Bioengineering Tools and Services for Agriculture – Focus on Genetically Modified Crops and Public Perceptions

Ahmed Hani Mohamed Abdelaziz, Department of Engineering, Fayoum University, Fayoum, Egypt

Abstract
The field of bioengineering has delivered several new technologies for precision agriculture and genetically modified crops and livestock. There is even greater potential to leverage the tools developed by bioengineering within agriculture to improve the productivity, resilience, and health of our crops and livestock while mitigating the effects of climate change and environmental stress. In this review, we discuss the current and future potential of bioengineering in improving farm practices and providing accessible and equitable technologies to achieve the goals of sustainable farming. We focus on bioengineering techniques for genetically modified crops and mobile technologies that could help with farm decision support to address the field challenges in crop monitoring and improving productivity in a sustainable manner. We talk about the challenges in adopting bioengineering tools by the farmers and changing the public perceptions around genetically modified crops and livestock. Understanding the challenges in the field by farmers while being aware of the technological potentials is critical in adapting and improvising new technologies for the greater benefit of the farming communities.

Introduction

The field of bioengineering integrates principles from both engineering and biological sciences to innovate products and technologies aimed at enhancing human health, healthcare, and overall quality of life. This interdisciplinary field spans a diverse array of applications, ranging from medical devices and genetic engineering to bioprocessing. There is a significant role of engineering and automation within the field of bioengineering, and an increasing emphasis on technology adoption by end users.

In agriculture, bioengineering applies biological and engineering principles to advance technologies and methods that boost farm productivity and crop health, disease protection, sustainability of farm practices, and resilience to climate change and pests [1-10]. Key focus areas in bioengineering include genetic modification of crops and livestock, precision farming techniques for automated monitoring of crop health, and the development of bio-based products and biomanufacturing [5-13]. Bioengineering holds substantial potential in revolutionizing agriculture worldwide, enabling it to become more productive, sustainable, and resilient in the face of pressing global challenges like climate change and population growth [12-20].

Scope of Bioengineering in Sustainable Agriculture

Bioengineering offers significant contributions to agricultural research in several key areas, including genetic modifications, precision farming, and sensor development. Genetic modification of crops involves enhancing resistance to pests, diseases, and environmental stresses like drought or salinity [2-10]. In livestock farming, genetic advancements improve disease resistance, growth rates, and overall productivity. Precision farming utilizes sensors and Internet of Things (IoT) devices to monitor soil health, crop growth, and environmental conditions in real-time [12-20]. Drones and robotics aid in crop monitoring, as well as in automated systems for planting, weeding, and harvesting. Biofertilizers and biopesticides provide natural alternatives to chemical inputs, promoting soil health and reducing environmental impact. Additionally, the development of biodegradable materials supports sustainability by facilitating decomposition through natural processes.

These approaches promote sustainable agriculture practices. Techniques such as crop rotation, cover cropping, and reduced tillage enhance soil structure and fertility, thereby improving soil health. Efficient irrigation systems and water conservation practices optimize water use. These advancements aim to increase yield, enhance crop quality, and reduce reliance on chemical inputs. Improved soil health and water management contribute to environmental sustainability and agricultural efficiency, ultimately boosting the economic viability of farming communities. Bioengineering innovations play a crucial role in ensuring food security by meeting global food demand and ensuring a stable food supply [12-22].

Bioengineering Tools for Genetically Modified Crops

Creating new genetically modified crops and livestock involves several significant challenges and considerations when incorporating bioengineering practices 1-9]. Genetic modification and other bioengineering techniques such as CRISPR pose ethical dilemmas and necessitate strict regulatory oversight to ensure safety [1-10]. There is widespread public resistance to genetically modified crops and other bioengineered products, emphasizing the need for transparent communication and education efforts. Concerns persist regarding the potential long-term health impacts of consuming GM crops, despite rigorous testing and regulatory protocols in place.

Ethical debates center around the manipulation of natural organisms and the patenting of genetically modified seeds [21-30]. There is also concern about the risk of transgenes spreading to wild relatives or non-GM crops, potentially leading to the emergence of superweeds or impacting non-target species. The costly development and approval processes for genetically modified crops often inhibit smaller entities and public institutions from entering the market. Ensuring that bioengineering innovations are accessible to small-holder and resource-poor farmers is critical for fostering equitable development.

Navigating the complex regulatory landscape presents a significant challenge, as regulations vary widely by country, complicating global deployment efforts [22-30]. Public perception of genetically modified crops tends to be negative, influenced by misinformation and a lack of understanding of the underlying science behind genetic modification. Addressing these challenges requires a balanced approach that integrates rigorous scientific research, transparent regulatory processes, proactive public engagement, and policies aimed at ensuring fair access to the benefits of genetically modified technology while safeguarding environmental and human health [21-28].

Bioengineering Diagnostic Tools for Agriculture

Bioengineering diagnostic tools in agriculture employ advanced technologies and methodologies to evaluate and monitor various aspects of crop health, soil conditions, and environmental factors [29-35]. These tools are designed to furnish accurate and timely information to farmers and agronomists, facilitating proactive management and optimization of agricultural practices.

In remote sensing and imaging, satellite imagery utilizes satellite data to oversee crop growth, identify pest infestations, and evaluate vegetation health across extensive areas [1-10]. Drones equipped with multispectral or thermal cameras capture high-resolution images to conduct detailed crop analyses and monitor field conditions. For precision agriculture, soil sensors deployed in fields measure soil moisture content, nutrient levels (such as nitrogen and phosphorus), pH levels, and salinity. These sensors, often mounted on agricultural equipment or drones, assess crop vigor, chlorophyll content, and nutrient status throughout growth stages. Farmers utilize smartphone applications to gather and analyze field data, monitor weather conditions, and receive real-time alerts regarding pest outbreaks or disease risks [30-43]. Big Data Analytics processes large datasets from diverse sources, including sensors and satellites, to generate insights into crop performance, potential yields, and optimal resource allocation [40-48].

Mobile Tools in Bioengineering for Agriculture

Mobile tools in bioengineering agriculture utilize mobile devices such as smartphones and tablets to improve agricultural practices and management [40-48]. They enable farmers and agronomists to gather real-time data on soil health, crop growth, and environmental conditions through mobile applications. These devices integrate with field-deployed sensors to monitor critical parameters like soil moisture, temperature, and nutrient levels. Equipped with GPS technology, mobile apps assist farmers in mapping field boundaries, optimizing planting strategies, and overseeing equipment operations. Furthermore, these tools leverage remote sensing data to evaluate crop health, detect pests or diseases, and support informed decision-making in crop management processes [35-45].

Decision Support Tools in Bioengineering for Agriculture

Decision support tools encompass software platforms that merge data analytics, weather predictions, and agronomic models to aid farmers in making informed choices regarding irrigation, fertilization, and pest management [30-43]. These systems are accessible to farmers via mobile dashboards, providing insights derived from data analytics and predictive modeling. Mobile applications deliver up-to-the-minute weather forecasts, assisting farmers in scheduling irrigation and mitigating weather-related risks. Mobile platforms enable farmers to engage with buyers, negotiate prices, and oversee sales transactions. These tools also facilitate the monitoring of agricultural products from farm to market, ensuring adherence to quality standards and regulatory compliance. Farmers can remotely oversee and manage automated irrigation systems, drones, and robotic equipment using mobile interfaces. Additionally, mobile tools facilitate integration with Internet of Things devices, supporting comprehensive farm management and data-driven decision-making. These advancements in bioengineering agriculture equip farmers with real-time information, bolster operational efficiency, and promote sustainable agricultural practices. They are pivotal in driving forward agricultural productivity, resilience, and sustainability within the contemporary farming milieu [21-32].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the adoption of bioengineering in agriculture encounters numerous challenges due to a complex interplay of technological, economic, social, and regulatory factors [1-12]. Bioengineered crops and products undergo rigorous regulatory scrutiny, which varies significantly across countries and regions. The prolonged and costly approval processes for new biotechnological innovations can dissuade smaller companies and public institutions from entering the market. Public skepticism and apprehensions regarding the safety of genetically modified organisms and other bioengineered products can significantly influence consumer choices and market access. Effective communication and transparency about the benefits, risks, and regulatory oversight of bioengineered products are essential for fostering public trust [21-30]. Moreover, achieving a balance between the benefits of enhanced productivity and sustainable agricultural practices, such as soil health management and biodiversity conservation, is crucial. Addressing these challenges necessitates collaborative efforts among stakeholders, including policymakers, researchers, farmers, consumers, and civil society organizations. This collaborative approach involves promoting dialogue, ensuring regulatory frameworks that prioritize both safety and innovation, enhancing transparency, and investing in education and infrastructure to facilitate the sustainable adoption of bioengineering in agriculture [35-48].

References:

[1]. Ashley, C. and Maxwell, S. 2001. Rethinking rural development. Development Policy Review 19(4): 395–425.

[2]. Biggs, S.D. 1990. A multiple sources of innovation model of agricultural research and technology promotion. World Development 18(11): 1481–1499.Yoshida, S. and Shirasu, K. Plants that attack plants: molecular elucidation of plant parasitism. Curr. Opin. Plant Biol. 15, 708-713, 2012.

[3]. Wezel, A., S. Bellon, T. Dore, C. Francis, D. Vallod, and C. David. Agroecology as a science, a

movement and a practice. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 29: 503–515, 2009.

[4]. Parashar, A., Plant-in-chip: Microfluidic system for studying root growth and pathogenic interactions in Arabidopsis. Applied Physics Letters, 98, 263703, 2011.

[5]. Santosh Pandey, Upender Kalwa, Taejoon Kong, Baoqing Guo, Phillip C. Gauger, David Peters, Kyoung-Jin Yoon, "Behavioral Monitoring Tool for Pig Farmers: Ear Tag Sensors, Machine Intelligence, and Technology Adoption Roadmap", Animals, Vol. 11, Issue 9, pages 2665, 2021.

[6]. Whitmer, A., L. Ogden, J. Lawton, P. Sturner, P. M. Groffman, L. Schneider, D. Hart, B. Halpern, et al. 2010. The engaged university: providing a platform for research that transforms society. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 8: 314–321.

[7]. Mitchum MG. Soybean Resistance to the Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines: An Update. Phytopathology. 106(12):1444-1450, 2016.

[8]. Underwood, W. and Somerville, S. C. Focal accumulation of defenses at sites of fungal pathogen attack. J. Exp. Bot. 59, 3501-3508, 2008.

[9]. X. Ding, Z. Njus, T. Kong, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. 2017, eaao1254.

[10]. Petre, B. and Kamoun, S. How do filamentous pathogens deliver effector proteins into plant cells? PLoS Biol. 12, e1001801, 2014.

[11]. Beeman, Z. Njus, G. L. Tylka, Chip Technologies for Screening Chemical and Biological Agents against Plant-Parasitic Nematodes, Phytopathology, 106 (12), 1563-1571, 2016.

[12]. Niblack TL, Arelli PR, Noel GR, Opperman CH, Orf JH, Schmitt DP, Shannon JG, Tylka GL. A Revised Classification Scheme for Genetically Diverse Populations of Heterodera glycines. J Nematol. 34(4):279-88, 2002.

[13]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman, Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans, Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68, 2013.

[14]. Charlermroj, R., Himananto, O., Seepiban, C., Kumpoosiri, M., Warin, N., Oplatowska, M., et al. Multiplex detection of plant pathogens using a microsphere immunoassay technology. PloS One 8 (4), e62344, 2013.

[15]. R. Lycke, A. Parashar, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics. Biomicrofluidics. 7(6), 64103, 2013.

[16]. Carr JA, Parashar A, Gibson R, Robertson AP, Martin RJ, Pandey S. A microfluidic platform for high-sensitivity, real-time drug screening on C. elegans and parasitic nematodes. Lab Chip. 11(14):2385-96, 2011.

[17]. Christopher M. Legner, Gregory L Tylka. Robotic agricultural instrument for automated extraction of nematode cysts and eggs from soil to improve integrated pest management. Scientific reports, Vol. 11, Issue 1, pages 1-10, 2021.

[18]. Niblack TL, Lambert KN, Tylka GL. A model plant pathogen from the kingdom Animalia: Heterodera glycines, the soybean cyst nematode. Annu Rev Phytopathol. 2006;44:283-303.

[19]. Fang, Y., Ramasamy, R. P. Current and prospective methods for plant disease detection. Biosensors 5 (3), 537–561, 2015.

[20]. J. Jensen, Z. Njus, G. Tylka, Video Analysis Software To Measure Nematode Movement With Applications For Accurate Screening Of Nematode Control Compounds. Journal of Nematology, Volume 48, Issue 4, pp. 335-336, 2016.

[21]. Ding X, Njus Z, Kong T, et al. Effective drug combination for Caenorhabditis elegans nematodes discovered by output-driven feedback system control technique. Science Advances. eaao1254, 2017.

[22]. J.P. Jensen, U. Kalwa, G.L. Tylka, Avicta and Clariva Affect the Biology of the Soybean Cyst Nematode, Heterodera glycines. Plant Disease,102(12):2480-2486, 2018.

[23]. D. Cruz, D. Mayfield, Z. Njus, M. Beattie, L. Leandro and G. Munkvold, "Sensitivity of Fusarium species from soybean roots to seed treatment fungicides". Phytopathology Conference, 104(11), 29-29, 2014.

[24]. Sankaran S, Mishra A, Ehsani R, Davis C (2010) A review of advanced techniques for detecting plant diseases. Comput Electron Agric 72:1–13

[25]. Vishal Patel, Austin Chesmore, Christopher M. Legner, Santosh Pandey, Trends in Workplace Wearable Technologies and Connected-Worker Solutions for Next-Generation Occupational Safety, Health, and Productivity, Advanced Intelligent Systems, Article ID 2100099, 2021.

[26]. Velkov VV, Medvinsky AB, Sokolov MS, Marchenko AI. Will transgenic plants adversely affect the environment? J Biosci. 2005 Sep;30(4):515-48.

[27]. S. Pandey, Analytical modeling of the ion number fluctuations in biological ion channels, Journal of nanoscience and nanotechnology, 12(3), 2489-2495, 2012.

[28]. Akwete Bortei-Doku, Marvin H. White, Simulation of biological ion channels with technology computer-aided design. Computer

Methods and Programs in Biomedicine, 85, 1, 1-7, 2007.

[29]. B. Chen, A. Parashar, "Folded floating-gate CMOS biosensor for the detection of charged biochemical molecules", IEEE Sensors Journal, 2011.

[30]. Augustine Beeman, Leland E Harker, Jared P Jensen, Upender Kalwa, Taejoon Kong, Zach L Njus, Gregory L Tylka, Christopher M. Legner. Methods, apparatus, and systems to extract and quantify minute objects from soil or feces, including plant-parasitic nematode pests and their eggs in soil. US Patent 10,900,877, January 26, 2021.

[31]. S. Pandey, Marvin H White, Parameter-extraction of a two-compartment model for whole-cell data analysis, Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 120(2), 131-143, 2002.

[32]. Njus Z, Kong T, Kalwa U, et al. Flexible and disposable paper- and plastic-based gel micropads for nematode handling, imaging, and chemical testing. APL Bioengineering. 1(1):016102, 2017.

[33]. Buckelew LD, Pedigo LP, Mero HM, Owen MD, Tylka GL. Effects of weed management systems on canopy insects in herbicide-resistant soybeans. J Econ Entomol. 2000 Oct;93(5):1437-43.

[34]. Upender Kalwa, Christopher M. Legner, Elizabeth Wlezien, Gregory Tylka. New methods of cleaning debris and high-throughput counting of cyst nematode eggs extracted from field soil, PLoS ONE, 14(10): e0223386, 2019.

[35]. Z. Njus, D. Feldmann, R. Brien, T. Kong, U. Kalwa. Characterizing the Effect of Static Magnetic Fields on C. elegans Using Microfluidics, Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology, Vol. 6, No. 9, pp. 583-591, 2015.

[36]. J. A. Carr, R. Lycke, A. Parashar. Unidirectional, electrotactic-response valve for Caenorhabditis elegans in microfluidic devices. Applied Physics Letters, 98, 143701, 2011.

[37]. J. Saldanha, A. Parashar, J. Powell-Coffman. Multi-parameter behavioral analyses provide insights to mechanisms of cyanide resistance in Caenorhabditis elegans, Toxicological Sciences 135(1):156-68, 2013.

[38]. Owen MD, Zelaya IA. Herbicide-resistant crops and weed resistance to herbicides. Pest Manag Sci. 61(3):301-11, 2005.

[39]. Mytelka, L.K. 2000. Local systems of innovation in a globalized world economy. Industry and Innovation 77(1): 15–32, 2000.

[40]. R. Lycke, Microfluidics-enabled method to identify modes of Caenorhabditis elegans paralysis in four anthelmintics, Biomicrofluidics 7, 064103, 2013.

[41]. Parashar A, Lycke R, Carr JA. Amplitude-modulated sinusoidal microchannels for observing

adaptability in C. elegans locomotion. Biomicrofluidics. 5(2):24112, 2011.

[42]. T. Kong, S. Flanigan, M. Weinstein, U. Kalwa, C. Legner, “A fast, reconfigurable flow switch for paper microfluidics based on selective wetting of folded paper actuator strips”, Lab on a Chip, 17 (21), 3621-3633, 2017.

[43]. Joseph, A., Lycke, R. Decision-making by nematodes in complex microfluidic mazes. Advances in Bioscience and Biotechnology 2(6), 409-415, 2011.

[44]. J. Saldanha, J. Powell-Coffman. The effects of short-term hypergravity on Caenorhabditis elegans. Life Science Space Research, 10:38-46, 2016.

[45]. J.P. Jensen, A.Q. Beeman, Z.L. Njus et al. Movement and Motion of Soybean Cyst Nematode Heterodera glycines Populations and Individuals in Response to Abamectin. Phytopathology. 108(7):885-891, 2018.

[46]. Wezel, A., and V. Soldat. A quantitative and qualitative historical analysis of the scientific discipline of agroecology. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability 7: 3–18, 2009.

[47]. Lombardo L, Coppola G, Zelasco S. New Technologies for Insect-Resistant and Herbicide-Tolerant Plants. Trends Biotechnol. 34(1):49-57, 2016.

[48]. Hall, A.J., Sulaiman, R.V., Clark, N.G. and Yoganand, B. From measuring impact to learning institutional lessons: An innovation systems perspective on improving the management of international agricultural research. Agricultural Systems 78: 213–241, 2003.