Quest Journals
Journal of Research in Agriculture and Animal Science
Volume 11 ~ Issue 11 (November 2024) pp: 30-37
ISSN(Online) : 2321-9459
www.questjournals.org

Review Paper

Advances in Molecular Tools for Plant Breeding, Genetics, and Crop Improvement

S. B. Verma
Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Botany (Genetics and Plant Breeding)
Udai Pratap College , Varanasi U.P.221002 India.

ABSTRACT
Molecular tools have revolutionized the field of plant breeding, enabling rapid and precise improvement in crop genetics. This review highlights the key advancements in molecular breeding techniques including molecular markers, next-generation sequencing (NGS), genome-wide association studies (GWAS), CRISPR-Cas systems, marker-assisted selection (MAS), and genomic selection (GS). The paper explores how these technologies have enhanced the efficiency of crop improvement programs, reduced breeding cycles, and enabled the development of climate-resilient, high-yielding, and disease-resistant varieties. We also discuss the integration of omics platforms—genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics—for comprehensive trait analysis. Challenges such as data interpretation, regulatory bottlenecks, and limited access to technology in developing regions are addressed. The paper concludes with future prospects, including AI-based breeding models, pan-genomics, and molecular phenotyping. This review aims to provide a consolidated reference for plant scientists, breeders, and policymakers working to address global food security through advanced molecular breeding strategies.

Keywords*: Molecular breeding, CRISPR, GWAS, Genomic selection, Crop improvement, NGS, Plant genomics*

I. INTRODUCTION

Plant breeding has long served as the cornerstone of agricultural innovation, underpinning global food security through the development of improved crop varieties with higher yields, better nutritional quality, and enhanced resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses. In the face of a rapidly growing global population, changing climate, and increasing pressure on arable land, the importance of advanced plant breeding technologies cannot be overstated. Traditional breeding methods, while impactful, often rely on phenotypic selection and can be time-consuming and imprecise. These limitations necessitated the integration of molecular tools to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of crop improvement programs.

The use of molecular approaches in plant breeding began to gain momentum in the latter half of the 20th century, particularly following the discovery of DNA structure and the advent of molecular biology techniques. The early years of molecular breeding were marked by the use of restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) markers, which laid the groundwork for subsequent advances. Over time, molecular marker technologies evolved significantly, encompassing simple sequence repeats (SSRs), amplified fragment length polymorphisms (AFLPs), and more recently, single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). The shift from low-throughput to high-throughput genotyping platforms has revolutionized the scope and scale of plant genetic studies.

Additionally, advances in genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics have collectively enabled a systems biology approach to crop improvement. The mapping of plant genomes, beginning with Arabidopsis and rice, opened new vistas in functional genomics and marker-assisted selection (MAS). More recently, genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and genomic selection (GS) have emerged as powerful tools for accelerating genetic gains in plant breeding programs. Moreover, the advent of CRISPR/Cas-based gene-editing technologies has added a new dimension to precision breeding by enabling targeted modifications in plant genomes with unprecedented specificity.

This review explores the evolution and current landscape of molecular tools in plant breeding, emphasizing how these technologies have enhanced genetic research and enabled crop improvement strategies to meet future food and environmental challenges. By understanding the historical trajectory and the

contemporary toolkit available to plant geneticists and breeders, we can better appreciate the potential of molecular approaches in shaping the next generation of climate-resilient and nutritionally enriched crops.

1.1 Objective

1. To explore and evaluate the latest molecular tools and technologies employed in plant breeding and genetic improvement.
2. To assess the impact of molecular techniques such as CRISPR, marker-assisted selection, and genomic selection on crop yield, disease resistance, and stress tolerance.
3. To identify the practical applications and integration of molecular tools in modern crop improvement programs.
4. To highlight the challenges, limitations, and future prospects of molecular approaches in sustainable agriculture and food security.

1.2 scope of the review

This review explores recent advances in molecular tools such as CRISPR-Cas systems, marker-assisted selection (MAS), genomic selection (GS), transcriptomics, proteomics, and next-generation sequencing (NGS) in the context of plant breeding, genetics, and crop improvement. It highlights how these technologies enhance precision, accelerate breeding cycles, and contribute to developing stress-resistant, high-yield, and climate-resilient crops. The review also examines the integration of omics technologies and bioinformatics for trait mapping and gene discovery, providing a comprehensive understanding of modern plant biotechnology applications.

II. OVERVIEW OF MOLECULAR TOOLS IN PLANT BREEDING

2.1 Molecular Markers

Andersen and Lübberstedt (2003) explained the role of molecular markers in QTL mapping, stressing how markers like SSR and SNP are key in identifying loci associated with agronomic traits such as disease resistance, yield, and drought tolerance.

Collard and Mackill (2008) emphasized that molecular markers like RFLP (Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism), SSR (Simple Sequence Repeats), AFLP (Amplified Fragment Length Polymorphism), and SNPs (Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms) are powerful tools for plant breeders, offering high-resolution genotyping capabilities essential for mapping and diversity studies. Their work highlighted the advantages and limitations of each marker system in plant breeding programs.

Gupta and Varshney (2000) reviewed the applications of SSR markers in crop improvement and germplasm characterization, noting that SSRs have become the markers of choice for constructing high-resolution linkage maps due to their high polymorphism, abundance, and ease of use.

Powell et al. (1996) compared SSRs and AFLPs in various plant species and found that SSRs, due to their co-dominant nature and high reproducibility, are especially suitable for genetic diversity analysis and variety identification, while AFLPs are more useful in detecting a larger number of polymorphisms, even in species with limited genetic variation.

Rafalski (2002) discussed the emergence of SNPs as a dominant marker system in modern genomics, especially due to their abundance and amenability to automation. SNP markers were noted as crucial for high-throughput genotyping and genome-wide association studies (GWAS).

Semagn et al. (2006) analyzed the use of SSRs and SNPs in genetic diversity studies, concluding that while SSRs remain valuable for population genetics, SNPs are now preferred for genome-wide analyses due to their sheer abundance and high-throughput capability.

Tanksley et al. (1989) were among the first to use RFLP markers extensively in plant genetics, demonstrating their utility in constructing high-density genetic linkage maps in crops like tomato. This foundational work paved the way for QTL mapping and comparative genomics across species.

Varshney et al. (2005) provided a comprehensive overview of SNPs and SSRs in crop plants, detailing their role in gene tagging, marker-assisted selection (MAS), and diversity analysis. Their study emphasized the shift towards SNPs due to advances in sequencing technologies.

Vos et al. (1995) introduced the AFLP technique, which gained wide application in plants due to its ability to generate a large number of markers rapidly without prior sequence information. They illustrated its application in fingerprinting, linkage mapping, and genetic diversity studies.

Zhang et al. (2009) evaluated various marker systems in rice and showed that the integration of multiple marker types (e.g., SSRs with SNPs) can enhance the resolution of genetic maps and improve the accuracy of trait mapping and gene discovery.

2.2 Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS)

Liqiang Song et al. 2023, Highlighted that MAS is time-saving, cost-effective, and goal-oriented. It enables selection at single-plant level, efficient pyramiding of alleles, selection of recessive genes without phenotypic screening, evaluation in constrained environments, and higher selection intensity with fewer replications.

UNL PASSel resource, Described MAS advantages such as early selection from seedlings (versus waiting until flowering), independence from environmental conditions (e.g., disease resistance tests), cost and time savings, and the ability to use one DNA sample for multiple-marker evaluations.

IntechOpen review, Stated MAS excels in early-stage selection (seedlings), environmental insensitivity, effective recessive allele selection, and suitability for gene pyramiding—especially for low-heritability traits or under challenging screening conditions.

Biological Research review, 2024, MAS enabled the integration of the **Pi-ta** gene for blast disease resistance, and the **Sub1** gene for submergence tolerance into high-yielding varieties like *Swarna Sub1*, *IR64 Sub1*, and *Samba Mahsuri Sub1* (circa 2009).

Agricultural Reviews (Arccjournals), Utilized MAS to stack multiple QTLs—*Xa4, xa5, xa13, Xa21* (bacterial leaf blight), *Pi9* (blast), *Gm4, Gm8* (gall midge), and drought tolerance QTLs (*qDTY1.1, qDTY3.1*)—in **Swarna** background. Resulted in introgression lines (ILs) showing multi-stress tolerance.

Electronic Journal of Plant Breeding (2018), SSR-based MAS applied to develop heat-tolerant, high-yielding rice by differentiating between heat-tolerant 'N22' and susceptible 'Uma' using 41 polymorphic SSR markers.

Song et al., 2023, Reported MAS reduced cultivar development time from ~12 years (conventional) to ~5 years, using marker-guided transfer of rust resistance and quality loci into elite lines via doubled-haploid techniques.

Plant Science Archives (Pradhan et al. 2022), Reviewed MAS for drought resistance in wheat. Emphasized identification of QTLs for root traits, osmotic adjustments, and stomatal conductance, facilitated by markers (SNPs via NGS) and integration with genomic selection and CRISPR approaches.

Agricultural Reviews (Arccjournals), Used MAS to pyramid crtRB1 (β-carotene) and Opaque-2 (O2) genes in maize. Employing 236 SSR markers for background selection and foreground markers for crtRB1 and O2, researchers achieved elevated tryptophan, lysine, and β-carotene levels.

Crop	Case Study Highlights
Rice	Blast and flooding resistance (Pi-ta, Sub1), multi-stress ILs in Swarna, heat tolerance via SSR markers
Wheat	Rust resistance locus introgression and quality trait transfer in 5 years; drought QTL mapping and MAS integration
Maize	Nutritional enhancement via crtRB1 and O2 gene pyramiding (β-carotene, lysine, tryptophan) using MAS

Across the literature, MAS consistently offers faster, more precise, and resource-efficient crop improvement compared to traditional phenotypic selection. Its strength is particularly evident in introgressing specific genes (e.g., disease resistance in rice, quality traits in wheat and maize), and stacking multiple traits simultaneously. When treating complex quantitative traits, MAS is increasingly coupled with genomic selection, genome editing, and high-throughput genotyping to enhance effectiveness.

2.3 Genomic Selection (GS)

Genomic Selection, introduced by **Meuwissen et al. (2001)**, revolutionizes breeding by using genome-wide markers to estimate Genomic Estimated Breeding Values (GEBVs) for selection—unlike MAS, which focuses on a few loci. It builds prediction models from a training population of individuals with both genotypic and phenotypic data, enabling GEBV estimation for breeding candidates solely from their genetic profiles.

Bhat et al. (2016) highlighted that GS's viability dramatically improved with next-generation sequencing (NGS), which enabled affordable, high-throughput SNP genotyping (e.g., GBS), enhancing prediction accuracy and enabling GS even in non-model and reference-genome-poor species.

Recent methodological advances include **Scutari et al. (2013)** exploring feature selection and kinship adjustments—using methods like ridge regression, LASSO, and elastic net—and finding that streamlined marker sets (informative only) can retain high prediction accuracy.

More recently, **Chen et al. (2024)** tested deep learning via Transformer models on rice and wheat datasets, showing that attention mechanisms and k-mer tokenization can outperform traditional GS methods by better capturing non-linear marker interactions.

Li et al. (2024) emphasized that GS aggregates effects from numerous markers across the genome, whereas MAS targets only a few. GS yields higher accuracy and faster selection for complex traits like yield and stress tolerance.

A study in **rye** found that GS via RR-BLUP achieved *higher and more reliable predictive accuracy* than MAS for traits like grain yield, plant height, starch content, and pentosan content, across environments and years.

Frontiers in Plant Science (2018) confirmed that GS-MAS (a hybrid strategy using GEBVs) outpaces traditional QTL-MAS for complex traits, and combining both approaches—leveraging MAS for major-effect loci and GS for polygenic background—can enhance predictive performance.

Supporting theoretical comparisons, **Li et al. (Evolving Landscape of Genomic Selection)** noted that while MAS misses small-effect QTLs, GS captures them by using whole-genome prediction, thus improving selection efficacy

III. GENOMIC TECHNOLOGIES AND HIGH-THROUGHPUT PLATFORMS

3.1 Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS): Explanation

Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) is a high-throughput DNA sequencing technology that allows the rapid sequencing of entire genomes, transcriptomes, and targeted DNA regions. Unlike traditional Sanger sequencing, NGS offers massive parallelization, enabling the simultaneous sequencing of millions of DNA fragments. This has revolutionized genomic research by significantly reducing both time and cost while increasing sequencing depth and resolution.

Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS)

Whole Genome Sequencing involves reading the complete DNA sequence of an organism's genome. It captures both coding and non-coding regions, enabling comprehensive analysis of genetic variations, structural variants, and evolutionary biology. WGS is widely used in plant and animal breeding, human health, and biodiversity research.

Genotyping-by-Sequencing (GBS)

Genotyping-by-Sequencing is a reduced-representation NGS technique used primarily for discovering and genotyping large numbers of SNPs (Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms) across many individuals. It is particularly useful in species with large and complex genomes like maize or wheat and is highly cost-effective for marker discovery in genomic selection and association studies.

RNA Sequencing (RNA-Seq)

RNA-Seq allows the sequencing of the transcriptome, providing insights into gene expression patterns under various conditions. It identifies novel transcripts, alternative splicing events, and gene regulation mechanisms. RNA-Seq is widely employed in functional genomics and stress biology.

Cost Trends and Accessibility

Since its introduction in the mid-2000s, the cost of NGS has decreased drastically. The cost of sequencing a human genome has dropped from around $100 million (early 2000s) to under $1,000 (as of the 2020s), making NGS accessible even to smaller research institutions and breeding programs. Cloud-based bioinformatics platforms and open-source pipelines have further improved accessibility by reducing infrastructure requirements.

Table: Summary of NGS Methods and Their Features

NGS Method	Purpose	Key Features	Applications	Approximate Cost Trend (2020s)
Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS)	Full genome analysis	Covers entire DNA (coding + non-coding); High resolution	Variant discovery, evolutionary studies	$600–$1,200 per genome
Genotyping-by-Sequencing (GBS)	SNP discovery and genotyping	Reduced genome complexity; Cost-effective	Breeding, GWAS, diversity analysis	$20–$50 per sample (depends on multiplex)
RNA Sequencing (RNA-Seq)	Transcriptome profiling	Measures gene expression; detects isoforms and novel transcripts	Functional genomics, stress response	$100–$300 per sample (bulk RNA)

3.2 Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS)

Methodology and Key Traits Identified

Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS) involve scanning the entire genome of a large population to identify genetic variants associated with specific traits. This method typically uses Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms (SNPs) as markers across the genome to find associations between these genetic variants and phenotypic traits. By employing statistical models such as mixed linear models (MLMs), researchers can correct for population structure and kinship, enhancing accuracy. GWAS has successfully identified genes associated with key traits in various crops. For example, in rice, GWAS has pinpointed loci linked to drought tolerance and grain quality. In maize, GWAS has uncovered genes associated with kernel size, flowering time, and resistance to pests. Similarly, in wheat, important loci for disease resistance and grain yield have been mapped using GWAS techniques.

Limitations and Future Refinements

Despite its utility, GWAS has notable limitations. One of the primary challenges is its reduced power to detect rare alleles with significant effects due to their low frequency in the population. Moreover, GWAS results often explain only a small fraction of the total heritability of complex traits—a phenomenon known as "missing heritability." Population stratification and false-positive associations are additional concerns that can affect the

reliability of results. To address these issues, future refinements may involve integrating GWAS with genomic selection (GS) and multi-omics approaches such as transcriptomics and metabolomics. Advances in machine learning and deep learning are also being explored to improve predictive models and trait discovery in GWAS.

IV. GENE EDITING AND SYNTHETIC BIOLOGY TOOLS

4.1 CRISPR-Cas Systems

The CRISPR-Cas (Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats and CRISPR-associated proteins) system is a revolutionary gene-editing technology derived from a naturally occurring defense mechanism in bacteria and archaea. In these organisms, CRISPR-Cas acts as an adaptive immune system, allowing them to recognize and cut the DNA of invading viruses using guide RNA and the Cas enzyme, most commonly Cas9. The CRISPR-Cas9 system has been adapted for genome editing in eukaryotic cells by programming a synthetic guide RNA to direct the Cas9 protein to a specific DNA sequence, where it creates a double-strand break (DSB). This DSB is repaired by cellular mechanisms, primarily non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) or homology-directed repair (HDR).

Regulatory Status and Public Acceptance

The global regulatory landscape for CRISPR-Cas systems varies considerably depending on the application and the country. In the United States, the USDA has taken a relatively permissive stance towards CRISPR-edited crops, especially when no foreign DNA is introduced. The FDA oversees its medical applications, with several clinical trials currently underway to treat conditions such as sickle cell anemia and cancer. In contrast, the European Union has classified genome-edited organisms as genetically modified organisms (GMOs), subjecting them to strict regulation similar to traditional transgenic crops.

Public acceptance is similarly diverse. In regions like North America and parts of Asia, there is growing support for gene-editing technologies, particularly when used for therapeutic purposes. However, ethical concerns persist around issues like germline editing, potential off-target effects, and equitable access. High-profile debates, such as the case of gene-edited babies in China (2018), have triggered global calls for tighter ethical oversight. Therefore, while scientific and commercial interest in CRISPR-Cas is accelerating, its societal acceptance and regulatory pathways remain dynamic and complex.

4.2 TALENs and ZFNs

TALENs and ZFNs are programmable nucleases used for genome editing by creating double-stranded breaks (DSBs) at targeted genomic locations. These breaks are repaired by the cell's natural repair mechanisms, allowing insertion, deletion, or replacement of specific DNA sequences.

1. Comparison with CRISPR

While CRISPR-Cas9 has gained dominance in recent years, ZFNs and TALENs were precursors that introduced gene-editing capability.

- ZFNs are based on DNA-binding zinc finger proteins fused to a FokI nuclease. They recognize DNA triplets and require complex protein engineering for each target.
- TALENs consist of a DNA-binding domain derived from transcription activator-like effectors (TALEs) from *Xanthomonas* bacteria. These bind to specific DNA sequences and are also fused with the FokI nuclease.

Compared to CRISPR:

- CRISPR uses RNA-guided DNA recognition, making it easier and cheaper to design and use.
- ZFNs/TALENs require custom protein engineering for each target site, which is labor-intensive and costlier.

However, ZFNs and TALENs are often more specific and have fewer off-target effects in some contexts.

2. Use in Precise Trait Modifications

TALENs and ZFNs have been widely applied in agricultural biotechnology and medicine for precise gene editing. Applications include:

- Crop improvement: Enhancing resistance to pests, herbicides, and drought.
- Livestock: Improving disease resistance and productivity traits.
- Human therapeutics: Used in experimental treatments like modifying immune cells to fight diseases (e.g., ZFNs in HIV therapy).

These tools allow targeted editing without inserting foreign DNA, which is advantageous for regulatory acceptance and precision breeding.

V. INTEGRATION OF MULTI-OMICS IN BREEDING PROGRAMS

5.1 Genomics

Genomics is the branch of molecular biology focused on the structure, function, evolution, mapping, and editing of genomes — the complete set of DNA within a single cell of an organism. It plays a critical role in understanding gene function, trait inheritance, and applications like breeding, genetic engineering, and disease resistance in plants and animals.

Pan-genome Concepts and Reference Genomes

- Pan-genome refers to the entire set of genes within all strains of a species, including:

a) Core genome: Genes shared by all individuals of a species.
b) Accessory genome: Genes present in some but not all individuals.
c) This concept helps in understanding the full genetic diversity and evolutionary adaptability of a species.

- Reference genome is a standardized, representative example of a species' genome, used as a baseline for comparison. While it is useful for identifying genetic variation, it may not represent all genetic diversity, which is why pan-genomic approaches are becoming more important in modern genomics.

5.2 Transcriptomics and Epigenomics

Transcriptomics and epigenomics are key genomic tools for understanding how plants respond to various stress conditions such as drought, salinity, heat, or pathogen attacks. Transcriptomics involves the comprehensive analysis of RNA transcripts (mRNA) to determine which genes are actively expressed at a given time and under specific conditions. It helps identify differential gene expression patterns, revealing stress-responsive genes and pathways involved in tolerance mechanisms.

On the other hand, epigenomics studies heritable changes in gene expression that do not involve alterations in the DNA sequence, such as DNA methylation, histone modifications, and non-coding RNAs. These epigenetic mechanisms regulate the accessibility and activity of genes, playing a vital role in stress memory and adaptive responses.

Together, these approaches provide insights into the regulatory networks governing plant responses to stress, aiding in the development of more resilient crop varieties through marker discovery, gene editing, or genetic engineering strategies.

5.3 Proteomics and Metabolomics

Proteomics and metabolomics are powerful omics approaches used to understand the biological functions of genes and their impact on plant traits. Proteomics focuses on the large-scale study of proteins, including their expression, structure, functions, and interactions. It helps identify differentially expressed proteins associated with specific traits such as drought tolerance, disease resistance, or yield enhancement. On the other hand, metabolomics deals with profiling metabolites—small molecules involved in metabolic pathways—providing a snapshot of biochemical activity in plants under different conditions.

These approaches are essential for functional validation of candidate genes identified through genomics or transcriptomics. By correlating protein and metabolite profiles with phenotypic traits, researchers can identify biomarkers, understand gene function, and elucidate complex regulatory networks. For example, altered metabolite accumulation patterns in stress-tolerant vs. sensitive genotypes reveal how certain metabolic pathways contribute to phenotypic differences. This makes proteomics and metabolomics invaluable for trait improvement and precision breeding in modern crop science.

VI. DIGITAL AND COMPUTATIONAL BREEDING TOOLS

Digital and computational breeding tools are transforming modern plant breeding by enabling faster, more accurate, and cost-effective decision-making. At the core of this revolution is the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML), which enhance predictive breeding by analyzing large-scale genotypic, phenotypic, and environmental data. These algorithms can forecast trait performance and suggest optimal breeding strategies based on learned patterns, improving both selection accuracy and breeding cycle efficiency.

In addition, simulation models and data analytics platforms such as Crop Growth Models (CGMs) and tools like DSSAT and APSIM help breeders simulate various genetic and environmental interactions. These simulations enable virtual testing of breeding scenarios, reducing the need for extensive field trials and helping prioritize the most promising genotypes under diverse conditions.

Furthermore, integration with phenomics—the large-scale study of phenotypes using sensors, drones, and imaging technologies—provides real-time, high-throughput phenotypic data. Coupled with computational tools, phenomics accelerates the identification of desirable traits, bridges the genotype-to-phenotype gap, and strengthens the decision-support systems in breeding programs.

VII. CONCLUSION

In recent years, remarkable advances in genome editing and molecular breeding have transformed the landscape of crop improvement. Tools such as CRISPR, TALENs, ZFNs, and approaches like Marker-Assisted Selection (MAS) and Genomic Selection (GS) have enabled breeders to precisely modify traits, accelerate breeding cycles, and enhance crop resilience and productivity. Compared to traditional methods, these techniques offer higher accuracy, speed, and cost-efficiency.

These innovations have significantly contributed to sustainable agriculture by improving drought tolerance, disease resistance, and yield potential in major crops like rice, wheat, and maize. They also reduce reliance on chemical inputs, thereby supporting environmental conservation.

Looking ahead, the focus must shift toward scalable, inclusive, and ethically governed technologies that are accessible to smallholder farmers. Integrating AI, big data, and open-access genomic databases with these biotechnological tools will pave the way for next-generation crop breeding that is not only faster but also globally equitable and sustainable.

REFERENCES

[1]. Bortesi, L., & Fischer, R. (2015). The CRISPR/Cas9 system for plant genome editing and beyond. *Biotechnology Advances*, 33(1), 41–52.

[2]. Chen, K., Wang, Y., Zhang, R., Zhang, H., & Gao, C. (2019). CRISPR/Cas genome editing and precision plant breeding in agriculture. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, 70, 667–697.

[3]. Belhaj, K., Chaparro-Garcia, A., Kamoun, S., Patron, N. J., & Nekrasov, V. (2015). Editing plant genomes with CRISPR/Cas9. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 32, 76–84.

[4]. Gao, C. (2021). Genome engineering for crop improvement and future agriculture. *Cell*, 184(6), 1621–1635.

[5]. Zhang, Y., Malzahn, A. A., Sretenovic, S., & Qi, Y. (2019). The emerging and uncultivated potential of CRISPR technology in plant science. *Nature Plants*, 5(8), 778–794.

[6]. Voytas, D. F. (2013). Plant genome engineering with sequence-specific nucleases. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, 64, 327–350.

[7]. Mahfouz, M. M., Piatek, A., & Stewart, C. N. (2014). Genome engineering via TALENs and CRISPR/Cas9 systems: Challenges and perspectives. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 12(8), 1006–1014.

[8]. Schmidt, C., Pacher, M., & Puchta, H. (2019). Efficient induction of heritable inversions in plant genomes using the CRISPR/Cas system. *The Plant Journal*, 98(4), 577–589.

[9]. Wang, W., Pan, Q., He, F., Akhunova, A., Chao, S., Trick, H., & Akhunov, E. (2018). Transgenerational CRISPR-Cas9 activity facilitates multiplex gene editing in allopolyploid wheat. *The Plant Cell*, 30(2), 254–271.

[10]. Zhang, H., Zhang, J., Wei, P., Zhang, B., Gou, F., Feng, Z., Mao, Y., Yang, L., Zhang, H., Xu, N., & Zhu, J.-K. (2014). The CRISPR/Cas9 system produces specific and homozygous targeted gene editing in rice in one generation. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 12(6), 797–807.

[11]. Li, T., Liu, B., Spalding, M. H., Weeks, D. P., & Yang, B. (2012). High-efficiency TALEN-based gene editing produces disease-resistant rice. *Nature Biotechnology*, 30(5), 390–392.

[12]. Char, S. N., Neelakandan, A. K., Nahampun, H., Frame, B., Main, M., Spalding, M. H., ... & Yang, B. (2017). An Agrobacterium-delivered CRISPR/Cas9 system for high-frequency targeted mutagenesis in maize. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 15(2), 257–268.

[13]. Jinek, M., Chylinski, K., Fonfara, I., Hauer, M., Doudna, J. A., & Charpentier, E. (2012). A programmable dual-RNA–guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. *Science*, 337(6096), 816–821.

[14]. Doudna, J. A., & Charpentier, E. (2014). The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. *Science*, 346(6213), 1258096.

[15]. Yin, K., Gao, C., & Qiu, J.-L. (2017). Progress and prospects in plant genome editing. *Nature Plants*, 3(8), 17107.

[16]. Zhu, H., Li, C., & Gao, C. (2020). Applications of CRISPR–Cas in agriculture and plant biotechnology. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 21(11), 661–677.

[17]. Liu, H., Ding, Y., Zhou, Y., Jin, W., & Xie, K. (2017). CRISPR-P 2.0: An improved CRISPR-Cas9 tool for genome editing in plants. *Molecular Plant*, 10(3), 530–532.

[18]. Zhang, F., Wen, Y., & Guo, X. (2014). CRISPR/Cas9 for genome editing: Progress, implications and challenges. *Human Molecular Genetics*, 23(R1), R40–R46.

[19]. Zhang, Y., Liang, Z., Zong, Y., Wang, Y., Liu, J., Chen, K., ... & Gao, C. (2016). Efficient and transgene-free genome editing in wheat through transient expression of CRISPR/Cas9 DNA or RNA. *Nature Communications*, 7, 12617.

[20]. Wang, F., Wang, C., Liu, P., Lei, C., Hao, W., Gao, Y., ... & Zhao, K. (2016). Enhanced rice blast resistance by CRISPR/Cas9-targeted mutagenesis of the ERF transcription factor gene OsERF922. *PLoS ONE*, 11(4), e0154027.

[21]. Zsögön, A., Čermák, T., Naves, E. R., Notini, M. M., Edel, K. H., Weinl, S., ... & Peres, L. E. P. (2018). De novo domestication of wild tomato using genome editing. *Nature Biotechnology*, 36(12), 1211–1216.

[22]. Holme, I. B., Wendt, T., & Holm, P. B. (2013). Intragenesis and cisgenesis as alternatives to transgenic crop development. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 11(4), 395–407.

[23]. Lassner, M., & Halpin, C. (2020). Plant biotechnology for sustainable agriculture. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38(9), 1086–1091.

[24]. Zaidi, S. S., Mahfouz, M. M., & Mansoor, S. (2017). CRISPR-Cpf1: A new tool for plant genome editing. *Trends in Plant Science*, 22(7), 550–553.

[25]. Wang, D., Zhang, C., Wang, B., Li, B., & Wang, Y. (2020). Development of a multiplex genome editing tool for maize. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 18(10), 2007–2009.

[26]. Zhang, D., Hussain, A., Manghwar, H., Xie, K., Xie, S., Zhao, S., ... & Jin, S. (2020). Genome editing with the CRISPR-Cas system: An art, ethics and global regulatory perspective. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 18(8), 1651–1669.

[27]. Sun, Y., Zhang, X., Wu, C., He, Y., Ma, Y., Hou, H., ... & Yang, Y. (2016). Engineering herbicide-resistant rice plants through CRISPR/Cas9-mediated homologous recombination of acetolactate synthase. *Molecular Plant*, 9(4), 628–631.

[28]. Begemann, M. B., Gray, B. N., January, E., Gordon, G. C., He, Y., Liu, H., ... & Voytas, D. F. (2017). Precise insertion and guided editing of higher plant genomes using Cpf1 CRISPR nucleases. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 11606.

[29]. Puchta, H. (2017). Applying CRISPR/Cas for genome engineering in plants: The best is yet to come. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology*, 36, 1–8.

[30]. Xie, K., & Yang, Y. (2013). RNA-guided genome editing in plants using a CRISPR–Cas system. *Molecular Plant*, 6(6), 1975–1983.
[31]. Murovec, J., Pirc, Ž., & Yang, B. (2017). New variants of CRISPR RNA-guided genome editing enzymes. *Plant Biotechnology Journal*, 15(9), 917–926.
[32]. Lowder, L. G., Malzahn, A., Qi, Y. (2017). Rapid evolution of CRISPR systems for plant genome editing. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 8, 1213.
[33]. Butler, N. M., Baltes, N. J., Voytas, D. F., & Douches, D. S. (2015). Geminivirus-mediated genome editing in potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) using sequence-specific nucleases. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 6, 679.
[34]. Osakabe, Y., & Osakabe, K. (2015). Genome editing with engineered nucleases in plants. *Plant & Cell Physiology*, 56(3), 389–400.
[35]. Maher, M. F., Nasti, R. A., Vollbrecht, M., Starker, C. G., Clark, M. D., & Voytas, D. F. (2020). Plant gene editing through de novo induction of meristems. *Nature Biotechnology*, 38(1), 84–89.
[36]. Zhang, L., Riaz, A., Li, H., & Gao, C. (2022). Recent advances in genome editing of horticultural crops. *Horticulture Research*, 9, uhac025.
[37]. Qi, Y. (2019). Plant genome editing with CRISPR systems: Advances and opportunities. *The Plant Cell*, 31(2), 282–289.
[38]. Neelakandan, A. K., & Wang, K. (2012). Recent progress in the understanding of tissue culture-induced genome level changes in plants and potential applications. *Plant Cell Reports*, 31(4), 597–620.
[39]. Jones, H. D. (2015). Regulatory uncertainty over genome editing. *Nature Plants*, 1, 14011.
[40]. Hirsch, C. N., Foerster, J. M., Johnson, J. M., Sekhon, R. S., Muttoni, G., Vaillancourt, B., ... & Buell, C. R. (2014). Insights into the maize pan-genome and pan-transcriptome. *The Plant Cell*, 26(1), 121–135.