International Journal of Biological Research, *11 (2) (2024) 57-66*

International Journal of Biological Research

Website: www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJBR

Research paper

Revolutionizing plant breeding: a historical perspective from cross-pollination to gene editing

Ugandhar.T.*, Komala. E., Shyam Prasad. S., Sammaiah. D. , Ghan Singh. M., Narender M., Gandhi. N

Department of Botany Kakatiya Govt College, Hanamkonda Dist: Hanamkonda-506001 (T.G.)
**Corresponding author E-mail: dhartudr@gmail.com*

Abstract

The history of plant breeding can be broadly divided into four eras: the Pre-Mendelian era (before 1900), the Mendelian era (1900-1920), the post-Mendelian era (1921-1950), and the Modern era (after 1950). Significant milestones include the release of the first hybrid maize varieties in 1961, the first sorghum hybrid (CSH-1) in 1964, the first bajra hybrid (HB-1) in 1965, and the first pigeon pea hybrid (ICPH-8) in 1991. Achieving a world with zero hunger requires a sustainable increase in food production and distribution and elimination of poverty. This goal demands scientific, logistical, and humanitarian approaches to ensure food security from farmers and breeders to policymakers and governments.
Conventional breeding techniques alone are insufficient to meet the challenges posed by climate change, biotic and abiotic stress, and the growing global population projected to reach 10 billion by 2050. Novel plant breeding techniques, such as genome editing, speed breeding, and omics technology integration, offer precise, cost-effective, and less time-consuming solutions. These techniques enable the editing of agriculturally significant genes, promoting hybrid seed production, induced apomixis, and resistance to biotic and abiotic stress.
Genome editing technologies have evolved, with CRISPR/Cas9 and its variants, base editing (BE), and prime editing (PE) playing pivotal roles in generating transgene-free plants. These advancements have significant implications for crop improvement, meeting food and nutrition security, and catering to regional preferences. Syngenta's initiative to open rights to CRISPR-based technologies through the Shoots by Syngenta platform exemplifies the collaborative efforts needed to drive agricultural innovation and sustainability. The review discusses the current regulatory regimes governing genome-edited crops, prospects of new tools such as DNA-free editing systems and nanotechnology, and their applicability in crop improvement. A multidisciplinary approach involving political, social, economic, and scientific stakeholders is essential for the successful adoption of genome editing technologies, which will ultimately make agriculture a lucrative profession and attract youth to the field.

Keywords: *Genome Editing; CRISPR/Cas9; Hybrid Seed Production; Food Security; Novel Plant Breeding Techniques; Biotic Stress Resistance; Abiotic Stress Resistance; Crop Improvement Sustainable Agriculture; Regulatory Regimesnome Editing; Mutation; Hybrid Seed Production; Quality Improvement; Regulatory Concerns; Genetic Gain; Speed Breeding.*

1. Introduction

Outline the history of plant breeding, highlighting the four major eras: Pre-Mendelian (before 1900), Mendelian (1900-1920), Post-Mendelian (1921-1950), and Modern (after 1950).

1.1. Pre-mendelian era (before 1900)

- Overview:

Before the advent of Mendelian genetics, the understanding of heredity and plant breeding was grounded in various speculative theories and empirical practices. The concept of heredity was influenced by a range of theories, some of which were scientifically unsubstantiated and later disproved. This period reflects a time when the principles of genetic inheritance were not yet scientifically established, leading to reliance on observational and practical methods in agriculture.
Pre-Mendelian Theories of Heredity:
Pre-formation Theory: Description: The Pre-formation Theory posits that development occurs from a pre-existing miniature version of the organism, known as the homunculus, which is present in the egg or sperm. This theory was proposed by Dutch biologists Jan Swammerdam and Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon in the 17th and 18th centuries.
Limitations: The theory was not supported by empirical evidence and eventually fell out of favor as it lacked scientific validation (Swammerdam, 1737; Buffon, 1774).

1) Theory of epigenesis

Description: Proposed by German biologist Caspar Friedrich Wolff, this theory suggested that the development and differentiation of body parts arise from the zygote after the fusion of male and female gametes. Unlike Pre-formation Theory, Epigenesis is broadly accepted in modern biology.
Significance: This theory laid the groundwork for understanding developmental biology and embryogenesis (Wolff, 1759).

2) Theory of acquired characteristics

Description: Proposed by Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, this theory argued that characteristics acquired during an organism's lifetime could be inherited by the next generation. For example, Lamarck suggested that traits gained through use or disuse of organs could be passed on.
Disapproval: The theory was discredited by August Weismann, who conducted experiments showing that cutting off the tails of mice for 22 generations did not result in tailless offspring, challenging the idea of inheritance of acquired traits (Lamarck, 1809; Weismann, 1891).

3) Theory of pangenes

Description: Proposed by Charles Darwin, this theory suggested that small, invisible particles called "gemmules" from each body organ were transported via the bloodstream to the gametes, influencing offspring development.
Limitations: This theory lacked empirical support and was eventually abandoned as it did not fit within the framework of modern genetics (Darwin, 1868).

4) Germplasm theory

Description: As proposed by August Weismann, the germplasm theory posits that heredity is mediated exclusively through germplasm (the reproductive cells) and not through somatic cells. This theory emphasizes that genetic information is passed through the germ cells and not altered by environmental factors.
Acceptance: This theory is considered a cornerstone of modern genetics and provided a crucial foundation for the development of Mendelian genetics (Weismann, 1892).
Early Practices in Plant Breeding:

- Ancient Cultures: Early agricultural practices involved selective breeding based on observable traits such as yield and pest resistance. Civilizations such as the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans engaged in the systematic selection and crossbreeding of crops like wheat and barley, though their methods lacked a scientific understanding of genetics (Zohary & Hopf, 2000).
- Empirical Methods: Methods of plant improvement included crossbreeding and selection, with early records from China and India indicating the use of these techniques to enhance crop varieties. However, the genetic mechanisms behind these practices were not understood until later developments in genetics (Ladizinsky, 1985).

1.2. Mendelian era (1900-1920)

The Mendelian Era marks the rediscovery and validation of Gregor Mendel's work on inheritance. Although Mendel's experiments were conducted in the mid-19th century, their significance was not recognized until 1900, when three botanists Hugo de Vries, Carl Correns, and Erich von Tschermak—independently rediscovered Mendel's principles of inheritance. This period laid the foundation for modern genetics and revolutionized the field of plant breeding.
Key Developments:

1) Rediscovery of Mendel's work

Mendel's principles of segregation and independent assortment were revalidated, providing a scientific basis for the inheritance of traits (Mendel, 1866; de Vries, 1900; Correns, 1900; von Tschermak, 1900).

2) Application to plant breeding

The rediscovery led to the application of Mendelian genetics in plant breeding, particularly in hybridization programs. This period saw the introduction of controlled crossbreeding techniques that utilized Mendelian principles to predict and select desirable traits (Shull, 1908).

3) Establishment of genetic theories

The Mendelian Era was characterized by the establishment of fundamental genetic concepts, including linkage, mutation, and chromosomal inheritance, which were integrated into breeding programs to improve crop varieties (Morgan, 1915).

1.3. Post-mendelian era (1921-1950)

The Post-Mendelian Era witnessed the expansion of genetic research and the application of new genetic theories to plant breeding. This period was marked by the development of more sophisticated breeding techniques, including the use of hybrid vigor and the discovery of quantitative traits.
Key Developments:

1) Development of Hybrid Crops:

The concept of hybrid vigor, or heterosis, was extensively explored during this period. In 1921, hybrid maize was introduced in the United States, leading to significant increases in crop yields. The success of hybrid maize spurred interest in applying similar techniques to other crops (Shull, 1909; Jones, 1922).

2) Discovery of quantitative genetics

The study of quantitative traits, which are controlled by multiple genes, became prominent in this era. The development of statistical methods for analysing these traits allowed breeders to select complex traits such as yield and resistance to diseases (Fisher, 1918).

3) Advancements in cytogenetics

The post-Mendelian Era also saw advancements in cytogenetics, including the study of chromosomal behaviors during meiosis. The understanding of chromosomal abnormalities and their impact on inheritance further refined breeding techniques (Bridges, 1923).

1.4. Modern era (after 1950)

The Modern Era in plant breeding is characterized by the integration of molecular biology, biotechnology, and genomics into traditional breeding practices. This era has seen unprecedented advancements in the precision and efficiency of plant breeding.
Key Developments

1) Introduction of molecular markers

Molecular markers, such as RFLPs (Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphisms) and SSRs (Simple Sequence Repeats), were introduced in the 1980s. These markers allowed for marker-assisted selection, significantly improving the efficiency of breeding programs (Botstein et al., 1980; Tautz, 1989).

2) Genetic engineering and GM crops

The advent of genetic engineering in the 1980s and 1990s enabled the direct manipulation of plant genomes. Genetically modified (GM) crops with traits such as pest resistance and herbicide tolerance were developed, leading to widespread adoption in agriculture (Vaeck et al., 1987).

3) Genomics and genome editing

The completion of the first plant genome sequence (Arabidopsis thaliana) in 2000 marked the beginning of the genomics era. Techniques such as CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing have revolutionized plant breeding by allowing precise modifications to plant genomes, accelerating the development of new varieties (Arabidopsis Genome Initiative, 2000; Jinek et al., 2012).

1.5. Importance of innovation in plant breeding across four major eras

Innovation in plant breeding has been a crucial driver for addressing global challenges such as food security, poverty reduction, climate change, and population growth. The four major Pre-Mendelian, Mendelian, Post-Mendelian, and Modern innovations have significantly contributed to the advancement of agriculture. (Table-1)The table below summarizes the key innovations in each era and their impact on addressing these challenges.

- Pre-Mendelian Era

Innovation: The primary innovation during this era was the empirical selection and crossbreeding of crops based on observable traits. Although the underlying genetic mechanisms were unknown, these practices laid the groundwork for more sophisticated breeding techniques in later eras.

Impact: Early innovations contributed to food security by improving yields and ensuring the sustainability of agricultural practices. By selecting crops with traits suited to local environments, early farmers laid the foundation for climate-resilient agriculture.

Table 1: Summary of key innovations across eras and their impact on overcoming challenges"

Era	Key Innovations	Impact on Global Challenges
Pre-Mendelian (Before 1900)	Empirical Selection and Crossbreeding: Traditional practices of selecting plants with desirable traits and performing crossbreeding, despite the lack of scientific understanding.	Food Security: Improved crop yields through selective breeding, supporting early agricultural societies.
		Poverty Elimination: Enhanced crop production contributed to economic stability.
		Climate Adaptation: Selection for climate-resilient traits.
Mendelian (1900-1920)	Mendelian Genetics: Rediscovery and application of Mendel's principles of inheritance; development of controlled crossbreeding techniques.	Food Security: Laid the foundation for systematic plant breeding, improving the predictability of desirable traits.
		Poverty Elimination: Enhanced crop varieties led to increased productivity.
		Climate Adaptation: Early identification of stress-tolerant traits.
Post-Mendelian (1921-1950)	Hybridization and Quantitative Genetics: Development of hybrid crops; understanding and application of quantitative traits; advancements in cytogenetics.	Food Security: Introduction of hybrid crops like maize significantly boosted yields.
		Poverty Elimination: Increased agricultural output reduced poverty in rural areas.
		Climate Adaptation: Breeding for quantitative traits improved resilience to environmental stresses.
Modern (After 1950)	Biotechnology and Genomics: Integration of molecular markers, genetic engineering, GM crops, and genome editing technologies like CRISPR/Cas9.	Food Security: Enabled precise breeding for high-yield, pest-resistant, and climate-resilient crops.
		Poverty Elimination: Biotechnology-led innovations created new agricultural opportunities, reducing poverty.
		Climate Adaptation: Advanced tools for developing climate-smart crops.

- Mendelian Era:

Innovation: The rediscovery of Mendel's principles revolutionized plant breeding. Controlled crossbreeding techniques based on Mendelian genetics allowed breeders to predict the inheritance of desirable traits, making plant breeding more systematic and reliable.

Impact: These innovations significantly contributed to food security by increasing the predictability and success rate of breeding programs. The ability to select for specific traits also laid the groundwork for developing crops that could better withstand environmental stresses.

1) Post-mendelian era

Innovation: This period was marked by the development of hybrid crops, particularly maize, which demonstrated hybrid vigor or heterosis. The understanding of quantitative traits and advancements in cytogenetics also played a significant role in enhancing plant breeding.

Impact: The introduction of hybrid crops led to substantial yield increases, contributing to both food security and poverty reduction. The understanding and application of quantitative genetics allowed breeders to improve complex traits, including those related to climate resilience.

2) Modern era

Innovation: The Modern Era has seen the integration of biotechnology and genomics into plant breeding. Innovations such as genetic engineering, molecular markers, and genome editing (e.g., CRISPR/Cas9) have allowed for unprecedented precision in developing new crop varieties.

Impact: These innovations have had a profound impact on global food security by enabling the development of crops with enhanced yields, pest resistance, and climate resilience. The introduction of GM crops has also opened new economic opportunities, contributing to poverty reduction. Additionally, genome editing technologies have accelerated the development of climate-smart crops, providing a critical tool in the fight against climate change.

2. Historical evolution of plant breeding

Plant breeding has undergone significant transformations over time, evolving through various stages that reflect the deepening understanding of genetics and the increasing application of technology. Below is a detailed examination of the evolution of plant breeding across four key eras: the Pre-Mendelian Era, the Mendelian Era, the Post-Mendelian Era, and the Modern Era.

2.1. Pre-mendelian era

Before the discovery of genetics, plant breeding was primarily empirical, based on the observable traits of plants. Early agricultural societies, including those in ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, and China, practiced selective breeding by saving seeds from plants with desirable characteristics, such as higher yields or resistance to pests. Despite the lack of scientific knowledge about heredity, these practices laid the foundation for agricultural development.

During this era, various theories of heredity were proposed, although they lacked scientific rigor. For instance, the Preformation Theory suggested that organisms develop from miniature versions of themselves, while Lamarck's Theory of Acquired Characteristics posited that traits acquired during an organism's life could be passed on to its offspring. These theories were eventually debunked as the field of genetics advanced, but they represent early attempts to understand the mechanisms of inheritance (Wolff, 1759; Lamarck, 1809).

2.2. Mendelian era

The Mendelian Era began with the rediscovery of Gregor Mendel's work in the early 20th century. Mendel's experiments with pea plants revealed the fundamental principles of inheritance, demonstrating that traits are passed from parents to offspring in predictable patterns. His work, initially published in 1866, went largely unnoticed until it was independently rediscovered by Hugo de Vries, Carl Correns, and Erich von Tschermak in 1900 (Mendel, 1866).

Mendel's discoveries revolutionized plant breeding by providing a scientific basis for the selection of traits. Breeders could now predict the outcomes of crossbreeding and select parent plants to achieve specific genetic outcomes. This era also saw the development of controlled crossbreeding techniques, which significantly improved the efficiency and effectiveness of breeding programs. The application of Mendelian principles laid the groundwork for the systematic improvement of crop varieties, leading to increased agricultural productivity (Olby, 1985).

2.3. Post-mendelian era

The Post-Mendelian Era (1921-1950) marked significant advancements in hybridization and the understanding of quantitative traits. The most notable achievement of this period was the development and release of hybrid crops. In 1961, the first hybrid maize variety was introduced, followed by the release of the first hybrid sorghum (CSH-1) in 1964, the first hybrid bajra (HB-1) in 1965, and the first hybrid pigeon pea (ICPH-8) in 1991 (Shull, 1909; Duvick, 1999).

Hybrid crops exhibited heterosis, or hybrid vigor, which led to significantly higher yields compared to their parent varieties. The development of these hybrids was a major milestone in agricultural history, as it enabled the large-scale production of high-yielding crops. Additionally, advancements in cytogenetics and quantitative genetics during this period allowed breeders to better understand and manipulate complex traits, further enhancing the efficiency of plant breeding programs (Stuber, 1994).

2.4. Modern era

The Modern Era of plant breeding, beginning in the latter half of the 20th century and continuing today, has been characterized by the integration of biotechnology and genomic tools. The advent of molecular markers, genetic engineering, and genome editing technologies such as CRISPR/Cas9 has ushered in a new phase of precision breeding (Jinek et al., 2012).

These technologies have enabled breeders to directly modify specific genes associated with desirable traits, greatly accelerating the breeding process and improving the accuracy of trait selection. The development of genetically modified (GM) crops, which are engineered to express traits such as pest resistance or herbicide tolerance, has also been a significant achievement of this era. Moreover, the application of genome editing techniques like CRISPR/Cas9 has allowed for the creation of transgene-free plants, addressing some of the regulatory and public concerns associated with GM crops (Chen et al., 2019).

The Modern Era represents a culmination of centuries of innovation in plant breeding, offering solutions to the challenges of food security, climate change, and population growth. By combining traditional breeding methods with cutting-edge biotechnology, breeders can now develop crop varieties that are more productive, resilient, and sustainable.

3. Challenges in current agricultural systems

Agriculture today faces numerous challenges that threaten global food security and sustainability. These challenges, compounded by climate change and increasing population pressures, necessitate innovation in plant breeding and agricultural practices. Below is a detailed exploration of these challenges, including the current state of food production, the impact of climate change, and the limitations of conventional breeding techniques.

3.1. Food production and distribution

Global food production has increased significantly over the past century, largely due to advancements in agricultural practices and plant breeding. However, despite this progress, food distribution remains uneven, and hunger persists in many parts of the world. According to the United Nations, nearly 690 million people were undernourished in 2019, a number that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic (FAO, 2020).

One of the key challenges in food production is the efficient distribution of food to areas in need. Factors such as poor infrastructure, political instability, and economic inequality hinder the effective distribution of food, leading to both surplus and scarcity in different regions. Plant breeding plays a crucial role in addressing these challenges by developing more resilient crop varieties, that have higher yields, and are better suited to different environments (Pingali, 2012).

3.2. Climate change and stress factors

Climate change is one of the most significant threats to global agriculture. Rising temperatures, changing precipitation patterns, and the increased frequency of extreme weather events such as droughts and floods have already begun to impact crop yields. Additionally, climate change exacerbates the spread of pests and diseases, further threatening food security (IPCC, 2019).

To combat these challenges, it is essential to develop crops that can withstand both biotic (pests and diseases) and abiotic (drought, heat, salinity) stresses. Conventional breeding techniques have had some success in this area, but the process is often slow and labor-intensive. The integration of modern biotechnological tools, such as marker-assisted selection and genome editing, offers new opportunities to accelerate the development of stress-resistant crops (Lobell, Schlenker, & Costa-Roberts, 2011).

3.3. Limitations of conventional breeding

Traditional plant breeding techniques, which rely on selecting and crossbreeding plants with desirable traits, have been the backbone of agricultural development for centuries. However, these methods have several limitations that make them insufficient to meet the growing demands and challenges posed by modern agriculture.

One of the primary limitations is the time required to develop new crop varieties. Conventional breeding often takes many years to produce a commercially viable variety, especially when dealing with complex traits such as drought tolerance or disease resistance. Additionally, traditional breeding is limited by the genetic diversity available within a species, which can restrict the ability to introduce new traits (Moose & Mumm, 2008).

Furthermore, conventional breeding does not always allow for the precise control of genetic traits. Crossbreeding can result in the unintended introduction of undesirable traits, necessitating additional breeding cycles to eliminate them. This lack of precision is particularly problematic when dealing with traits that are controlled by multiple genes (multigenic traits), as is often the case with stress resistance (Tester & Langridge, 2010).

The advent of modern techniques such as genetic engineering and genome editing has provided plant breeders with tools to overcome these limitations. These technologies allow for the precise modification of specific genes, enabling the rapid development of crop varieties with targeted traits. As a result, they hold the potential to address the urgent challenges of food production and climate change more effectively than conventional breeding alone (Chen, 2019).

4. Novel plant breeding techniques

In response to the growing challenges in agriculture, novel plant breeding techniques have emerged as powerful tools to enhance crop traits more efficiently and precisely than traditional methods. These techniques, particularly genome editing technologies, speed breeding, and the integration of omics technologies are revolutionizing the field of plant breeding.

4.1. Genome editing technologies

Genome editing technologies have significantly advanced the ability to make precise modifications in the DNA of plants. Among these, CRISPR/Cas9, base editing (BE), and prime editing (PE) stand out as transformative tools.

CRISPR/Cas9 is the most widely used genome editing technique. It allows for the targeted modification of specific genes within a plant's genome. The CRISPR/Cas9 system works by using a guide RNA to direct the Cas9 enzyme to a specific DNA sequence, where it introduces a double-strand break. This break can then be repaired by the plant's natural repair mechanisms, either by non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) or homology-directed repair (HDR), resulting in the deletion, insertion, or replacement of genetic material (Jinek et al., 2012).

Base editing (BE) is a more refined technique that enables the direct, irreversible conversion of one DNA base pair into another without inducing double-strand breaks. This precision minimizes the risks of unintended mutations and allows for the correction of point mutations, which are responsible for many genetic traits (Komor et al., 2016).

Prime editing (PE) is an even more advanced technique that combines the capabilities of CRISPR/Cas9 with an engineered reverse transcriptase. This allows for precise insertions, deletions, and all 12 possible base-to-base conversions without requiring double-strand breaks. Prime editing offers greater precision and fewer off-target effects, making it an invaluable tool for developing crops with desirable traits (Anzalone et al., 2019).

4.2. Speed breeding and omics integration

Speed breeding is a technique designed to accelerate the plant breeding process by optimizing the growing environment to reduce the time required for plants to flower and produce seeds. This approach can shorten the breeding cycle from years to months, enabling the rapid development of new crop varieties. Speed breeding has been particularly effective in crops like wheat, barley, and chickpeas, where it has reduced generation times and allowed for faster selection of desirable traits (Watson et al., 2018).

4.3. Omics technologies

Which include genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics provide comprehensive insights into the molecular mechanisms underlying plant traits. By integrating omics data with traditional breeding methods, researchers can identify genes associated with desirable traits more accurately and develop crops with enhanced nutritional quality, stress resistance, and yield (Fernie & Schauer, 2009).

4.4. Applications and benefits

The practical applications of these novel plant breeding techniques are vast and varied. Genome editing has been used to develop crops with enhanced nutritional content, such as high-lysine maize and low-gluten wheat, which cater to specific dietary needs. CRISPR/Cas9 has also been employed to confer resistance to diseases like powdery mildew in wheat and bacterial blight in rice (Li et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2014).

Speed breeding, combined with genome editing, has led to the rapid development of high-yielding, stress-resistant crops. For example, speed breeding has been used to produce wheat varieties with improved tolerance to drought and salinity, addressing key challenges posed by climate change (Ghosh et al., 2018).

The integration of omics technologies has facilitated the identification of key metabolic pathways involved in stress responses, enabling the development of crops that are better equipped to withstand environmental stresses. This approach has been instrumental in improving the resilience of crops such as rice and soybean under adverse conditions (Zhu et al., 2016).

5. Regulatory and socio-economic considerations

As novel plant breeding techniques, particularly genome editing, gain prominence in agriculture, regulatory and socio-economic considerations have become crucial factors in their adoption and implementation. This section examines the existing regulatory frameworks, challenges in harmonizing global standards, and the potential socio-economic impacts of these technologies.

5.1. Regulatory regimes

The regulation of genome-edited crops varies significantly across different countries, reflecting diverse approaches to risk assessment, public policy, and scientific advancement.

United States: In the U.S., the regulation of genome-edited crops is primarily overseen by the USDA (United States Department of Agriculture), the FDA (Food and Drug Administration), and the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). The USDA has adopted a relatively permissive approach, particularly towards crops developed using genome editing techniques that do not involve the introduction of foreign DNA. For example, the USDA has clarified that certain CRISPR-edited plants that could also be produced through traditional breeding are not subject to the same stringent regulations as genetically modified organisms (GMOs) (USDA, 2018).

European Union: In contrast, the European Union has taken a more cautious stance. The European Court of Justice ruled in 2018 that organisms produced through genome editing should be considered GMOs and thus subject to the EU's strict GMO regulations (European Court of Justice, 2018). This decision has been contentious, with debates over whether it stifles innovation and impedes the adoption of beneficial technologies.

Japan: Japan has adopted a middle-ground approach. In 2019, the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare announced that genome-edited foods would be treated differently from GMOs if no foreign genes were introduced. This framework aims to facilitate innovation while ensuring safety (MHLW, 2019).

5.2. Challenges in harmonization

The varying regulatory approaches present significant challenges for the harmonization of global standards. Differences in definitions, risk assessment procedures, and public perception create barriers to international trade and the global adoption of genome-edited crops. Efforts to harmonize regulations, such as through international organizations like the Codex Alimentarius, are ongoing but face complexities due to differing national priorities and legal frameworks (Smyth, McHughen, & Phillips, 2014).

5.3. Socio-economic impact

The socio-economic impact of adopting novel plant breeding techniques is multifaceted, encompassing potential benefits as well as challenges related to consumer acceptance and market dynamics.

5.4. Potential benefits

The adoption of novel breeding techniques offers several socio-economic benefits. For instance, crops developed through genome editing can be tailored to local conditions, improving food security by enhancing yields and resilience to environmental stresses. This can be particularly beneficial in regions prone to climate change impacts, where traditional crops may struggle to thrive (Qaim, 2020). Additionally, these technologies can reduce the reliance on chemical inputs, lowering production costs and minimizing environmental impacts.

5.5. Consumer acceptance

However, consumer acceptance remains a critical challenge. Public perception of genome-edited crops is often influenced by concerns over safety, environmental impact, and ethical considerations. While some consumers view genome editing as a natural extension of traditional breeding, others express concerns about potential risks and the long-term effects on ecosystems and human health (Shew et al., 2018). Effective communication and transparency about the benefits and safety of these technologies are essential to gaining public trust.

5.6. Market dynamics

The introduction of genome-edited crops into the market also affects dynamics within the agricultural sector. These technologies have the potential to disrupt traditional seed markets, where large agribusinesses have historically dominated. Novel breeding techniques could democratize access to advanced crop varieties, benefiting smaller-scale farmers and promoting agricultural diversity (Hickey et al., 2019). However, there is also the risk that the high costs associated with developing and commercializing genome-edited crops could exacerbate existing inequalities in the agricultural sector.

5.7. Role of stakeholders

The successful implementation of novel plant breeding techniques requires the collaboration of multiple stakeholders, including farmers, policymakers, researchers, and industry leaders. Policymakers play a crucial role in developing and enforcing regulations that balance innovation with safety. Researchers are responsible for advancing the science behind these technologies and ensuring that they address real-world agricultural challenges. Farmers, as the end-users, need to be involved in the development process to ensure that the resulting crops meet their needs and are accessible (Wolt et al., 2016).

6. Syngenta's role in agricultural innovation

Syngenta, a global leader in agricultural innovation, has played a significant role in advancing crop science through various initiatives and technologies. This section highlights Syngenta's collaborative platforms, such as the Shoots by Syngenta initiative, and their contributions to optimizing CRISPR-based technologies for crop improvement.

6.1. Collaborative platforms: Shoots by Syngenta

Shoots by Syngenta is an innovative platform designed to foster collaboration and accelerate agricultural research. Launched in 2020, this initiative aims to connect scientists, researchers, and entrepreneurs with Syngenta's resources and expertise to develop solutions that address the challenges facing modern agriculture. The platform encourages the exchange of ideas and facilitates partnerships across the agricultural value chain, enabling participants to leverage Syngenta's global reach and technological capabilities.

One of the key features of Shoots by Syngenta is its focus on open innovation. The platform allows external collaborators to propose research projects that align with Syngenta's strategic priorities, such as improving crop yields, enhancing sustainability, and developing new biotechnologies. Selected projects receive funding, technical support, and access to Syngenta's research infrastructure, creating opportunities for groundbreaking discoveries in plant science (Syngenta, 2020).

Through Shoots by Syngenta, the company has successfully brought together a diverse range of stakeholders, including academic institutions, startups, and industry partners. This collaborative approach has not only accelerated the development of innovative agricultural solutions but has also strengthened Syngenta's position as a leader in the global agricultural research community.

6.2. CRISPR-based technologies

Syngenta has been at the forefront of optimizing CRISPR (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats) technologies for crop improvement. CRISPR is a powerful genome-editing tool that allows for precise modifications to plant DNA, enabling the development of crops with enhanced traits such as disease resistance, improved yield, and tolerance to environmental stresses.

One of Syngenta's significant contributions to CRISPR technology is its commitment to making these tools more accessible to the academic research community. In 2017, Syngenta announced an open rights policy that grants academic researchers free access to their proprietary CRISPR intellectual property for non-commercial research purposes. This policy aims to encourage innovation in plant science by allowing researchers to explore new applications of CRISPR without the burden of licensing fees or legal restrictions (Syngenta, 2017).

Syngenta has also focused on optimizing CRISPR systems for use in a wide range of crops. By refining the CRISPR-Cas9 technique and developing more efficient delivery methods, Syngenta has improved the precision and reliability of genome editing in plants. These advancements have facilitated the creation of new crop varieties with desirable traits, contributing to the global effort to enhance food security and agricultural sustainability.

Moreover, Syngenta's work with CRISPR technologies extends to the development of traits that address specific challenges in agriculture, such as resistance to pests and diseases. For example, Syngenta has used CRISPR to engineer crops with enhanced resistance to fungal pathogens, reducing the need for chemical fungicides and promoting more sustainable farming practices (Langridge, 2019).

7. Future prospects and recommendations for innovation pathways

As we look to the future of plant breeding, the integration of emerging technologies presents exciting opportunities for innovation. DNA-free editing systems are one such promising development. Unlike traditional CRISPR methods, which involve introducing foreign DNA into the plant genome, DNA-free editing avoids potential regulatory hurdles and public concerns by delivering gene-editing tools directly to the plant cells. This approach could pave the way for faster and more widely accepted crop improvements (Kaur & Zhan, 2021).

Another innovative avenue is the application of nanotechnology in plant breeding. Nanomaterials can be used to deliver genetic material or gene-editing tools directly to specific plant tissues, enhancing precision and efficiency. Nanotechnology also offers the potential to improve plant resistance to environmental stresses by enabling the controlled release of agrochemicals or enhancing nutrient uptake (Kah et al., 2018). Combining these advanced tools with existing breeding techniques can lead to the development of crops that are more resilient, nutritious, and sustainable.

7.1. Policy and stakeholder engagement

For the successful adoption of genome editing technologies, it is crucial to develop robust policy frameworks that balance innovation with safety and ethics. Policymakers should work towards harmonizing regulations across countries to facilitate international collaboration and trade. Clear guidelines on the safety assessment and labeling of genome-edited crops can also help build public trust and acceptance (Wolt, Wang, & Yang, 2016).

7.2. Stakeholder collaboration

This is another key factor in advancing plant breeding innovations. Researchers, farmers, industry leaders, and policymakers must engage in continuous dialogue to align their goals and address potential challenges. Public-private partnerships can accelerate the development

and deployment of new technologies while involving farmers in the research process ensures that innovations are practical and meet real-world needs (Folta & Krichevsky, 2020).
Increasing public awareness about the benefits and safety of genome editing is also essential. Educational campaigns, transparent communication, and community involvement can help demystify these technologies and address concerns related to food safety, environmental impact, and ethical considerations.

7.3. Sustainable agriculture goals

The long-term goal of plant breeding innovations should be to contribute to sustainable agriculture, ensuring food security while preserving natural resources. This involves developing crops that require fewer inputs, such as water, fertilizers, and pesticides, and are more resilient to climate change. By focusing on sustainability, plant breeders can help mitigate the environmental impact of agriculture, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote biodiversity (Godfray et al., 2010).

7.4. Improving rural prosperity

Is another critical aspect of sustainable agriculture. Innovations in plant breeding can enhance crop yields and quality, leading to increased incomes for smallholder farmers. This, in turn, supports rural economies and contributes to poverty reduction. Empowering farmers with access to improved seeds and knowledge of best practices is vital for achieving these outcomes (Thompson & Scoones, 2009).
Finally, plant breeding must address the challenge of food and nutrition security by developing crops that are not only high-yielding but also nutrient-rich. Biofortification, the process of increasing the nutrient content of crops through breeding, can play a significant role in combating malnutrition and improving public health (Bouis & Saltzman, 2017). By integrating these goals into future research and development efforts, the plant breeding community can make meaningful contributions to global sustainability and human well-being.

8. Conclusion

Plant breeding has undergone a remarkable evolution, beginning with the early practices of cross-pollination and selection by ancient farmers, through the groundbreaking work of Gregor Mendel that established the foundation of genetics, to the advanced hybridization techniques of the 20th century. The modern era of plant breeding is marked by the integration of cutting-edge technologies like genome editing, which allows for unprecedented precision in crop improvement. These innovations have led to the development of crops with enhanced yield, quality, and resilience to environmental stresses, contributing significantly to global food security and sustainability.

Call to action

As we face the pressing challenges of climate change, population growth, and food insecurity, it is imperative to continue pushing the boundaries of innovation in plant breeding. Interdisciplinary collaboration among scientists, policymakers, farmers, and industry leaders will be crucial in developing and implementing new technologies that can meet the demands of a growing global population. Additionally, supportive regulatory frameworks that balance innovation with safety and ethics are needed to facilitate the adoption of these technologies worldwide.
To ensure the future of agriculture, it is also essential to make the field more attractive and accessible to the next generation of researchers and practitioners. By fostering a culture of innovation, providing education and training, and promoting the benefits of modern plant breeding, we can inspire young people to contribute to the future of sustainable agriculture. Through these collective efforts, we can achieve the long-term goals of food security, rural prosperity, and environmental sustainability, ensuring a healthy and prosperous future for all.

Acknowledgment

We extend our heartfelt gratitude to Dr. G. Raja Reddy, Principal of Kakatiya Government College (Autonomous), Hanamkonda, for his unwavering support and invaluable assistance in publishing this review paper. This marks the first paper for our department's new academic staff in 2024, and it would not have been possible without his encouragement. Dr. Raja Reddy's commitment to educational excellence inspires and motivates us all.

References

[1] Anzalone, A. V., Randolph, P. B., Davis, J. R., Sousa, A. A., Koblan, L. W., Levy, J. M., ... & Liu, D. R. (2019). Search-and-replace genome editing without double-strand breaks or donor DNA. Nature, 576(7785), 149-157. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1711-4.
[2] Arabidopsis Genome Initiative. (2000). Analysis of the genome sequence of the flowering plant Arabidopsis thaliana. Nature, 408(6814), 796-815. https://doi.org/10.1038/35048692.
[3] Botstein, D., White, R. L., Skolnick, M., & Davis, R. W. (1980). Construction of a genetic linkage map in man using restriction fragment length polymorphisms. American Journal of Human Genetics, 32(3), 314-331.
[4] Bouis, H. E., & Saltzman, A. (2017). Improving nutrition through biofortification: A review of evidence from HarvestPlus, 2003 through 2016. Global Food Security, 12, 49-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2017.01.009.
[5] Bridges, C. B. (1923). The chromosome theory of heredity. Zeitschrift für induktive Abstammungs- und Vererbungslehre, 32(1), 1-18.
[6] Buffon, G.-L. (1774). Histoire naturelle. Imprimerie Royale.
[7] Chen, K., Wang, Y., Zhang, R., Zhang, H., & Gao, C. (2019). CRISPR/Cas genome editing and precision plant breeding in agriculture. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 70, 667-697. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-050718-100049.
[8] Correns, C. (1900). G. Mendel's Law Concerning the Behavior of the Progeny of Racial Hybrids. Botanical Magazine, 82, 158-168.
[9] Darwin, C. (1868). The variation of animals and plants under domestication. John Murray.
[10] de Vries, H. (1900). Sur la loi de disjonction des hybrides. Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences, 130, 845-847.
[11] Duvick, D. N. (1999). Heterosis: Feeding people and protecting natural resources. In Genetics and Exploitation of Heterosis in Crops (pp. 19-29). ASA, CSSA, and SSSA. https://doi.org/10.2134/1999.geneticsandexploitation.c3.

[12] European Court of Justice. (2018). Judgment in Case C-528/16: Confédération paysanne and Others v Premier ministre and Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Agroalimentaire et de la Forêt. Retrieved from https://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-528/16

[13] FAO. (2020). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2020. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/publications

[14] Fernie, A. R., & Schauer, N. (2009). Metabolomics-assisted breeding: a viable option for crop improvement? Trends in Genetics, 25(1), 39-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2008.10.010.

[15] Fisher, R. A. (1918). The correlation between relatives on the supposition of Mendelian inheritance. Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 52(2), 399-433. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0080456800012163.

[16] Folta, K. M., & Krichevsky, A. (2020). Public-Private Partnerships in Plant Breeding. The Plant Journal, 101(5), 844-855.

[17] Ghosh, S., Watson, A., Gonzalez-Navarro, O. E., Ramirez-Gonzalez, R. H., Yanes, L., Mendoza-Suárez, M., ... & Hickey, L. T. (2018). Speed breeding in growth chambers and glasshouses for crop breeding and model plant research. Nature Protocols, 13(12), 2944-2963. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41596-018-0072-z.

[18] Godfray, H. C. J., Beddington, J. R., Crute, I. R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., ... & Toulmin, C. (2010). Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people. Science, 327(5967), 812-818. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1185383.

[19] Hickey, L. T., Hafeez, A. N., Robinson, H., Jackson, S. A., Leal-Bertioli, S. C., Tester, M., ... & Wulff, B. B. (2019). Breeding crops to feed 10 billion. Nature Biotechnology, 37(7), 744-754. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0152-9.

[20] IPCC. (2019). Climate Change and Land: An IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/report/srccl/

[21] Jinek, M., Chylinski, K., Fonfara, I., Hauer, M., Doudna, J. A., & Charpentier, E. (2012). A programmable dual-RNA–guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. Science, 337(6096), 816-821. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1225829.

[22] Jinek, M., Chylinski, K., Fonfara, I., Hauer, M., Doudna, J. A., & Charpentier, E. (2012). A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. Science, 337(6096), 816-821. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1225829.

[23] Jones, D. F. (1922). The product of the combination of Mendelian factors considered as a cause of heterosis. Genetics, 7(5), 456-457.

[24] Kah, M., Kookana, R. S., Gogos, A., & Bucheli, T. D. (2018). A critical evaluation of nanopesticides and nanofertilizers against their conventional analogues. Nature Nanotechnology, 13(8), 677-684. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-018-0131-1.

[25] Kaur, K., & Zhan, X. (2021). DNA-Free Genome Editing for Crop Improvement. Trends in Biotechnology, 39(8), 897-899.

[26] Komor, A. C., Kim, Y. B., Packer, M. S., Zuris, J. A., & Liu, D. R. (2016). Programmable editing of a target base in genomic DNA without double-stranded DNA cleavage. Nature, 533(7603), 420-424. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature17946.

[27] Ladizinsky, G. (1985). The origin of cultivated plants. University of Arizona Press.

[28] Lamarck, J.-B. (1809). Philosophie zoologique. Dentu.

[29] Lamarck, J.-B. (1809). Philosophie Zoologique. Dentu.

[30] Langridge, P. (2019). Syngenta and CRISPR: Crop Innovation through Collaboration. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 17(4), 785-792.

[31] Li, M., Li, X., Zhou, Z., Wu, P., Fang, M., Pan, X., & Lin, Q. (2012). Overexpression of a Harpin-encoding gene hrf1 in rice enhances drought tolerance. Journal of Plant Physiology, 169(13), 1400-1409.

[32] Lobell, D. B., Schlenker, W., & Costa-Roberts, J. (2011). Climate trends and global crop production since 1980. Science, 333(6042), 616-620. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1204531.

[33] Mendel, G. (1866). Versuche über Pflanzen-Hybriden. Verhandlungen des naturforschenden Vereines in Brünn, 4, 3-47. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.61004.

[34] MHLW (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare). (2019). Guidelines on the handling of foods and food additives derived from genome editing technology. Retrieved from https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/newpage_09548.html

[35] Moose, S. P., & Mumm, R. H. (2008). Molecular plant breeding as the foundation for 21st century crop improvement. Plant Physiology, 147(3), 969-977. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.108.118232.

[36] Morgan, T. H. (1915). The mechanism of Mendelian heredity. Henry Holt and Company. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.22551.

[37] Olby, R. C. (1985). Origins of Mendelism. University of Chicago Press.

[38] Pingali, P. L. (2012). Green Revolution: Impacts, limits, and the path ahead. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(31), 12302-12308. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0912953109.

[39] Qaim, M. (2020). Role of new plant breeding technologies for food security and sustainable agricultural development. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 42(2), 129-150. https://doi.org/10.1002/aepp.13044.

[40] Shew, A. M., Nalley, L. L., Snell, H. A., Nayga Jr, R. M., & Dixon, B. L. (2018). CRISPR versus GMOs: Public acceptance and valuation. Global Food Security, 19, 71-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.10.005.

[41] Shull, G. H. (1908). The composition of a field of maize. Journal of Heredity, 4(1), 296-301. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/os-4.1.296.

[42] Shull, G. H. (1909). A pure line method of corn breeding. American Breeders Association Report, 5, 51-59. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/os-5.1.51.

[43] Smyth, S. J., McHughen, A., & Phillips, P. W. B. (2014). Regulating genome edited crops: Risk, uncertainty, and the precautionary principle. Global Food Security, 3(1), 7-12.

[44] Stuber, C. W. (1994). Heterosis in plant breeding. Plant Breeding Reviews, 12, 227-251. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470650493.ch8.

[45] Syngenta. (2017). Syngenta Offers Open Access to CRISPR Technology for Non-Commercial Research. Retrieved from https://www.syngenta.com/en/newsroom/news-releases/syngenta-offers-open-access-crispr-technology

[46] Syngenta. (2020). Shoots by Syngenta: Fostering Innovation in Agriculture. Retrieved from https://www.syngenta.com/en/newsroom/news-releases/shoots-syngenta-collaborative-platform

[47] Tautz, D. (1989). Hypervariability of simple sequences as a general source for polymorphic DNA markers. Nucleic Acids Research, 17(16), 6463-6471. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/17.16.6463.

[48] Tester, M., & Langridge, P. (2010). Breeding technologies to increase crop production in a changing world. Science, 327(5967), 818-822. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1183700.

[49] Thompson, J., & Scoones, I. (2009). Addressing the dynamics of agri-food systems: An emerging agenda for social science research. Environmental Science & Policy, 12(4), 386-397. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2009.03.001.

[50] USDA (United States Department of Agriculture). (2018). Secretary Perdue issues USDA statement on plant breeding innovation. Retrieved from https://www.usda.gov/media/press-releases/2018/03/28/secretary-perdue-issues-usda-statement-plant-breeding-innovation

[51] Vaeck, M., Reynaerts, A., Höfte, H., Jansens, S., De Beuckeleer, M., Dean, C., Zabeau, M., Van Montagu, M., & Leemans, J. (1987). Transgenic plants protected from insect attack. Nature, 328(6125), 33-37. https://doi.org/10.1038/328033a0.

[52] von Tschermak, E. (1900). Über künstliche Kreuzung bei Pisum sativum. Berichte der Deutschen Botanischen Gesellschaft, 18, 232-239. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1438-8677.1900.tb04903.x.

[53] Wang, F., Wang, C., Liu, P., Lei, C., Hao, W., Gao, Y., ... & Zhao, K. (2014). Enhanced rice blast resistance by CRISPR/Cas9-targeted mutagenesis of the ERF transcription factor gene OsERF922. PLOS ONE, 9(9), e107623.

[54] Watson, A., Ghosh, S., Williams, M. J., Cuddy, W. S., Simmonds, J., Rey, M. D., ... & Hickey, L. T. (2018). Speed breeding is a powerful tool to accelerate crop research and breeding. Nature Plants, 4(1), 23-29. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-017-0083-8.

[55] Weismann, A. (1891). The theory of heredity. Macmillan.

[56] Wolff, C. F. (1759). Theoria generationis. Johann Christian Dieterich.

[57] Wolt, J. D., Wang, K., & Yang, B. (2016). The Regulatory Status of Genome-edited Crops. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 14(2), 510-518. https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12444.

[58] Wolt, J. D., Wang, K., Sashital, D., & Lawrence-Dill, C. J. (2016). Achieving plant CRISPR targeting that limits off-target effects. The Plant Genome, 9(3), 1-8.
[59] Zhu, X., Gong, H., Chen, G., Wang, S., Zhang, L., Li, P., ... & Dong, Z. (2016). Metabolomics analysis reveals the mechanism of OsSRFP1-mediated drought tolerance in rice. Scientific Reports, 6, 27157. https://doi.org/10.3835/plantgenome2016.05.0047.
[60] Zohary, D., & Hopf, M. (2000). Domestication of plants in the old world: The origin and spread of cultivated plants in West Asia, Europe, and the Nile Valley. Oxford University Press.