding techniques still pose serious challenges to the international market integration (Rios et al., 2025; Spaans et al., 2025). To alleviate such discrepancies, the international policy discussions should focus on the shift towards outcome-based risk assessment models that would focus on the safety nature of the end product rather than the laboratory procedures used (Zheng et al., 2025). In addition, non-tariff barriers can be greatly minimized with the creation of multilateral institutions on regulatory convergence, such as the attempts by countries to promote science-based regulation by determining agricultural uses of precision biotechnology through the International Statement on Agricultural Applications of Precision Biotechnology (Entine et al., 2021). This kind of harmonization is critical in dealing with stacked-trait innovations, which provide multilayered protection against climate induced biotic and abiotic stresses (Xie, 2025).

Collaborative Models for Global Impact

The idea of knowledge transfer and resource sharing between developed and developing countries is still very essential to make sure that biotechnology does not lead to a wider gap in the world disparity. In this respect, the development of international collaboration may assist the countries in sharing scarce resources to facilitate the priority areas within the agricultural development process, and eventually develop the required confidence and knowledge in the regulatory mechanisms of a partner state (Gall, 2016). Moreover, the templates of re-tooling of the programmes of the public sector can be provided by the private sector plant-breeding companies, so that the proprietary innovations can be properly utilized to increase the quality of foods and their productivity (Mba et al., 2012). The democratization of intellectual property should be also included among strategic initiatives, as a bonus of the democratic character should be given to patent-sharing deals to enable regional agricultural hubs to implement CRISPR-enabled solutions based on the local climatic and nutritional demands (Tahakik et al., 2024). In addition, regional centres of excellence focused on genome editing can be important channels of training local researchers and optimising transformation protocols on elite, crop-specific cultivars (Verma et al., 2023). Institutional decentralisation of this kind encourages a stronger degree of autonomy in bio-safety regulation and enables emerging economies to exit in both reliance on alien technology and also customize biotechnological innovations to the demands of their local environment and socioeconomic conditions (Mbaya et al., 2022). Finally, ending up with a more balanced regulatory framework is necessary so that the small-scale players can avoid being pushed out of the financial market and thus the advantages of genome editing could be evenly distributed among the entire agricultural industry worldwide (Angelotti-Mendonça et al., 2021; Keiper et al., 2023). The creation of such inclusive ecosystems presupposes that policymakers should not only concentrate on the technical infrastructure but also on the building of public trust in the form of clear and evidence-based communication plans on the safety and utility of gene-edited crops (Mbaya et al., 2022).

Recommendations for Policy Makers and Industry Leaders

Prior to commercialisation, stakeholders are expected to focus on the adoption of early engagement mechanisms that would enhance the active discussion of the matter with the population and the ethical issues noted in intellectual property and equitable access to technologies (Dash et al., 2025). Moreover, the leaders in the industry should invest in participatory policymaking models that can promote inclusive technology transfer to avoid concentration of genomic assets in large agribusinesses and smallholder farmers access new technology in agriculture (Sharma et al., 2025). As well, encouraging cross-sectoral alliances including those based on open-source hardware movements may allow smallholders to escape proprietary lock-ins and reassert control over the localised seed systems (Wit, 2021). In addition, the combination of these decentralised strategies with international public-private collaborations can support the implementation of climate-resilient characteristics that are specially adapted to various, underutilised crops that nourish smallholders (Akinbo et al., 2025; Gall, 2016). In order to achieve these goals, funding agencies will have to change their grant evaluation criteria by focusing on granting research projects in which local clinicians and researchers actively participate, thus guaranteeing the availability and accessibility of the outcomes of biotechnology to the end-users of their products within the local community (Lee and Sawai, 2024).

Conclusion

Finally, biotechnological integration in the global food systems should be harmonised with regulatory flexibility and strong, inclusive systems that enable farmers and focus on localised innovation (Mbaya et c al, 2022). The bridging of the gap between complex genomic science and societal disclosure makes such combined strategies the difference between biotechnology supporting the meeting of the health, food security, and environmental sustainability intersection (Pixley et al., 2022). This development demands the shift of traditional linear thinking on the innovation to non-linear forms that incorporate social thinking and technical viability in the full lifecycle of research and development (Anyshchenko, 2022). The socio-economic effectiveness of these decentralised innovation models should be directly tested in the future to make sure that the smallholder farmers adopt the use of gene-edited technologies in a way that is appropriate in terms of nutritional demands and management skills (Hallerman et al., 2024; Henderson et al., 2023). In this endeavor, policy frameworks should be built on foresight analysis and integrated impact assessment, which can be used to connect the traditional knowledge with the empirical data to ensure technological deployment is contextually appropriate and socially sustainable (Gall, 2016). These adaptive governance mechanisms will have the potential to transform the international community and end its short-term crisis management system in favor of a long-term, resilient system of agricultural innovations by integrating them into the broader international development agendas (Kong, 2025; Tahakik et al., 2024). This strategic development will be informed by the creation of regional bioscience facilities and technology platforms which will be a key conduit to the development of capacity in the long run and multi-stakeholder collaborations. These programmes are essential in creating a collaborative effect that supports the unique agricultural and health-related issues that are common in varied geographical locations through harmonised frameworks of consultation (Masehela and Barros, 2023). In addition, these regulatory strategies should be aligned with the local socioeconomic situational realities to make sure that the innovations that are developed acquire the required social licence and policy directive to be widely adopted. It is on this basis that the continued success of agricultural biotechnology will depend on the manner in which these frameworks overcome the challenge of negotiating between the scientific advances and the diverse, site-specific demands of world stakeholders (Anyshchenko, 2022; Toledo-Hernandez et al., 2021). In this regard, institutional innovation has continued to be the major catalyst in the creation of governance hybrids that will broaden the decision-making horizons without imposing prohibitive regulatory costs on the developers of emerging technologies (Barry et al., 2025).

References

Adenle, A. A., Aworh, O. C., Akromah, R., & Parayil, G. (2012). Developing GM super cassava for improved health and food security: future challenges in Africa. *Agriculture & Food Security*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/2048-7010-1-11

Adenle, A. A., Chertow, M., Moors, E. H. M., & Pannell, D. J. (2020a). Conclusions and Future Policies for Meeting the Sustainable Development Goals. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (p. 547). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190949501.003.0026

Adenle, A. A., Chertow, M., Moors, E. H. M., & Pannell, D. J. (2020b). What Can Science, Technology, and Innovation Offer in the Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals? In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (p. 3). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190949501.003.0001

Adeyi, O., Yadav, P., & Kazatchkine, M. D. (2024). Frontiers of medicine unveiled: equitable access is an imperative. *Frontiers in Science*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsci.2024.1422583

Adisa, O., Ilugbusi, B. S., Adelekan, O. A., Asuzu, O. F., & Ndubuisi, N. L. (2024). A comprehensive review of redefining agricultural economics for sustainable development: Overcoming challenges and seizing opportunities in a changing world [Review of *A comprehensive review of redefining agricultural economics for sustainable development: Overcoming challenges and seizing opportunities in a changing world*]. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *21*(1), 2329. GSC Online Press. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0322

Agarwala, C., Jemaneh, J., & Kassie, Y. (2022). Government Policies and Sustainable Food Systems: Navigating Challenges, Seizing Opportunities, and Advancing Environmental and Social Resilience. *Law and Economics*, *16*(2), 88. https://doi.org/10.35335/laweco.v16i2.53

Agricultural Innovation Systems. (2012). In *The World Bank eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8684-2

Akinbo, O., Nkhabindze, B. Z., Amedu, J., Ebegba, R., Asagbra, A., Ratemo, B. O., Dada, S. A., Muia, A. N., Mugiira, R. B., Chimphepo, L., Wristberg, L. O., Rouamba, M. W., Some, K., Nuaila, V. N. A., Atanásio, A., Shittu, O. B., Adetunji, C. O., Hamidi, L., Monga, E., … Fotabong, E. (2025). Africa and zero hunger agenda: genome editing policy landscape, challenges and opportunities [Review of *Africa and zero hunger agenda: genome editing policy landscape, challenges and opportunities*]. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *13*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2025.1526851

Amimo, F. (2024). Leveraging malaria vaccines and mRNA technology to tackle the global inequity in pharmaceutical research and production towards disease elimination. *Malaria Journal*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-024-04972-5

Anal, A. K., Khadka, A., Rice, D. L., Shrestha, N. K., Valerozo, J. A., Zaw, K. N. C., & Nagase, R. (2025). Aquatic Plants for Blue Protein Innovation: Bridging Nutrition, Sustainability, and Food Security. *Resources*, *14*(12), 192. https://doi.org/10.3390/resources14120192

Andersson, M. S. (2017). Progress update: Crop development of biofortified staple food crops under HarvestPlus. *African Journal of Food Agriculture Nutrition and Development*, *17*(2), 11905. https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.78.harvestplus05

Angelotti-Mendonça, J., Koltun, A., Oliveira, F. F. de, & Siva, N. V. e. (2021). Genome editing:

propelling the next generation of crop improvement. *Colloquium Agrariae*, *17*(4), 83. https://doi.org/10.5747/ca.2021.v17.n4.a451

Anyanwu, E. C., Arowoogun, J. O., Odilibe, I. P., Akomolafe, O., Onwumere, C., & Ogugua, J. O. (2024). The role of biotechnology in healthcare: A review of global trends [Review of *The role of biotechnology in healthcare: A review of global trends*]. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, *21*(1), 2740. GSC Online Press. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0382

Anyshchenko, A. (2022). Aligning Policy Design With Science to Achieve Food Security: The Contribution of Genome Editing to Sustainable Agriculture. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2022.897643

Arimond, M., Hawkes, C., Ruel, M. T., Sifri, Z., Berti, P. R., Leroy, J. L., Low, J. W., Brown, L. R., & Frongillo, E. A. (2010). Agricultural interventions and nutrition: lessons from the past and new evidence. In *CABI eBooks* (p. 41). https://doi.org/10.1079/9781845937140.0041

Arun, V., Archakam, J. K. K., Kumar, C. P., Nagpal, A., Chandra, P. K., & Abedi, T. A. A. U. (2024). Examining the Relationship between Biotech Crop Cultivation and Global Food Security Sustainable Index: A Comparative Analysis from 2012 to 2018. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *552*, 1072. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202455201072

Aryee, A. N. A., & English, M. (2022). Improving Nutrition through Biofortification - A Systematic Review [Review of *Improving Nutrition through Biofortification - A Systematic Review*]. *Research Square (Research Square)*. Research Square (United States). https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2031143/v1

Atia, M. A. M., Jiang, W., Sedeek, K., Butt, H., & Mahfouz, M. M. (2024). Crop bioengineering via gene editing: reshaping the future of agriculture. *Plant Cell Reports*, *43*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00299-024-03183-1

AUTHOR_ID, N. (2023). Overview- Guest Editors'. *Indian Journal of Animal Health*, *62*. https://doi.org/10.36062/ijah.2023.spl.overview

Avnee, Sood, S., Chaudhary, D. R., Jhorar, P., & Rana, R. S. (2023). Biofortification: an approach to eradicate micronutrient deficiency [Review of *Biofortification: an approach to eradicate micronutrient deficiency*]. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *10*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2023.1233070

Ayoub, M. (2022). Three essays on green innovation and bioeconomy. *HAL (Le Centre Pour La Communication Scientifique Directe)*. https://theses.hal.science/tel-04089278

Baker, S. (2021). Challenges and opportunities in antimicrobial resistance research. *Microbiology*, *167*(1). https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.000999

Barry, N., Barnhill, S., & Johnson, B. B. (2025). Exploring experts' uncertainties about gene drive technology for agricultural pest control in the U.S.: a qualitative study to inform innovation and decision-making. *Environment Systems & Decisions*, *45*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10669-025-10051-0

Bayoumi, R., Bosqui, T., Awad, A., & Dajani, R. (2025). Editorial: Science diplomacy and neocolonialism: lessons from the field with a view to the future. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1700272

Beckmann, V. (2021). Transitioning to Sustainable Life on Land. In *MDPI eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.3390/books978-3-03897-879-4

Birgand, G., Castro-Sánchez, E., Hansen, S., Gastmeier, P., Lucet, J.-C., Ferlíe, E., Holmes, A., & Ahmad, R. (2018). Comparison of governance approaches for the control of antimicrobial resistance: Analysis of three European countries [Review of *Comparison of governance approaches for the control of antimicrobial resistance: Analysis of three European countries*]. *Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control*, *7*(1). BioMed Central. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-018-0321-5

Birol, E., & Bouis, H. E. (2023). Role of socio-economic research in developing, delivering and scaling new crop varieties: the case of staple crop biofortification [Review of *Role of socio-economic research in developing,* *delivering and scaling new crop varieties: the case of staple crop biofortification*]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *14*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2023.1099496

Bouis, H. (2017). The way forward. *African Journal of Food Agriculture Nutrition and Development*, *17*(2), 12130. https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.78.harvestplus17

Bouis, H. E., & Saltzman, A. (2017). Improving nutrition through biofortification: A review of evidence from HarvestPlus, 2003 through 2016 [Review of *Improving nutrition through biofortification: A review of evidence from HarvestPlus, 2003 through 2016*]. *Global Food Security*, *12*, 49. Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2017.01.009

Bulut, M., & Filik, G. (2024). The Future of Innovative Agriculture: Bioeconomy and Sustainable Agriculture. *Turkish Journal of Agriculture - Food Science and Technology*, *12*(6), 1110. https://doi.org/10.24925/turjaf.v12i6.1110-1119.6793

Bunge, A. C., Wood, A., Halloran, A., & Gordon, L. (2022). A systematic scoping review of the sustainability of vertical farming, plant-based alternatives, food delivery services and blockchain in food systems. *Nature Food*, *3*(11), 933. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-022-00622-8

Caceres, A. M., Singh, K. K., Minssen, T., Katwyk, S. R. V., & Hoffman, S. J. (2022). Using the International Pandemic Instrument to Revitalize the Innovation Ecosystem for Antimicrobial R&D. *The Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics*, *50*, 47. https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2022.79

Candia, N. B., Mayans, M. G. U., Sotelo, P. H., Nara, E., Arrúa, A. A., & Ríos, D. F. (2024). Paraguay's approach to biotechnology governance: a comprehensive guide. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2024.1373473

Ceylani, T., & Akçay, G. H. (2024). Innovative Solutions and Environmental Analysis of Current and Future Food Problems. *DergiPark (Istanbul University)*. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/maummfd/issue/89715/1575631

Cong, P., Assefa, Y., & Reid, S. (2023). An analysis of Australia's national action plan on antimicrobial resistance using a governance framework. *Journal of Public Health*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-023-02029-6

Covic, N. (2017). Advocacy for biofortification: Building stakeholder support, integration into regional and national policies, and sustaining momentum. *African Journal of Food Agriculture Nutrition and Development*, *17*(2), 12116. https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.78.harvestplus16

Dabić, M., Hjortsø, C. N., Marzi, G., & Vlačić, B. (2022). Guest editorial: Open innovation in the food industry: what we know, what we don't know, what we need to know. *British Food Journal*, *124*(6), 1777. https://doi.org/10.1108/bfj-06-2022-029

Dahabieh, M. S., Bröring, S., & Maine, E. (2018). Overcoming barriers to innovation in food and agricultural biotechnology. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, *79*, 204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2018.07.004

Das, K., Roy, P., & Tiwari, R. K. (2023). Biofortification of Rice, An Impactful Strategy for Nutritional Security: Current Perspectives and Future Prospect. In *IntechOpen eBooks*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.110460

Dash, B., Bhuyan, S. S., Sahoo, R. K., Swain, N., Jeughale, K., Sarkar, S., Verma, R., Parameswaran, C., Devanna, B. N., & Samantaray, S. (2025). CRISPR/Cas-mediated genome editing: playing a versatile role in mitigating the challenges of sustainable rice improvement [Review of *CRISPR/Cas-mediated genome editing: playing a versatile role in mitigating the challenges of sustainable rice improvement*]. *3 Biotech*, *15*(10), 327. Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-025-04494-0

Dhawi, F., & Aleidan, M. M. (2024). Oasis agriculture revitalization and carbon sequestration for climate-resilient communities. *Frontiers in Agronomy*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fagro.2024.1386671

Dheeran, P., Anantharaja, K., Campal, E. I., Kara, T. C., Selvaraj, M., Arisekar, U., Assiri, M. A., & Iswarya, K. (2025). Harnessing Biofloc technology: a sustainable paradigm for modern aquaculture. *Annals of Animal Science*. https://doi.org/10.2478/aoas-2025-0090

Doda, H., Sharma, A., & Thakur, N. (2025). A systematic review on sustainable practices transforming global agribusiness [Review of *A systematic review on sustainable practices transforming global agribusiness*]. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *9*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1566708

Domingo, J. L. (2025). Genetically modified Crops: Balancing safety, sustainability, and global security [Review of *Genetically modified Crops: Balancing safety, sustainability, and global security*]. *Environmental Research*, *286*, 122892. Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2025.122892

Dong, G., & Fan, Z. (2024). CRISPR/Cas-mediated germplasm improvement and new strategies for crop protection. *Crop Health*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44297-023-00020-x

Dorrego-Viera, J. I., Urbinati, A., Hansen, E. G., & Lazzarotti, V. (2025). Open innovation for circular and sustainable business models: case evidence from the bioeconomy sector. *Innovation*, *28*(1), 124. https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2025.2506731

Dougherty, J., Ridoutt, B. G., Jackson, M., Arsic, M., Juliano, P., & Oddy, V. H. (2023). A conceptual framework for modelling the role of livestock systems in sustainable diets and a sustainable planet. *Animal Production Science*, *63*(18), 1866. https://doi.org/10.1071/an23300

Dutia, S. (2014). AgTech: Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable Growth. *Innovations Technology Governance Globalization*, *9*, 161. https://doi.org/10.1162/inov_a_00208

Emelogu, U., Ponce, K., & Ganji, S. (2025). Harvesting Solutions: The Intersection of Technology, Agriculture, and Healthcare. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.33423/jsis.v20i1.7593

Entine, J., Felipe, M. S. S., Groenewald, J., Kershen, D. L., Lema, M. A., McHughen, A., Nepomuceno, A. L., Ohsawa, R., Ordonio, R. L., Parrott, W. A., Quemada, H., Ramage, C. M., Slamet-Loedin, I. H., Smyth, S. J., & Wray-Cahen, D. (2021). Regulatory approaches for genome edited agricultural plants in select countries and jurisdictions around the world [Review of *Regulatory approaches for genome edited agricultural plants in select countries and jurisdictions around the world*]. *Transgenic Research*, *30*(4), 551. Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11248-021-00257-8

Fahrudin, F. A., & Fahrudin, F. I. (2024). Food Biotechnology in Indonesia: Obstacles and Prospects in the Future. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 170. https://doi.org/10.51584/ijrias.2024.909015

Fears, R., Holzeis, C. C., & Meulen, V. ter. (2020). Designing inter-regional engagement to inform cohesive policy making. *Palgrave Communications*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-0487-3

Foley, J., Michaux, K. D., Mudyahoto, B., Kyazike, L., Cherian, B., Kalejaiye, O., Ifeoma, O., Ilona, P., Reinberg, C., Mavindidze, D., & Boy, E. (2021). Scaling Up Delivery of Biofortified Staple Food Crops Globally: Paths to Nourishing Millions. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*, *42*(1), 116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0379572120982501

Friedrich, J., Bunker, I., Uthes, S., & Zscheischler, J. (2021). The Potential of Bioeconomic Innovations to Contribute to a Social-Ecological Transformation: A Case Study in the Livestock System. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, *34*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-021-09866-z

Gaikwad, K. B., Rani, S., Kumar, M., Gupta, V., Babu, P. H., Bainsla, N. K., & Yadav, R. (2020). Enhancing the Nutritional Quality of Major Food Crops Through Conventional and Genomics-Assisted Breeding [Review of *Enhancing the Nutritional Quality of Major Food Crops Through Conventional and Genomics-Assisted Breeding*]. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *7*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2020.533453

Gall, O. L. (2016). Report of outcomes from the three parallel sessions dedicated to the theme of climate change. *HAL (Le Centre Pour La Communication Scientifique Directe)*. https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02739991

Genetic frontiers for conservation: an assessment of synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation: technical assessment. (2019). https://doi.org/10.2305/iucn.ch.2019.05.en

Gerullis, M. K., Pieruschka, R., Fahrner, S., Hartl, L., Schurr, U., & Heckelei, T. (2023). From genes to policy: mission-oriented governance of plant-breeding research and technologies. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2023.1235175

Gillum, D., & Moritz, R. (2025). Why implementation gaps could undermine synthetic nucleic acid oversight. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2025.1689753

Gostin, L. O., Friedman, E., & Finch, A. (2023). The Global Health Architecture: Governance and International Institutions to Advance Population Health Worldwide. *Milbank Quarterly*, *101*, 734. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12627

Gostin, L. O., Tomori, O., Wibulpolprasert, S., Jha, A. K., Frenk, J., Moon, S., Phumaphi, J., Piot, P., Stocking, B., Dzau, V. J., & Leung, G. (2016). Toward a Common Secure Future: Four Global Commissions in the Wake of Ebola. *PLoS Medicine*, *13*(5). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002042

Grote, U., Faße, A., Nguyễn, T. T., & Erenstein, O. (2021). Food Security and the Dynamics of Wheat and Maize Value Chains in Africa and Asia. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2020.617009

Gupta, O. P., Singh, A., Pandey, V., Sendhil, R., Khan, Mohd. K., Pandey, A., Kumar, S., Hamurcu, M., Ram, S., & Singh, G. P. (2024). Critical assessment of wheat biofortification for iron and zinc: a comprehensive review of conceptualization, trends, approaches, bioavailability, health impact, and policy framework [Review of *Critical assessment of wheat biofortification for iron and zinc: a comprehensive review of conceptualization, trends, approaches, bioavailability, health impact, and policy framework*]. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *10*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2023.1310020

Gupta A, Rajpurohit D. Antioxidant and antimicrobial activity of nutmeg (*Myristica fragrans*). In: [Book title if applicable]. 2011. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-375688-6.10098-2

Habib, M., Singh, S., Jan, S., Jan, K., & Bashir, K. (2025). The future of the future foods: understandings from the past towards SDG-2. *Npj Science of Food*, *9*(1), 138. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41538-025-00484-x

Hackfort, S. (2024). Democratization through precision technologies? Unveiling power, participation, and property rights in the agricultural bioeconomy. *Frontiers in Political Science*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1363044

Hallerman, E. M. (2019). Environmental Biology at a Critical Juncture in Human History. *Journal of Environmental Biology*, *40*(3), 271. https://doi.org/10.22438/jeb/40/3/editorial

Hallerman, E. M., Bredlau, J. P., Camargo, L. S. A., Dagli, M. L., Karembu, M., Kovich, D., Muia, A. N., Murrone, M. L., Rocha-Salavarrieta, P. J., Romero-Aldemita, R., Tizard, M., Walton, M., & Wray-Cahen, D. (2024). Enabling regulatory policy globally will promote realization of the potential of animal biotechnology. *CABI Agriculture and Bioscience*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43170-024-00221-6

Hamid, M. G., Elsafy, M., & Abdelhalim, T. S. (2025). Integrating sensory evaluation into biofortification breeding: assessing consumer acceptance and market segmentation of porridge made from biofortified pearl millet cultivars. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2025.1594589

Hamlyn, O. (2022). Synthesize this: integrating innovation governance and EU regulation of synthetic biology. *Journal of Law and Society*, *49*(3), 577. https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12375

Haq, Z., Irshad, S., Khan, A. A., Ahmad, S. F., & Bashir, S. M. (2024). Advances in Managing Nitrogen and Phosphorus Emissions in Ruminants: A Holistic Approach. In *Veterinary medicine and science*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1006578

Haque, H., Rahim, F. O., Munshi, Z. R., Sandhu, M., Ojelade, T., Khan, E., Malladi, E., Hmeda, A. B., Jang, A. S., Mahatara, E. V., Sule, Y., & Kapologwe, N. (2026). Strategic pathways to pharmaceutical self-reliance in Africa: lessons, enablers, and opportunities. *Journal of Global Health Economics and Policy*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.7189/001c.154008

Hartley, S., Gillund, F., Hove, L. van, & Wickson, F. (2016). Essential Features of Responsible Governance of Agricultural Biotechnology. *PLoS Biology*, *14*(5). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002453

Henderson, K., Lang, B., Kemper, J. A., & Conroy, D. (2023). Exploring diverse food system actor perspectives on gene editing: a systematic review of socio-cultural factors influencing acceptability [Review of *Exploring diverse food system actor perspectives on gene editing: a systematic review of socio-cultural factors influencing acceptability*]. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *41*(2), 883. Springer Nature (Netherlands). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-023-10523-6

Herrero, M., Thornton, P. K., Mason-D'Croz, D., Palmer, J., Bodirsky, B. L., Pradhan, P., Barrett, C. B., Benton, T. G., Hall, A., Pikaar, I., Bogard, J., Bonnett, G. D., Bryan, B. A., Campbell, B. M., Christensen, S., Clark, M., Fanzo, J., Godde, C., Jarvis, A., … Rockström, J. (2020). Articulating the effect of food systems innovation on the Sustainable Development Goals [Review of *Articulating the effect of food systems innovation on the Sustainable Development Goals*]. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, *5*(1). Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2542-5196(20)30277-1

Hoffman, S. J. (2016). Reimagining international law to address global health challenges. *HAL (Le Centre Pour La Communication Scientifique Directe)*. https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03498694

Hokanson, K. (2019). When Policy Meets Practice: The Dilemma for Guidance on Risk Assessment Under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2019.00082

Hotez, P. J., Pécoul, B., Rijal, S., Boehme, C., Aksoy, S., Malecela, M. N., Tapia-Conyer, R., & Reeder, J. C. (2016). Eliminating the Neglected Tropical Diseases: Translational Science and New Technologies [Review of *Eliminating the Neglected Tropical Diseases: Translational Science and New Technologies*]. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, *10*(3). Public Library of Science. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0003895

Huey, S. L., Islam, S., Mehta, N. H., Konieczynski, E. M., Friesen, V. M., Krisher, J. T., Mbuya, M. N. N., Monterrosa, E., Nyangaresi, A. M., & Mehta, S. (2024). Review of the facilitators and barriers to adoption of biofortified foods and food products [Review of *Review of the facilitators and barriers to adoption of biofortified foods and food products*]. *Nutrition Research Reviews*, 1. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954422424000258

Husain A, Alouffi S, Khanam A, Akasha R, Farooqui A, Ahmad S. Therapeutic efficacy of natural product C-phycocyanin in alleviating streptozotocin-induced diabetes via inhibition of glycation reaction in rats. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2022 Nov 17;23(22):14235. doi:10.3390/ijms232214235.

Ingrao, C., Bacenetti, J., Bezama, A., Blok, V., Goglio, P., Koukios, E. G., Lindner, M., Nemecek, T., Siracusa, V., Zabaniotou, A., & Huisingh, D. (2018). The potential roles of bio-economy in the transition to equitable, sustainable, post fossil-carbon societies: Findings from this virtual special issue. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *204*, 471. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.068

Institute, I. F. P. R. (2016). *Achieving a nutrition revolution for Africa: The road to healthier diets and optimal nutrition*. https://doi.org/10.2499/9780896295933

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation. (2021). *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*. https://doi.org/10.54660/anfo

James, R., Hardefeldt, L. Y., Ierano, C., Charani, E., Dowson, L., Elkins, S., & Thursky, K. (2025). Antimicrobial stewardship from a One Health perspective [Review of *Antimicrobial stewardship from a One Health perspective*]. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. Nature Portfolio. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-025-01233-3

Katwyk, S. R. V., Balasegaram, M., Boriello, P., Farrar, J., Giubilini, A., Harrison, M., Kiény, M.-P., Kirchhelle, C., Liu, J., Outterson, K., Pate, M. A., Poirier, M. J. P., Røttingen, J., Savulescu, J., Sugden, R., Thamlikitkul, V., Weldon, I., Davies, S. C., & Hoffman, S. J. (2019). A roadmap for sustainably governing the global antimicrobial commons. *The*

Lancet, *394*(10211), 1788. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(19)32767-9

Katwyk, S. R. V., Weldon, I., Giubilini, A., Kirchhelle, C., Harrison, M., McLean, A. R., Savulescu, J., & Hoffman, S. J. (2020). Making Use of Existing International Legal Mechanisms to Manage the Global Antimicrobial Commons: Identifying Legal Hooks and Institutional Mandates. *Health Care Analysis*, *31*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-020-00393-y

Keiper, F., & Atanassova, A. (2022). Enabling Genome Editing for Enhanced Agricultural Sustainability. *Frontiers in Genome Editing*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgeed.2022.898950

Keiper, F., Sprink, T., & Godwin, I. D. (2023). Editorial: Genome editing for agricultural sustainability: developments in tools, potential applications, and regulatory policy. *Frontiers in Genome Editing*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgeed.2023.1324921

Kesande, M., Jere, J., McCoy, S. I., Walekhwa, A. W., Nkosi-Mjadu, B. E., & Ndzerem-Shang, E. (2024). Self-Determination in Global Health Practices – Voices from the Global South. *Annals of Global Health*, *90*(1). https://doi.org/10.5334/aogh.4162

Khanjani, M. H., Sharifinia, M., & Hajirezaee, S. (2023). Strategies for promoting sustainable aquaculture in arid and semi-arid areas – A review [Review of *Strategies for promoting sustainable aquaculture in arid and semi-arid areas – A review*]. *Annals of Animal Science*, *24*(2), 293. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.2478/aoas-2023-0073

Khoruzhy, L. I., Katkov, Yu. N., Romanova, A. A., Katkova, E. A., & Dzhikiya, M. K. (2022). Adaptive management reporting system in inter-organizational relations of agricultural enterprises according to ESG principles. *Journal of Infrastructure Policy and Development*, *6*(2), 1649. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v6i2.1649

Knorr, D., & Augustin, M. A. (2023). Vanishing Water: Rescuing the Neglected Food Resource. *Food Engineering Reviews*, *15*(4), 609. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12393-023-09349-z

Komen, J., Tripathi, L., Mkoko, B., Ofosu, D. O., Oloka, H. K., & Wangari, D. (2020). Biosafety Regulatory Reviews and Leeway to Operate: Case Studies From Sub-Sahara Africa. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00130

Kong, X. (2025). GMO approvals under pressure: How climate shocks shape policy across nations. *PLoS ONE*, *20*(10). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0332298

Kuzma, J., Grieger, K., Cimadori, I., Cummings, C. L., Loschin, N., & Wei, W. (2023). Parameters, practices, and preferences for regulatory review of emerging biotechnology products in food and agriculture. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1256388

Lakshmanan, S., Rangasami, S. R. S., Somasundaram, S., Anantharaju, P., Vijayalakshmi, D., Rathika, S., & Dhamodharan, P. (2025). BIOFORTIFICATION IN PULSES AND LEGUMES FOR ALLEVIATING MALNUTRITION AND ENHANCING NUTRITIONAL SECURITY: A REVIEW [Review of *BIOFORTIFICATION IN PULSES AND LEGUMES FOR ALLEVIATING MALNUTRITION AND ENHANCING NUTRITIONAL SECURITY: A REVIEW*]. *Applied Ecology and Environmental Research*, *23*(1), 889. Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences. https://doi.org/10.15666/aeer/2301_889914

Lee, T.-L., & Sawai, T. (2024). Navigating equity in global access to genome therapy expanding access to potentially transformative therapies and benefiting those in need requires global policy changes. *Frontiers in Genetics*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2024.1381172

Li, Y., Herzog, F., Levers, C., Mohr, F., Verburg, P. H., Bürgi, M., Dossche, R., & Williams, T. G. (2024). Agricultural technology as a driver of sustainable intensification: insights from the diffusion and focus of patents. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, *44*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-024-00949-5

Lundgren, M. R., Cavanagh, A. P., & Macnaghten, P. (2025). Agricultural biotechnology: Potential, challenges, and debate. *Plants People Planet*, *7*(5), 1215. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppp3.70019

Lutta, A., Bößner, S., Johnson, F. X., Virgin, I., Trujillo, M. S., & Osano, P. (2024). Transnational innovation systems for bioeconomy: insights from cassava value chains in East Africa. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2024.1205795

Malézieux, É., Verger, E. O., Avallone, S., Alpha, A., Ngigi, P. B., Lourme-Ruiz, A., Bazile, D., Bricas, N., Ehret, I., Martin-Prével, Y., & Amiot, M. J. (2023). Biofortification versus diversification to fight micronutrient deficiencies: an interdisciplinary review. *Food Security*, *16*(1), 261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-023-01422-z

Malhotra, N. (2025). Harnessing genomics for sustainable food systems with orphan crops. *Discover Agriculture*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44279-025-00354-w

Malkawi, H. I., & Kapiel, T. (2024). Microbial Biotechnology: A Key Tool for Addressing Climate Change and Food Insecurity. *European Journal of Biology and Biotechnology*, *5*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbio.2024.5.2.503

Marcone, M. F., Madan, P., & Grodzinski, B. (2020). An Overview of the Sociological and Environmental Factors Influencing Eating Food Behavior in Canada [Review of *An Overview of the Sociological and Environmental Factors Influencing Eating Food Behavior in Canada*]. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *7*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2020.00077

Masehela, T., & Barros, E. (2023). The African continent should consider a harmonized consultative and collaborative effort towards coordinated policy and regulatory guidelines across the fields of biotechnology. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1211789

May, M., Hirsch, S., & Abramson, M. (2023). Transformation of Plantation Forestry Productivity for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a041670

Mazzucato, M. (2023). Rethinking Innovation in Drugs: A Pathway to Health for All. *The Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics*, *51*, 16. https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2023.157

Mba, C., Guimarães, E. P., & Ghosh, K. (2012). Re-orienting crop improvement for the changing climatic conditions of the 21st century. *Agriculture & Food Security*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/2048-7010-1-7

Mbaya, H., Lillico, S., Kemp, S. J., Simm, G., & Raybould, A. (2022). Regulatory frameworks can facilitate or hinder the potential for genome editing to contribute to sustainable agricultural development. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2022.959236

McWhorter, A. R., Trott, D. J., Schembri, M. A., Goldberg, J. B., Chattaway, M., Wrighton, K., Boll, R. M., Blair, J. M. A., Bonello, M., Applegate, T., Badman, S. G., Bradshaw, C. S., Broom, A., Field, P. R., Hocking, J. S., Huston, W. M., Kong, F. Y. S., Murray, G. L., Mokany, E., … Guy, R. (2024). Volume 45 Number 2. *Microbiology Australia*, *45*(2), 45. https://doi.org/10.1071/mav45n2

Meléndez, J. R. (2023). Economía agroalimentaria circular: tendencias gerenciales para la sostenibilidad de los sistemas de producción. *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia*, *28*, 664. https://doi.org/10.52080/rvgluz.28.e9.41

Mešić, A., Jurić, M., Donsì, F., Bandić, L. M., & Jurić, S. (2024). Advancing climate resilience: technological innovations in plant-based, alternative and sustainable food production systems. *Discover Sustainability*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00581-z

Mfuh, K. O., Abanda, N. N., & Titanji, B. K. (2023). Strengthening diagnostic capacity in Africa as a key pillar of public health and pandemic preparedness. *PLOS Global Public Health*, *3*(6). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0001998

Morgan, E. H., Hawkes, C., Dangour, A. D., & Lock, K. (2018). Analyzing food value chains for nutrition goals. *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition*, *14*(4), 447. https://doi.org/10.1080/19320248.2018.1434106

Moritz, J., Mazac, R., Ueta, M. H., Räty, N. S., Tuomisto, H. L., & Ryynänen, T. (2024). Prospects of Justice for Cellular Agriculture: A just Transition or Reinvesting in Unsustainability? *Food Ethics*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s41055-024-00156-8

Mudenda, S., Chabalenge, B., Daka, V., Mfune, R. L., Salachi, K. I., Mohamed, S., Mufwambi, W., Kasanga, M., & Matafwali, S. K. (2023).

Global Strategies to Combat Antimicrobial Resistance: A One Health Perspective. *Pharmacology &amp Pharmacy*, *14*(8), 271. https://doi.org/10.4236/pp.2023.148020

Mutuku, J., Mwaniki, M., Onjong, H., & Michira, J. (2020). The biofortification continuum: Implications for food and nutrition security in developing countries. *African Journal of Food Agriculture Nutrition and Development*, *20*(1), 15317. https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.89.18445

Naik, B., Kumar, V., Rizwanuddin, S., Mishra, S., Kumar, V., Saris, P. E. J., Khanduri, N., Kumar, A., Pandey, P., Gupta, A. K., Khan, J. M., & Rustagi, S. (2024). Biofortification as a solution for addressing nutrient deficiencies and malnutrition. *Heliyon*, *10*(9). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e30595

Ngongolo, K., & Mmbando, G. S. (2024). Harnessing biotechnology and breeding strategies for climate-resilient agriculture: pathways to sustainable global food security. *Discover Sustainability*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00653-0

Niazi, S. K. (2023). A Proposed Global Medicines Agency (GMA) to Make Biological Drugs Accessible: Starting with the League of Arab States. *Healthcare*, *11*(14), 2075. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11142075

Nizamani, M. M., Zhang, Q., Muhae-Ud-Din, G., & Wang, Y. (2023). High-throughput sequencing in plant disease management: a comprehensive review of benefits, challenges, and future perspectives [Review of *High-throughput sequencing in plant disease management: a comprehensive review of benefits, challenges, and future perspectives*]. *Phytopathology Research*, *5*(1). BioMed Central. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42483-023-00199-5

Ochieng, J. W., & Ananga, A. (2019). Biotechnology in Agricultural Policies of Sub-Saharan Africa. In *IntechOpen eBooks*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.85567

Ofori, K. F., Antoniello, S., English, M., & Aryee, A. N. A. (2022). Improving nutrition through biofortification–A systematic review [Review of *Improving nutrition through biofortification–A systematic review*]. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *9*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2022.1043655

Ofori, K. F., English, M., & Aryee, A. N. A. (2022). Improving Nutrition through Biofortification - A Systematic Review [Review of *Improving Nutrition through Biofortification - A Systematic Review*]. *Research Square (Research Square)*. Research Square (United States). https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2031143/v2

Okoye, C. U., Oladeji, O. A., Shittu, F. Y., Idriss, I. H., Orede, V. O., David, O. M., & Aja-Nwachuku, A. G. (2025). Fortified blended foods for malnutrition recovery in food aid programs. *Discover Food*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44187-025-00596-z

Oriekhoe, O. I., Ashiwaju, B. I., Ihemereze, K. C., Ikwue, U., & Udeh, C. A. (2024). REVIEW OF TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENTS IN FOOD SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN THE U.S. AND AFRICA. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, *6*(1), 132. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i1.713

Outterson, K., & Rex, J. (2023, February 11). Global Pull Incentives for Better Antibacterials: The UK Leads the Way. In *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy* (Vol. 21, Issue 3, p. 361). Adis, Springer Healthcare. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-023-00793-w

Payumo, J., Assem, S. K., Bhooshan, N., Galhena, H., Mbabazi, R., & Maredia, K. (2018). Managing Agricultural Research for Prosperity and Food Security in 2050: Comparison of Performance, Innovation Models and Prospects. *The Open Agriculture Journal*, *12*(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874331501812010020

Pedersen, D. B., Allen, K., Simon-Kumar, N., & Mills, G. (2022). Strengthening The Role of Communication in Evidence-Informed Policy. *Research Portal Denmark*, 72. https://local.forskningsportal.dk/local/dki-cgi/ws/cris-link?src=aau&id=aau-d6736d30-c354-49ee-b6bb-58ac7c9b70c8&ti=Strengthening%20The%20Role%20of%20Communication%20in%20Evidence-Informed%20Policy

Pehlivan, N., Altaf, M. T., Emamverdian, A., & Ghorbani, A. (2025). Beyond the lab: future-proofing agriculture for climate resilience and stress management [Review of *Beyond the lab: future-proofing agriculture for climate resilience and stress management*]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *16*, 1565850. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2025.1565850

Pixley, K. V., Falck-Zepeda, J. B., Paarlberg, R., Phillips, P. W. B., Slamet-Loedin, I. H., Dhugga, K. S., Campos, H., & Gutterson, N. (2022). Genome-edited crops for improved food security of smallholder farmers. *Nature Genetics*, *54*(4), 364. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01046-7

Pyone, T., & Swaminathan, S. (2024). Global Health Governance. In *Routledge eBooks* (p. 444). Informa. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032699028-30

Ranjan, D., Singh, S., Singh, A. K., Misra, V. K., Singh, C. P., & Kumar, D. (2026). Recent advancements in sustainable aquaculture: innovative techniques and future prospects. *Frontiers in Aquaculture*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/faquc.2026.1770106

Ren, M., So, A. D., Chandy, S. J., Mpundu, M., Peralta, A. Q., Åkerfeldt, K., Sjöblom, A. K., & Cars, O. (2022). Equitable Access to Antibiotics: A Core Element and Shared Global Responsibility for Pandemic Preparedness and Response. *The Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics*, *50*, 34. https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2022.77

Ríos, D. F., Quintana, S. A., Paniagua, P. G., Arrúa, A. A., Brozón, G. R., Hicar, M. S. B., Alegría, A., & Goberna, M. F. (2025). Regulatory challenges and global trade implications of genome editing in agriculture. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *13*, 1609110. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2025.1609110

Ríos, D. F., Rubinstein, C., & Vicién, C. (2018). Capacities for the Risk Assessment of GMOs: Challenges to Build Sustainable Systems. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2018.00040

Rodas-Moya, S., Giudici, F. M., Mudyahoto, B., Birol, E., Kodish, S., Lachat, C., Abreu, T. C., Melse-Boonstra, A., Hof, K. H. van het, Brouwer, I. D., Osendarp, S., & Feskens, E. J. M. (2022). Critical review of indicators, metrics, methods, and tools for monitoring and evaluation of biofortification programs at scale. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2022.963748

Rosegrant, M. W., & Cline, S. A. (2003). Global Food Security: Challenges and Policies. *Science*, *302*(5652), 1917. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1092958

Rosegrant, M. W., Ringler, C., Zhu, T., Tokgöz, S., & Bhandary, P. (2013). Water and food in the bioeconomy: challenges and opportunities for development. *Agricultural Economics*, *44*, 139. https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12058

Roy, P. K. (2024). Overview- Guest editors. *Indian Journal of Animal Health*, *63*. https://doi.org/10.36062/ijah.2024.spl.overview

Rushchitskaya, O., Kulikova, E., Кот, E., & Kruzhkova, T. (2024). Sustainable practices and technological innovations transforming agribusiness dynamics. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *542*, 3003. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202454203003

Rusmayadi, G., Mulyanti, D. R., & Alaydrus, A. Z. A. (2023). Revolutionizing Agrotechnology: Meeting Global Food Demand through Sustainable and Precision Farming Innovations. *West Science Interdisciplinary Studies*, *1*(8), 600. https://doi.org/10.58812/wsis.v1i08.172

Saxena, A., Baker, B. K., Banda, A., Herlitz, A., Miller, J., Karrar, K., Fleurbaey, M., Chiwa, E., Atuire, C., Hirose, I., & Hassoun, N. (2023). Pandemic preparedness and response: beyond the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator [Review of *Pandemic preparedness and response: beyond the Access to COVID-19 Tools Accelerator*]. *BMJ Global Health*, *8*(1). BMJ. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2022-010615

Sebastian, L. S., & Payumo, J. (2006). NARES Capacity in Relation to International Treaties and Conventions on Intellectual Property Rights, Agricultural Biotechnology, and Plant Genetic Resources Management. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Development*, *3*, 91. https://doi.org/10.37801/ajad2006.3.1-2.6

Sharma, U., Nisha, N., & Ray, A. (2025). An insight into the journey of CRISPR-CAS9 and its application in crop improvement. *Discover Plants.*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44372-025-00343-9

Sharma D, Rai S, Arora S, Gupta P, Sharma R, Chopra AK. Study of the trace elements in *Aloe vera* L. (*Aloe barbadensis* Miller) (Liliaceae) and its biological and environmental importance. *J Chem Pharm Res.* 2011;3:64–68.

Sharma DK, Sharma M, Singh DK, Gupta PM. Comparative nutritional analysis of *Spinacia oleracea* in different cities of western Uttar Pradesh (India). *Int J Chem Pharm Sci.* 2013 Dec;4(4):56–63.

Shevade, A., & Naik, S. (2023). Mitigation of Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) in G20. *Indian Public Policy Review*, *4*, 1. https://doi.org/10.55763/ippr.2023.04.04.001

Shukla S, Hegde S, Kumar A, Chaudhary G, Tewari S, Upreti D, Pal M. Fatty acid composition and antibacterial potential of *Cassia tora* (leaves and stem) collected from different geographic areas of India. *J Food Drug Anal.* 2017;26. doi:10.1016/j.jfda.2016.12.010.

Silva, R. G. L. da. (2024). The advancement of artificial intelligence in biomedical research and health innovation: challenges and opportunities in emerging economies. *Globalization and Health*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-024-01049-5

Spaans, G. W., Berg, J. P. van der, Bouwman, L. M. S., & Kleter, G. A. (2025). Advancements in genomic crop techniques and considerations for regulation and food safety. *Transgenic Research*, *34*(1), 49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11248-025-00467-4

Srivastava, K. K. (2024). Biomedical Advancements and Marginalized Communities: A Call for Inclusive Legal Frameworks. *African Journal of Biomedical Research*, 4158. https://doi.org/10.53555/ajbr.v27i4s.4376

Straeten, D. V. D., Bhullar, N. K., Steur, H. D., Gruissem, W., MacKenzie, D. J., Pfeiffer, W., Qaim, M., Slamet-Loedin, I. H., Strobbe, S., Tohmé, J., Trijatmiko, K. R., Vanderschuren, H., Montagu, M. V., Zhang, C., & Bouis, H. E. (2020). Multiplying the efficiency and impact of biofortification through metabolic engineering [Review of *Multiplying the efficiency and impact of biofortification through metabolic engineering*]. *Nature Communications*, *11*(1). Nature Portfolio. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19020-4

Strobbe, S., Lepeleire, J. D., & Straeten, D. V. D. (2018). From in planta Function to Vitamin-Rich Food Crops: The ACE of Biofortification [Review of *From in planta Function to Vitamin-Rich Food Crops: The ACE of Biofortification*]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *9*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2018.01862

Tahakik, R., Deshmukh, A. G., Moharil, M. P., Jadhav, P. V., Kogade, V. T., More, K. D., & Shinde, V. (2024). Transitioning from the Green Revolution to the Gene Revolution: strengthening nutritional security using climate resilient traditional crops. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre/Bulletin of the National Research Center*, *48*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-024-01281-4

Temple, V. A. K. (2012). Ending Hidden Hunger: Is there a weak link? *African Journal of Food Agriculture Nutrition and Development*, *12*(7), 1. https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.55.ed048

The Water, Energy and Food Security Nexus. (2014). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315848686

Toledo-Hernández, M., Lander, T. A., Chen, B., Xie, K., Atta-Boateng, A., & Wanger, T. C. (2021). Genome-edited tree crops: mind the socioeconomic implementation gap. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *36*(11), 972. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.08.007

Tomson, G., & Vlad, I. (2014). The need to look at antibiotic resistance from a health systems perspective [Review of *The need to look at antibiotic resistance from a health systems perspective*]. *Upsala Journal of Medical Sciences*, *119*(2), 117. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.3109/03009734.2014.902879

Torreele, E., Kazatchkine, M. D., Liu, J., Dybul, M., Cárdenas, M., Singh, S., Quigley, H. L., McNab, C., Sirleaf, E. J., Mazzucato, M., & Clark, H. (2023). Stopping epidemics when and where they occur. *The Lancet*, *401*(10374), 324. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(23)00015-6

Torreele, E., Wolfe, D., Kazatchkine, M. D., Sall, A. A., Ruxrungtham, K., Fitchett, J. R. A., Liu, J., Kobinger, G., Vaca-González, C., Gómez, C., Terblanche, P., Swaminathan, S., Olliaro, P., & Clark, H. (2023). From private incentives to public health need: rethinking research and development for pandemic preparedness [Review of *From private incentives to public health need: rethinking* *research and development for pandemic preparedness*]. *The Lancet Global Health*, *11*(10). Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2214-109x(23)00328-5

Tubb, C., & Seba, T. (2019). *Rethinking Food and Agriculture 2020-2030: The Second Domestication of Plants and Animals, the Disruption of the Cow, and the Collapse of Industrial Livestock Farming*. https://doi.org/10.61322/ijip9096

Verma, V., Kumar, A., Partap, M., Thakur, M., & Bhargava, B. (2023). CRISPR-Cas: A robust technology for enhancing consumer-preferred commercial traits in crops [Review of *CRISPR-Cas: A robust technology for enhancing consumer-preferred commercial traits in crops*]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *14*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2023.1122940

VijayaKumar, A., Syed, I., Dhulipalla, H., Ghosh, P., Srinivasan, L. V., Ahmad, F., Rana, S. S., & Singh, V. K. (2025). Biofortification as a sustainable strategy to address micronutrient malnutrition in South Asia. *Journal of Health Population and Nutrition*, *44*(1), 425. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41043-025-01108-6

Virk, P. S., Andersson, M. S., Arcos, J., Govindaraj, M., & Pfeiffer, W. (2021). Transition From Targeted Breeding to Mainstreaming of Biofortification Traits in Crop Improvement Programs [Review of *Transition From Targeted Breeding to Mainstreaming of Biofortification Traits in Crop Improvement Programs*]. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *12*. Frontiers Media. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.703990

Vogel, K. M., & Ouagrham-Gormley, S. B. (2018). Anticipating emerging biotechnology threats. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, *37*(2), 203. https://doi.org/10.1017/pls.2018.21

Wakeel, A., Farooq, M., Bashir, K., & Öztürk, L. (2018). Micronutrient Malnutrition and Biofortification: Recent Advances and Future Perspectives. In *Elsevier eBooks* (p. 225). Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-812104-7.00017-4

Weldon, I., & Hoffman, S. J. (2024). "Fit for Purpose?" Assessing the Ecological Fit of the Social Institutions that Globally Govern Antimicrobial Resistance. *Perspectives on Politics*, *22*(4), 1157. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1537592723002906

Weldon, I., Liddell, K., Katwyk, S. R. V., Hoffman, S. J., Minssen, T., Outterson, K., Palmer, S., Viens, A. M., & Viñuales, J. E. (2022). A Pandemic Instrument Can Start Turning Collective Problems into Collective Solutions by Governing the Common-Pool Resource of Antimicrobial Effectiveness. *The Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics*, *50*, 17. https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2022.75

Weldon, I., Yaseen, S., & Hoffman, S. J. (2022). A Pandemic Instrument can Optimize the Regime Complex for AMR by Striking a Balance between Centralization and Decentralization. *The Journal of Law Medicine & Ethics*, *50*, 26. https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2022.76

Whulanza, Y., Kusrini, E., Sahlan, M., & Kartohardjono, S. (2025). Food Securing Pathways: Balancing Progress and Rising Inequalities. *International Journal of Technology*, *16*(5), 1446. https://doi.org/10.14716/ijtech.v16i5.8100

Wilcks, A., & Quemada, H. (2023). Editorial: Policy and regulation in bioengineering and biotechnology. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1337663

Wit, M. M. de. (2021). Can agroecology and CRISPR mix? The politics of complementarity and moving toward technology sovereignty. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *39*(2), 733. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-021-10284-0

Xiao, S., Yang, J., He, J., Qu, L., & Chen, S. (2023). Launching Advanced Biotechnology to elevate biotechnology research across disciplines, from biomedicine to agriculture. *Advanced Biotechnology*, *1*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44307-023-00001-9

Xie, C. (2025). The role of modern agricultural technologies in improving agricultural productivity and land use efficiency. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *16*, 1675657. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2025.1675657

Yam, E. L. Y., Hsu, L. Y., Yap, E. P. H., Yeo, T. W., Lee, V., Schlundt, J., Lwin, M. O., Limmathurotsakul, D., Jit, M., Dedon, P. C., Turner, P., & Wilder-Smith, A. (2019). Antimicrobial Resistance in the Asia Pacific region: a meeting report. *Antimicrobial*

Resistance and Infection Control, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-019-0654-8

Yu, X., Wang, H., Wang, J., Yuan, X., Zhou, X., He, Q., Mokrousov, I., Sun, L., Dong, Y., & Zou, Z. (2026). Using implementation science to bridge the gaps between political commitment and action in antimicrobial resistance governance under the one health approach in the WHO Southeast Asia and Western Pacific regions. *The Lancet Regional Health - Western Pacific*, *66*, 101783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanwpc.2025.101783

Yuan, Y., Umer, M., Yang, X., & Qu, M. (2025). Agri-sustainability transitions: innovation-policy coordination mechanisms in green system restructuring. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2025.1628073

Zawedde, B. M., Kwehangana, M., Ongu, I., Ibanda, A., Wasswa, P., Kiggundu, A., Mugoya, C. F., Kasule, D., Makara, A., Hafashimana, D., Ssengooba, T., & Oloka, H. K. (2025). Uganda’s evolving national biosafety system: lessons from the past 30 years. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2025.1654335

Zefreh, M. G., Viera, M. E. D., Moghayer, S., Kristkova, Z. S., Zeist, W. van, Bunnefeld, N., Pong-Wong, R., Dettenhofer, M., Manikas, I., & Doeschl-Wilson, A. (2025). Rethinking livestock futures: Integrating climate impacts and genomic technologies into global food security models. *EarthArXiv (California Digital Library)*. https://doi.org/10.31223/x5ft94

Zenda, M. (2025). Climate change adaptation and mitigation in different livestock production systems and agro-ecological zones in South Africa: A systematic review [Review of *Climate change adaptation and mitigation in different livestock production systems and agro-ecological zones in South Africa: A systematic review*]. *Tropical Animal Health and Production*, *57*(8). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-025-04660-9

Zheng, L., Zhang, H. R., Zhang, S., Hua, Y., & Li-hu, W. (2025). Editorial: Genetic dissection and improvement of crop quality and stress adaptation. *Frontiers in Genetics*, *16*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2025.1694599

何千山. (2025). The influence of organizational policies on firm environmental performance through sustainable technologies and innovation and stakeholder concerns. *Scientific Reports*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-94499-9