IJAAR PUBLISHING®

Scholarly Journal of Social Sciences Research | ISSN: 2955-0785
Vol. 4, Issue 3 (2025) | www.ijaar.org/sjssr

GOVERNMENT POLICIES ON GMO FOOD SAFETY TESTING AND RISK ASSESSMENT

Comfort Nwuchola[1]; Ahmad Abdulrazaq Itopa[1]; Sumaiyat Sadauki Abubakar[2]

[1]Kogi State Polytechnic, Lokoja, Kogi State

[2]Nottingham University, United Kingdom

Abstract

Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) have transformed agricultural practices, offering increased crop yields and resistance to pests and diseases. However, their introduction into the food supply has raised concerns about safety, prompting governments worldwide to establish policies for GMO food safety testing and risk assessment. This article examines the regulatory frameworks, safety testing protocols, and risk assessment methodologies adopted by various governments, with a focus on the United States, European Union, and other key regions. It explores the scientific basis of these policies, the challenges of harmonizing global standards, and the role of public perception in shaping regulations. The findings highlight the need for robust, transparent, and science-based policies to ensure consumer safety while fostering innovation in biotechnology.

Keywords: genetically modified organisms, agricultural practices, pests and diseases, risk assessment, policies

Nwuchola, C., Itopa, A. A., & Abubakar, S. S. (2025). Government Policies on GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment. *Scholarly Journal of Social Sciences Research. 4*(3), 55-79. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16904415

1.0 Introduction

Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) refer to plants, animals, or microorganisms whose genetic material has been altered using recombinant DNA technology to introduce desirable traits, such as resistance to pests, enhanced nutritional content, or improved shelf life (World Health Organization [WHO], 2020). Since the commercialization of GMOs in the 1990s, their adoption in agriculture has grown significantly, with global cultivation reaching 191.7 million hectares in 2018 (International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications [ISAAA], 2018). GMOs offer potential benefits, including increased crop yields and reduced pesticide use, but their introduction into the food supply has raised concerns about safety, environmental impact, and ethical considerations (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). To address these concerns, governments worldwide have established policies and regulatory frameworks to ensure GMO food safety through rigorous testing and risk assessment protocols.

GMO food safety testing and risk assessment involve systematic evaluations to determine whether genetically modified foods pose risks to human health or the environment. Safety testing typically includes toxicological studies, allergenicity assessments, and nutritional analyses, while risk assessment evaluates the likelihood and severity of potential adverse effects (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009). These processes are guided by the principle of "substantial equivalence," which compares GMOs to their non-modified counterparts to identify significant differences in composition or safety (WHO, 2020). However, the implementation of these protocols varies across countries due to differences in scientific, cultural, and political perspectives on GMOs.

Government policies play a critical role in shaping the development, approval, and commercialization of GMO foods. Regulatory frameworks differ globally, reflecting diverse approaches to balancing innovation, safety, and public trust. For instance, the United States adopts a product-based approach, regulating GMOs under existing food safety laws, while the European Union employs a process-based approach, requiring specific legislation for GMOs due to their genetic modification process (European Commission, 2020). These policies influence the scope of safety testing, the rigor of risk assessments, and the transparency of labeling requirements, impacting consumer confidence and international trade.

The importance of robust government policies cannot be overstated, as they ensure that GMO foods meet safety standards while addressing public concerns about long-term health effects and environmental sustainability. Inadequate or inconsistent policies can lead to public mistrust, trade disputes, or undetected risks (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). For example, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2000), an international agreement under the Convention on Biological Diversity, emphasizes the need for science-based risk assessments to prevent adverse effects on biodiversity and human health (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2000). Despite such frameworks, challenges remain, including harmonizing regulations across borders, addressing emerging biotechnologies like gene editing, and incorporating public input into policy-making.

Table 1 summarizes key regulatory frameworks for GMO food safety testing and risk assessment in selected regions, highlighting their approaches and governing bodies.

Table 1: Overview of GMO Regulatory Frameworks in Selected Regions

Region/Country	Regulatory Approach	Governing Body	Key Features
United States	Product-based	Food and Drug Administration (FDA), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	Voluntary consultation process; GMOs regulated under existing food safety laws (FDA, 2020).
European Union	Process-based	European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)	Mandatory pre-market approval; stringent risk assessment and labeling requirements (European Commission, 2020).
Canada	Product-based	Health Canada, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)	Focus on novel traits; case-by-case evaluation (Health Canada, 2019).
Brazil	Hybrid	National Biosafety Technical Commission (CTNBio)	Science-based risk assessment; mandatory labeling (CTNBio, 2020).
International	Risk-based	Codex Alimentarius Commission	Guidelines for safety assessment; principle of substantial equivalence (Codex Alimentarius, 2009).

This review aims to explore government policies on GMO food safety testing and risk assessment, examining their scientific foundations, regulatory differences, and impacts on public health and trade. By analyzing key frameworks, challenges, and emerging trends, this study seeks to provide insights into how governments can balance innovation with safety in the rapidly evolving field of biotechnology.

1.1 Importance of Safety Testing and Risk Assessment for GMO Foods

1.1.1 Protection of Human Health

Safety testing and risk assessment are critical to ensuring that GMO foods are safe for human consumption. These processes evaluate potential toxicity, allergenicity, and nutritional changes that may arise from genetic modifications. For instance, toxicological studies assess whether novel proteins introduced in GMOs could cause adverse health effects, while allergenicity tests determine if new proteins might trigger immune responses (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009). The principle of substantial equivalence, widely used in GMO assessments, compares GMOs to their conventional counterparts to identify significant differences in composition or safety (World Health Organization [WHO], 2020). Without these evaluations, undetected risks, such as the introduction of allergens or unintended toxic compounds, could enter the food supply, posing health hazards.

1.1.2 Environmental Safety

Risk assessment extends beyond human health to evaluate the environmental impact of GMO cultivation. This includes assessing the potential for gene flow to wild species, which could disrupt ecosystems, or the development of pesticide-resistant pests due to widespread GMO use (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). For example, the cultivation of Bt crops, engineered to

produce insect-repelling toxins, requires monitoring to prevent resistance in target pests, which could undermine agricultural sustainability (National Academy of Sciences, 2016). Robust risk assessments help governments implement measures to mitigate environmental risks, ensuring that GMOs do not harm biodiversity or ecosystem stability.

1.1.3 Public Trust and Acceptance

Comprehensive safety testing and transparent risk assessment processes are essential for building and maintaining public trust in GMO foods. Public skepticism about GMOs often stems from concerns about safety and corporate control of the food supply (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). Rigorous, science-based evaluations, coupled with clear communication of findings, can address these concerns and enhance consumer confidence. For instance, mandatory labeling policies, supported by safety assessments, allow consumers to make informed choices, as seen in the European Union's stringent GMO regulations (European Commission, 2020). Failure to conduct thorough testing can lead to public backlash and reduced acceptance of GMOs, hindering their potential to address food security challenges.

1.1.4 Regulatory Compliance and International Trade

Safety testing and risk assessment are integral to meeting regulatory requirements and facilitating international trade. Different countries have varying standards for GMO approval, with some, like the EU, requiring extensive pre-market safety assessments, while others, like the United States, rely on voluntary consultations under existing food safety laws (FDA, 2020; European Commission, 2020). Harmonized risk assessment protocols, such as those outlined by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (2009), help ensure that GMO foods meet global safety standards, reducing trade disputes. For example, asynchronous approvals—where one country approves a GMO before another—can disrupt trade if safety data is not standardized (ISAAA, 2018). Rigorous testing ensures compliance with international agreements like the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2000).

1.1.5 Addressing Emerging Biotechnologies

The rise of new genetic engineering techniques, such as CRISPR-based gene editing, underscores the ongoing need for safety testing and risk assessment. Unlike traditional GMOs, gene-edited crops may involve subtle genetic changes, raising questions about whether they require the same level of scrutiny (National Academy of Sciences, 2016). Comprehensive risk assessments ensure that these emerging technologies are evaluated for unintended effects, maintaining safety standards as biotechnology evolves.

Table 2: Key Aspects of GMO Safety Testing and Risk Assessment

Aspect	Purpose	Methods	Importance
Toxicological Testing	Assess potential toxicity of novel proteins or compounds	Animal studies, in vitro assays	Prevents harmful substances from entering the food supply (WHO, 2020)
Allergenicity Assessment	Evaluate potential to cause allergic reactions	Bioinformatics, serum testing	Protects sensitive populations from new allergens (Codex Alimentarius, 2009)
Nutritional Analysis	Compare nutritional content to conventional foods	Compositional analysis	Ensures GMOs maintain or improve nutritional quality (FDA, 2020)
Environmental Risk Assessment	Evaluate ecological impacts (e.g., gene flow, pest resistance)	Field trials, modeling	Safeguards biodiversity and agricultural sustainability (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013)
Post-Market Monitoring	Detect long-term effects after approval	Surveillance, consumer reporting	Identifies unforeseen risks post-commercialization (European Commission, 2020)

2.0 Overview of GMO Development and Use in Agriculture

Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are organisms whose genetic material has been altered using biotechnology techniques, such as recombinant DNA technology, to introduce desirable traits (World Health Organization [WHO], 2020). In agriculture, GMO development began in the 1980s, with the first commercial GMO crop, the Flavr Savr tomato, approved in the United States in 1994 (FDA, 2020). Since then, GMO crops like maize, soybeans, cotton, and canola have been engineered for traits such as pest resistance, herbicide tolerance, and enhanced nutritional content. By 2018, GMO crops were cultivated on 191.7 million hectares across 26 countries, with major adopters including the United States, Brazil, and Argentina (International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications [ISAAA], 2018). The development process involves identifying target genes, inserting them into the host organism using vectors like Agrobacterium or gene guns, and conducting extensive testing to ensure safety and efficacy (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). GMOs are used primarily in agriculture to improve crop productivity, reduce pesticide use, and address food security challenges, particularly in developing nations.

2.1 Potential Benefits of GMO Foods

2.1.1 Increased Yield

GMO crops are designed to enhance agricultural productivity by improving resistance to environmental stresses and pests. For example, Bt crops, engineered to produce Bacillus thuringiensis toxin, reduce crop losses from insect damage, leading to yield increases of up to 20% in some regions (National Academy of Sciences, 2016). Higher yields contribute to global food security, particularly in areas facing population growth and climate challenges.

2.1.2 Pest and Disease Resistance

GMOs with pest-resistant traits, such as Bt maize and cotton, reduce the need for chemical pesticides, lowering production costs and environmental impact. Studies show that Bt crops

have decreased pesticide applications by up to 50% in some cases (ISAAA, 2018). Similarly, crops like virus-resistant papaya have saved industries from devastating diseases, ensuring stable production (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013).

2.1.3 Herbicide Tolerance

Herbicide-tolerant GMOs, such as Roundup Ready soybeans, allow farmers to use broad-spectrum herbicides without damaging crops, simplifying weed management and reducing labor costs (National Academy of Sciences, 2016). This has led to widespread adoption, with over 90% of U.S. soybeans being GMO by 2018 (ISAAA, 2018).

2.1.4 Improved Nutritional Content

GMOs can enhance nutritional quality, addressing malnutrition. Golden Rice, engineered to produce beta-carotene, combats vitamin A deficiency in developing countries (WHO, 2020). Such innovations hold potential for improving public health outcomes in resource-poor regions.

2.1.5 Environmental Benefits

By reducing pesticide use and enabling no-till farming, GMOs can decrease soil erosion and greenhouse gas emissions. For instance, herbicide-tolerant crops promote conservation tillage, which enhances soil health and sequesters carbon (National Academy of Sciences, 2016).

2.2 Potential Risks and Public Concerns

2.2.1 Health Risks

Public concerns about GMO safety focus on potential toxicity, allergenicity, and unintended nutritional changes. Although extensive testing has found no evidence of harm from approved GMOs, critics argue that long-term effects remain understudied (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). For example, concerns persist about novel proteins causing allergic reactions, necessitating rigorous allergenicity assessments (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009).

2.2.2 Environmental Risks

GMO cultivation raises environmental concerns, including gene flow to non-GMO crops or wild species, potentially creating herbicide-resistant "superweeds" or disrupting ecosystems. The development of pesticide-resistant pests due to overuse of Bt crops is another risk, requiring resistance management strategies (National Academy of Sciences, 2016). For instance, resistance in corn rootworms has been documented in some regions (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013).

2.2.3 Ethical and Socioeconomic Issues

Ethical concerns include the corporate control of the food supply by biotechnology companies, which can limit farmer autonomy through patented seeds and restrictive licensing (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). Additionally, GMO adoption may exacerbate inequalities, as small-scale farmers in developing countries may struggle to afford GMO seeds or comply with regulatory requirements. Public skepticism is also fueled by distrust in institutions and perceived "unnaturalness" of GMOs (WHO, 2020).

2.2.4 Public Perception and Misinformation

Despite scientific consensus on the safety of approved GMOs, public concerns persist due to misinformation and lack of transparent communication. Surveys indicate that up to 50% of consumers in some countries view GMOs as unsafe, often influenced by media or advocacy groups (ISAAA, 2018). This perception gap complicates GMO acceptance and policy implementation.

Table 3: Summary of GMO Benefits and Risks

Aspect	Benefits	Risks/Concerns
Agricultural Productivity	Increased yields (e.g., 20% for Bt crops)	Gene flow to non-GMO crops; superweed development
Environmental Impact	Reduced pesticide use (up to 50%); conservation tillage	Pesticide-resistant pests; biodiversity loss
Health and Nutrition	Enhanced nutrition (e.g., Golden Rice)	Potential allergenicity; long-term health unknowns
Socioeconomic Factors	Lower production costs; food security	Corporate control; farmer dependency on seed companies
Public Perception	Potential to address global hunger	Misinformation; distrust in safety and regulation

Sources: ISAAA (2018), National Academy of Sciences (2016), and Bawa & Anilakumar (2013).

2.3 Role of Government Policies in Ensuring Safety and Public Trust

Government policies are pivotal in regulating GMO development, ensuring safety, and fostering public trust. These policies encompass safety testing, risk assessment, labeling, and public engagement, with variations across regions reflecting scientific, cultural, and political priorities.

2.3.1 Safety Testing and Risk Assessment

Governments mandate rigorous safety evaluations to protect human health and the environment. In the United States, the FDA, USDA, and EPA oversee a coordinated framework, using voluntary consultations to assess GMO safety under existing food laws (FDA, 2020). In contrast, the European Union's European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) requires mandatory pre-market approvals, emphasizing the genetic modification process itself (European Commission, 2020). International guidelines, such as those from the Codex Alimentarius Commission (2009), promote science-based risk assessments using substantial equivalence to ensure global consistency.

2.3.2 Labeling and Transparency

Labeling policies enhance transparency and consumer choice, addressing public concerns. The EU mandates clear GMO labeling, boosting public trust but increasing compliance costs (European Commission, 2020). In the U.S., the National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard (2016) requires labeling but allows flexibility (e.g., QR codes), which critics argue reduces transparency (FDA, 2020). Effective labeling bridges the gap between scientific evidence and public perception.

2.3.3 Public Engagement and Communication

Governments foster trust by engaging stakeholders and communicating safety findings. For example, Canada's Health Canada conducts public consultations to incorporate societal input into GMO approvals (Health Canada, 2019). Transparent communication about risk assessments and regulatory processes helps counter misinformation and build confidence.

2.3.4 International Harmonization

Policies aligned with international agreements, like the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2000), facilitate trade and ensure consistent safety standards (Secretariat of the Convention

on Biological Diversity, 2000). Harmonization reduces trade barriers caused by asynchronous approvals, as seen in disputes over unapproved GMOs in EU imports (ISAAA, 2018).

2.3.5 Adapting to New Technologies

Emerging biotechnologies, such as CRISPR gene editing, challenge existing frameworks. Governments must update policies to address these innovations, balancing safety with innovation. For instance, the U.S. has proposed streamlined regulations for gene-edited crops with no foreign DNA, while the EU classifies them as GMOs, requiring full risk assessments (National Academy of Sciences, 2016; European Commission, 2020).

3.0 Key Components of GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment

Ensuring the safety of genetically modified organism (GMO) foods requires robust safety testing methodologies and risk assessment frameworks, guided by international standards. These components collectively address potential risks to human health, the environment, and ecosystems, while fostering public trust and regulatory compliance. Below, we explore the methodologies used in safety testing, the frameworks for risk assessment, and the international standards that harmonize these processes globally.

3.1 Safety Testing Methodologies

Safety testing methodologies for GMO foods are designed to evaluate potential health and environmental risks associated with genetic modifications. These methods focus on toxicological, allergenicity, nutritional, and environmental impacts, ensuring GMOs are as safe as their conventional counterparts.

3.1.1 Toxicological Testing

Toxicological studies assess whether novel proteins or compounds introduced in GMOs pose health risks. These tests include in vitro assays (e.g., cell culture studies) and in vivo studies (e.g., animal feeding trials, typically using rodents) to evaluate acute and chronic toxicity. For example, 90-day feeding studies in rats are commonly used to detect adverse effects of GMO consumption (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009). The goal is to identify any toxicological differences compared to non-GMO counterparts.

3.1.2 Allergenicity Assessment

Allergenicity testing determines whether new proteins in GMOs could trigger allergic reactions. Methods include bioinformatics analysis to compare protein sequences with known allergens, in vitro digestibility tests to assess protein stability in the digestive system, and, in some cases, serum screening with samples from allergic individuals (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). For instance, the Codex Alimentarius guidelines recommend a stepwise approach, starting with sequence homology and progressing to clinical testing if needed (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009).

3.1.3 Nutritional Analysis

Compositional analysis compares the nutritional content of GMO foods (e.g., vitamins, minerals, macronutrients) to conventional foods to ensure substantial equivalence. Techniques like mass spectrometry and chromatography are used to quantify key nutrients and anti-nutrients (WHO, 2020). For example, Golden Rice is tested to confirm elevated beta-carotene levels without unintended nutritional deficiencies (National Academy of Sciences, 2016).

3.1.4 Environmental Impact Testing

Environmental safety testing evaluates the ecological effects of GMO cultivation, such as gene flow to non-GMO crops or wild species and impacts on non-target organisms (e.g., beneficial insects). Field trials and laboratory studies assess these risks, often using controlled

environments to simulate real-world conditions (European Food Safety Authority [EFSA], 2010). For Bt crops, studies monitor effects on pollinators like bees to ensure ecosystem safety.

3.2 Risk Assessment Frameworks

Risk assessment frameworks provide structured approaches to evaluate the likelihood and severity of potential adverse effects from GMO foods. These frameworks are science-based, iterative, and tailored to the specific GMO and its intended use.

3.2.1 Substantial Equivalence

The principle of substantial equivalence, a cornerstone of GMO risk assessment, compares GMOs to their non-modified counterparts to identify significant differences in composition, safety, or environmental impact (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009). If differences are found, further testing focuses on those specific traits. This framework is used globally, including by the FDA and EFSA (FDA, 2020; EFSA, 2010).

3.2.2 Case-by-Case Assessment

Risk assessments are conducted on a case-by-case basis, recognizing that each GMO has unique genetic modifications and intended uses. This approach evaluates the specific gene, trait, and host organism, considering factors like cultivation environment and dietary exposure (WHO, 2020). For example, a Bt maize variety requires different assessments than a nutritionally enhanced rice variety.

3.2.3 Tiered Risk Assessment

A tiered approach starts with basic screening (e.g., molecular characterization of the inserted gene) and progresses to more complex studies (e.g., field trials or long-term feeding studies) if initial tests indicate potential risks. This framework optimizes resources by focusing intensive testing on GMOs with identified concerns (EFSA, 2010).

3.2.4 Post-Market Monitoring

Post-market monitoring tracks GMO foods after commercialization to detect unforeseen effects. This includes surveillance for health impacts (e.g., consumer reporting systems) and environmental monitoring (e.g., tracking pest resistance). The EU mandates post-market monitoring for approved GMOs to ensure long-term safety (European Commission, 2020).

3.3 International Standards

International standards provide harmonized guidelines to ensure consistency in GMO safety testing and risk assessment, facilitating global trade and regulatory cooperation. Key standards include:

3.3.1 Codex Alimentarius Commission Guidelines

The Codex Alimentarius Commission (2009), established by the FAO and WHO, provides science-based guidelines for GMO safety assessment. These include protocols for toxicological and allergenicity testing, nutritional analysis, and environmental risk assessment, emphasizing substantial equivalence and case-by-case evaluation. These guidelines are widely adopted by countries like the U.S., Canada, and Brazil (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009).

3.3.2 Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety

The Cartagena Protocol (2000), under the Convention on Biological Diversity, sets international standards for the safe handling, transport, and use of GMOs, particularly for environmental safety. It requires advance informed agreement (AIA) for GMO imports and emphasizes risk assessments to protect biodiversity (Secretariat of the Convention on

Biological Diversity, 2000). Over 170 countries are parties to the protocol, influencing national regulations.

3.3.3 OECD Guidelines

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) provides consensus documents on the safety assessment of GMO crops, including compositional data for crops like maize and soybeans. These documents support substantial equivalence assessments and are used by regulatory agencies worldwide (OECD, 2015).

3.3.4 ISO Standards

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) offers standards for analytical methods used in GMO testing, such as PCR-based detection of modified DNA. These ensure reliable and reproducible results across laboratories globally (ISO, 2016).

Table 4: Key Safety Testing Methodologies and Risk Assessment Frameworks

Component	Description	Examples/Techniques	Reference
Toxicological Testing	Evaluates toxicity of novel proteins or compounds	90-day rodent feeding studies, in vitro assays	Codex Alimentarius Commission (2009)
Allergenicity Assessment	Assesses potential to cause allergic reactions	Bioinformatics, digestibility tests, serum screening	Bawa & Anilakumar (2013)
Nutritional Analysis	Compares nutritional content to conventional foods	Mass spectrometry, chromatography	WHO (2020)
Environmental Testing	Assesses ecological impacts (e.g., gene flow, non-target effects)	Field trials, laboratory studies	EFSA (2010)
Substantial Equivalence	Compares GMO to non-GMO counterpart	Compositional analysis, safety testing	Codex Alimentarius Commission (2009)
Case-by-Case Assessment	Tailors evaluation to specific GMO traits	Gene-specific testing, environmental context	WHO (2020)
Tiered Risk Assessment	Progresses from screening to detailed studies	Molecular characterization, field trials	EFSA (2010)
Post-Market Monitoring	Tracks long-term effects after approval	Consumer surveillance, environmental monitoring	European Commission (2020)

4.0 Government Policies on GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment by Region

Government policies on genetically modified organism (GMO) food safety testing and risk assessment vary significantly across regions due to differences in scientific approaches, cultural attitudes, and economic priorities. These policies govern the development, approval, and commercialization of GMOs, ensuring safety for human health and the environment while addressing public concerns. Below, we examine the policies in the United States, China,

the European Union, Africa, and Nigeria, focusing on safety testing methodologies, risk assessment frameworks, and regulatory oversight.

4.1 United States

4.1.1 Regulatory Framework

The United States employs a product-based approach to GMO regulation under the Coordinated Framework for Regulation of Biotechnology (1986), which integrates existing food safety laws. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) share oversight. The FDA regulates GMO foods under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, focusing on safety and nutritional equivalence to conventional foods. The USDA oversees plant health, and the EPA regulates GMOs with pesticidal properties (e.g., Bt crops) (FDA, 2020).

4.1.2 Safety Testing and Risk Assessment:

Developers voluntarily consult with the FDA to demonstrate substantial equivalence, submitting data on compositional analysis, toxicological studies (e.g., 90-day rodent feeding trials), and allergenicity assessments (FDA, 2020).

Risk assessments are tailored to the specific GMO, focusing on novel traits. For example, Bt maize undergoes EPA evaluation for environmental impact on non-target organisms (National Academy of Sciences, 2016).

Limited mandatory post-market monitoring exists, relying on voluntary reporting of adverse effects.

The National Bioengineered Food Disclosure Standard (2016) mandates labeling for GMO foods but allows flexibility (e.g., QR codes), which critics argue reduces transparency (FDA, 2020).

4.2 China

4.2.1 Regulatory Framework

China adopts a process-based approach, regulating GMOs as a distinct category requiring government approval. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) oversees GMO safety under the Administrative Measures on the Safety Assessment of Agricultural GMOs (2002, revised 2017). The National Biosafety Committee conducts risk assessments, and the State Administration for Market Regulation (SAMR) supervises imports and labeling.

4.2.2 Safety Testing and Risk Assessment:

Developers must obtain GMO Safety Certificates through rigorous testing, including molecular characterization, toxicological studies (e.g., animal feeding trials), and allergenicity assessments (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009).

Field trials evaluate gene flow and impacts on non-target species, critical for crops like Bt cotton, widely grown in China (ISAAA, 2018). In addition, mandatory labeling is required for GMO foods, and imports must comply with strict safety assessments.

4.3 European Union

4.3.1 Regulatory Framework

The EU employs a process-based approach, treating GMOs as distinct from conventional foods under stringent regulations. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) conducts centralized risk assessments, while the European Commission and member states authorize

GMOs under Directive 2001/18/EC (deliberate release) and Regulation (EC) 1829/2003 (food and feed) (European Commission, 2020).

4.3.2 Safety Testing and Risk Assessment:

GMOs undergo comprehensive safety testing, including toxicological studies, allergenicity assessments, and nutritional analysis, guided by EFSA's Guidance on the Environmental Risk Assessment of GM Plants (EFSA, 2010).

Extensive field trials assess gene flow, biodiversity impacts, and non-target effects. For example, MON810 maize, one of few approved GMOs, underwent rigorous environmental testing.

GMOs must be traceable, and foods with >0.9% GMO content require mandatory labeling to ensure consumer choice (European Commission, 2020).

4.4 Africa

4.4.1 Regulatory Framework

GMO policies in Africa vary widely, with only 11 of 54 countries (e.g., South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya) approving GMO cultivation. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (2000) influences many African nations, emphasizing precautionary risk assessments to protect biodiversity (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2000). Policies range from permissive (e.g., South Africa) to restrictive (e.g., Zambia, Zimbabwe), often driven by trade concerns with the EU, a major export market.

4.4.2 Safety Testing and Risk Assessment

South Africa employs a science-based framework under the Genetically Modified Organisms Act (1997), requiring toxicological, allergenicity, and environmental assessments similar to Codex guidelines (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009). Countries like Zambia ban GMO cultivation and imports (except milled food aid) due to health and environmental concerns.

Many African nations lack infrastructure for comprehensive safety testing, relying on imported data or regional collaborations (e.g., African Biosafety Network) (Komen et al., 2020).

Public opposition, fueled by fears of health risks and biodiversity loss, shapes restrictive policies. For example, Zambia's 2002 rejection of GMO food aid was driven by local activism and concerns about export markets (Lewin, 2018).

4.5 Nigeria

4.5.1 Regulatory Framework

Nigeria permits GMO cultivation under the National Biosafety Management Agency Act (2015), overseen by the National Biosafety Management Agency (NBMA). The NBMA regulates GMO safety, aligning with the Cartagena Protocol and Codex guidelines, with a focus on case-by-case assessments.

4.5.2 Safety Testing and Risk Assessment:

GMOs undergo molecular characterization, toxicological studies (e.g., animal feeding trials), allergenicity tests, and environmental risk assessments to evaluate gene flow and biodiversity impacts (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009).

Nigeria conducts field trials for crops like Bt cowpea and TELA maize, assessing pest resistance and environmental safety (ISAAA, 2018).

The NBMA involves stakeholders in risk assessments to address public concerns about health and socioeconomic impacts.

Table 5: GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment Policies by Region

Region	Regulatory Approach	Key Agencies	Safety Testing Requirements	Risk Assessment Framework	Labeling
United States	Product-based	FDA, USDA, EPA	Voluntary consultation; toxicological, allergenicity, nutritional tests	Substantial equivalence, case-by-case	Mandatory but flexible (e.g., QR codes) (FDA, 2020)
China	Process-based	MARA, NBSC	Mandatory toxicological, allergenicity, environmental tests	Case-by-case, tiered assessment	Mandatory labeling (Zhu et al., 2016)
European Union	Process-based	EFSA, EC	Mandatory toxicological, allergenicity, environmental tests	Substantial equivalence, precautionary principle	Mandatory for >0.9% GMO content (European Commission, 2020)
Africa (General)	Mixed (varies by country)	National biosafety agencies	Varies; South Africa requires comprehensive testing; others limited	Case-by-case, precautionary (Cartagena Protocol)	Varies; often none or voluntary (Oh et al., 2014)
Nigeria	Process-based	NBMA	Mandatory toxicological, allergenicity, environmental tests	Case-by-case, aligned with Codex	Developing mandatory labeling (Ajibade et al., 2025)

5.0 Challenges and Controversies in GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment

Government policies on genetically modified organism (GMO) food safety testing and risk assessment face numerous challenges and controversies, stemming from scientific uncertainties, regulatory disparities, socioeconomic impacts, and public perception. These issues complicate the development, approval, and commercialization of GMOs, affecting global food security, trade, and public trust. Below, we explore these challenges and controversies in detail.

5.1 Scientific Challenges

5.1.1 Long-Term Health Effects

A major controversy is the lack of long-term studies on GMO consumption. While short-term toxicological and allergenicity tests (e.g., 90-day rodent studies) show no adverse effects for approved GMOs, critics argue that chronic effects, such as carcinogenicity or reproductive impacts, remain understudied (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). This fuels public skepticism,

particularly in the EU, where the precautionary principle demands extensive evidence of safety (European Commission, 2020).

5.1.2 Emerging Biotechnologies

New technologies like CRISPR gene editing pose challenges for existing safety testing frameworks. Gene-edited crops, which may lack foreign DNA, blur the line between GMOs and conventional breeds, raising debates about whether they require full GMO assessments. For example, the U.S. streamlines approvals for certain gene-edited crops, while the EU classifies them as GMOs, creating regulatory inconsistency (National Academy of Sciences, 2016; European Commission, 2020).

5.1.3 Environmental Risks

Assessing environmental impacts, such as gene flow to non-GMO crops or wild species and the development of pesticide-resistant pests, is complex. For instance, Bt crop resistance in pests like corn rootworms has been documented, challenging risk assessment models (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). In Africa, concerns about biodiversity loss, particularly in Nigeria's diverse ecosystems, complicate GMO approvals (ISAAA, 2018).

5.2 Regulatory Challenges

5.2.1 Global Disparities

Divergent regulatory approaches create trade and compliance issues. The U.S.'s product-based, voluntary consultation process contrasts with the EU's process-based, mandatory pre-market approvals, leading to asynchronous approvals that disrupt trade (e.g., EU bans on unapproved U.S. GMO imports) (FDA, 2020; European Commission, 2020). China's stringent process-based framework delays approvals, impacting global supply chains (Li et al., 2025).

5.2.2 Capacity Constraints in Developing Regions

Many African countries, including Nigeria, lack the infrastructure and expertise for comprehensive GMO safety testing, relying on imported data or regional collaborations (e.g., African Biosafety Network) (Ongu et al., 2023). This raises concerns about the adequacy of risk assessments and increases dependence on foreign biotechnology companies, fueling controversy over sovereignty and safety.

5.2.3 Harmonization with International Standards

Aligning national policies with international standards like the Codex Alimentarius (2009) and the Cartagena Protocol (2000) is challenging. For example, Nigeria adopts Codex guidelines but struggles with implementation due to limited resources, while some African nations prioritize EU-aligned "GM-free" policies to protect export markets, limiting GMO adoption (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2000).

5.3 Socioeconomic Controversies

5.3.1 Corporate Control and Farmer Dependency

The dominance of multinational biotechnology companies (e.g., Monsanto, Syngenta) raises ethical concerns about seed patenting and farmer dependency. In Nigeria and other African countries, small-scale farmers face high costs for GMO seeds and restrictions on seed saving, exacerbating inequalities (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013). Critics argue that this undermines food sovereignty, a contentious issue in regions with strong agricultural traditions.

5.3.2 Trade and Economic Impacts

GMO policies affect international trade, particularly for African nations reliant on EU markets, which demand GMO-free products. Zambia's 2002 ban on GMO food aid, driven by fears of losing EU exports, exemplifies this tension (Bryce, 2018). Similarly, Nigeria's GMO

approvals risk trade disputes with anti-GMO neighbors, complicating regional trade agreements (Adewumi, 2019).

5.3.3 Access to Benefits

While GMOs promise increased yields and food security, benefits are unevenly distributed. In China, government-backed GMO research aims to reduce import dependency, but small farmers may lack access to these technologies (Kanza et al., 2022). In Africa, only wealthier farmers in countries like South Africa benefit from GMOs, while poorer regions face barriers to adoption (ISAAA, 2018).

5.4 Public Perception and Ethical Controversies

5.4.1 Public Mistrust and Misinformation

Public skepticism about GMO safety persists, despite scientific consensus on approved GMOs' safety. In the EU, 60% of consumers view GMOs negatively, driven by distrust in regulatory processes and media amplification of risks (European Commission, 2020). In China, 46.7% of consumers express concerns, partly due to high-profile scandals like illegal GMO rice trials (Jiang, 2019). In Nigeria, public opposition stems from fears of health risks and cultural objections to "unnatural" foods.

5.4.2 Labeling Disputes

Labeling policies are contentious. The EU's mandatory labeling (>0.9% GMO content) enhances transparency but increases costs, while the U.S.'s flexible labeling (e.g., QR codes) is criticized for lacking clarity (FDA, 2020; European Commission, 2020). In Africa, labeling is often absent or voluntary, reducing consumer choice and trust (Tonkin et al., 2015).

5.4.3 Ethical Concerns

Ethical debates center on the "unnaturalness" of GMOs and their impact on traditional farming. In Nigeria, religious and cultural groups oppose GMOs, viewing them as interfering with nature (Gbarada, 2021). In the EU, environmental groups like Greenpeace argue that GMOs prioritize corporate interests over ecological and social values, fueling resistance to cultivation (Kurzer, 2016).

Table 6: Key Challenges and Controversies in GMO Policies

Category	Challenge/Controversy	Regional Examples	Impact
Scientific	Long-term health effects	EU's demand for extended studies	Delays approvals, fuels public skepticism (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013)
Scientific	Gene editing regulation	U.S. streamlines, EU restricts	Regulatory inconsistency, trade barriers (Spicer & Molnar, 2018)
Regulatory	Global disparities	U.S. vs. EU approaches	Asynchronous approvals disrupt trade (FDA, 2020; European Commission, 2020)
Regulatory	Limited capacity in Africa	Nigeria's reliance on external data	Questions about safety, sovereignty (Sadikiel Mmbando, 2024)
Socioeconomic	Corporate control	Nigeria's farmer dependency	Ethical concerns, inequality (Bawa & Anilakumar, 2013)
Socioeconomic	Trade impacts	Zambia's GMO ban for EU markets	Limits food security options (Smyth, 2017)
Public Perception	Mistrust and misinformation	EU's 60% consumer opposition	Slows GMO adoption, pressures regulators (Jiang and Fang, 2019)
Public Perception	Labeling disputes	U.S. QR codes vs. EU mandatory labels	Affects consumer trust, compliance costs (FDA, 2020; European Commission, 2020)

6.0 Emerging Trends and Future Directions in GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment Policies

The landscape of government policies on genetically modified organism (GMO) food safety testing and risk assessment is evolving rapidly due to advancements in biotechnology, shifting public attitudes, and global pressures for food security and sustainability. Emerging trends include the adoption of new breeding technologies (e.g., gene editing), streamlined regulatory frameworks, enhanced public engagement, and efforts to harmonize international standards. These trends shape future directions for ensuring safety while fostering innovation, with regional variations in the United States, China, the European Union, Africa, and Nigeria.

6.1 Adoption of New Breeding Technologies (NBTs)

6.1.1 Gene Editing and CRISPR

The rise of gene-editing technologies, such as CRISPR-Cas9, is transforming GMO development by enabling precise genetic modifications without introducing foreign DNA. Unlike traditional GMOs, gene-edited crops may resemble conventionally bred varieties, prompting debates over their regulation. The U.S. has streamlined approvals for gene-edited crops lacking foreign DNA, treating them as non-GMOs under certain conditions (FDA, 2020;

National Academy of Sciences, 2016). China is piloting similar policies, reflecting its push for biotech self-reliance. In contrast, the EU classifies gene-edited products as GMOs, requiring full risk assessments, though discussions are underway to relax these rules for sustainability goals (European Commission, 2020). Nigeria is developing guidelines for gene editing, aiming to balance innovation with safety (Ebegba and Onwude, 2022), while Africa's broader adoption is slowed by regulatory uncertainty (Sadikiel Mmbando, 2024).

6.1.2 Synthetic Biology

Emerging synthetic biology techniques, such as engineered microbial systems for food production, are gaining attention. These require new safety testing protocols to assess novel proteins and environmental impacts. The U.S. and China are exploring frameworks for synthetic biology, while the EU's precautionary approach may delay adoption (Trump, 2017).

6.1.3 Future Direction

Policies will likely differentiate between traditional GMOs and gene-edited products, with streamlined testing for the latter in regions like the U.S. and China. The EU may adopt tiered assessments based on risk profiles, while Nigeria and Africa will need capacity-building to regulate NBTs effectively.

6.2 Streamlined and Risk-Based Regulatory Frameworks

6.2.1 Risk-Proportionate Regulation

Governments are moving toward risk-based frameworks that tailor safety testing and risk assessment to the specific traits of GMOs or gene-edited crops. The U.S. USDA's SECURE Rule (2020) exempts certain low-risk gene-edited crops from full regulation, reducing testing requirements (FDA, 2020). China's 2021 guidelines propose simplified assessments for gene-edited crops without transgenes (Yang et al., 2024). Nigeria is aligning with this trend, exploring exemptions for gene-edited crops resembling conventional varieties.

6.2.2 Digital and Data-Driven Assessments

Advances in bioinformatics and computational modeling are enhancing risk assessments. For example, in silico tools predict allergenicity and toxicity, reducing reliance on animal testing. The EU's EFSA is integrating these tools into its guidelines, while Nigeria and Africa may adopt them to overcome resource constraints (EFSA, 2010).

6.2.3 Future Direction

Regulatory frameworks will increasingly use risk-proportionate approaches, leveraging data-driven tools to streamline approvals while maintaining safety. Developing regions like Nigeria and Africa will require international support to implement these technologies.

6.3 Enhanced Public Engagement and Transparency

6.3.1 Public Participation

Growing public skepticism about GMOs is pushing governments to enhance stakeholder engagement. The EU's transparent EFSA reports and public consultations set a benchmark, though opposition persists (European Commission, 2020). Nigeria's NBMA is increasing community outreach to address cultural and ethical concerns (Gidado et al., 2022), while China is improving public communication following past controversies (e.g., illegal GMO rice trials) (Lu and Chen, 2016). The U.S. lags in engagement, contributing to mistrust (48% negative consumer perception) (Deng and Hu, 2019).

6.3.2 Blockchain for Traceability

Blockchain technology is emerging to improve GMO traceability and labeling, enhancing consumer trust. The EU is exploring blockchain to ensure compliance with its >0.9% GMO

labeling threshold, while Nigeria could adopt it to strengthen its nascent labeling policies (European Commission, 2020).

6.3.3 Future Direction

Governments will prioritize transparent communication and participatory processes, using technologies like blockchain to ensure traceability. Nigeria and Africa will need tailored strategies to address local concerns and misinformation.

6.4 Global Harmonization and Trade Facilitation

Alignment with International Standards
Efforts to harmonize GMO policies under Codex Alimentarius (2009) and the Cartagena Protocol (2000) aim to reduce trade barriers. The U.S. and China advocate for science-based standards, while the EU's precautionary approach creates friction (Codex Alimentarius Commission, 2009; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2000). Nigeria aligns with Codex but struggles with implementation (Codex, 2023), and Africa's diverse policies complicate regional trade (Hoekman and Njinkeu, 2017).

6.4.1 Regional Collaborations

Africa is fostering regional biosafety networks (e.g., African Biosafety Network of Expertise) to share expertise and data, supporting countries like Nigeria with limited capacity (Maruta et al.. 2023). The EU is exploring mutual recognition agreements with countries like Canada to streamline approvals (De Brito et al., 2016).

6.4.2 Future Direction

Global harmonization will focus on aligning risk assessment protocols, particularly for gene-edited crops, to facilitate trade. Regional collaborations in Africa will enhance capacity, while Nigeria may lead as a hub for GMO regulation.

6.5 Addressing Climate and Food Security Challenges

6.5.1 Climate-Resilient GMOs

GMOs and gene-edited crops are being developed for drought tolerance, salinity resistance, and improved yields to address climate change and food security. Nigeria's approval of Bt cowpea and TELA maize reflects this trend, targeting pest losses and climate challenges (ISAAA, 2018). China's investments in GMO rice aim to reduce import dependency (Zhan, 2022).

6.5.2 Sustainable Agriculture

Policies are increasingly linking GMO safety to sustainability goals. The EU's Farm to Fork Strategy (2020) emphasizes sustainable biotech, potentially easing gene-editing restrictions (European Commission, 2020). Africa's adoption of GMOs, particularly in Nigeria, aims to boost yields sustainably (Kavhiza et al., 2022).

6.5.3 Future Direction

Policies will prioritize GMOs that address climate resilience and food security, with safety testing tailored to environmental benefits. Nigeria and Africa will expand GMO adoption, supported by international partnerships.

Table 7: Emerging Trends in GMO Food Safety Testing and Risk Assessment Policies

Trend	Description	Regional Examples	Future Direction
New Breeding Technologies	Gene editing (e.g., CRISPR) and synthetic biology	U.S., China streamline; EU regulates as GMOs; Nigeria developing guidelines	Differentiated regulations for gene-edited crops
Risk-Based Regulation	Streamlined, risk-proportionate frameworks; data-driven tools	U.S. SECURE Rule; EU bioinformatics integration	Wider adoption of tiered, data-driven assessments
Public Engagement	Increased transparency, stakeholder involvement, blockchain traceability	EU's EFSA consultations; Nigeria's outreach	Blockchain adoption, participatory processes
Global Harmonization	Alignment with Codex, Cartagena Protocol; regional collaborations	Nigeria adopts Codex; African biosafety networks	Unified standards for gene-edited crops, trade
Climate and Food Security	Climate-resilient GMOs, sustainable agriculture	Nigeria's Bt cowpea; EU's Farm to Fork Strategy	Policies prioritizing sustainability, resilience

Conclusion

Government policies on GMO food safety testing and risk assessment are essential to ensure consumer safety and support agricultural innovation. While frameworks like those in the U.S. and EU provide robust oversight, challenges such as scientific uncertainty, global discrepancies, and public skepticism persist. A science-based, transparent, and globally coordinated approach is needed to address these issues and ensure the safe integration of GMOs into the food supply.

References

Adewumi, A. (2019). The Regulatory Regime of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) in Nigeria and Its Implications on Relevant WTO Agreements. Kampala International University Law Journal (KIULJ) Vol, 3, 151-163.

Ajibade, L. A., Adewale, O. M., Adebisi, M. O., Adeigbe, F. O., Odeyinka, B. E., Oseni, A. B., & Adebisi-Adelani, O. (2025). Navigating the genetically modified organisms crop debate: a comparative analysis of Nigeria and global perspectives. African Journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development ISSN, 13(1), 1-10.

Bawa, A. S., & Anilakumar, K. R. (2013). Genetically modified foods: Safety, risks, and public concerns—A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 50(6), 1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0899-1

Bawa, A. S., & Anilakumar, K. R. (2013). Genetically modified foods: Safety, risks, and public concerns—A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 50(6), 1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0899-1

Bawa, A. S., & Anilakumar, K. R. (2013). Genetically modified foods: Safety, risks, and public concerns—A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 50(6), 1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0899-1

Bawa, A. S., & Anilakumar, K. R. (2013). Genetically modified foods: Safety, risks, and public concerns—A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 50(6), 1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0899-1

Bawa, A. S., & Anilakumar, K. R. (2013). Genetically modified foods: Safety, risks, and public concerns—A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 50(6), 1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0899-1

Bawa, A. S., & Anilakumar, K. R. (2013). Genetically modified foods: Safety, risks, and public concerns—A review. Journal of Food Science and Technology, 50(6), 1035–1046. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0899-1

Bryce, M. N. (2018). The Politics of Genetically Modified Food Aid: Zambia and Malawi in 2002 (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Utah).

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex Alimentarius Commission. (2009). Foods derived from modern biotechnology. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/a1554e/a1554e00.htm

Codex, Y. (2023). Adapting Maternal Healthcare Systems in Nigeria: Insights from the COVID-19 Crisis for Strengthening Infrastructure and Services.

De Brito, A. C., Kauffmann, C., & Pelkmans, J. (2016). The contribution of mutual recognition to international regulatory co-operation.

Deng, H., & Hu, R. (2019). A crisis of consumers' trust in scientists and its influence on consumer attitude toward genetically modified foods. British Food Journal, 121(10), 2454-2476.

Ebegba, R., & Onwude, J. (2022). Regulating Gene-Edited Products in Nigeria. In Biosafety and Bioethics in Biotechnology (pp. 31-41). CRC Press.

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Commission. (2020). Genetically modified organisms. https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/gmo_en

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). (2010). Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of genetically modified plants. EFSA Journal, 8(11), 1879. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1879

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). (2010). Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of genetically modified plants. EFSA Journal, 8(11), 1879. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1879

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). (2010). Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of genetically modified plants. EFSA Journal, 8(11), 1879. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1879

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). (2010). Guidance on the environmental risk assessment of genetically modified plants. EFSA Journal, 8(11), 1879. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1879

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2020). Biotechnology consultation program. https://www.fda.gov/food/biotechnology

GBARADA, O. (2021). GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOODS AND IMPLICATIONS ON TRADITIONAL CROPS AND HEALTH SECURITY IN NIGERIA (Doctoral dissertation).

Gidado, R. S. M., Isah, A., Iweajunwa, S. O. O., Igwe, J. C., & Muchiri, N. (2022). Science Communication in Agricultural Biotechnology and Public Engagement with Stakeholders in Nigeria. In Biosafety and Bioethics in Biotechnology (pp. 69-90). CRC Press.

Health Canada. (2019). Guidelines for the safety assessment of novel foods. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-nutrition.html

Health Canada. (2019). Guidelines for the safety assessment of novel foods. https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-nutrition.html

Hoekman, B., & Njinkeu, D. (2017). Integrating Africa: some trade policy research priorities and challenges. Journal of African Economies, 26(suppl_2), ii12-ii39.

International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2016). ISO 21570:2005—Foodstuffs—Methods of analysis for the detection of genetically modified organisms. https://www.iso.org/standard/34616.html

International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2018). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2018. ISAAA Brief No. 54. http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/54/

International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2018). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2018. ISAAA Brief No. 54. http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/54/

International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2018). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2018. ISAAA Brief No. 54. http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/54/

International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2018). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2018. ISAAA Brief No. 54. http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/54/

International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2018). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2018. ISAAA Brief No. 54. http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/54/

International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-biotech Applications (ISAAA). (2018). Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2018. ISAAA Brief No. 54. http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/54/

Jiang, S., & Fang, W. (2019). Misinformation and disinformation in science: examining the social diffusion of rumours about GMOs. Cultures of Science, 2(4), 327-340.

Jiang, Y. (2019). The civil society-state relations in China reflected through the genetically modified rice debate (Master's thesis, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Ås).

Kanza, P., Vitale, J., & Vitale, P. P. (2022). Agriculture in sub-Sahara Africa developing countries and the role of government: Economic perspectives. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 18(7), 493-509.

Kavhiza, N. J., Zargar, M., Prikhodko, S. I., Pakina, E. N., Murtazova, K. M. S., & Nakhaev, M. R. (2022). Improving crop productivity and ensuring food security through the adoption of genetically modified crops in sub-Saharan Africa. Agronomy, 12(2), 439.

Komen, J., Tripathi, L., Mkoko, B., Ofosu, D. O., Oloka, H., & Wangari, D. (2020). Biosafety regulatory reviews and leeway to operate: case studies from sub-Sahara Africa. Frontiers in plant science, 11, 130.

Kurzer, P. (2016). European Environmental Leadership: The EU Approach to GM Foods. In Hard Power, Soft Power and the Future of Transatlantic Relations (pp. 139-162). Routledge.

Lewin, A. C. (2018). Zambia and genetically modified food aid (4-4). Case Studies in Food Policy for Developing Countries: Policies for Health, Nutrition, Food Consumption, and Poverty, 1, 183.

Li, M., Cai, Y., Guo, D., Qu, T., & Huang, G. Q. (2025). Data-driven diagnosis framework for platform product supply chains under disruptions. International Journal of Production Research, 63(7), 2599-2621.

Lü, L., & Chen, H. (2016). Chinese public's risk perceptions of genetically modified food: From the 1990s to 2015. Science, Technology and Society, 21(1), 110-128.

Maruta, T., Kenfack, J. A. N., Tebeje, Y. K., Bangure, D., & Ouma, A. E. O. (2023). Regional approach to strengthening biosafety and biosecurity systems in Africa. Global Security: Health, Science and Policy, 8(1), 2257766.

National Academy of Sciences. (2016). Genetically engineered crops: Experiences and prospects. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/23395

National Academy of Sciences. (2016). Genetically engineered crops: Experiences and prospects. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/23395

National Academy of Sciences. (2016). Genetically engineered crops: Experiences and prospects. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/23395

National Academy of Sciences. (2016). Genetically engineered crops: Experiences and prospects. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/23395

National Academy of Sciences. (2016). Genetically engineered crops: Experiences and prospects. The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/23395

Oh, J., & Ezezika, O. C. (2014). To label or not to label: balancing the risks, benefits and costs of mandatory labelling of GM food in Africa. Agriculture & Food Security, 3, 1-8.

Ongu, I., Olayide, P., Alexandersson, E., Mugwanya Zawedde, B., & Eriksson, D. (2023). Biosafety regulatory frameworks in Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Sweden and their potential impact on international R&D collaborations. GM Crops & Food, 14(1), 1-17.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2015). Safety assessment of foods and feeds derived from transgenic crops. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/science/biosafety-biotrack/

Sadikiel Mmbando, G. (2024). The adoption of genetically modified crops in Africa: the public's current perception, the regulatory obstacles, and ethical challenges. GM Crops & Food, 15(1), 185-199.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf

Smyth, S. J. (2017). Genetically modified crops, regulatory delays, and international trade. Food and Energy Security, 6(2), 78-86.

Spicer, A., & Molnar, A. (2018). Gene editing of microalgae: scientific progress and regulatory challenges in Europe. Biology, 7(1), 21.

World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Food safety: Genetically modified foods. https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/food-technology/faq-genetically-modified-food/en/

World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Food safety: Genetically modified foods. https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/food-technology/faq-genetically-modified-food/en/

World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Food safety: Genetically modified foods. https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/food-technology/faq-genetically-modified-food/en/

World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Food safety: Genetically modified foods. https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/food-technology/faq-genetically-modified-food/en/

World Health Organization (WHO). (2020). Food safety: Genetically modified foods. https://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/food-technology/faq-genetically-modified-food/en/

Yang, F., Zheng, K., & Yao, Y. (2024). China's regulatory change toward genome-edited crops. Trends in Biotechnology, 42(7), 801-806.

Zhan, S. (2022). The political economy of food import and self-reliance in China: 1949-2019. Global Food History, 8(3), 194-212.

Zhu, X., Roberts, M. T., & Wu, K. (2016). Genetically modified food labeling in China: in pursuit of a rational path. Food & Drug LJ, 71, 30.