

Safety Considerations for Genetically Engineered Rice

By Lim Li Ching

INTRODUCTION

Rice feeds more than half of the world's population. In much of Asia, rice is the staple food. The highest producing countries of rice are in Asia; in 2004, China produced 177,434,000 Mt (metric ton) of rice paddy, India produced 129,000,000 Mt and Indonesia produced 54,060,816 Mt (FAOSTAT 2005).

Agricultural biotechnology has been developing at a rapid pace, and genetic engineering has been proposed as a means of improving various aspects of crop production. Rice has been no exception, and developing countries have been urged to facilitate the adoption of genetically engineered (GE) rice (e.g. Datta 2004).

Uptake of GE rice in Asia, particularly China, is seen by some as potentially demonstrating the benefits of genetic engineering and reducing opposition to it (Brookes and Barfoot 2004). China, the world's largest producer and consumer of rice, is reportedly on the brink of commercializing GE rice (AsiaPulse 2005; Jia 2004; Lei 2004). Chinese scientists have been researching GE rice since the 1980s. Research is also being conducted in other Asian countries, including Japan, India, the Philippines and Thailand.

Despite the apparent positive outlook for GE rice, serious concerns have been raised in respect of its impact on the environment, human and animal health, and socio-economic situations (e.g. Cummins 2004; Stabinsky and Cotter 2004a, 2004b). There have also been a number of reports about unapproved GE rice entering the market

and food chain in China (Barboza 2005; Brown 2005; Reuters 2005), highlighting instances of regulatory failure.

In particular, it appears that GE rice research has thus far outpaced safety considerations. He Changchui, Assistant Director-General/Regional Representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, has been quoted as saying that Asian governments should move cautiously before approving commercial planting of GE rice (Mohanty 2004). He urged governments to undertake extensive risk assessment on food safety.

This paper examines some of the safety issues that will need to be seriously considered before any commercialization of GE rice occurs.

RESEARCH ON GE RICE

This section briefly and selectively highlights some of the research conducted on GE rice. Traits reportedly closest to commercialisation are glyphosate and glufosinate tolerance, resistance to bacterial leaf blight (using the Xa21 gene), and resistance to Lepidopteran insects (using Bt toxins) (Brookes and Barfoot 2004).

Herbicide tolerance

Aventis (formerly AgrEvo) has developed GE rice tolerant to the herbicide glufosinate ammonium. Two events, LLRICE06 and LLRICE62, are no

TWNN THIRD WORLD NETWORK is a network of groups and individuals involved in bringing about a greater articulation of the needs, aspirations and rights of the people in the Third World and in promoting a fair distribution of world resources and forms of development which are humane and are in harmony with nature.

Address: 121-S, Jalan Utama, 10450, Penang, MALAYSIA
E-mail: twnet@po.jaring.my **Website:** www.twinside.org.sg

Tel: 60-4-2266728/2266159

Fax: 60-4-2264505

longer considered regulated items in the U.S. and can be grown commercially (APHIS 1999). However, these GE rice have not been commercially grown yet, presumably due to the lack of markets. Bayer, which bought over Aventis, is currently seeking approval for the import of LLRICE62 for food, feed and industrial uses into the European Union (Bayer 2003). Monsanto is developing GE rice tolerant to the herbicide glyphosate, and has reportedly conducted field trials in Japan and the U.S. (Brookes and Barfoot 2004).

Scientists have expressed various human cytochrome genes in GE rice, to confer tolerance to the sulphonylurea herbicides (Inui et al. 2001), and to the triazine herbicides atrazine and simazine (Kawahigashi et al. 2005). The latter research also proposed the use of the GE rice for phytoremediation, to reduce herbicide residues in the water and soil surrounding the plants themselves.

Insect resistance

The Cry toxin genes from the bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) code for several insecticidal Bt toxins; these have been introduced into rice to protect against Lepidopteran pests, particularly yellow stem borer (*Scirpophaga incertulas*), striped stem borer (*Chilo suppressalis*) and rice leaf folder (*Cnaphalocrocis medinalis*) (Khanna and Raina 2002; Ye et al. 2001; Ye et al. 2003). The most frequently used Cry toxin genes are Cry1Ab and/or Cry1Ac genes (High et al. 2004).

Plant protease inhibitors like the cowpea trypsin inhibitor (CpTI) inhibit plant protein digestion in insects. The CpTI gene has been introduced into rice to protect against striped stem borer and pink stem borer (*Sesamia inferens*) (Xu et al. 1996).

GE rice with the snowdrop lectin *Galanthus nivalis* agglutinin (GNA) gene resists sap-sucking insects, such as the small brown planthopper (*Laodelphax striatellus*) (Sun et al. 2002). GE rice expressing three insecticidal genes (Bt genes Cry1Ac and Cry2A, and *gna*) provided protection against rice leaf folder, yellow stem borer and brown planthopper (*Nilaparvata lugens*) (Maqbool et al. 2001).

Disease resistance

Bacterial blight is caused by the bacterium *Xanthomonas oryzae* pv. *oryzae* (Xoo). The rice gene Xa21 provides wide-spectrum resistance against Xoo, although the endogenous gene is expressed at low levels. Genetically engineering rice by inserting Xa21 enhances bacterial blight resistance. Xa21 has been pyramided (combining

genes by conventional crossing) with a fused Cry1Ab/Cry1Ac gene to confer resistance to insects and bacterial blight (Jiang et al. 2004). Two transgenic lines, one with Xa21, the other with a rice chitinase gene for protection against sheath blight and a synthetic gene with fused Cry1Ab/Cry1Ac, were pyramided to resist bacterial blight, yellow stem borer and sheath blight (Datta et al. 2002).

Rice blast is caused by the fungus *Pyricularia oryzae*. A gene from a medicinal herb, *Trichosanthes kirilowii* expressed the protein trichosanthin in GE rice, delaying blast infection (Ming et al. 2000). Rice chitinase genes and maize genes triggering anthocyanin (a flavonoid pigment) production can also confer blast resistance (Brookes and Barfoot 2004; Gandikota et al. 2001).

Research on virus resistant GE rice includes resistance to rice yellow mottle virus (RYMV), rice hoja blanca virus (RHBV), rice tungro spherical virus (RTSV) and rice ragged stunt virus (RRSV) (Brookes and Barfoot 2004).

Tolerance to abiotic stress

GE rice has been developed to tolerate low iron availability in alkaline soils (Takahashi et al. 2001). Over-expressing a rice sodium antiporter (a pump that moves sodium ion) gene improved salt tolerance (Fukuda et al. 2004). Manipulating plant polyamine biosynthesis produced drought-tolerant rice (Capell et al. 2004) and the barley gene Hva1 inserted into rice reduced drought damage (Babu et al. 2004).

Nutritional enhancement

Scientists have expressed provitamin A (beta-carotene) in rice grains, creating 'Golden Rice' (Ye et al. 2000), promoted as a cure for vitamin A deficiency (e.g. Potrykus 2003). GE rice rich in iron has been developed to combat iron deficiency anaemia. Insertion of a ferritin (an iron storage protein) gene from the bean *Phaseolus vulgaris* increased iron content up to two-fold (Lucca et al. 2002).

Production of pharmaceuticals

Rice has been genetically engineered to produce pharmaceutical products. Field trials of GE rice that produce the human milk proteins lactoferrin, lysozyme and alpha-1-antitrypsin have been conducted in California since 1997 (Freese et al. 2004). In 2004, Ventria Bioscience proposed starting commercial cultivation of biopharmaceutical rice (expressing the human proteins lactoferrin and lysozyme) in California, but was met with local opposition. Since then, Ventria has been seeking

approval to grow the biopharmaceutical rice in Missouri.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

There is a wide range of GE rice under development. However, all GE rice must undergo thorough risk assessment and decisions should be made according to the Precautionary Principle. This section points to some of the potential environmental, health and socio-economic impacts of GE rice.

Environmental concerns

Asia is the centre of origin for the genus *Oryza*. There exist wild relatives of rice, known to hybridise with cultivated rice and weedy relatives (e.g., red rice). Gene flow via outcrossing or cross-pollination is thought to be inevitable as the necessary spatial, temporal and biological conditions are met in many Asian rice-producing areas (Lu et al. 2003). Although outcrossing rates may be low as rice is largely self-pollinating, "given the vast area over which rice is cultivated and wild and weedy rices occur, transgenes will almost certainly escape into non-transgenic plants" (High et al. 2004:288).

Gene flow between cultivated rice (*O. sativa*) and the widely distributed wild rice *O. rufipogon* was shown to occur considerably under natural conditions (Lu et al. 2003). Gene flow was also demonstrated with a noticeable frequency from cultivated rice to its weedy (~0.011-0.046%) and wild (~1.21-2.19%) relatives (Chen et al. 2004).

Weedy rice is already a problem in more than 50 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, reducing rice yield and quality. Traits such as herbicide tolerance, insect, virus and disease resistance, and abiotic stress tolerance, if acquired from GE rice by wild and weedy relatives, could significantly enhance their ecological fitness. One possible consequence is the creation of more aggressive weeds, with resulting unpredictable damage to local ecosystems. Chen et al. (2004) recommend that GE rice should not be released when it has transgenes that can significantly enhance the ecological fitness of weedy rice or that confer herbicide tolerance in regions where weedy rice is already abundant and causing problems.

Hybrids of GE rice and its wild relatives could swamp populations of wild species, possibly leading to their extinction and impacting negatively on agrobiodiversity. Crop genetic diversity is important for food security, acting as a reservoir for future breeding efforts. As Asia is the centre of origin of rice, any release of GE rice there must

be mindful of this fact. Traditional varieties of maize in Mexico, a centre of origin and diversity of maize, have already been contaminated by transgenes (CEC 2004; Quist and Chapela 2001). So much so that the Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America (CEC) (2004) has recommended strictly enforcing the current moratorium on commercial GE maize planting in Mexico.

Gene flow through horizontal gene transfer (HGT; no parent-to-offspring transfer of genes) from GE rice to soil microorganisms is an area of omitted research. However, studies have shown that HGT can occur between GE plants and microbes, under certain conditions (Nielsen et al. 1998). Significantly, methods for monitoring HGT from GE crops to microbes are problematic and too insensitive to detect HGT events (Heinemann and Traavik 2004; Nielsen and Townsend 2004). As such, even though monitoring so far has largely failed to observe HGT events in the field or has deemed frequencies too low or too rare to pose risks, claims that HGT is not a significant risk are not justified.

Widespread adoption of herbicide tolerant GE rice could lead to problems in the long-term. In the U.S., where GE crops have been planted commercially for nine years, pesticide use has increased overall (Benbrook 2004). This was primarily due to an increase in herbicide usage, largely because there has been a shift towards more herbicide tolerant weed species or the development of weeds resistant to herbicides, particularly glyphosate. The shifts have been perpetuated by widespread reliance on glyphosate, which is used in conjunction with glyphosate tolerant GE crops, placing greater selection pressure for weed resistance. As a result, farmers have had to spray incrementally more herbicides, and ultimately would require the usage of more toxic herbicides.

The impacts of GE rice on biodiversity have yet to be adequately researched. Some herbicide tolerant crops (GE oilseed rape and beet) have significant effects on biodiversity (FSE 2003). Weed densities and biomass, and abundance of some invertebrates, were found to be lower in GE crops than in conventional controls. In particular, reduced weed densities and biomass would have negative implications for the insects and birds that depend on weeds and weed seed for survival. A follow-up study has shown that the impacts of GM crops on biodiversity can persist for at least two years (Firbank et al. 2005). It is clear that the long term impacts of GM crops have to be considered even if they are only grown for a short period of time, as any negative impacts are likely to persist.

Insects may eventually evolve resistance to insect resistant GE rice. If this happens, GE rice will

no longer be effective at controlling insect pests and more harmful insecticides could be used instead. It is widely assumed that resistance to Bt crops will occur (Snow et al. 2004). This is no longer a theoretical possibility, as a paper published in May 2005 provides "unequivocal evidence" that, in Australia, a strain of cotton bollworm (*Helicoverpa armigera*) has developed resistance to the Cry1Ac toxin in "Ingard" Bt cotton (Gunning et al. 2005).

In the U.S., there are strict requirements for planting Bt refuges (areas of non-Bt crops) to delay the build-up of resistance. Such refuges may not be enforceable or practical on small farms like those in Asia, making insect resistance a real concern. It is also known that insects can adapt to protease inhibitors (Jongsma and Bolter 1997), so the effectiveness of CpTI in GE rice might be short-lived. Fungi, bacteria and viruses may also evolve resistance to GE rice resistant to them.

GE rice could impact non-target organisms (that are not direct targets of pest control), including beneficial species like natural enemies of pests (e.g. lacewings) and pollinators. Bt toxins have the potential to directly kill non-target insects (e.g. Losey et al., 1999). While pollen levels need to be sufficiently high to cause acute toxicity, chronic effects at lower pollen levels cannot be dismissed. Tritrophic studies have shown increased mortality of non-target beneficial lacewings when preying on herbivore insects feeding on Bt toxins and Bt plants (Hilbeck 2001). The effects of CpTI and GNA on non-target organisms have not been investigated fully yet and there is little experience with these GE crops. There is also little research on ecological consequences; as ecosystems are complex, impacts on one organism could have significant impacts elsewhere in the ecosystem (Snow et al. 2004).

Effects on soil biodiversity have not been adequately assessed yet. Bt toxin is released into the soil from roots and can accumulate in the soil, implying that soil organisms can be exposed to the toxin over a long time (Saxena et al. 2002). There are indications that earthworms are affected when fed Bt maize litter; after 200 days, the earthworms experienced significant weight loss (Zwahlen et al. 2003). Studies have identified changes in important biological activities when Bt rice straw was incorporated in water-flooded soils, indicating a probable shift in microbial populations or in metabolic activities (Wu et al. 2004).

Health concerns

It is now internationally recognised that genetic engineering can cause unintended effects, e.g. by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the joint WHO/FAO agency that deals with the interna-

tional regulation of food safety. Codex principles and guidelines related to risk analysis and food safety assessment of GE food (Codex 2003), adopted in 2003, clearly oblige an analysis of unintended effects, by requiring a case-by-case pre-market safety assessment that includes an evaluation of both direct and unintended effects that could result from gene insertion (Haslberger 2003).

Unintended effects can result from the random insertion of DNA sequences into the plant genome, which may disrupt or silence genes, activate silent genes, or modify gene expression. Insertion of transgenic DNA is often imprecise, and associated with significant rearrangement and/or loss of plant genomic DNA, as well as multiple copies, multiple insertion sites, multiple insertion of parts of the event and insertion of extraneous material, e.g. from the vector (Collonier et al. 2003; Wilson et al. 2004).

In five commercial GE plants that have been carefully analyzed so far, the transgenic inserts found in the plants are rearranged, compared to the sequences first notified to regulators (Collonier et al. 2003). The nature of the rearrangements includes deletion, recombination, and tandem or inverted repeats. Moreover, rearranged fragments of the insert can be scattered in the genome. Some of the rearrangements involve the cauliflower mosaic virus (CaMV) 35S promoter, which has a recombination hotspot (Kohli et al. 1999). The CaMV promoter, used in some GE rice, may also carry specific risks (Cummins et al. 2000; Ho et al. 1999, 2000a, 2000b).

Recombination may occur between plasmids before or during transformation, or between plasmid and genomic DNA during or after transformation. Transgenic inserts appear to show a preference for mobile genetic elements such as retrotransposons and repeated sequences. Transgene insertions into, or close to, such elements may lead to altered spatial and temporal expression patterns of genes nearby. All this may have unpredictable effects on the long-term genetic stability of the GE plants, and on their nutritional value, allergenicity and toxicology.

As rice is a staple food in Asia, thorough risk assessments must be done on GE rice. The most relevant testing for unintended effects is a well-designed feeding trial of proper duration, conducted using the actual GE plant or product (not bacterial surrogate products, as is the current practice). In spite of the obvious need, few studies investigating the effects of GE food/feed on animals or humans have been published in peer-reviewed journals (Domingo 2000). Most animal feeding studies conducted so far have been designed to show husbandry production differences between GE and non-GE crops. The few studies

that have been designed to reveal physiological or pathological differences demonstrate a worrying trend (Pryme and Lembcke 2003): Studies conducted by industry find no differences, while studies by independent researchers show differences that merit immediate follow-up.

For example, young rats fed GE potatoes expressing GNA showed changes in their gastrointestinal tract (Ewen and Pusztai 1999). Crypt length in their jejunums was significantly greater. The findings are similar to research describing fine structural changes in the small intestine of mice fed Bt potatoes (Fares and El-Sayed 1998). In addition, the number of cells in the crypt and the mitotic rate (number of cells dividing) increased in the jejunum of rats fed GNA potatoes (Pusztai et al. 2003). The implications for GE rice with GNA or Bt toxins have not been explored.

The liver of mice fed glyphosate tolerant GE soya underwent significant modifications of some morphological features (Malatesta et al. 2002). The liver had irregularly-shaped nuclei, more nuclear pores and more irregular nucleoli, suggestive of increased metabolic rate. However, the mechanisms responsible remain unknown. Glyphosate tolerant GE rice should be investigated for such effects.

Other health concerns include toxicity and allergenicity of transgenic products. One particular aspect of GE rice is that fused, stacked or pyramided genes are increasingly used, although the full health implications have yet to be considered. At the very least, the toxicity of each transgenic toxin, and the combinations of toxins, must be risk assessed (Cummins 2004). Nutritionally enhanced GE rice also needs to be evaluated fully, as changes are being made directly to nutritional content.

Many transgenic proteins contain sequence similarities to known allergenic proteins (Kleter and Peijnenburg 2002), a first indication of potential allergenicity. Notably, Bt protoxin Cry1Ac, expressed in some GE rice lines, is a potent systemic and mucosal immunogen (invokes immune response) (Moreno-Fierros et al. 2000; Vázquez-Padrón et al. 1999). Immune response should be further investigated for being indicative of a potential allergic response.

The persistence and fate of DNA and proteins from GE crops have not been extensively studied. However, *in vivo* studies showed that Bt protein (Cry1Ab), as well as transgenic DNA from Bt maize (fragments of Cry1Ab gene), survived digestion in the gut of pigs (Chowdhury et al. 2003). Others found that a 1914-bp DNA fragment containing the entire coding region of the synthetic Cry1Ab gene was amplifiable from sheep rumen fluid sampled 5 hours after feeding maize grains and “may provide a source of transforming DNA

in the rumen” (Dugan et al. 2003:159).

If transgenic DNA survives digestion, it may be available for HGT to gut bacteria. This could possibly create new disease-causing viruses and bacteria, and spread antibiotic resistance marker genes (ARMGs) to pathogenic bacteria, making infections harder to treat (Ho 2004). The use of ARMGs in many GE rice lines is a concern. European legislation (Directive 2001/18/EC) mandates the phase out of ARMGs in GE crops which may have adverse effects on human health and the environment. In the only human study, research showed that transgenic DNA can survive digestion in the human stomach and small intestine, and provided evidence of pre-existing HGT from GE soya to gut bacteria (Netherwood et al. 2004).

GE crops producing pharmaceutical products are intended for use as drugs and not for consumption. The compounds are often biologically active chemicals and are potentially toxic. Pharmaceutical production should not be conducted in food crops such as rice because of the high risk of contamination (Editorial 2004) and subsequent entry into the food chain. Contamination could occur via gene flow, grain admixture or human error.

In 2002, soybean and non-GE maize were contaminated with GE maize engineered to produce an experimental pig vaccine (APHIS 2002). The CEC (2004) recommends that maize genetically engineered to produce pharmaceuticals and industrial compounds should be prohibited in Mexico and that a similar ban should be considered in other countries; the same should apply to GE biopharmaceutical rice.

Socio-economic concerns

Rice is much more than a vital food crop; it is also culturally, religiously and socially embedded in many societies. For example, the Balinese have cultivated a diversity of traditional varieties of rice for religious ceremonies. Subak organizations, comprising rice farmers in adjacent fields, collectively irrigate the rice terraces. They also make decisions on all aspects of rice production, including offerings at the small temple each subak has in the fields.

These practices embody an agriculture, intricately linking rice production with religion, culture and social relations. The potential contamination of traditional varieties of rice with transgenes from GE rice would be an affront to peoples for whom rice is, literally, life itself.

Contamination of non-GE rice could also jeopardize people’s right to choose non-GE and could affect export markets. Organic agriculture, which has standards that explicitly exclude the use of GE organisms, would bear the disproportionate

burden as contamination for organic farmers would mean lost business. Some degree of cross-pollination between GE and non-GE rice is almost inevitable. GE rice previously planted in the same field and seed in the soil seed bank could germinate at a later date, contaminating non-GE rice. Seed saving and seed exchange, common practices in Asia, and spillage during transport, could also lead to the inadvertent spread of GE rice.

Another issue to consider is that of intellectual property rights (IPRs) over GE rice. Many patents on rice genes have been lodged; in 2001, 240 patents had been granted on rice, 60.8% of which were corporate-owned (Madeley 2001). Patented GE rice owned by corporations would take control of rice out of the hands of local farming communities and would mean that farmers planting GE rice can no longer save, replant or sell the seeds. Should patented GE rice contaminate non-GE rice, the implications for farmers who traditionally save and exchange seeds are unclear, but could be viewed as a threat to farmers' rights.

Other socio-economic issues that could be potentially be related to GE rice, such as inequitable distribution of benefits, land concentration and labour displacement, have not been adequately considered or researched. Much more needs to be done to assess the social implications of GE rice.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that there are still many unanswered questions with regard to the safety of GE rice and its potentially serious negative environmental, health and socio-economic impacts. Given this situation, GE rice should not be commercialized.

References

APHIS (Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture) 1999. "AgrEvo USA Co.; Availability of determination of nonregulated status for rice genetically engineered for glufosinate herbicide tolerance". http://www.aphis.usda.gov/brs/aphisdocs2/98_32901p_com.pdf accessed October 6, 2005.

APHIS 2002. "USDA investigates biotech company for possible permit violations". <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/lpa/news/2002/11/prodigene.html> accessed December 1, 2004.

Asia Pulse 2005. "China could be 1st country to approve genetically modified rice". Asia Pulse 29 September 2005.

Babu, R.C., Zhang, J., Blum, A., Ho, T.H.D., Wu, R., Nguyen, H.T. 2004. "HVA1, a LEA gene from barley confers dehydration tolerance in transgenic rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) via cell membrane protection". Plant Science 166: 855-862.

Barboza, D. 2005. "Signs of altered rice around China". New York Times 14 June 2005.

Bayer 2003. "Notification C/GB/03/M5/3: Glufosinate-tolerant rice transformation event LLRICE62". <http://gmoinfo.jrc.it/csnifs/C-GB-03-M5-3.pdf> accessed November 28, 2004.

Benbrook, C.M. 2004. Genetically Engineered Crops and Pesticide Use in the United States: The First Nine Years. BioTech InfoNet Technical Paper No. 7. http://www.biotech-info.net/Full_version_first_nine.pdf accessed November 30, 2004.

Brookes, G., Barfoot, P. 2004. GM Rice: Will This Lead the Way for Global Acceptance of GM Crop Technology? ISAAA Briefs No. 28. ISAAA: Ithaca, NY.

Brown, P. 2005. "Unlicensed GM rice may be in UK food chain". The Guardian 14 April 2005.

Capell, T., Bassie, L., Christou, P. 2004. "Modulation of the polyamine biosynthetic pathway in transgenic rice confers tolerance to drought stress". Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 101(26): 9909-9914.

CEC (Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America) 2004. Maize and Biodiversity: The Effects of Transgenic Maize in Mexico. http://www.cec.org/files/PDF//Maize-and-Biodiversity_en.pdf accessed November 30, 2004.

Chen, L.J., Lee, D.S., Song, Z.P., Suh, H.S., Lu, B.R. 2004. "Gene flow from cultivated rice (*Oryza sativa*) to its weedy and wild relatives". Annals of Botany 93: 67-73.

Chowdhury, E.H., Kuribara, H., Hino, A., Sultana, P., Mikami, O., Shimada, N., Guruge, K.S., Saito, M., Nakajima, Y. 2003. "Detection of corn intrinsic and recombinant DNA fragments and CryIAb protein in the gastrointestinal contents of pigs fed genetically modified corn Bt11". J. Anim. Sci. 81: 2546-51.

Codex 2003. Codex Principles for the Risk Analysis of Foods Derived from Modern Biotechnology. Codex Guidelines for the Conduct of Food Safety Assessment of Foods Derived from Recombinant-DNA Plants. http://www.codexalimentarius.net/web/standard_list.do?lang=en accessed December 1, 2004.

Collonier, C., Berthier, G., Boyer, F., Duplan, M-N., Fernandez, S., Kebdani N., Kobilinsky, A., Romanuk, M., Bertheau, Y. 2003. "Characterization of commercial GMO inserts: a source of useful material to study genome fluidity". Poster presented at International Congress for Plant Molecular Biology (n°VII), Barcelona, June 23-28, 2003.

Cummins, J. 2004. "Promises and perils of GM rice". Science in Society 23: 20-21.

Cummins, J., Ho, M.W., Ryan, A.R. 2000. "Hazardous CaMV promoter?" Nature Biotechnology 18: 263.

Datta, K., Baisakh, N., Thet, K.M., Tu, J., Datta, S.K. 2002. "Pyramiding transgenes for multiple resistance in rice against bacterial blight, yellow stem borer and sheath blight". Theor. Appl. Genet. 106(1): 1-8.

Datta, S.K. 2004. "Rice Biotechnology: A Need for Developing Countries". AgBioForum, 7(1&2): 31-35.

Domingo, J.L. 2000. "Health risks of genetically modified foods: many opinions but few data". Science 288: 1748-1749.

- Duggan, P.S., Chambers, P.A., Heritage, J., Forbes, J.M. 2003. "Fate of genetically modified maize DNA in the oral cavity and rumen of sheep". *British Journal of Nutrition* 89: 159-166.
- Editorial 2004. *Nature Biotechnology* 22(2): 133.
- Ewen, S.W.B., Pusztai, A. 1999. Effects of diets containing genetically modified potatoes expressing *Galanthus nivalis* lectin on rat small intestine. *Lancet* 354: 135-1354.
- FAOSTAT data. 2005. <http://faostat.fao.org/faostat/servlet/XteServlet3?Areas=%3E862&Items=27&Elements=51&Years=2003&Format=Table&Xaxis=Years&Yaxis=Countries&Aggregate=&Calculate=&Domain=SUA&ItemTypes=Production.Crops.Primary&language=EN> accessed October 5, 2004.
- Fares, N.H., El-Sayed, A.K. 1998. "Fine structural changes in the ileum of mice fed on dendotoxin-treated potatoes and transgenic potatoes". *Natural Toxins* 6: 219-33.
- Firbank, L.G., Rothery, P., May, M.J., Clark, S.J., Scott, R.J., Stuart, R.C., Boffey, C.W.H., Brooks, D.R., Champion, G.T., Haughton, A.J., Hawes, C., Heard, M.S., Dewar, A.M., Perry, J.N., Squire, G.R. 2005. "Effects of genetically modified herbicide-tolerant cropping systems on weed seedbanks in two years of following crops." *Biology Letters* DOI 10.1098/rsbl.2005.0390, Web Release Date: September 28, 2005.
- Freese, B., Hansen, M., Gurian-Sherman, D. 2004. "Pharmaceutical Rice in California". USA: Friends of the Earth, Centre for Food Safety, Consumers Union, Environment California.
- FSE (Farm Scale Evaluations of spring-sown genetically modified crops) 2003. Themed issue *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences (B)* 358(1439).
- Fukuda, A., Nakamura, A., Tagiri, A., Tanaka, H., Miyao, A., Hirochika, H., Tanaka, Y. 2004. "Function, intracellular localization and the importance in salt tolerance of a vacuolar Na(+)/H(+) antiporter from rice". *Plant Cell Physiol.* 45(2): 146-59.
- Gandikota, M., de Kochko, A., Chen, L. Ithal, N., Fauquet, C., Reddy, A.R. 2001. "Development of transgenic rice plants expressing maize anthocyanin genes and increased blast resistance". *Molecular Breeding* 7: 73-83.
- Gunning, R.V., Dang, H.T., Kemp, F.C., Nicholson, I.C., Moores, G.D. 2005. "New resistance mechanism in *Helicoverpa armigera* threatens transgenic crops expressing *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ac toxin." *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 71(5): 2558-2563.
- Haslberger, A.G. 2003. "Codex guidelines for GM foods include the analysis of unintended effects". *Nature Biotechnology* 21(7): 739-741.
- Heinemann, J.A., Traavik, T. 2004. "Problems in monitoring horizontal gene transfer in field trials of transgenic plants". *Nature Biotechnology* 22: 1105-1109.
- High, S.M., Cohen, M.B., Shu, Q.Y., Altosaar, I. 2004. "Achieving successful deployment of Bt rice". *Trends in Plant Science* 9(6): 286-292.
- Hilbeck, A. 2001. "Transgenic host plant resistance and non-target effects". In D.K. Letourneau and B.E. Burrows (eds): *Genetically Engineered Organisms: Assessing Environmental and Human Health Effects*. Pp. 167-186. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.
- Ho, M.W. 2004. "Living with the Fluid Genome". London and Penang: Institute of Science in Society and Third World Network.
- Ho, M.W., Ryan, A.R., Cummins, J. 1999. "The cauliflower mosaic viral promoter - a recipe for disaster?" *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* 11: 194-197.
- Ho, M.W., Ryan, A.R., Cummins, J. 2000a. "Hazards of transgenic plants with the cauliflower mosaic viral promoter". *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* 12: 6-11.
- Ho, M.W., Ryan, A.R., Cummins, J. 2000b. "CaMV 35S promoter fragmentation hotspot confirmed, and it is active in animals". *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* 12: 189.
- Inui, H., Shiota, N., Ido, Y., Inoue, T., Hirose, S., Kawahigashi, H., Ohkawa, Y., Ohkawa, H. 2001. "Herbicide metabolism and tolerance in the transgenic rice plants expressing human CYP2C9 and CYP2C19". *Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology* 71(3): 156-169.
- Jia, H. 2004. "China ramps up efforts to commercialize GM rice". *Nature Biotechnology* 22(6): 642.
- Jiang, G.H., Xu, C.G., Tu, J.M., Li, X.H., He, Y.Q., Zhang, Q.F. 2004. "Pyramiding of insect- and disease-resistance genes into an elite indica, cytoplasm male sterile restorer line of rice, 'Minghui 63'. *Plant Breeding* 123: 112-116.
- Jongsma, M.A., Bolter, C. 1997. "The adaptation of insects to plant protease inhibitors". *J. Insect Physiol.* 43(10): 885-895.
- Kawahigashi, H., Hirose, S., Ohkawa, H., Ohkawa, Y. 2005. "Transgenic rice plants expressing human CYP1A1 remediate the triazine herbicides atrazine and simazine." *J. Agric. Food Chem.* DOI 10.1021/jf051370f. Web Release Date: September 30, 2005
- Khanna, H.K., Raina, S.K. 2002. "Elite Indica transgenic rice plants expressing modified Cry1Ac endotoxin of *Bacillus thuringiensis* show enhanced resistance to yellow stem borer (*Scirpophaga incertulas*)". *Transgenic Res.* 11(4): 411-23.
- Kleter, G., Peijnenburg, A. 2002. "Screening of transgenic proteins expressed in transgenic food crops for the presence of short amino acid sequences identical to potential, IgE-binding linear epitopes of allergens". *BMC Structural Biology* 2: 8-19.
- Kohli, A., Griffiths, S., Palacios, N., Twyman, R.M., Vain, P., Laurie, D.A., Christou, P. 1999. "Molecular characterization of transforming plasmid rearrangements in transgenic rice reveals a recombination hotspot in the CaMV 35S promoter and confirms the predominance of microhomology mediated recombination". *Plant Journal* 17: 591-601
- Lei, X. 2004. "China could be first nation to approve sale of GM rice". *Science* 306: 1458-1459.
- Losey, J.E., Rayor, L.S., Carter, M.E. 1999. "Transgenic pollen harms monarch larvae". *Nature* 399: 214.
- Lu, B., Song, Z., Chen, J. 2003. "Can transgenic rice cause ecological risks through transgene escape?" *Progress in Natural Science* 13(1): 17-24.
- Lucca, P., Hurrell, R., Potrykus, I. 2002. "Fighting iron deficiency anemia with iron-rich rice". *J. Am. Coll. Nutr.* 21: 184S-190S.
- Madeley, J. 2001. "Crops and Robbers". London: Action Aid.

- Malatesta, M., Caporaloni, C., Gavaudan, S., Rocchi, M.B.L., Serafini, S., Tiberi, C., Gazzanelli, G. 2002. "Ultrastructural morphometrical and immunocytochemical analyses of hepatocyte nuclei from mice fed on genetically modified soybean". *Cell Struct. and Function* 27: 173-80.
- Maqbool, S.B., Riazuddin, S., Loc, N.T., Gatehouse, A.M.R., Gatehouse, J.A., Christou, P. 2001. "Expression of multiple insecticidal genes confers broad resistance against a range of different rice pests". *Molecular Breeding* 7: 85-93.
- Ming, X., Wang, L., An, C., Yuan, H., Chen, Z. 2000. "Resistance to rice blast (*Pyricularia oryzae*) caused by the expression of trichosanthin gene in transgenic rice plants transferred through agrobacterium method." *Chinese Science Bulletin* 45(19): 1774-1778.
- Mohanty, S. 2004. "Asian nations may have to be cautious on GMO rice". Reuters. October 28, 2004.
- Moreno-Fierros, L., García, N., Gutiérrez, R., López-Revilla, R., Vázquez-Padrón, R.I. 2000. "Intranasal, rectal and intraperitoneal immunization with protoxin Cry1Ac from *Bacillus thuringiensis* induces compartmentalized serum, intestinal, vaginal and pulmonary immune responses in Balb/c mice". *Microbes and Infection* 2: 885-890.
- Netherwood, T., Martin-Orue, S.M., O'Donnell, A.G., Gockling, S., Graham, J., Mathers, J.C., Gilbert, H.J. 2004. "Assessing the survival of transgenic plant DNA in the human gastrointestinal tract". *Nature Biotechnology* 22: 204-209.
- Nielsen, K.M., Bones, A.M., Smalla, K., van Elsas, J.D. 1998. "Horizontal gene transfer from transgenic plants to terrestrial bacteria - a rare event?" *FEMS Microbiology Reviews* 22: 79-103.
- Nielsen, K.M., Townsend, J.P. 2004. "Monitoring and modeling horizontal gene transfer". *Nature Biotechnology* 22: 1110-1114.
- Potrykus, I. 2003. "Nutritionally enhanced rice to combat malnutrition disorders of the poor". *Nutr. Rev.* 61(6 Pt 2): S101-4.
- Pryme, I.F., Lembcke, R. 2003. "In vivo studies on possible health consequences of genetically modified food and feed - with particular regard to ingredients consisting of genetically modified plant materials". *Nutrition and Health* 17: 1-8.
- Pusztai, A., Bardocz, S., Ewen, S.W.B. 2003. "Genetically Modified Foods: Potential Human Health Effects". In J.P.F. D'Mello (ed): *Food Safety: Contaminants and Toxins*. Pp. 347-372. London: CABI.
- Quist, D., Chapela, I.H. 2001. "Transgenic DNA introgressed into traditional maize landraces in Oaxaca, Mexico". *Nature* 414: 541-543.
- Reuters 2005. "Unapproved GMO rice found in China - GeneScan". Reuters 11 August 2005.
- Saxena, D., Flores, S., Stotzky, G. 2002. "Bt toxin is released in root exudates from 12 transgenic corn hybrids representing three transformation events". *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 34(1): 133-137.
- Snow, A.A., Andow, D.A., Gepts, P., Hallerman, E.M., Power, A., Tiedje, J.M., Wolfenbarger, L.L. 2004. "Genetically engineered organisms and the environment: Current status and recommendations". *Ecological Society of America*. http://www.esa.org/pao/esaPositions/Papers/geo_position.htm accessed November 30, 2004.
- Stabinsky, D., Cotter, J. 2004a. "Genetically Engineered Rice: Not Sustainable Agriculture". The Netherlands: Greenpeace International.
- Stabinsky, D., Cotter, J. 2004b. "Rice at Risk: Will There Be a Choice With GE Rice?". The Netherlands: Greenpeace International.
- Sun, X., Wu, A., Tang, K. 2002. "Transgenic rice lines with enhanced resistance to the small brown planthopper". *Crop Protection* 21: 511-514.
- Takahashi, M., Nakanishi, H., Kawasaki, S., Nishizawa, N.K., Mori, S. 2001. "Enhanced tolerance of rice to low iron availability in alkaline soils using barley nicotianamine aminotransferase genes". *Nature Biotechnology* 10: 466-469.
- Vázquez-Padrón, R.I., Moreno-Fierros, L., Neri-Bazán, L., de la Riva, G.A., López-Revilla, R. 1999. "Intragastric and intraperitoneal administration of Cry1Ac protoxin from *Bacillus thuringiensis* induces systemic and mucosal antibody responses in mice". *Life Sciences* 64(21): 1897-1912.
- Wilson, A., Latham, J., Steinbrecher, R. 2004. "Genome Scrambling Myth or Reality? Transformation-induced mutations in transgenic crop plants". Brighton: EcoNexus.
- Wu, W., Ye, Q., Min, H. 2004. "Effects of straws from Bt-transgenic rice on selected biological activities in water-flooded soil". *European Journal of Soil Biology* 40: 15-22.
- Xu, D.P., Xue, Q.Z., McElroy, D., Mawal, Y., Hilder, V.A., Wu, R. 1996. "Constitutive expression of a cowpea trypsin inhibitor gene, CpTi, in transgenic rice plants confers resistance to two major rice insect pests". *Molecular Breeding* 2:167-173.
- Ye, G.Y., Shu, Q.Y., Yao, H.W., Cui, H.R., Cheng, X.Y., Hu, C., Xia, Y.W., Gao, M.W., Altosaar, I. 2001. "Field evaluation of resistance of transgenic rice containing a synthetic cry1Ab gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* Berliner to two stem borers." *J. Econ. Entomol.* 94(1): 271-6.
- Ye, G.Y., Yao, H.W., Shu, Q.Y., Cheng, X., Hu, C., Xia, Y.W., Gao, M.W., Altosaar, I. 2003. "High levels of stable resistance in transgenic rice with a cry1Ab gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* Berliner to rice leafhopper, *Cnaphalocrocis medinalis* (Guenée) under field conditions". *Crop Protection* 22: 171-178.
- Ye, X., Al-Babili, S., Klott, A., Zhang, J., Lucca, P., Beyer, P., Potrykus, I. 2000. "Engineering the provitamin A (beta-carotene) biosynthetic pathway into (carotenoid-free) rice endosperm". *Science* 287(5451): 303-5.
- Zwahlen, C., Hilbeck, A., Howald, R., Nentwig, W. 2003. "Effects of transgenic Bt corn litter on the earthworm *Lumbricus terrestris*". *Molecular Ecology* 12(4): 1077-86.

(A version of this paper was first published in *Asian Biotechnology and Development Review*, November 2004, Vol. 7 No.1 pp. 67-80, Research and Information System for Developing Countries (RIS).)

LIM LI CHING is a researcher with Third World Network.