Synthetic Biology in Crop Production: Emerging Strategies for Precision and Sustainability

*Adeel Asghar**

Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan

Correspondence:
Adeel Asghar, Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan,
E-mail: decentboys867hh@gmail.com

Received Date: *06 Aug 2026*
Accepted Date: *11 Sep 2026*
Published Date: *12 Sep 2026*

Citation:
Adeel Asghar. Synthetic Biology in Crop Production: Emerging Strategies for Precision and Sustainability. WebLog J Biotechnol Biomed Eng. wjbtbe.2026.i1207. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22842923

Abstract

Synthetic biology is transforming the field of crop improvement by allowing the precise control of genetic circuits, metabolic pathways, and regulatory networks. Unlike the conventional transgenic approaches, which involve the alteration of single genes, synthetic biology involves the incorporation of multi-gene constructs, synthetic promoters, and programmable regulatory networks to control the physiological processes in crops. For instance, the engineering of photosynthetic genes such as SBPase and Rubisco activase resulted in the enhancement of carbon assimilation by 15 to 30 percent. Moreover, the rewiring of the nitrogen metabolic pathway and the incorporation of the microbial nitrogen fixation pathway resulted in the partial substitution of 10 to 25 percent. However, the performance is compromised to 5 to 15 percent in the field conditions. This is because the regulatory instability and environmental sensitivity reduce the performance. Synthetic gene circuits involving the regulation of stress regulators such as DREB and AREB resulted in the improvement of drought tolerance. However, the growth penalty is associated with the expression of these genes. Furthermore, the engineering of the microbiome using synthetic biology constructs is also facing challenges in terms of colonization stability.

Keywords: Synthetic Biology; Gene Regulatory Circuits; Metabolic Engineering; Nitrogen Use Efficiency; Plant-Microbe Interactions

Introduction: From Gene Addition to Regulatory

Traditional crop biotechnologies have traditionally focused on overexpression or suppression of single genes, which have had only limited successes in enhancing complex traits like crop yield stability and abiotic stress tolerance [1]. Although single-gene biotechnologies have been successful in enhancing monogenic traits, they have, nonetheless, underperformed in enhancing crop traits controlled by multiple genes and complex regulatory systems [2]. For example, constitutive overexpression of transcription factors like DREB1A, which play important roles in regulating plant responses to drought and other abiotic stresses, has been shown to enhance drought tolerance in transgenic plants, often resulting in improved survival and water-use efficiency under controlled experimental conditions [3]. However, these beneficial effects often come with costs, like growth penalties of 10 to 20 percent, which have been observed in many cases, especially because of the constant expression of these genes, which often results in constant expression of stress-response genes and, consequently, reduced plant growth and reproduction. This illustrates one of the major limitations of single-gene biotechnologies, which often fail to account for the complex trade-offs between plant growth and responses to abiotic stresses [4].

At the molecular and genetic levels, crop traits like drought tolerance, nutrient use efficiency, and crop yields are controlled by complex genetic networks involving multiple transcription factors and signaling pathways. Synthetic biology offers a promising approach to addressing this limitation of single-gene biotechnologies, which often fail to accurately mimic endogenous genetic and molecular pathways [5]. Synthetic biology, which often involves multiple genes, offers the opportunity to design more complex genetic and molecular systems that can accurately mimic endogenous genetic and molecular pathways. For example, synthetic promoters can be used to restrict expression of genes like DREB1A to specific environments, thus reducing negative impacts on plant growth under non-stress conditions [6].

However, the application of these systems is also accompanied by challenges. For instance, the incorporation of these constructs into the native regulatory networks is extremely complex. Endogenous networks of genes are highly interconnected and subject to complex control mechanisms [7]. They can be controlled at the epigenetic level, the level of post-transcriptional modification, and

Table 1: Synthetic biology targets in crop production: genes, pathways, and quantitative outcomes.

Target Process	Key Genes / Elements	Engineering Strategy	Observed Outcome	Major Limitation	Representative References
Photosynthesis enhancement	*SBPase*, *Rubisco activase (RCA)*	Overexpression, pathway optimization	15-30% ↑ photosynthesis; ~10-20% field yield gain	Metabolic bottlenecks, feedback regulation	(Kromdijk et al., 2016) [21]
Photorespiration bypass	Glycolate pathway enzymes	Synthetic bypass pathways	20-40% biomass increase (controlled)	Intermediate toxicity, incomplete flux control	(South et al., 2019) [22]
Nitrogen assimilation	*NRT1*, *NRT2*, *GS*, *GOGAT*	Overexpression, transporter engineering	10-20% ↑ NUE	Carbon–nitrogen imbalance	(Xu et al., 2012a) [23]
Nitrogen fixation (non-legumes)	*nifH*, *nifD*, *nifK*	Heterologous expression	Partial expression, low activity	Oxygen sensitivity, ATP demand	(Allen et al., 2017) [24]
Stress response regulation	*DREB*, *AREB/ABF*, *RD29A*	Inducible promoter systems	10-25% yield increase under stress	Growth penalty if misregulated	(Nakashima et al., 2014) [25]
Hormonal regulation	*IPT*, auxin-related genes	Controlled expression systems	Improved growth under stress	Hormonal imbalance	(Rivero et al., 2007) [26]
Synthetic gene circuits	Synthetic TFs, promoters	Feedback-regulated systems	Improved regulation precision	Gene silencing, instability	(Liu & Stewart, 2015) [27]
Microbiome engineering	Engineered microbial genes	Synthetic consortia	10-20% growth improvement	Poor field persistence	(Niu et al., 2017) [28]

the protein level. Another major bottleneck is the context dependency of the regulation of plant genes. It is extremely challenging to design stable constructs because the expression of genes is highly variable [8]. As such, the constructs show less stability and efficiency when transferred to the field. This is because the environmental variables affect the precision of the regulation.

Engineering Photosynthesis: Gene Targets and Regulatory Constraints

Photosynthesis is one of the main targets for the application of synthetic biology. It is the main process responsible for the production of biomass [9]. Genes such as the RuBP regeneration enzymes, which include sedoheptulose-1,7-bisphosphatase (SBPase), RuBP Carboxylase Activase (RCA), and RuBP carboxylase, have been the main targets for the improvement of the efficiency of this process [10, 11]. Overexpression of SBPase has resulted in the improvement of the rates of photosynthesis by 20 to 30 percent. Moreover, the biomass produced is improved by 25 percent [12]. Engineering the RCA gene has improved the stability of the process under heat stress. However, the improvement is less pronounced in the field to the tune of 10 to 15 percent [13].

One major bottleneck is the complex control mechanisms. Carbon fixation is subject to control. It is controlled by the processes to which it is directly linked. Increasing the efficiency of one process can affect the efficiency of the other processes. For instance, the activity of RuBP can lead to the production of intermediates [14]. Synthetic bypasses of photorespiration have shown promise in reducing losses and increasing productivity; however, these bypasses involve coordinated regulation of several genes and may lead to problems of accumulation of toxic substances and/or metabolic inefficiency.

Synthetic Gene Circuits: Precision vs Instability

Synthetic gene circuits offer a highly versatile tool set for dynamically regulating gene expression by engineering promoters, transcription factors, and regulatory elements. These systems offer a significant advantage over constitutive gene expression systems in that they can offer spatiotemporal regulation of gene expression by allowing gene expression in response to specific environmental stimuli [15]. For example, stress-inducible promoters like RD29A and ABA response elements regulating transcription factors like DREB and AREB/ABF have been used to limit stress response gene activation in plants grown under drought stress and salinity stress conditions. These systems have shown 10-25% improvement in yields under moderate stress conditions, compared to minimal or negative effects observed in constitutive systems [16]. However, these systems are highly dependent on the accuracy of signal perception and transduction systems. Environmental signals can vary significantly in plants grown in different conditions; for example, Abscisic Acid (ABA) content can vary significantly in response to temperature fluctuations and soil moisture content. These fluctuations can result in delayed or insufficient gene expression in response to stress stimuli [17].

One such limitation is the long-term stability of synthetic constructs. Transgenes often undergo Transcriptional Gene Silencing (TGS) or Post-Transcriptional Gene Silencing (PTGS). This is often mediated through DNA methylation, histone modification, and small RNA pathways [18]. This can lead to the gradual silencing of the transgene over time. In addition, the structural instability of synthetic circuits, such as mutations occurring within repetitive promoter elements, also pose an important limitation. Another important limitation is the cross-talk between synthetic circuits and endogenous networks. Synthetic transcription factors and synthetic promoters do not act in isolation. Synthetic transcription factors often cross-talk with endogenous networks, especially those regulated by hormones such as ABA, jasmonic acid, and ethylene [19].

Synthetic circuits also place an important metabolic burden on the host system. The continuous expression of regulatory proteins, transcriptional machinery, and signal molecules requires the host system to divert resources from growth, survival, and reproduction [20]. This often results in an important trade-off, where the biomass yield is reduced by 5-15%. This is particularly important because such yield is often observed in the absence of stress. In order to overcome the aforementioned limitations, synthetic circuits must be designed as cost-effective, self-regulating circuits that minimize the metabolic burden on the host system while ensuring the reliability of the circuit (Table 1).

Reprogramming Nitrogen and Nutrient Pathways

Nitrogen metabolism has been identified as a major target for synthetic biology due to its central role in crop productivity and the inefficiency associated with nitrogen fertilizer use. Current approaches have primarily focused on engineering key genes involved in nitrogen uptake and assimilation [29], particularly Nitrate Transporters (NRT1 and NRT2 families) and enzymes such as Glutamine Synthetase (GS) and glutamate synthase (GOGAT), which regulate the incorporation

Table 2: System-level performance, trade-offs, and constraints of synthetic biology in crops.

Application Area	Controlled Environment Outcome	Field-Level Outcome	Key Constraint	Critical Trade-Off	Representative References
Photosynthesis engineering	20-40% biomass increase	10-20% yield increase	Environmental variability	Carbon flux imbalance	(Dolezel et al., 2025) [40]
Nitrogen metabolism	10-20% NUE	~5-15% improvement	Feedback regulation	Energy/carbon cost	(Xu et al., 2012) [23]
Gene circuit regulation	Precise expression control	Variable performance	Signal inconsistency	Metabolic burden	(Liu & Stewart, 2015) [27]
Stress tolerance engineering	15-30% improvement	5-20% yield stability	Multi-stress interaction	Growth vs stress trade-off	(Nakashima et al., 2014) [25]
Microbiome engineering	10-20% growth increase	Often inconsistent	Microbial competition	Ecological instability	(Mueller & Sachs, 2015) [41]
Multi-gene systems	Enhanced integration	Limited scalability	Regulatory complexity	System instability	(Allen et al., 2017) [24]

of nitrogen into amino acids [30]. Overexpression of GS and high-affinity nitrate transporters has been shown to improve Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) by approximately 10-20%, largely through enhanced nitrogen uptake and assimilation [31]. However, these improvements are often limited by feedback inhibition mechanisms, whereby the accumulation of downstream metabolites suppresses further nitrogen uptake, resulting in diminishing returns.

A key constraint is the close integration between nitrogen and carbon metabolism. Enhanced nitrogen assimilation requires a corresponding supply of carbon skeletons and energy in the form of ATP and reducing equivalents. Disruption of this balance can lead to metabolic bottlenecks, resulting in inefficient nitrogen utilization or unintended penalties on plant growth. This underscores the difficulty of modifying individual components of nitrogen pathways without considering system-level coordination [32].

Efforts to introduce biological nitrogen fixation into non-leguminous crops represent one of the most ambitious objectives in synthetic biology. These strategies have focused on expressing essential nitrogenase genes such as nifH, nifD, and nifK. Although partial expression has been achieved, functional nitrogen fixation remains limited due to several constraints [33]. Nitrogenase is highly sensitive to oxygen and requires a tightly controlled microaerobic environment, which is difficult to maintain within plant cells. In addition, nitrogen fixation is energetically demanding, requiring approximately 16 ATP per molecule of N_2 reduced, thereby imposing a substantial metabolic burden on host plants [34].

Similarly, engineering phosphorus uptake and utilization pathways has yielded limited success. While manipulation of Phosphate Transporters (PHT1 family) can enhance phosphorus acquisition, the effectiveness of these modifications is often constrained by soil chemistry, particularly phosphorus fixation in calcareous and alkaline soils [35]. This highlights a broader limitation: genetic improvements in nutrient acquisition are frequently restricted by external environmental factors, emphasizing the need for integrated strategies that combine genetic engineering with soil and agronomic management practices [36].

Microbiome Engineering: Synthetic Control *vs* Ecological Reality

Synthetic biology has also been applied to the engineering of plant-associated microbiomes, including the development of microbial strains with enhanced nutrient cycling capabilities. Engineered microbes expressing genes for nitrogen fixation or phosphorus solubilization have demonstrated 10-20% improvements in plant growth under controlled conditions [37].

However, their performance in field environments remains inconsistent due to ecological competition. Introduced microbial populations often decline by 50-90% within a few weeks, limiting their long-term effectiveness. Furthermore, engineered traits may not be stably maintained within microbial communities, particularly under competitive environmental conditions. An additional concern is the potential disruption of native microbial communities, which may lead to unintended consequences for soil health and overall ecosystem function [38]. These challenges illustrate the difficulty of translating synthetic biological designs into complex and dynamic ecological systems.

Trade-Offs, Risks, and System Limitations

A recurring challenge in synthetic biology is the presence of trade-offs between different traits. Enhancing stress tolerance frequently occurs at the expense of reduced growth, while increased metabolic activity can lead to depletion of cellular resources. For example, constitutive activation of stress-response pathways can reduce yield by 10-20% under non-stress conditions, whereas increased metabolic flux may create imbalances that lower overall efficiency [39]. These trade-offs reflect the highly interconnected nature of plant physiological systems. Regulatory and biosafety considerations also present significant challenges, particularly with respect to gene flow and ecological impacts. The complexity of synthetic constructs complicates risk assessment processes and underscores the need for the development of updated and robust regulatory frameworks [40] (Table 2).

Conclusion: Toward Dynamic and Context-Aware Systems

Synthetic biology has provided crops with a set of powerful tools that can control genetic and metabolic processes in a precise manner. However, the impact of synthetic biology is limited by regulatory uncertainty, environmental variability, and system-level complexity. To achieve significant progress in synthetic biology in the future, there is a need to develop systems that can dynamically adapt and adjust gene expression in real-time while minimizing trade-offs and improving robustness. Instead of achieving optimal performance in controlled environments, there is a need to focus on achieving consistent performance in real environments, where significant improvements may not exceed 5-15%.

References

1. Riaz M, Yasmeen E, Saleem B, Hameed MK, Almheiri MTS, Al Mir ROS, et al. Evolution of agricultural biotechnology is the paradigm shift in crop resilience and development: A review. Front Plant Sci. 2025; 16: 1585826.
2. Leong R, He X, Beijen BS, Sakai T, Goncalves J, Ding P. Unlocking gene regulatory networks for crop resilience and sustainable agriculture. Nature Biotechnol. 2025; 43(8): 1254-1265.

3. Ravikumar G, Manimaran P, Voleti SR, Subrahmanyam D, Sundaram RM, Bansal KC, et al. Stress-inducible expression of AtDREB1A transcription factor greatly improves drought stress tolerance in transgenic indica rice. Transgenic Res. 2014; 23(3): 421-439.

4. Sadau SB, Liu Z, Ninkuu V, Guan L, Sun X. DREB transcription factors are crucial regulators of abiotic stress responses in Gossypium spp. Plant Stress. 2024; 11: 100350.

5. Hrmova M, Hussain SS. Plant Transcription Factors Involved in Drought and Associated Stresses. Int J Mol Sci. 2021; 22(11): 5662.

6. Gutha LR, Reddy AR. Rice DREB1B promoter shows distinct stress-specific responses, and the overexpression of cDNA in tobacco confers improved abiotic and biotic stress tolerance. Plant Mol Biol. 2008; 68(6): 533-555.

7. García-Gómez ML, Castillo-Jiménez A, Martínez-García JC, Álvarez-Buylla ER. Multi-level gene regulatory network models to understand complex mechanisms underlying plant development. Curr Opin Plant Biol. 2020; 57: 171-179.

8. Tresas T, Isaioglou I, Roussis A, Haralampidis K. A Brief Overview of the Epigenetic Regulatory Mechanisms in Plants. Int J Mol Sci. 2025; 26(10): 4700.

9. Batista-Silva W, Fonseca-Pereira P, Martins AO, Zsögön A, Nunes-Nesi A, Araújo WL. Engineering Improved Photosynthesis in the Era of Synthetic Biology. Plant Commun. 2020; 1(2): 100032.

10. Raines CA. Improving plant productivity by re-tuning the regeneration of RuBP in the Calvin–Benson–Bassham cycle. New Phytol. 2022; 236(2): 350-356.

11. Suzuki Y, Wada S, Kondo E, Yamori W, Makino A. Effects of co-overproduction of sedoheptulose-1,7-bisphosphatase and Rubisco on photosynthesis in rice. Soil Science Plant Nutr. 2019; 65(1): 36-40.

12. López-Calcagno PE, Brown KL, Simkin AJ, Fisk SJ, Lawson T, Raines CA. Simultaneous stimulation of RuBP regeneration and electron transport increases productivity and water use efficiency under field conditions. bioRxiv. 2020.

13. Liang F, Lindberg P, Lindblad P. Engineering photoautotrophic carbon fixation for enhanced growth and productivity. Sustainable Energy & Fuels. 2018; 2(12): 2583-2600.

14. Jin K, Chen G, Yang Y, Zhang Z, Lu T. Strategies for manipulating Rubisco and creating photorespiratory bypass to boost C3 photosynthesis: Prospects on modern crop improvement. Plant Cell Environ. 2023; 46(2): 363-378.

15. Meo ED. Review. Genetic switchboards: Rewiring plant traits with synthetic circuits. Plantae. 2025.

16. Lee SY, Boon NJ, Webb AAR, Tanaka RJ. Synergistic Activation of RD29A Via Integration of Salinity Stress and Abscisic Acid in Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant Cell Physiol. 2016; 57(10): 2147-2160.

17. Muhammad Aslam M, Waseem M, Jakada BH, Okal EJ, Lei Z, Saqib HSA, et al. Mechanisms of Abscisic Acid-Mediated Drought Stress Responses in Plants. Int J Mol Sci. 2022; 23(3): 1084.

18. Méndez C, Ahlenstiel CL, Kelleher AD. Post-transcriptional gene silencing, transcriptional gene silencing and human immunodeficiency virus. World J Virol. 2015; 4(3): 219-244.

19. Kaya C. Molecular crosstalk of transcription factors and hormones in drought tolerance genes in plants. Turk J Botan. 2025; 49(3): 145-164.

20. Khan A, Lister R. Synthetic gene circuits in plants: Recent advances and challenges. Quant Plant Biology. 2025; 6: e6.

21. Kromdijk J, Głowacka K, Leonelli L, Gabilly ST, Iwai M, Niyogi KK, Long SP. Improving photosynthesis and crop productivity by accelerating recovery from photoprotection. Science. 2016; 354(6314): 857-861.

22. South PF, Cavanagh AP, Liu HW, Ort DR. Synthetic glycolate metabolism pathways stimulate crop growth and productivity in the field. Science. 2019; 363(6422): eaat9077.

23. Xu G, Fan X, Miller AJ. Plant nitrogen assimilation and use efficiency. Ann Rev Plant Biol. 2021; 63: 153-182.

24. Allen RS, Tilbrook K, Warden AC, Campbell PC, Rolland V, Singh SP, et al. Expression of 16 Nitrogenase Proteins within the Plant Mitochondrial Matrix. Front Plant Sci. 2017a; 8: 287.

25. Nakashima K, Yamaguchi-Shinozaki K, Shinozaki K. The transcriptional regulatory network in the drought response and its crosstalk in abiotic stress responses including drought, cold, and heat. Front Plant Sci. 2014; 5: 170.

26. Rivero RM, Kojima M, Gepstein A, Sakakibara H, Mittler R, Gepstein S, et al. Delayed leaf senescence induces extreme drought tolerance in a flowering plant. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2007; 104(49): 19631-19636.

27. Liu W, Stewart CN. Plant synthetic biology. Trends in Plant Science. 2015; 20(5): 309-317.

28. Niu B, Paulson JN, Zheng X, Kolter R. Simplified and representative bacterial community of maize roots. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2017; 114(12): E2450-E2459.

29. Navarro BB, Machado MJ, Figueira A. Nitrogen Use Efficiency in Agriculture: Integrating Biotechnology, Microbiology, and Novel Delivery Systems for Sustainable Agriculture. Plants. 2025; 14(19): 2974.

30. Rashid S, Rashid K, Javid H, Wani BA, Magray JA, Qadir R, et al. Assimilation of Nitrates in Plants. CRC Press. 2022.

31. Tiong J, Sharma N, Sampath R, MacKenzie N, Watanabe S, Metot C, et al. Improving Nitrogen Use Efficiency Through Overexpression of Alanine Aminotransferase in Rice, Wheat, and Barley. Front Plant Sci. 2021; 12: 628521.

32. Foyer C, Ferrario-Méry S, Noctor G. Interactions Between Carbon and Nitrogen Metabolism. Plant Nitrogen. 2001.

33. Bennett EM, Murray JW, Isalan M. Engineering Nitrogenases for Synthetic Nitrogen Fixation: From Pathway Engineering to Directed Evolution. Biodes Res. 2023; 5: 0005.

34. Naghshbandi M. Engineering Nitrogenase for Planetary Sustainability: Renewable-Powered Biohybrid Ammonia and the Road Beyond Haber–Bosch. Planetary Sustainability. 2026; 4: 72-84.

35. Seeda A, Abou El-Nour EZ, Zaghloul S. Improving of phosphorus use efficiency in Plant-Soil-System. A review. Middle East Journal of Agriculture Research. 2020.

36. Lallawmkimi C, Ashoka M, Veda DJMSNK, Yadav A, Kumar MD, Rout A. Innovative Approaches in Crop Genetic Engineering for Sustainable Agriculture: A Review. J Sci Res Rep. 2024; 30: 901-920.

37. Ullah F, Ali S, Siraj M, Akhtar MS, Zaman W. Plant Microbiomes Alleviate Abiotic Stress-Associated Damage in Crops and Enhance Climate-Resilient Agriculture. Plants. 2025; 14(12): 1890.

38. Khare E, Arora N. Effects of Soil Environment on Field Efficacy of Microbial Inoculants. Plant Microbes Symbiosis: Applied Facets. 2014.

39. Awais Ibrahim M, Sattar MM, Bashir R, Riaz S, Iqbal J, Abbasi BA, et al. Metabolic Adjustment and Stress Tolerance in Plants. Molecular Biology of Plant Stress Responses. 2025.

40. Dolezel M, Miklau M, Heissenberger A, Kroeger I, Otto M. Complexity Meets Risk—The Next Generation of Genome-Edited Plants Challenges Established Concepts for Environmental Risk Assessment in the EU. Plants. 2025; 14(11): 1723.

41. Mueller UG, Sachs JL. Engineering Microbiomes to Improve Plant and Animal Health. Trends Microbiol. 2015; 23(10): 606-617.