

Volume 8, No. 5, September 2018 * Bimonthly

ISSN: 2251-9939

Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine



Available online at www.jlsb.science-line.com

*Published by
Scienceline Publications*



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Parham Jabbarzadeh Kaboli

PhD of Molecular Biology and Cancer researcher; Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University Putra, Malaysia ([Website](#); [Emails: researchgroups@drugdiscovery.ir](#))

Managing Editor: Yusuf Kaya

PhD, Professor of Biology, Atatürk University, Erzurum, ([Website](#), [Email: ykaya@atauni.edu.tr](#))

Executive Editor: Zohreh Yousefi

PhD candidate, Biosystematics, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey ([Emails: zohreh.yousefi12@ogr.atauni.edu.tr](#))

Language Editor: Samuel Stephen Oldershaw

Master of TESOL, The Humberston School & The Grimsby Institute, Nuns Corner, Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire, United Kingdom ([Email: s.s.oldershaw@hotmail.com](#))

Associate Editors

Aleksandra K. Nowicka

PhD, Pediatrics and Cancer researcher; MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA ([Email: aknowicka@mdanderson.org](#))

Paola Roncada

PhD, Pharmacokinetics, Residues of mycotoxins in food and in foodproducing species, University of Bologna, Italy ([Email: paola.roncada@unibo.it](#))

Tohid Vahdatpour

PhD, Assistant Prof., Physiology, Islamic Azad University, Iran ([Website](#); [Scopus](#); [Emails: vahdatpour@iaushab.ac.ir](#))

Veghar Hejazi

MD, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran ([Email: vegharhejazi@gmail.com](#))

Nefise Kandemir

MD, PhD, Department of Medical Genetics, Erciyes University, Kayseri, Turkey

Reviewers

Abolghasem Yousefi

PhD, Assistant Professor of Anesthesiology, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran ([Website](#); [Email: ayousefi@gmail.com](#))

Aleksandra K. Nowicka

PhD, Pediatrics and Cancer researcher; MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA ([Email: aknowicka@mdanderson.org](#))

Amany Abdin

PhD, Pharmacology; MSc, Medical Biochemistry; Tanta University, Egypt ([Emails: amanyabdin@med.tanta.edu.eg, amanynh@hotmail.com](#))

Babak Yousefi

Physician, General Surgery Resident at Hamedan University of Medical Science, Hamedan, Iran

Fazal Shirazi

PhD, Infectious Disease researcher at MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA

Fikret Çelebi

Professor of Veterinary Physiology; Atatürk University, Turkey ([Website](#); [Email: fncelebi@atauni.edu.tr](#))

Ghada Khalil Al Tajir

PhD, Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, UAE University, Al Ain, UAE

M.R. Ghavamnasiri

PhD, Professor of Oncology at Omid Cancer Hospital, MUMS; Cancer Research Center, Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Iran

Kaviarasan Thanamegm

PhD of Marine Bioactive compounds, Department of Ecology and Environmental Sciences, Pondicherry University, India (Email: marinekavi@gmail.com)

Jahan Ara Khanam

PhD, Anti-cancer Drug Designer and Professor of UR; Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh

Mozafar Bagherzadeh Homaei

PhD, Plant Physiology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Osman Erganiş

Professor, PhD, Veterinary Microbiology, Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey

Paola Roncada

PhD, Pharmacokinetics, Residues of mycotoxins in food and in foodproducing species, University of Bologna, Italy (Email: paola.roncada@unibo.it)

Perumal Karthick

Professor, PhD, Marine Biology, Pondicherry University, Brookshabad Campus, Port Blair, Andamans. 744112, India (Email: karthickmicrobes@gmail.com)

Reza Khodarahmi

PhD, Biochemistry at KU; Pharmacy School, Kermanshah University, Kermanshah, Iran

Saeid Chekani Azar

PhD, Veterinary Physiology, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey ([Google Scholar](#); Emails: saeid.azar@atauni.edu.tr; schekani@gmail.com)

Siamk Sandoughchian

PhD Student, Immunology, Juntendo University, Japan

Siva Sankar. R.

PhD, Marine Biology, Dept. of Ecology & Environmental Sciences, Pondicherry University, Puducherry - 605014, India (Email: sivauniverse@gmail.com)

Tohid Vahdatpour

PhD, Assistant Prof., Physiology, Islamic Azad University, Iran ([Website](#); [Scopus](#); [Google Scholar](#); Emails: vahdatpour@iaushab.ac.ir)

Veghar Hejazi

MD, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran (Email: vegharhejazi@gmail.com)

Yusuf Kaya

PhD, Professor of Plant Biology, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey (Email: ykaya@atauni.edu.tr)

Join JLSB Team

Journal of Life Sciences and Biomedicine (JLSB) as international journal is always striving to add diversity to our editorial board and operations staff. Applicants who have previous experience relevant to the position they are applying for may be considered for more senior positions (Section Editor) within JLSB. All other members must begin as Deputy Section Editors before progressing on to more senior roles. Editor and editorial board members do not receive any remuneration. These positions are voluntary.

If you are currently an undergraduate, M.Sc. or Ph.D. student at university and interested in working for JLSB, please fill out the application form below. Once your filled application form is submitted, the board will review your credentials and notify you within a week of an opportunity to membership in editorial board.

If you are PhD, assistant, associate editors, distinguished professor, scholars or publisher of a reputed university, please rank the mentioned positions in order of your preference. Please send us a copy of your resume (CV) or your [ORCID ID](#) or briefly discuss any leadership positions and other experiences you have had that are relevant to applied Medical and Pharmaceutical Researches or publications. This includes courses you have taken, editing, publishing, web design, layout design, and event planning. If you would like to represent the JLSB at your university, join our volunteer staff today! JLSB representatives assist students at their university to submit their work to the JLSB. You can also, registered as a member of JLSB for subsequent contacts by email and or invitation for a honorary reviewing articles.

Contact us at: editors@jlsb.science-line.com

Download [Application Form \(.doc\)](#)

Volume 8 (5); September 25, 2018

Research Paper**Controlling Powdery Mildew; Use of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi as Biocontrol Agent instead of Chemical Fungicides**

Yousefi Z, Zanganeh S, Riahi H and Kaya Y.

J. Life Sci. Biomed., 8(5): 77-83, 2018;

pii:S225199391800012-8

Abstract

Plant protection based solely on modern fungicides could lead to genetic changes in neurons of animal and humans that contribute to cases of autism and Alzheimer disease, unless the bio control agents is applied or replaced. Most researches is focused on the strongest chemical fungicides, dangerous to human health, for effective plant disease control and we believe that non-chemical control methods such as biological agents like AMF are of great importance. The aim of study was to investigate whether the soil inoculation with Glomus isolates of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) affected control of powdery mildew disease of apple MM111 and its survival and growth instead of use of chemical fungicides such as Flint and Strobby. Twenty apple seedlings were randomly arranged to 4 treatments, each with 5 replicates (T1, control = no AMF, no fungicide, T2= Flint fungicide, T3= Strobby fungicide and T4 = only AMF mixture) and were monitored throughout 9 weeks. All seedlings were exposed to powdery mildew on week 6 and only T2 and T3 plants treated by fungicides after developing mildew colonies on the leaves. Results showed that, seedling length in plants cultivated in AMF-inoculated-soil was significantly higher than other treatments especially in weeks 1-4 and weeks 6-9. Leaf growth rate of all plants during the experimental growth period non-significantly increased between treatments with the exception of first week that did show a significant increase in leaf growth rate of group 4 plants, even after exposure to disease. T4 samples showed a high average of leaves numbers ($P < 0.05$) in compared to other groups followed by T3 samples during the experimental growth period. The data from this study confirmed the response of seedling and leaf growth rates of apple seedlings to mycorrhizal colonization. It was concluded that plants cultivated in soil inoculated to AMF throughout 6 weeks had higher resistance and growth rates against *Podosphaera leucotricha* fungi as an agent of powdery mildew disease in apple seedling and it can be considered as an applicable strategy in biocontrol measures against pathogens when most researches is focused on chemical fungicides.


Keywords: Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, Modern fungicide, Powdery mildew, Apple seedling and leaf, Plant biocontrol[Full text-[PDF](#)] [[XML](#)]

Figure 1. Mycorrhiza spp. in the roots of inoculated seedlings with Mycorrhiza

Yousefi Z, Zanganeh S, Riahi H and Kaya Y. 2018. Controlling Powdery Mildew; Use of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi as Biocontrol Agent instead of Chemical Fungicides. *J. Life Sci. Biomed.* 8(5): 77-83; www.ilsb.science-line.com

Research Paper**Review on Genetic Engineering and Omitted Health Research.**

Birhan M, Yayeh M and Kinubeh A.

J. Life Sci. Biomed., 8(5): 84-89, 2018;

pii:S225199391800013-8

Abstract

Central to the development of green lifestyles is the consumption of foods that by dint of their status as chemical free locally produced and/or free of genetically modified ingredients, reduce the environmental impact of food provision. Yet there are many other factors, such as health concerns, that may also encourage the consumption of 'green' foods. Commercialization of genetically modified organisms has sparked profound controversies concerning adequate approaches to risk regulation. Scientific uncertainty and ambiguity, omitted research areas, and lack of basic knowledge crucial to risk assessments have become apparent. A major conclusion is that the void in scientific understanding concerning risks posed by secondary effects and the complexity of cause-effect relations warrant further research. Initiatives to approach the acceptance or rejection of a number of risk-associated hypotheses are badly needed. Further, since scientific advice plays a key role in genetically modified organism's regulations, scientists have a responsibility to address and communicate uncertainty to policy makers and the public. Hence, the acceptance of uncertainty is not only a scientific issue, but is related to public policy and involves an ethical dimension.

Keywords: Chemical, Foods, Genetically, Health, Organisms, Risk[Full text-[PDF](#)] [[XML](#)]

Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine



ISSN: 2251-9939

Frequency: Bimonthly

Current Issue: 2018, Vol: 8, Issue 5 (September)

Publisher: [SCIENCELINE](http://www.science-line.com)

The Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine is aimed to improve the quality and standard of life with emphasis on the related branches of science such as biology, physiology, biochemistry, zoology, anatomy, pathology and their applications and innovations in medicine and healthcare... [view full aims and scope](#)

<http://jlsb.science-line.com>

» JLSB indexed/covered by [NLM Catalog](#), [RiCest \(ISC\)](#), [Ulrich's™](#), [SHERPA/RoMEO](#), [Genamics](#), [Google Scholar \(h-index= 10\)](#), [Index Copernicus](#), [ICV2015: 66.26...](#) [details](#)

» Open access full-text articles is available beginning with Volume 1, Issue 1.

» Full texts and XML articles are available in ISC-RiCest.

» This journal is in compliance with [Budapest Open Access Initiative](#) and [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors' Recommendations](#).

ICMJE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

» High visibility of articles over the internet.

» Publisher Item Identifier [...details](#)

» This journal encourage the academic institutions in low-income countries to publish high quality scientific results, free of charges... [view Review/Decisions/Processing/Policy](#)



[ABOUT US](#)

| [CONTACT US](#)

| [PRIVACY POLICY](#)

Editorial Offices:

Atatürk University, Erzurum 25100, Turkey

University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2, Canada

University of Maragheh, East Azerbaijan, Maragheh 55136, Iran

Homepage: www.science-line.com

Phone: +98 914 420 7713 (Iran); +90 538 770 8824 (Turkey); +1 204 8982464 (Canada)

Emails:

administrator@science-line.com

saeid.azar@atauni.edu.tr

Controlling Powdery Mildew; Use of Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi as Biocontrol Agent instead of Chemical Fungicides

Zohreh Yousefi^{1✉}, Sima Zanganeh², Hossein Riahi³ and Yusuf Kaya⁴

¹ Ph.D. candidate of Plant Biosystematics, Faculty of Biological Sciences, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

² Assoc. Dr. of Plant Biosystematics, Faculty of Biological Sciences, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

³ Assoc. Dr. of Plant Biology, Department of Botany, Plant Pests & Diseases Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

⁴ Prof. Dr. of Plant Biosystematics, Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, Ataturk University, P.O.Box 25010, Erzurum, Turkey

✉Corresponding author's Email: zohreh.yousefi12@ogr.atauni.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

Plant protection based solely on modern fungicides could lead to genetic changes in neurons of animal and humans that contribute to cases of autism and Alzheimer disease, unless the bio control agents is applied or replaced. Most researches is focused on the strongest chemical fungicides, dangerous to human health, for effective plant disease control and we believe that non-chemical control methods such as biological agents like AMF are of great importance. The aim of study was to investigate whether the soil inoculation with *Glomus* isolates of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) affected control of powdery mildew disease of apple MM₁₁₁ and its survival and growth instead of use of chemical fungicides such as Flint and Strobry. Twenty apple seedlings were randomly arranged to 4 treatments, each with 5 replicates (T1, control = no AMF, no fungicide, T2= Flint fungicide, T3= Strobry fungicide and T4 = only AMF mixture) and were monitored throughout 9 weeks. All seedlings were exposed to powdery mildew on week 6 and only T2 and T3 plants treated by fungicides after developing mildew colonies on the leaves. Results showed that, seedling length in plants cultivated in AMF-inoculated-soil was significantly higher than other treatments especially in weeks 1-4 and weeks 6-9. Leaf growth rate of all plants during the experimental growth period non-significantly increased between treatments with the exception of first week that did show a significant increase in leaf growth rate of group 4 plants, even after exposure to disease. T4 samples showed a high average of leaves numbers ($P < 0.05$) in compared to other groups followed by T3 samples during the experimental growth period. The data from this study confirmed the response of seedling and leaf growth rates of apple seedlings to mycorrhizal colonization. It was concluded that plants cultivated in soil inoculated to AMF throughout 6 weeks had higher resistance and growth rates against *Podosphaera leucotricha* fungi as an agent of powdery mildew disease in apple seedling and it can be considered as an applicable strategy in biocontrol measures against pathogens when most researches is focused on chemical fungicides.

Original Article

PII: S225199391800012-8

Rec. 22 Apr. 2018
Rev. 30 Aug. 2018
Pub. 25 Sep. 2018

Keywords

Arbuscular mycorrhizal Fungi,
Fungicide,
Powdery Mildew,
Apple Seedling,
Leaf

INTRODUCTION

Podosphaera leucotricha is an obligate, parasite that overwinters on apple as mycelium in dormant buds infected during the previous growing season [1]. The "primary infection phase" of the disease is initiated by conidia produced on overwintering mycelium at bud break, which infect young leaves, flowers and shoots. Newly formed conidia from these sources are inoculum for the "secondary infection phase", which is the infection of healthy leaves during the growing season [2]. The reduction of primary inoculum and the protection of leaves, fruit and buds from secondary infections are two areas of concern for effective disease control measures. Timely application of fungicides is widely used to prevent new infections and to reduce the number of spores produced on new lesions.

Powdery mildew (PM), caused by *P. leucotricha* (Ell. & Ev.) Salm., is an important disease of apple in the interior of British Columbia. Disease severity and need for control measures are related to host susceptibility

and to the intended market for the cultivar [3]. The pathogen may cause death of vegetative shoots or flower buds, and russetting of fruit [4]. The grower's primary concern with mildew is the russet symptoms that markedly reduce fruit quality [4]. Infected young trees of susceptible cultivars may be seriously damaged or become poorly shaped because of retarded vegetative growth or loss of terminal buds. In British Columbia the very susceptible apple cultivars, such as McIntosh and Golden Delicious, are treated regularly with fungicides for control of fruit russet. The fungicides most commonly used for powdery mildew. Several new cultivars have been recently introduced, which also will require regular fungicide treatments [5]

The most promising new fungicides for control of powdery mildew are the broad-spectrum, sterol-inhibiting compounds [6]. With the exception of the morpholines, all sterol inhibitors have a common site of action within the biosynthesis pathway and are grouped together as demethylation inhibitors or DMIs [7]. Stroby and Flint are often called stroby fungicides and are very effective for controlling Black Spot (scab), mildew, and black rot. They provide adequate control of rust diseases when applied ahead of rains, but they have very little post-infection activity against rust diseases. For apple scab and mildew, they can provide roughly 48 hr of post-infection activity, but they are not effective for arresting apple scab after lesions are visible on foliage.

All stroby-containing fungicides carry labels stating that combined usage for any product in this group is limited to four applications per year. Thus, one can apply a maximum of four sprays per year that contain Stroby, Flint, or Pristine, otherwise controlling disease, not guarantee. For example, if Flint is applied three times to control mildew, then Pristine can be used only one time during summer. Based on using methods and rates of sprays of mentioned fungicide for control powdery mildew, it is detected that the additional time is required for a good controlling plants against types of pathogens that markedly reduce fruit quality, while there is several biological solutions for improving resistance of plants via boosting mineral nutrition against different pathogens or the attacker lifestyle [8]. For example, colonization of the original soil by AMF can boost resistance/tolerance of plant such as apple seedling against powdery mildew in an uninterrupted manner without spending additional costs to fungicides, sprays times and labor costs.

Biological control of plant pathogens is currently accepted as a key practice in sustainable agriculture because it is based on the management of a natural resource. Arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) associations have been shown to reduce damage caused by soil-borne plant pathogens. This prophylactic ability of AM fungi could be exploited in cooperation with other rhizospheric microbial antagonists to improve plant growth and health. The most important roles and benefits [9-11] of the Arbuscular Mycorrhiza (AM) are: 1- Increasing plant nutrition by exploring and deploying soil volumes; 2- Increase plant nutrition by obtaining a form of nutrition that is not available to the plant; 3- Increasing the tolerance of plants against dirt pathogens such as phytophthora, fusarium and pityum; 4- Improve water and plant relationships, plant hormonal changes; 5- Increased plant crop, increased food supply and reproduction; 6- Mycorrhiza can cause changes in the form of growth and root and vascular tissues; 7- The network of mycorrhiza fungi and plant roots provide a reasonable level of nutritional for a population of soil bacteria that increases host growth; 8. Hyphae of mycorrhiza arbuscular fungi contributes to the soil structure, their role in the physical aggregation of the soil is questionable, but sticky secretions such as Glomalin may be important; 9. Mycorrhizal fungi affect carbon storage in soil due to their impact on the quantity and quality of organic matter; 10- Arbuscular mycorrhiza increases plant resistance to environmental stresses such as dryness, cold and root pathogens; 11. Mineral absorption of soil, especially low-mobility elements such as phosphorus, zinc and copper, is considered to be the main function of mycorrhiza.

Common benefits for the plant are improved plant nutrition and/or increased capability to cope with adverse conditions. In the case of arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) associations, the symbioses alter plant physiology, leading to a better mineral nutrition and to increased resistance/tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses and or pathogens. Enhanced resistance/tolerance to soil-borne pathogens has been widely reported in mycorrhizal plants [12]. Although it is clear that the symbiosis may also impact plant interactions with aboveground attackers, the outcome of those interactions is less clear and seems to depend largely on the attacker lifestyle [8]. This finding points to a differential regulation of plant defense signaling pathways.

Although Flint and Stroby was registered for the control of powdery mildew on apples and grapes in Iran, it is unclear whether soil inoculated by AMF are comparable to these DMI fungicides, which are used to control powdery mildew on apples in Iran. Hence, this study compares the activities of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in compared to DMI fungicides on seedling and leaf growth rates of apple seedlings infected to powdery mildew disease under controlled conditions in the greenhouse.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted during the 2011/04 season in Iran on Maling merton (MM₁₁₁) apple seedlings which cultivated in soil with and without AMF, infected to powdery mildew (*Podosphaera leucotricha*) and treated by fungicides or AMF-inoculated soil. The fungicides used in these experiments [Flint and stroby, Kersoxim-methyl & Trifloxy strobil (% 50) WG, are a pre-mix products containing the strobilurin trifloxystrobin; registered in pome and stone fruits] were commercial formulations provided by the manufacturers.

MM₁₁₁ apple seedlings were planted through tissue culture to free from any contamination by microorganisms in institute of tissue culture, Pishtaz Bldg., Karaj/Safadasht, Iran then all seedlings replaced in 10-cm dia. pots in a soil mixture containing equal volumes of loam, sand and vermiculite, perlite and coco-pit. Selected seedlings for trial were transferred to larger pots (35-cm dia.) containing 50% sterile sand and 50% AMF-inoculated soil. Prior to starting the experiment inoculation concentration of AMF were cleaned from soil of all new pots with the exception of those selected as mycorrhizal treatment (5 pots).

The symbiosis of the roots of apple seedlings of control group and treatment 4 (plants inoculated with Mycorrhiza) has been studied. Forty-two days after inoculation of apple seedlings with inoculum containing mycorrhizal fungi, apple rootstocks were sampled to determine if they have been able to coexist. The investigation of the seedlings showed that there was no fungal organ in the root of the control plants that had not received any inoculum, whereas the plants that were planted in the soil containing the mycorrhizal inoculum were created fungal structures (Figure 1). The rate of mycorrhizal symbiosis in these roots was moderate (less than 30%).




Figure 1. Mycorrhiza spp. in the roots of inoculated seedlings with Mycorrhiza

Therefore, twenty apple seedlings were selected and randomly arranged to four groups and five replicates including Treatment 1 as control group= without AMF mixture and fungicide; T2= Flint fungicide in 6th week; T3= Stroby fungicide in 6th week; and T4 = AMF mixture, which were monitored throughout 9 week. All groups' seedlings were exposed to Powdery Mildew on 6th week. Only T4 plants were cultivated in soil inoculated to AMF while only T2 and T3 plants treated by fungicides after developing mildew colonies on the leaves. The active ingredient (a.i.) dosages applied for the DMI materials were those recommended by the manufacturer. The experimental pots were placed in the greenhouse (22°C day, 18°C night, 77- 84% RH) for germination and subsequent growth for approximately 9 weeks so that plants protected against pesticides for disease or insect up to 6th week.

The inoculum source was infected apple shoots from an eight year old Jonagold tree in Research Station orchard in the Iranian Research Institute of Plant Protection. The fungus was identified as *Podosphaera leucotricha* (Ell. & Ev.) Salm. on the basis of symptom development and a comparison of the morphological characters of the conidia and fruiting bodies with those described for *P. leucotricha* by Ogawa and English [7]. The infected shoots

were placed in a 1°C cold storage room for approximately 4 hrs while the fungicide suspensions were being prepared. Maling merton (MM₁₁₁) seedlings were sprayed to runoff using a hand operated mister. The leaves were allowed to dry for 30-min before inoculation with *P. leucotricha* conidia. Each treatment consisted of 5 seedlings (replicates). A conidial suspension was prepared by brushing conidia from diseased shoots into sterile water containing 20 µl/mL of Triton X 100 according to used method of Dekker [13]. The concentration was adjusted to 8.0×10^{11} conidi d.m.l. with a haemocytometer. Within 15-min of preparation the suspension was sprayed on the leaves. Seedlings length and leaves numbers of experimental apple seedlings were monitored and measured in day 1 and weekly during a 9-wks trial (Figure 2).

All data from the trial were analyzed by ANOVA using the GLM procedure of SAS software [14], which was appropriate for a randomized complete block design. When significances were detected ($P < 0.05$), values were compared post-hoc using the Duncan test. The results are expressed as averages and their Standard Error (SE).



Figure 2. Seedlings length in control and mycorrhizal plants after 4 weeks of Mycorrhiza inoculation

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of seedling length and leaves number of apple seedlings of treatments are shown in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Seedling length in apple seedlings cultivated in AMF-inoculated-soil was higher than other treatments so that significant differences were observed in weeks 1-4 and weeks 6-9. Leaf growth rate of all experimental plants in weeks of plant growth non-significantly increased between treatments with the exception of first week that did showed a significant increase in leaf growth rate of group 4 plants (grown in AMF mixtures) compared to other treatments, even after infecting to disease. The data confirmed the response of seedling and leaf growth rates of apple seedlings to mycorrhizal colonization.

In the present study, results related to seedling length in different treatments indicated that apple seedlings cultivated in AMF-inoculated-soil did showed a higher continuous growth than control groups or those treated with fungicides. Hence, it seems mycorrhizal soil resulted in boosting seedling growth in apple seedling (MM₁₁₁). Our findings are agreement with results of Hause and Fester [15], Xu and Madden [16] and Stevens et al. [17]. Fortuna et al. [18] reported that soil contain arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) via an beneficial interactions between plant and AMF improved plant nutrition and/or increased capability to cope with adverse conditions [19]. In the case of arbuscular mycorrhizal (AM) associations, the symbioses alter plant physiology, leading to a better mineral nutrition and to increased seedling and leaf growth rates and resistance/tolerance to biotic and abiotic stresses and or pathogens [20, 21].

Comparison of average of seedlings length revealed that in spray fungicides to T2 and T3 plants in 6th week, had no deterrent effect on seedlings in the subsequent weeks (seventh, eighth, ninth). Researchers reported that Flint and Strobby fungicides that were used against *Podosphaera leucotricha*, had no effect on the seedlings length or leave numbers [22, 23]. Average of leave numbers in different treatment significantly ($P <$

0.05) increased between treatments in first week that did show highest leaf effects in group 4 plants (fertilized by AMF mixtures) compared to other treatments, even after infected to disease.

These results could be due to boosting nutritional minerals of plants planted in soil inoculated by AMF which finally lead to a fast growth and leaf effects compared to those grown in AMF-deficient-soils [20, 24-26].

Table 1. Comparing the average of seedlings length during the experimental growth period

Date	Treatment	T1	T2	T3	T4	Standard errors	Significant level
Day 1		17.40	17.00	18.60	19.20	0.815	NS
Week 1		21.60 ^b	22.40 ^b	24.20 ^b	33.00 ^a	2.866	*
Week 2		24.00 ^b	23.60 ^b	28.80 ^{ab}	38.20 ^a	3.789	*
Week 3		26.20 ^b	25.40 ^b	32.40 ^{ab}	42.60 ^a	4.793	*
Week 4		29.40 ^{ab}	27.80 ^b	35.00 ^{ab}	46.40 ^a	5.499	NS
Week 5		35.00	32.20	38.80	54.40	6.912	NS
Week 6		42.20 ^{ab}	37.60 ^b	43.20 ^{ab}	66.60 ^a	8.202	*
Week 7		46.40 ^{ab}	39.80 ^b	48.40 ^{ab}	71.20 ^a	8.571	*
Week 8		48.60 ^{ab}	42.20 ^b	54.60 ^{ab}	74.20 ^a	8.587	*
Week 9		52.20 ^{ab}	43.80 ^b	60.20 ^{ab}	78.60 ^a	8.467	*

^{ab} Values in the same row and variable with no common superscript differ significantly; Values are means of 5 observations per treatment and their standard errors. Treatment 1 (T1) = control (non-AMF mixture, non-fungicide); T2 = non-AMF mixture + fungicide Flint in 6th week; T3 = non-AMF mixture + fungicide Strobry in 6th week; T4 = AMF mixture; NS= p>0.05; *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01.

Table 2. Comparing the average of leaves numbers during the experimental growth period

Date	Treatment	T1	T2	T3	T4	Standard errors	Significant level
Day 1		13.20	11.20	14.00	13.80	1.185	NS
Week 1		15.00 ^b	14.80 ^b	18.20 ^{ab}	23.00 ^a	2.143	*
Week 2		16.60	15.60	20.80	24.00	2.704	NS
Week 3		17.20	16.60	22.00	25.00	3.033	NS
Week 4		19.60	18.60	22.60	27.60	3.136	NS
Week 5		21.60	21.60	24.60	31.40	3.991	NS
Week 6		26.60	24.00	26.80	35.40	4.622	NS
Week 7		28.40	25.80	30.60	38.20	4.693	NS
Week 8		30.80	28.00	34.20	39.00	5.137	NS
Week 9		32.80	29.60	38.00	43.60	5.146	NS

^{ab} Values in the same row and variable with no common superscript differ significantly; Values are means of 5 observations per treatment and their standard errors. Treatment 1 (T1) = control (non-AMF mixture, non-fungicide); T2 = non-AMF mixture + fungicide Flint in 6th week; T3 = non-AMF mixture + fungicide Strobry in 6th week; T4 = AMF mixture; NS= p>0.05; *= p<0.05; **= p<0.01

CONCLUSION

The data confirmed the response of seedling and leaf growth rates of apple seedlings to mycorrhizal colonization. From the results of this study, it was concluded that plants cultivated in soil inoculated to AMF throughout 6 weeks had higher resistance and growth rates against *Podosphaera leucotricha* fungi as an agent of Powdery Mildew disease in apple seedling and it can be considered as an applicable strategy in bio control measures against pathogens.

Nowadays, many works has been performed for improving plant growth and crop production. Most researches is focused on the strongest chemical fungicides, dangerous to human health, for effective plant disease control and we believe that non-chemical control methods such as biological agents like AMF are of great importance. Meanwhile, our work suggested that the combined use of both arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and most safely fungicides is an effective strategy to management of diseases such as powdery mildew; so that, using AMF-fertilized-soil at the foot of the trees in early spring and then use fungicides only once (instead of three phases) in order to decline additional sprays times and labor costs is recommended.

DECLARATIONS

Acknowledgements

The manuscript was summarized from the master thesis in faculty of biological sciences, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran. We would like to thank Prof. Dr. Hossein Riahi for directing us with his experiences in research. The authors are also grateful for valuable support and the skilled technical assistances throughout the experimental analyses from Hossein Khabbaz-Jolfaei, Assistant Professor in biological control, Iranian research institute of plant protection, Tehran, Iran and Sima Zanganeh, Assistant Professor in Botany, Plant Pests & Diseases Res. Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

Authors' Contributions

All authors contributed equally to this work.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Hickey KD and Yoder KS. 1990. Powdery mildew. Pages 9- 10 in: A.L. Jones and H.S. Aldwinckle, eds. Compendium of Apple and Pear Diseases. APS Press, St. Paul, MN.
2. Burchill RT. 1960. The role of secondary infections in spread of apple powdery mildew, *Podosphaera leucotricha* (Ell. & Ev.) Salm. *J. Hort. Sci.*, 35366-72.
3. Yoder KS and Hickey KD. 1983. Control of apple powdery mildew in the Mid-Atlantic region. *Plant Dis.* 67:245-248.
4. Jones AL and Sutton TB. 1984. Diseases of Tree Fruits. Cooperative Extension Service, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
5. Spotts RA, Covey RP and MacSwan IC. 1981. Apple powdery mildew and scab control studies in the Pacific Northwest. *Plant Dis.* 65: 1006-1009.
6. Anon. 1992. Tree Fruit Production Guide for Commercial Growers, Interior Districts. Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.
7. Ogawa JM and English H. 1991. Powdery mildew of pome fruit. Pages 50-53 in: Diseases of Temperate Zone Tree Fruit and Nut Crops. University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Publication 3345, Oakland, CA.
8. Pozo MJ, Azcón-Aguilar C. 2007. Unravelling mycorrhiza induced resistance. *Curr Opin Plant Biol.* 10 : 393 – 398
9. Sylvia DM, and Williams SE. 1992. Mycorrhizae and environmental stresses. In: Bethlenfalvay, G.J., and Linderman, R.G. (Eds.), *Mycorrhizae in Sustainable Agriculture*. Madison, WI: ASA Special Publication No. 54, pp. 101-124.
10. Linderman RG. (1992). Vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae and soil microbial interactions. pp. 45-70 In: *Mycorrhizae in Sustainable Agriculture*. Bethlenfalvay, G. J. and Linderman, R. G. eds., ASA Special Publication No. 54, Madison, WI.
11. Linderman RG and Davis EA. (2002). Vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhiza and plant growth response to soil amendent with composed grape pomace or its water extract. *Phyton-Annales botanicae*, 11(3):446-450.
12. Whipps JM. 2004. Prospects and limitations for mycorrhizas in biocontrol of root pathogens. *Can J Bot* 82 : 1198 – 1227
13. Dekker J. 1982. Method of fungicide resistance in powdery mildew of cucumber - FAO Method No. 27. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *FAO Plant Prot. Bull.* 3059-61.
14. SAS Institute Inc. SAS User's Guide: Statistics. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC. 1998.
15. Hause B and Fester T. 2005. Molecular and cell biology of arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis. *Planta*, 221: 184–196.
16. Xu, X.M. and Madden, L.V. 2002. Incidence and Density Relationships of Powdery Mildew on Apple. *Epidemiology*, 92 (9): 1005-1014.
17. Stevens KJ, Wall CB, Janssen JA. 2010. Effects of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on seedling growth and development of two wetland plants, *Bidens frondosa* L., and *Eclipta prostrata* (L.) L., grown under three levels of water availability. *Mycorrhiza*. 21(4):279-88.
18. Fortuna P, Citernes AS, MORINI S, Vitagliano C and Giovannetti M. 1996. Influence of arbuscular mycorrhizae and phosphate fertilization on shoot apical growth of micropropagated apple and plum rootstocks. *Tree Physiology* 16, 757-763.
19. Wehner J, Antunes PM, Powell JR, Mazukatow J, Rillig MC. 2009. Plant pathogen protection by arbuscular mycorrhizas: A role for fungal diversity?. *Pedobiologia*, 53: 197-201.
20. Brundrett M, Bougher N, Dell B, Grove T, Malajczuk N. 1996. Working with mycorrhizas in forestry and agriculture. *Aust Cent Int Agric Res Monogr* 32:1–374.
21. Smith SE, Read DJ. 1997. *Mycorrhizal symbiosis*. 2d ed. Academic Press, San Diego, Calif.
22. Wilcox WF, Wasson DI and Kovach J. 1992. Development and evaluation of an integrated, reduced-spray program using sterol demethylation inhibitor fungicides for control of primary apple scab. *Plant Dis.* 76:669-677.

23. Sholberg PL and Haag P. 1994. Control of apple powdery mildew (*Podosphaera leucotricha*) in British Columbia by demethylation-inhibiting fungicides. *Canadian Plant Disease Survey* 74:1.
24. Fortin JA, Becard G, Declerck S, Dalpe Y, St-Arnaud M, Coughland A, Piche Y. 2002. Arbuscular mycorrhizae and root-organ cultures. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, 80:1-20.
25. Turk MA, Assaf TA, Hameed KM and Al-Tawaha AM. 2006. Significance of Mycorrhizae. *World Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 2 (1): 16-20.
26. Daft MJ and Nicolson TH. 2011. Effect of Endogone Mycorrhiza on Plant Growth. III. Influence of Inoculum Concentration on Growth and Infection in Tomato. *New Phytologist*, 68 (4): 953-961.

Review on Genetic Engineering and Omitted Health Research

Mastewal Birhan✉, Muluken Yayeh and Amebaye Kinubeh

Department of Veterinary Paraclinical Studies, College of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Sciences, University of Gondar, Gondar, Ethiopia

✉Corresponding author's Email: maste675@gmail.com; ORCID: [0000-0002-0984-5582](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0984-5582)

ABSTRACT

Central to the development of green lifestyles is the consumption of foods that by dint of their status as chemical free locally produced and/or free of genetically modified ingredients, reduce the environmental impact of food provision. Yet there are many other factors, such as health concerns, that may also encourage the consumption of 'green' foods. Commercialization of genetically modified organisms has sparked profound controversies concerning adequate approaches to risk regulation. Scientific uncertainty and ambiguity, omitted research areas, and lack of basic knowledge crucial to risk assessments have become apparent. A major conclusion is that the void in scientific understanding concerning risks posed by secondary effects and the complexity of cause-effect relations warrant further research. Initiatives to approach the acceptance or rejection of a number of risk-associated hypotheses are badly needed. Further, since scientific advice plays a key role in genetically modified organism's regulations, scientists have a responsibility to address and communicate uncertainty to policy makers and the public. Hence, the acceptance of uncertainty is not only a scientific issue, but is related to public policy and involves an ethical dimension.

Original Article

PII: S225199391800013-8

Rec.	22 Jul	2018
Rev.	15 Aug	2018
Pub.	25 Sep	2018

Keywords

Chemical,
Foods,
Genetically,
Health,
Organisms,
Risk

INTRODUCTION

The world has been flooded with a vast amount of the writings and actions of root-and-branch proponents and opponents of genetic modification. There has also been a proliferation of arguments about differing philosophies of regulation and labeling [1].

Biotechnology has been applied as one of the eco-techno-political technologies in the 21st century. Many countries have developed their technological strategies to improve their productivity in different fields. In developing countries scientific and technological bases are weak and infrastructures are not strong [2]. The formation of new biotechnology firms is mostly a strategic response rather than based on a real appreciation of environmental threats. It is maintained that the applications of this technology provide potential contributions to sustainable agricultural productivity and new inputs for resource-poor and small-scale farmers [3].

Since the second half of the 1980s, when the first genetically modified (GM) organisms were introduced for the industrial production of medicinal products, there has been a heated debate over the applications of gene technology. To date, however, the debate has failed to clarify an agreed direction of policy, and has instead run into stalemate. Sharply opposed parties of stakeholders and experts characteristically advocate conflicting opinions. For the moment, the public is left on the sidelines, while scientists, stakeholders, and other experts are in dispute [4].

Environmental factors including damage from insects and competition with weeds for resources necessary to support growth contribute to decreased yield from field crops. Historically, synthetic insecticides have been used for protection of plants from insect damage and herbicides have been used to control weeds. While they have been effective, more recent developments have applied the tools of biotechnology to produce genetically modified (GM) crops for insect and weed control. Early generation GM crops including insect resistant maize and herbicide tolerant soybeans express proteins from foreign sources that endow them with these particular phenotypes. They have been cultivated in the United States for nearly 20 years with significant

benefits including decreased use of pesticides and herbicides, yield increases, decreased labor costs and improvements in quality [5].

In recent years, the use and release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) has been an issue of intense public concern and, in the case of foods, products containing GMOs or products thereof carry the risk of consumer rejection. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines GMOs as those organisms in which the genetic material has been altered in a way that does not occur naturally [6]. As genetically modified (GM) foods are starting to be present in our diet concerns have been expressed regarding GM food safety [7]. Although the WHO declares that the GM products that are currently on the international market have all gone through risk assessment by national authorities, the risk assessment of GM foods in general, and crops in particular for human nutrition and health, has not been systematically performed as indicated in the scientific literature [8]. Therefore, the aim of this review, I tried to summarize the current status, available evidence, and present several clinical and nonclinical data concerning mainly the use of genetically modified organisms and their impacts in the treatment of different industrial foods, highlighting both the opportunities and the limitations of genetic engineering and omitted health research.

DO WE KNOW THAT ANY GENETIC ENGINEERING FOOD IS SAFE FOR CONSUMPTION?

Based on the idea that any genetic information from any source can be expressed in any organism, genetic engineering has, for example, looked at improving the protection of agricultural crops. Other sought advantages include shortening the delay to obtain a new variety, improving the yield and quality of crops, producing high value-added molecules (like pharmaceuticals or vitamins or biopolymers for industry), and improving the nutritional quality of plants [9]. In general this process consists of three different steps:

1. Detection (screening of GMOs) in order to gain a first insight into the composition of the food and agricultural product.
2. Identification to reveal how many GMOs is present, and if so, whether they are authorized within the EU (or other countries with regard to their regulations). A prerequisite for the identification of GMOs is the availability of detailed information on their molecular make-up.
3. Quantification, in order to determine the amount of one or more authorized GMOs in a product or seed lot, and to assess compliance with the threshold regulation. For this approach it is necessary to get a better understanding of DNA/protein degradation during processing and of the robustness of the analytical methods [10].

Safety evaluation strategies

At an early stage in the introduction of recombinant-DNA technology in modern plant breeding and biotechnological food production systems, efforts began to define internationally harmonized evaluation strategies for the safety of foods derived from genetically modified organisms (GMOs) [11].

Two years after the first successful transformation experiment in plants (tobacco) in 1988, the International Food Biotechnology Council (IFBC) published the first report on the issue of safety assessment of these new varieties. The comparative approach described in this report has laid the basis for later safety evaluation strategies. Other organizations, such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI) have developed further guidelines for safety assessment which have obtained broad international consensus among experts on food safety evaluation [12].

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

GM Crops

The main advantage of GM food crops is their potential promise of future food security, especially for small-scale agriculture in developing countries. The main arguments of GM supporters are safe food security, improved food quality, and extended shelf-life as the reasons why they believe in GM crops which will benefit not only both consumers and farmers, but also the environment [13].

As Belcher *et al* discuss, a critical question is what impact(s) biotechnology companies should take into their account. For example, in corn, the productivity impact is mainly yield increase, and in soybeans the GM

technology allows saving on inputs of chemicals and labor. Moreover, the companies claim that GM technology will promote food security while they are also healthier, cheaper, and more stable. Yet, the nutrients will have more quality and better taste. The issue is the impact of international regulations on the food situation in the developing countries. In these countries, approximately 800 million people remain seriously malnourished, including at least 250 million children [14].

One main debate and disagreement has already been made on the claim that biotechnology can potentially help developing countries to go for such advances as higher yields while shorter growing duration, asking for less chemical fertilizers, advanced pest management, higher drought resistance, and increased nutrients quality. Such advantages of GM crops would mitigate public hesitation about GM technology [15]. Some also acknowledged the potential of plant biotechnology to improve plant breeding and crop production in developing countries.

In 2006, global cultivation of genetically modified (GM) crops exceeded 100 million hectares for the first time. In the European Union (EU), the only GM crop that is currently cultivated is Monsanto's maize event MON810, which is resistant to the European and Mediterranean corn borer. Throughout 2006 and 2007, the area planted with GM maize almost doubled, reaching the 100 thousand hectare milestone, spread over six countries. Despite this enthusiasm, GM maize plantings still cover less than 2% of the total EU maize cultivation area. With this evolution, the question now arises of whether GM crops can 'coexist' with conventional and organic farming while still preserving freedom of choice for consumers [16].

The same processes are also wiping out small efficient family farms and replacing them with inefficient and unhealthy industrialized food systems under multi-national agribusiness corporations. Such corporations are supposed to increase production of food, increase efficiency of food production, improve the economic situation of farmers and improve patterns of food consumption. However, the evidences point to the opposite direction. In fact, the beneficiaries of such corporations are neither farmers nor governments of in the South, but making more money for the North, as Senator McGovern of the US Senate had stated, "Food security in private hands is no food security at all" because corporations are in the business of making money, not feeding people [17].

Nevertheless, the critics of genetic engineering of foods have concerns, not only for safety, allergenicity, toxicity, carcinogenicity, and altered nutritional quality of foods, but also for the environment. In this context, it would be interesting to note that the recent research has contested the claims of reduced pesticide use by genetically modified cotton (Bt cotton) due to the rise of secondary pests (other than the main cotton pest the bollworm).

Evolution of insect resistance threatens the continued success of transgenic crops producing *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) toxins that kill pests. The approach used most widely to delay insect resistance to Bt crops is the refuge strategy, which requires refuges of host plants without Bt toxins near Bt crops to promote survival of susceptible pests [18].

Transgenic crops producing *Bacillus thuringiensis* (Bt) toxins kill some key insect pests and thus can reduce reliance on insecticides. Widespread planting of such Bt crops increased concerns that their usefulness would be cut short by rapid evolution of resistance to Bt toxins by pests [19]. However, economic performance is highly variable and seems dependent more on the market characteristics, support structures and culture of the systems in which Bt crops are deployed than on the Bt crops themselves. Given their specificity for key target pests and well demonstrated lack of impact on beneficial insects, Bt crops provide an important new platform for sustainable IPM systems, one that is compatible with a full range of other tactics [20]. These results were confirmed in a recent research, based on a survey of 1000 cotton farm households in China. It was then found that farmers have perceived a strong increase in secondary pests after Bt cotton was introduced [21].

Organic Farming

The recent growth in organic farming has given rise to the so-called "conventionalization hypothesis," the idea that organic farming is becoming a slightly modified model of conventional agriculture [22]. Concurrently, it avoids chemical [23], which are generally expensive for small-scale farmers who have a livelihood farming system and earn normally much less than large-scale farmers who can afford expensive technologies. Additionally, small farmers cannot easily eliminate the harmful effects of chemicals which normally need big funds to deal with. Yet, there is a fair amount of debate on whether or not it is a lower-cost technology [24], and promotes [25]. Another matter of debate is production costs which can potentially be increased by the adoption of, more specially, if major soil protection or restoration activities are needed. For instance, if farmers need to

control weeds mechanically, they may need bigger funds to buy or rent such vehicles than chemical ways. Although in other cases, they might be able to reduce the costs through biological ways of control [26].

COULD GENETIC ENGINEERING FOOD CAUSE ALLERGIES?

Safety Assessment of Proteins Used in GM Crops

Candidate proteins to be expressed in GM crops are compared and contrasted with proteins that are allergenic or toxic using a weight of evidence approach consisting of individual and independent studies. None of the individual studies or data is necessarily more or less important than the others when considered in the context of weight of evidence but typically numerous studies are conducted.

Allergenicity

In the US, it has been estimated that 6–8% of children and 1–2% of adults are allergic to one or more foods [27]. The percentage decreases with age as many people outgrow the allergy. The incidence of food allergy outside of the US is unknown. Based on the US population, it is also known that the majority of food allergies are attributable to a relatively small number of foods that include peanuts, soybeans, cow's milk, eggs, fish, shell fish, wheat and tree nuts. Many other foods have also been reported to cause allergic reactions though the frequency of these sensitivities is much lower [28].

Persons that are allergic to particular foods possess antibodies to certain proteins present within those foods and the primary method of treating food allergies is for the allergic person to simply avoid consuming them. Much is known about the particular proteins in foods to which persons are sensitive and they are often referred to as allergenic proteins. This is not necessarily a technically accurate appellation since it implies that these proteins present some risk of allergic reactions in anyone when in fact they only present a risk in persons that are sensitive to them. Nevertheless, key learning about these proteins have been applied to the safety assessment of foods from GM crops. In particular, safety assessments are designed to ensure that the developer did not select a protein to which a sensitive person could be exposed to unknowingly. Potential for allergenicity is assessed for proteins to ensure that they are not similar enough to cross react with the antibodies present in persons with food allergies.

The source of the proteins is an important criterion in selection of candidate proteins. This is one component of the safety assessment for individual proteins called History of Safe Use [29]. However, each situation needs to be considered on a case-by-case basis. For example, peanuts may not be the best source for proteins to be used in GM crops like maize or soybeans simply because peanuts are known to possess more than one allergenic protein [30]. Regardless of the identity of the individual protein there would likely be concerns that any protein from peanuts could possibly be allergenic. Alternatively, if a protein from peanuts were to be selected to be expressed in a GM peanut plant then no new hazard has been introduced with regard to potential allergenicity.

Toxicity

In addition to allergenicity, some proteins are known to exist in nature that is capable of causing adverse effects when consumed. Though many are found in venomous snakes and insects or are produced by pathogenic bacteria, there are some that are found in plants such as kidney bean lectin and ricin [31]. Accordingly, proteins used in GM crops have also been assessed for potential to cause adverse effects if for no other reason that they too are proteins. There are obvious overlaps in the methods used to assess the potential toxicity and allergenicity of proteins.

Specifically, consideration of history of safe use of the source of the protein, bioinformatics comparison to known protein toxins, and *in vitro* resistance to digestive [32]. The primary basis of these considerations being that proteins selected from sources that are not known to produce toxic proteins, are not similar in sequence to known protein toxins, and are readily degraded in the presence of digestive enzymes are unlikely to be toxins.

There are differences in the bioinformatics analysis compared with the allergenicity assessment to note. First, there are no predefined criteria that identify a "match" between two proteins such as the 35% identity over 80 amino acid sequences for allergenic proteins. Second, there is currently no annotated and updated database in which the sequence of protein toxins is maintained [33]. Rather, what is commonly conducted is a comparison to all known protein sequences in the NCBI BLAST database [34, 35] followed by manual inspection

to determine if sequence similarities are present. Consideration of these data provides strong evidence for whether the protein intended for use in a GM crop is likely to introduce a hazard [36].

CONCLUSION

It is indeed hard to give a straight answer or simple solution on how food insecurity is being solved. Due to the possibilities offered by GM technology in this new century, societies will need to make some important choices about the type of world that they wish to build up. The politicians in the developing countries are recently faced by a crucial question on how GM technology should be viewed in relation to off. It has been estimated that hunger affects an estimated 1 billion people many of whom live in countries with developing economies. Population growth and decreased availability of arable land will continue to confound this issue. Modern biotechnology has the potential to be a significant tool in fighting hunger as it has been well established to address agricultural problems such yield loss from insect infestation, competition with weeds, and even drought. Biotechnology has been used to improve the quality and yield of field crops in many parts of the world for more than 20 years. It is more specific and relatively fast in development compared with traditional breeding techniques. A comprehensive safety assessment has been conducted on GM crops before the products are commercialized that includes evaluation of proteins used in these crops for potential allergenicity and toxicity as well as analysis of the composition of the crop and often feeding studies in rodents and livestock species in support of demonstrating substantial equivalence.

DECLARATIONS

Authors' contributions

MB, MY and AK conceived the review, coordinated the overall activity, and reviewed the manuscript.

Acknowledgment

The authors' heartfelt thanks will also go to University of Gondar for recourse supporting.

Availability of data and materials

Data will be made available up on request of the primary author

Consent to publish

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Blanchfield, J., Genetically modified food crops and their contribution to human nutrition and food quality. *Journal of food science*, 2004. 69(1).
2. Hsu, Y.-G., J.Z. Shyu, and G.-H. Tzeng, Policy tools on the formation of new biotechnology firms in Taiwan. *Technovation*, 2005. 25(3): p. 281-292.
3. Huang, J., et al., Plant biotechnology in China. *Science*, 2002. 295(5555): p. 674-676.
4. Borch, K. and B. Rasmussen, Refining the debate on GM crops using technological foresight—the Danish experience. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 2005. 72(5): p. 549-566.
5. Brookes, G. and P. Barfoot, Global impact of biotech crops: socio-economic and environmental effects, 1996-2006. 2008.
6. Organization, W.H., Foods derived from modern technology: 20 questions on genetically modified foods. Available here, 2002.
7. Dona, A. and I.S. Arvanitoyannis, Health risks of genetically modified foods. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, 2009. 49(2): p. 164-175.
8. Domingo, J.L., Toxicity studies of genetically modified plants: a review of the published literature. *Critical reviews in food science and nutrition*, 2007. 47(8): p. 721-733.
9. Gachet, E., et al., Detection of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) by PCR: a brief review of methodologies available. *Trends in food science & Technology*, 1998. 9(11-12): p. 380-388.
10. Anklam, E., et al., Analytical methods for detection and determination of genetically modified organisms in agricultural crops and plant-derived food products. *European Food Research and Technology*, 2002. 214(1): p. 3-26.
11. Conner, A.J., T.R. Glare, and J.P. Nap, The release of genetically modified crops into the environment. *The Plant Journal*, 2003. 33(1): p. 19-46.

12. Kuiper, H.A., et al., Assessment of the food safety issues related to genetically modified foods. *The plant journal*, 2001. 27(6): p. 503-528.
13. Wisniewski, J.-P., et al., Between myth and reality: genetically modified maize, an example of a sizeable scientific controversy. *Biochimie*, 2002. 84(11): p. 1095-1103.
14. Liddle, B., Demographic dynamics and per capita environmental impact: Using panel regressions and household decompositions to examine population and transport. *Population and Environment*, 2004. 26(1): p. 23-39.
15. Soregaroli, C. and J. Wesseler, Minimum distance requirements and liability: implications for co-existence. 2005.
16. Demont, M. and Y. Devos, Regulating coexistence of GM and non-GM crops without jeopardizing economic incentives. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 2008. 26(7): p. 353-358.
17. Godfray, H.C.J., et al., Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *science*, 2010. 327(5967): p. 812-818.
18. Tabashnik, B.E., et al., Insect resistance to Bt crops: evidence versus theory. *Nature biotechnology*, 2008. 26(2): p. 199.
19. Tabashnik, B.E., T.J. Dennehy, and Y. Carrière, Delayed resistance to transgenic cotton in pink bollworm. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2005. 102(43): p. 15389-15393.
20. Fitt, G.P., Have Bt crops led to changes in insecticide use patterns and impacted IPM?, in *Integration of insect-resistant genetically modified crops within IPM programs*. 2008, Springer. p. 303-328.
21. Ho, P. and D. Xue, Ecological change and secondary pests in Bt cotton: a survey of 1, 000 farm household in China. *Int J Environ Sustain Dev*, 2008. 7(4): p. 396-417.
22. Best, H., Organic agriculture and the conventionalization hypothesis: A case study from West Germany. *Agriculture and human values*, 2008. 25(1): p. 95-106.
23. Mäder, P., et al., Soil fertility and biodiversity in organic farming. *Science*, 2002. 296(5573): p. 1694-1697.
24. Lampkin, N., *Organic farming*. 1990: Farming press books.
25. Hole, D., et al., Does organic farming benefit biodiversity? *Biological conservation*, 2005. 122(1): p. 113-130.
26. Closter, A., et al., *Organic farming and genetically modified crops in relation to food security*. Henning Høgh Jensen Publication, 2004.
27. Sampson, H.A., Update on food allergy. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 2004. 113(5): p. 805-819.
28. Hefle, S.L., J.A. Nordlee, and S.L. Taylor, Allergenic foods. *Critical Reviews in Food Science & Nutrition*, 1996. 36(S1): p. 69-89.
29. Constable, A., et al., History of safe use as applied to the safety assessment of novel foods and foods derived from genetically modified organisms. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 2007. 45(12): p. 2513-2525.
30. De Jong, E., et al., Identification and partial characterization of multiple major allergens in peanut proteins. *Clinical and Experimental Allergy*, 1998. 28(6): p. 743-751.
31. Rossi, M., J. Mancini Filho, and F. Lajolo, Jejunal ultrastructural changes induced by kidney bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) lectins in rats. *British journal of experimental pathology*, 1984. 65(1): p. 117.
32. Delaney, B., et al., Evaluation of protein safety in the context of agricultural biotechnology. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 2008. 46: p. S71-S97.
33. Ladics, G.S., et al., Bioinformatics and the allergy assessment of agricultural biotechnology products: industry practices and recommendations. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 2011. 60(1): p. 46-53.
34. Hileman, R.E., et al., Bioinformatic methods for allergenicity assessment using a comprehensive allergen database. *International archives of allergy and immunology*, 2002. 128(4): p. 280-291.
35. Altschul, S.F., et al., Basic local alignment search tool. *Journal of molecular biology*, 1990. 215(3): p. 403-410.
36. Gendel, S.M., Sequence analysis for assessing potential allergenicity. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 2002. 964(1): p. 87-98.

Instructions for Authors

Manuscript as Original Research Paper, Review and Case Reports are invited for rapid peer-review publishing in the *Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine*. Considered subject areas include: Biocontrol, Biochemistry, Biotechnology, Bioengineering, Neurobiology... [view full aims and scope](#)

[JLSB EndNote Style](#)

[Manuscript Template \(.doc\)](#)

[Sample Articles](#)

[Declaration form](#)

[Policies and Publication Ethics](#)

Submission

The manuscript and other correspondence should preferentially be [submit online](#). Please embed all figures and tables in the manuscript to become one single file for submission. Once submission is complete, the system will generate a manuscript ID and will send an email regarding your submission. Meanwhile, the authors can submit or track articles via editors@jlsb.science-line.com ; jlsb.editors@gmail.com. All manuscripts must be checked (by English native speaker) and submitted in English for evaluation (in totally confidential and impartial way).

Supplementary information

The online submission form allows supplementary information to be submitted together with the main manuscript file and covering letter. If you have more than one supplementary files, you can submit the extra ones by email after the initial [submission](#). Author guidelines are specific for each journal. Our Word template can assist you by modifying your page layout, text formatting, headings, title page, image placement, and citations/references such that they agree with the guidelines of journal. If you believe your article is fully edited per journal style, please use our [MS Word template](#) before submission. **Supplementary materials** may include figures, tables, methods, videos, and other materials. They are available online linked to the original published article. Supplementary tables and figures should be labeled with a "S", e.g. "Table S1" and "Figure S1". The maximum file size for supplementary materials is 10MB each. Please keep the files as small possible to avoid the frustrations experienced by readers with downloading large files.

Submission to the Journal is on the understanding that

- 1.The article has not been previously published in any other form and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere;
- 2.All authors have approved the submission and have obtained permission for publish work.
- 3.Researchers have proper regard for conservation and animal welfare considerations. Attention is drawn to the '[Guidelines for the Treatment of Animals in Research and Teaching](#)'. Any possible adverse consequences of the work for populations or individual organisms must be weighed against the possible gains in knowledge and its practical applications. If the approval of an ethics committee is required, please provide the name of the committee and the approval number obtained.

Ethics Committee Approval


Experimental research involving human or animals should have been approved by author's institutional review board or ethics committee. This information can be mentioned in the manuscript including the name of the board/committee that gave the approval. Investigations involving humans will have been performed in accordance with the principles of [Declaration of Helsinki](#). And the use of animals in experiments will have observed the *Interdisciplinary Principles and Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research, Testing, and Education* by the New York Academy of Sciences, Ad Hoc Animal Research Committee. If the manuscript contains photos or parts of photos of patients, informed consent from each patient should be obtained. Patient's identities and privacy should be carefully protected in the manuscript.

Graphical Abstract

Authors should provide a graphical abstract (a beautifully designed feature figure) to represent the paper aiming to catch the attention and interest of readers. Graphical abstract will be published online in the table of content. The graphical abstract should be colored, and kept within an area of 12 cm (width) x 6 cm (height) or with similar format. Image should have a minimum resolution of 300 dpi and line art 1200dpi.

Note: Height of the image should be no more than the width.

Please avoid putting too much information into the graphical abstract as it occupies only a small space. Authors can provide the graphical abstract in the format of PDF, Word, PowerPoint, jpg, or png, after a manuscript is accepted for publication. For preparing a Professional Graphical Abstract, please click [here](#).



Presentation of the article

Main Format

First page of the manuscripts must be properly identified by the title and the name(s) of the author(s). It should be typed in Times New Roman (font sizes: 17pt in capitalization for the title, 10pt for the section headings in the body of the text and the main text, double spaced, in A4 format with 2cm margins (both doc./docx formats). All pages and lines of the main text should be numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript. Abbreviations in the article title are not allowed. Manuscripts should be arranged in the following order:

1. **TITLE** (brief, attractive and targeted)
2. **Name(s) and Affiliation(s) of author(s)** (including post code and corresponding Email)
3. **ABSTRACT**
4. **Key words** (separate by semicolons; or comma,)
5. **Abbreviations** (those used throughout the manuscript)
6. **INTRODUCTION** (clear statement of the problem, the relevant literature on the subject, and the proposed approach or solution)
7. **MATERIAL AND METHOD** (should be complete enough to allow experiments to be reproduced)
8. **RESULTS**
9. **DISCUSSION**
10. **CONCLUSION**
11. **DECLARATIONS** (Acknowledgements, Consent to publish, Competing interests, Authors' contributions, and Availability of data etc.)
12. **REFERENCES**
13. **Tables**
14. **Figures**
15. **Graphs**

Results and Discussion can be presented jointly.

Discussion and Conclusion can be presented jointly.

Article Sections Format

Title should be a brief phrase describing the contents of the paper. The first letter of each word in title should use upper case. The Title Page should include the author(s)'s full names and affiliations, the name of the corresponding author along with phone and e-mail information. Present address (es) of author(s) should appear as a footnote.

Abstract should be informative and completely self-explanatory, briefly present the topic, state the scope of the experiments, indicate significant data, and point out major findings and conclusions. The abstract should be 150 to 300 words in length. Complete sentences, active verbs, and the third person should be used, and the abstract should be written in the past tense. Standard nomenclature should be used and abbreviations should be avoided. No literature should be cited.

Following the abstract, about 3 to 8 **key words** that will provide indexing references should be listed.

Introduction should provide a clear statement of the problem, the relevant literature on the subject, and the proposed approach or solution. It should be understandable to colleagues from a broad range of scientific disciplines.

Material and Method should be complete enough to allow experiments to be reproduced. However, only truly new procedures should be described in detail; previously published procedures should be cited, and important modifications of published procedures should be mentioned briefly. Capitalize trade names and include the manufacturer's name and address. Subheadings should be used. Methods in general use need not be described in detail. The **ethical approval** for using human and animals in the researches should be indicated in this section with a separated title.

Results should be presented with clarity and precision. The results should be written in the past tense when describing findings in the author(s)'s experiments. Previously published findings should be written in the present tense. Results should be explained, but largely without referring to the literature. In case of the effectiveness of a particular drug or other substances as inhibitor in biological or biochemical processes, the results should be provided as **IC₅₀** (**half maximal inhibitory concentration**) or similar appropriate manner.

Discussion should interpret the findings in view of the results obtained in this and in past studies on this topic. State the conclusions in a few sentences at the end of the paper. The Results and Discussion sections can include subheadings, and when appropriate, both sections can be combined.

Conclusion should be brief and tight about the importance of the work or suggest the potential applications and extensions. This section should not be similar to the Abstract content.

Declarations including Acknowledgements, Author contribution, Competing interests, Consent to publish, and Availability of data etc.

Tables should be kept to a minimum and be designed to be as simple as possible. Tables are to be typed double-spaced throughout, including headings and footnotes. Each table should be on a separate page, numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals and supplied with a heading and a legend. Tables should be self-explanatory without reference to the text. The details of the methods used in the experiments should preferably be described in the legend instead of in the text. The same data should not be presented in both table and graph forms or repeated in the text.

Figure legends should be typed in numerical order on a separate sheet. Graphics should be prepared using applications capable of generating high resolution GIF, TIFF, JPEG or PowerPoint before pasting in the Microsoft Word manuscript file. Use Arabic numerals to designate figures and upper case letters for their parts (Figure 1). Begin each legend with a title and include sufficient description so that the figure is understandable without reading the text of the manuscript. Information given in legends should not be repeated in the text.

Declarations

Please ensure that the sections: Ethics (and consent to participate, if any), Acknowledgements, Author contribution, Competing interests, Consent to publish, Availability of data and materials are included at the end of your manuscript in a Declarations section.

Acknowledgements

We encourage authors to include an Acknowledgements section. Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the study by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include their source(s) of funding. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study. Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements. Please list the source(s) of funding for the study, for each author, and for the manuscript preparation in the acknowledgements section. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Author contribution

For manuscripts with more than one author, JLSB require an Author Contributions section to be placed after the Acknowledgements section. An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. To qualify as an author one should 1) have made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) have been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) have given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content. Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not justify authorship. **We suggest the following format/example** (please use initials to refer to each author's contribution): AB carried out the molecular genetic studies, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. JY carried out the immunoassays. MT participated in the sequence alignment. ES participated in the design of the study and performed the statistical analysis. FG conceived of the study, and participated in its design and coordination and helped to draft the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

For authors that equally participated in a study please write 'All/Both authors contributed equally to this work.' Contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an acknowledgements section.

Competing interests

Competing interests that might interfere with the objective presentation of the research findings contained in the manuscript should be declared in a paragraph heading "Competing interests" (after Acknowledgment or Author Contribution sections). Examples of competing interests are ownership of stock in a company, commercial grants, board membership, etc. If there is no competing interest, please use the statement "The authors declare that they have no competing interests.".

Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine adheres to the definition of authorship set up by [The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICMJE\)](#). According to the ICMJE authorship criteria should be based on 1) substantial contributions to conception and design of, or acquisition of data or analysis and interpretation of data, 2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content and 3) final approval of the version to be published. Authors should meet conditions 1, 2 and 3. It is a requirement that all authors have been accredited as appropriate upon submission of the manuscript. Contributors who do not qualify as authors should be mentioned under Acknowledgements.

Consent to publish

Please include a 'Consent for publication section in your manuscript. If your manuscript contains any individual person's data in any form (including individual details, images or videos), consent to publish must be obtained from that person, or in the case of children, their parent or legal guardian. All presentations of case reports must have consent to publish. You can use your institutional consent form or our consent form if you prefer. You should not send the form to us on submission, but we may request to see a copy at any stage (including after publication). If your manuscript does not contain any individual persons data, please state "Not applicable" in this section.

Change in authorship

We do not allow any change in authorship after provisional acceptance. We cannot allow any addition, deletion or change in sequence of author name. We have this policy to prevent the fraud.

Data deposition

Nucleic acid sequences, protein sequences, and atomic coordinates should be deposited in an appropriate database in time for the accession number to be included in the published article. In computational studies where the sequence information is unacceptable for inclusion in databases because of lack of experimental validation, the sequences must be published as an additional file with the article.

REFERENCES

A JLSB reference style for [EndNote](#) may be found [here](#). However, we prefer [Vancouver](#) referencing style that is often used in medicine and the natural sciences. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to Biomedical Journals, published by International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, includes a list with examples of references https://www.nlm.nih.gov/bsd/uniform_requirements.html in the *Vancouver* style.

References should be numbered consecutively and cited in the text by number in square brackets [1, 2] instead of parentheses (and not by author and date). References should not be formatted as footnotes. Avoid putting personal communications and unpublished observations as references. All the cited papers in the text must be listed in References. All the papers in References must be cited in the text. Where available, URLs for the references should be provided.

Examples (at the text, blue highlighted)

Smit [1] ...; Smit and Janak [2]...; Nurai et al. [3] reported that ; ... [1], --- [2, 3], --- [3-7]. The references at the end of this document are in the preferred referencing style. Give all authors' names; do not use "et al." unless there are six authors or more. Use a space after authors' initials. Papers that have not been published should be cited as "unpublished". Papers that have been accepted for publication, but not yet specified for an issue should be cited as "to be published". Papers that have been submitted for publication should be cited as "submitted for publication". Capitalize only the first word in a paper title, except for proper nouns and element symbols. For papers published in translation journals, please give the English citation first, followed by the original foreign-language citation.

Acceptable Examples (at References section)

For Journals:

1. Hasan V, Sri Widodo M and Semedi B. 2015. Oocyte diameter distribution and fecundity of Javaen Barb (*Systemus Orphoides*) at the start of rainy season in Lenteng River, East Java, Indonesia insurance. J. Life Sci Biomed, 5(2): 39-42. DOI, Link
2. Karen KS, Otto CM. 2007. Pregnancy in women with valvular heart disease. Heart. 2007 May; 93(5): 552-558. DOI, Link
3. Doll MA, Salazar-González RA, Bodduluri S, Hein DW. Arylamine N-acetyltransferase 2 genotype-dependent N-acetylation of isoniazid in cryopreserved human hepatocytes. Acta Pharm Sin B, 2017; 7(4):517-522. DOI, Link

For In press manuscripts (maximum 2):

Hasan V, Sri Widodo M and Semedi B. 2015. Oocyte Diameter Distribution and Fecundity of Javaen Barb (*Systemus Orphoides*) at the Start of Rainy Season in Lenteng River, East Java, Indonesia insurance. In press.

For symposia reports and abstracts:

Cruz EM, Almatar S, Aludul EK and Al-Yaqout A. 2000. Preliminary Studies on the Performance and Feeding Behaviour of Silver Pomfret (*Pampus argentens euphrasen*) Fingerlings fed with Commercial Feed and Reared in Fibreglass Tanks. Asian Fisheries Society Manila, Philippine 13: 191-199. DOI, Link

For Conference:

Skinner J, Fleener B and Rinchiuso M. 2003. Examining the Relationship between Supervisors and Subordinate Feeling of Empowerment with LMX as A Possible Moderator. 24th Annual Conference for Industrial Organizational Behavior. DOI, Link

For Book:

Russell, Findlay E, 1983. Snake Venom Poisoning, 163, Great Neck, NY: Scholium International. ISBN 0-87936-015-1. DOI, Link

For Web Site:

Bhatti SA and Firkins JT. 2008. http://www.ohioline.osu.edu/sc1156_27.html. DOI, Link

Nomenclature and Abbreviations

Nomenclature should follow that given in NCBI web page and Chemical Abstracts. Standard abbreviations are preferable. If a new abbreviation is used, it should be defined at its first usage. Abbreviations should be presented in one paragraph, in the format: "term: definition". Please separate the items by ";".

E.g. ANN: artificial neural network; CFS: closed form solution; ...

Abbreviations of units should conform with those shown below:

Decilitre	dl	Kilogram	kg
Milligram	mg	hours	h
Micrometer	mm	Minutes	min
Molar	mol/L	Mililitre	ml
Percent	%	.	

Other abbreviations and symbols should follow the recommendations on units, symbols and abbreviations: in "A guide for Biological and Medical Editors and Authors (the Royal Society of Medicine London 1977). Papers that have not been published should be cited as "unpublished". Papers that have been accepted for publication, but not yet specified for an issue should be cited as "to be published". Papers that have been submitted for publication should be cited as "submitted for publication".

Formulae, numbers and symbols

1. Typewritten formulae are preferred. Subscripts and superscripts are important. Check disparities between zero (0) and the letter O, and between one (1) and the letter I.
2. Describe all symbols immediately after the equation in which they are first used.
3. For simple fractions, use the solidus (/), e.g. 10 /38.
4. Equations should be presented into parentheses on the right-hand side, in tandem.
5. Levels of statistical significance which can be used without further explanations are *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, and ***P < 0.001.
6. In the English articles, a decimal point should be used instead of a decimal comma.
7. Use Symbol fonts for "±"; "≤" and "≥" (avoid underline).
8. In chemical formulae, valence of ions should be given, e.g. Ca²⁺ and CO₃²⁻, not as Ca⁺⁺ or CO₃.
9. Numbers up to 10 should be written in the text by words. Numbers above 1000 are recommended to be given as 10 powered x.
10. Greek letters should be explained in the margins with their names as follows: Αα - alpha, Ββ - beta, Γγ - gamma, Δδ - delta, Εε - epsilon, Ζζ - zeta, Ηη - eta, Θθ - theta, Ιι - iota, Κκ - kappa, Λλ - lambda, Μμ - mu, Νν - nu, Ξξ - xi, Οο - omicron, Ππ - pi, Ρρ - rho, Σσ - sigma, Ττ - tau, Υυ - ipsilon, Φφ - phi, Χχ - chi, Ψψ - psi, Ωω - omega. Please avoid using math equations in Word whenever possible, as they have to be replaced by images in xml full text.

Review/Decisions/Processing/Policy

Firstly, all manuscripts will be checked by [Docol@c](#), a plagiarism finding tool. The received papers with plagiarism rate of more than 30% will be rejected. Manuscripts that are judged to be of insufficient quality or unlikely to be competitive enough for publication will be returned to the authors at the initial stage. The remaining manuscripts go through a single-blind review process by external reviewers selected by section editor of JLSB, who are research workers specializing in the relevant field of study. One unfavourable review means that the paper will not be published and possible decisions are: accept as is, minor revision, major revision, or reject. The corresponding authors should submit back their revisions within 14 days in the case of minor revision, or 30 days in the case of major revision. Manuscripts with significant results are typically published at the highest priority. The editor who received the final revisions from the corresponding authors shall not be hold responsible for any mistakes shown in the final publication.

The submissions will be processed free of charge for invited authors, authors of hot papers, and corresponding authors who are editorial board members of the *Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine*. This journal encourage the academic institutions in low-income countries to publish high quality scientific results, free of charges.

Plagiarism

Manuscripts are screened for plagiarism by [Docol@c](#), before or during publication, and if found (more than 30% duplication limit) they will be rejected at any stage of processing. If we discovered accidental duplicates of published article(s) that are determined to violate our journal publishing ethics guidelines (such as multiple submission, bogus claims of authorship, plagiarism, fraudulent use of data or the like), the article will be "Withdrawn" from SCIENCELINE database. Withdrawn means that the article content (HTML and PDF) is removed and replaced with a HTML page and PDF simply stating that the article has been withdrawn according to the [Scienceline Policy](#) on Published Article Withdrawal.

Date of issue

All accepted articles are published bimonthly around 25th of January, March, May, July, September and November, each year in full text on the internet.

The OA policy

Journal of Life Science and Biomedicine is an open access journal which means that all content is freely available without charge to the user or his/her institution. Users are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without asking prior permission from the publisher or the author. This is in accordance with the [BOAI definition of Open Access](#).

Submission Preparation Checklist

- Authors are required to check off their submission's compliance with all of the following items, and submissions may be returned to authors that do not adhere to the following guidelines.
- The submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments to the Editor).
- The submission file is in Microsoft Word, RTF, or PDF document file format. Where available, URLs for the references have been provided.
- The text is single-spaced; uses a 12-point font; and all illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end. The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in the Author Guidelines.

Paper Submission Flow




Scienceline Publication Ltd is a limited liability non-profit non-stock corporation incorporated in Turkey, and also is registered in Iran. Scienceline journals that concurrently belong to many societies, universities and research institutes, publishes internationally peer-reviewed open access articles and believe in sharing of new scientific knowledge and vital research in the fields of life and natural sciences, animal sciences, engineering, art, linguistic, management, social and economic sciences all over the world. Scienceline journals include:

Online Journal of Animal and Feed Research



ISSN 2228-7701; Bi-monthly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: editors@ojafr.ir
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of Civil Engineering and Urbanism




ISSN 2252-0430; Bi-monthly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: ojceu@ojceu.ir
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of Life Sciences and Biomedicine




ISSN: 2251-9939; Bi-monthly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: editors@jlsb.science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Asian Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Researches



ISSN: 2322-4789; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: editor@ajmpr.science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of World's Poultry Research



ISSN: 2322-455X; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: editor@jwpr.science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

World's Veterinary Journal




ISSN: 2322-4568; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: editor@wjv.science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of Educational and Management Studies




ISSN: 2322-4770; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: info@jems.science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of World's Electrical Engineering and Technology



ISSN: 2322-5114; Irregular
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: editor@jweet.science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of Art and Architecture Studies



ISSN: 2383-1553; Irregular
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: jaas@science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Asian Journal of Social and Economic Sciences



ISSN: 2383-0948; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: ajses@science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Journal of Applied Business and Finance Researches



ISSN: 2382-9907; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: jabfr@science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)

Scientific Journal of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering



ISSN: 2383-0980; Quarterly
[View Journal](#) | [Editorial Board](#)
 Email: sjmie@science-line.com
[Submit Online >>](#)