HarvestPlus

Biofortification **Evidence**

A summary of biofortification research findings related to nutrition, cost-effectiveness, and consumer demand to help transform food systems through the adoption and scaling of nutrient-enriched staple crops.

February 2025

This document provides a summary of over two decades of peer-reviewed research that has proven biofortification to be an efficacious, cost-effective, and scalable innovation that can play a pivotal role in transforming food systems to deliver affordable and accessible nutritious food for all.

Biofortification increases the amount of micronutrients in staple food crops through conventional plant breeding, agronomic practices, or genetic modification*. The result is biofortified, nutrient-enriched crops that measurably improve nutritional status and health, and specifically reduce the burden of vitamin A, iron, and zinc deficiencies. These deficiencies collectively account for the greatest unaddressed burden of disease associated with "hidden hunger" in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs)[1].

CGIAR is committed to mainstreaming biofortification into its breeding programs—that is, prioritizing the development of planting material that contains improved nutrition traits alongside other farmer-preferred traits. Nutrient-enriched seeds are used by private and public sector actors to produce more nutritious varieties of the foods eaten every day by the poorest farmers and consumers.

Biofortified crops have been endorsed by global and regional bodies as advantageous for improving rural food systems in LMICs, where diets of farming families are heavily dependent on their own or locally procured staple crops[2-5].

Several national governments have included biofortification in their agricultural and/or nutrition strategies, notably in geographies where the prevalence of deficiencies in vitamin A, iron, and zinc is high and where other year-around nutrition interventions including diverse diets, commercially fortified foods, or micronutrient supplements are often inaccessible, unaffordable, or both.

Young children, adolescent girls, and women are the priority target populations for biofortification. Their relatively high micronutrient needs, driven by rapid periods of growth and development, and menstruation for women, predispose them to hidden hunger.

For more information about biofortification and HarvestPlus, see pp. 8-10 in this brief.

The Scope of Biofortification Research

Multi-disciplinary research on biofortification follows an impact pathway from discovery to development, delivery, and scale-up. This research is conducted by crop, nutrition, food, and social scientists, and includes, among other themes:

- Modelling and forecasting to identify target populations, geographies, staple crops, and micronutrients for biofortification;
- plant breeding approaches to develop biofortified staple crop varieties;
- nutrient retention, bioavailability and absorption, efficacy, and effectiveness studies to assess the impact of consuming biofortified varieties on nutrition and health outcomes;
- socio-economic studies to assess farmers', consumers' and other value chain actors' acceptance of biofortified varieties and willingness to adopt them;
- and program evaluations to understand the cost-effectiveness, inclusivity, and impact of the delivery models implemented.

---

*All biofortified crops developed through the HarvestPlus program have been conventionally bred.

Iron-Biofortified Crops

A meta-analysis has shown that daily consumption of iron-biofortified crops significantly improves iron status and cognition among multiple age groups and across geographies. Moreover, the impact of the additional iron from biofortification had the greatest impact on those with poor iron status—in other words, on those who needed it most[6].

Studies also show that when biofortified beans and pearl millet are eaten as staples, the total amount of iron absorbed is higher than for conventional varieties and can meet between 75-90 percent of the daily average physiological iron requirement for women and children[7-11].

Iron Beans

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- In Rwanda, iron-depleted female university students (18-27 years old) experienced a significant increase in iron status (hemoglobin, serum ferritin, and total body iron) after eating iron beans daily for 4.5 months[12].

- In the same Rwanda study, the improvement in women's iron status also led to significant improvements in their memory, attention, and ability to do every day physical tasks[13-15] —improving their likelihood of reaching their potential at work, school, and home.

- In Mexico, school-aged children (5-12 years old) who ate iron beans for six months experienced improvements in iron status (hemoglobin, serum ferritin, serum transferrin receptor (sTfR) and total body iron). However, differences in iron status between children eating iron beans versus conventional beans were not statistically significant except for sTfR. Improvements by both groups indicate the potential benefit of a food-based nutrition intervention in this population[16].

Socio-Economic Evidence

- *Farmer Adoption:* In a 2015 study, a nationally representative sample of bean farming households in Rwanda found that after four years of iron bean delivery efforts, 28 percent of households had planted at least one iron bean variety in at least one of the past eight seasons, and in 2015, iron beans made up almost 12 percent of national bean production with 80 percent of iron beans produced being consumed on-farm. The study also found high awareness of iron beans (67 percent of bean farmer had heard about iron beans), significant farmer to farmer diffusion rates (with 40 percent of adopters getting the iron bean from their social networks), and adopting households allocating increasing proportions of bean area to iron beans (from 48 percent in season one to 70 percent in season six)[17].

- *Food and Nutrition Security:* Data from the same Rwanda survey showed that adoption of an iron bush bean variety resulted in a yield gain of 20-49 percent over traditional bush bean varieties. This effectively increased the length of time farmers could eat beans grown from their own fields by almost three weeks (reducing the need to buy beans), and increased the probability of selling beans by 12 percent[18]. These results indicate that iron bean production positively and significantly improved both food and nutrition security, as well as livelihood security, among adopting households.

- *Reaching Target Populations:* An outcome monitoring survey conducted in 2017 in Rwanda showed that 87 percent of the iron bean harvest was kept for home consumption. It was consumed by 98 percent of the women of childbearing age and 95 percent of the children under five who resided in these households. This showed that iron beans were reaching their intended primary beneficiaries, i.e., women and children in rural areas[19]. Iron bean delivery models implemented by the HarvestPlus Rwanda program are documented[20], as are lessons learned from the evaluation of the program activities[21].

- *Consumer Acceptance:* Consumer acceptance studies conducted in rural Rwanda showed that even in the absence of nutrition information, consumers liked iron bean varieties, often more than local varieties[22], with nutrition information having a positive effect on consumer valuation of iron beans. Similar studies conducted in Colombia[23] and Guatemala[24-26], also revealed that consumers liked iron beans at least as much as their most popular local bean varieties.

- *Livelihoods:* The yield advantage of iron beans released and adopted in Rwanda resulted in an estimated USD 57-78 additional profit per hectare[27]. From 2010—when the iron bean program was established in the country—to 2018, the total value of benefits was estimated to be USD 25 million. USD 5 million of this was due to the reduction in the burden of iron deficiency, and the rest from the increased production levels[27]. The cost-benefit analysis showed that for the period (2010-2018), every dollar invested yielded USD 3 worth of benefits[28].

Iron Pearl Millet

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- A study in rural Maharashtra, India showed that iron pearl millet was efficacious in improving the iron status and cognition of adolescent school children (12-16 years old). After only four months of eating flatbread (*bhakri*) and snacks (shev) made with iron pearl millet twice a day, iron deficiency was significantly reduced, and serum ferritin and total body iron were significantly improved. By six months, those who were iron deficient at the beginning of the study were 64 percent more likely to resolve their deficiency[29].

- By the end of the same study, the adolescents also experienced significant functional improvements in perception, memory, and attention[30,31], and spent less time sedentary and more time doing moderate physical activities[32].

Improving the learning and physical capabilities of adolescents through increased iron intake can have lasting positive impacts on their ability to be successful at school or secure a job.

Socio-Economic Evidence

- *Farmer Adoption:* A farmer feedback study conducted among iron pearl millet seed purchasers in rural Maharashtra in 2013, showed that 83 percent of pearl millet growers had replaced their traditional variety with a biofortified one; farmers liked the yield, input use and other production, processing, and consumption attributes of iron pearl millet more than the regular variety, and 84 percent of the iron pearl millet harvest was consumed by the household. A majority of the farmers were willing to plant iron pearl millet again next season, and plant more[33].

- A more-recent outcome monitoring survey conducted in 2018, also in rural Maharashtra, showed that one in five pearl millet farming households planted iron pearl millet, with nutritional benefits and high yield being the key factors motivating this decision. In almost all iron pearl millet adopting households, women and children were consuming iron pearl millet[34].

- *Consumer Acceptance:* A study of *bhakri* made with iron pearl millet revealed that even in the absence of information about the nutritional benefits, rural Maharashtra consumers liked the sensory attributes of iron pearl millet grain and *bhakri* as much as, if not more than, grain and *bhakri* of the most popular variety. When nutrition information was provided, consumer acceptance and willingness to pay was even greater[35].

- The operational cost of delivering biofortified pearl millet as part of a daily meal plan for children was evaluated as part of a randomized controlled feeding study in the urban slums of Mumbai. The delivery of nutrient-dense meals was shown to be highly cost-effective: over 15 months, nearly 100,000 meals were served at a total cost of USD 0.59/meal, which compares favorably to the costs of delivering national meal schemes[36].

Vitamin A-Biofortified Crops

Provitamin A carotenoids in biofortified vitamin A crops are efficiently converted into the active form of the vitamin (retinol)[37].

Vitamin A Maize

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- Vitamin A maize improves numerous measures of good nutrition and health; it holds potential to confer protection against malnutrition-induced blindness[38,39].

- The vitamin A in biofortified maize breaks down when its stored; regardless, maize meal made with biofortified maize can provide a significant portion of daily vitamin A needs even after four months of storage[40].

- In Zambia, a study among school-aged children (5-6 years old) found that replacing regular maize with vitamin A maize significantly improved the children's vitamin A status[41].

- Another study in Zambia with children (4-8 years old) did not show significant improvements in serum retinol; yet, among the children who were vitamin A deficient at baseline, those who ate vitamin A maize experienced significant improvements in their visual ability to see in dim (low) light conditions[42].

- A short-duration (3 week) study with lactating mothers showed no increase in average breast milk vitamin A concentration among women who consumed vitamin A maize; however, a downward trend in the risk of low retinol concentration in milk warranted further investigation[43].

- In a subsequent study, breastfeeding Zambian mothers who ate vitamin A maize twice a day for three months experienced improvements in the vitamin A content of their breast milk, and the prevalence of low vitamin A concentration in breast milk was reduced by over 50 percent[44].

Socio-Economic Evidence

- *Farmer Adoption:* In Zambia, a monitoring survey conducted in 2015 confirmed a strong preference by farmers for both the production and consumption attributes of vitamin A maize varieties compared with conventional white maize varieties. Nearly all farmers (97 percent) who participated in the study said that they would grow vitamin A maize in the next season, and on average, farmers were planning to plant four times more seed than they did in the previous (2014–2015) season[45].

- Another monitoring survey conducted in 2017 found that almost all the farming households who had acquired vitamin A maize seed did plant it, and 87 percent of the harvest was kept for home consumption. Further, 97 percent of women and 96 percent of children in adopting households consumed this nutritious maize, on average for three days in the last seven days[46]. The survey also showed that 44 percent of the vitamin A maize growers also purchased vitamin A maize grain from the market, showing that adopting households liked the vitamin A maize grain.

- *Consumer Acceptance:* In rural Zambia, consumers valued *nshima* (corn porridge) made with vitamin A maize more than *nshima* from white and yellow maize varieties, even in the absence of nutrition information. Nutrition information increased consumer valuation of vitamin A maize[47]. Similarly in Malawi, there was high acceptability of porridge prepared with vitamin A maize among caregivers and children[48].

- Another study, conducted in rural Ghana, found that consumers valued *kenkey* (maize dumpling) made with vitamin A maize less than *kenkey* made with either white or yellow maize, but the provision of nutrition information reversed this preference[49].

Vitamin A Cassava

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- In eastern Kenya, school-age children (5-13 years old) who ate boiled and mashed vitamin A cassava for 4.5 months experienced a modest but nutritionally significant improvement in their vitamin A status[50].

- In Nigeria, eating vitamin A cassava twice daily improved the vitamin A and iron status (serum retinol) of pre-school children (3-5 years old) after 3.5 months[51].

- In terms of retention, vitamin A cassava retains intermediate-to-high levels of provitamin A carotenoids when processed using traditional African recipes and methods such as boiling and frying. If boiled and eaten daily as a staple, it can provide young children with 100 percent of their average daily vitamin A needs. Yet, when processed as *fufu* or *chikwangue*—as is common in the Democratic Republic of the Congo—or when stored as *gari* (coarse flour) over months, retention is much lower, demonstrating that local context and cooking practices influence the potential nutritional impact of biofortified crops[52,53].

Socio-Economic Evidence

- *Farmer Adoption:* An outcome monitoring survey conducted in Akwa-Ibom, Anambra, Benue, and Ondo states of Nigeria in 2018 found 21 percent of the total cassava planting area was allocated to vitamin A cassava, and harvested vitamin A cassava roots constituted 25 percent of the cassava production, suggesting a significant yield advantage for vitamin A cassava varieties. Ninety-four percent of women and 85 percent of young children in vitamin A cassava-growing households were regularly consuming food made with this biofortified crop[54].

- *Consumer Acceptance:* A study conducted in Oyo and Imo states of Nigeria found that regardless of the color of the commonly consumed local *gari* (cassava flour), consumers liked *gari* made with vitamin A cassava varieties albeit in varying degrees depending on the color difference between local and vitamin A cassava *gari*.

- Once consumers received information about the nutritional benefits of vitamin A cassava varieties, they preferred vitamin A cassava *gari*[55].

- Another consumer acceptance study conducted in Nigeria compared traditional foods prepared with vitamin A cassava, fortified, or conventional foods, and found that consumers preferred food made with vitamin A cassava, associating the yellow color with improved eyesight and enhanced health[56].

- Studies conducted in Eastern Africa found that school children and their caregivers in Kenya preferred vitamin A cassava to local (white) varieties[57], while men and women farmers in Uganda favorably evaluated production traits of vitamin A cassava against popular varieties[58].

- *Livelihoods:* Other studies conducted in Nigeria found vitamin A cassava production to be profitable[59]. Delivery models implemented for vitamin A cassava by HarvestPlus Nigeria program, and its partners are documented[60,61], and lessons learned are summarized[62].

Vitamin A Orange Sweet Potato

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- Eating vitamin A orange sweet potato (OSP) significantly improves children's vitamin A status across age groups[63-66], contributes to a healthy immune system, and can reduce the burden of diarrhea, the second leading cause of death of young children in LMICs[67].

- Relatively small amounts of vitamin A are lost during storage and cooking of OSP, except when stored as flour for greater than two months[68, 69, 70].

- In Uganda, a large-scale effectiveness study showed that the introduction of OSP to farming households significantly increased vitamin A intake among children (3-5 years old) and women, and improved the vitamin A status of children who were deficient at the start of the study (9.5 percent reduction in low serum retinol prevalence) after four growing seasons[65].

- In Mozambique, another effectiveness study showed vitamin A intakes doubled among households accessing and growing OSP; almost all the vitamin A intake for children was provided by OSP[66]. Regular consumption of OSP also reduced child morbidity: in children under five, the likelihood of experiencing diarrhea was reduced by 39 percent, and duration of diarrhea episodes was reduced by more than 10 percent; in children under three, the reductions were by 52 percent and 27 percent, respectively[67].

- Three years after the Mozambique study concluded, vitamin A intakes remained higher among women in the intervention households and their young children born after the trial—demonstrating the long-term adoption and sustainability of biofortification as a food-based intervention[71].

Socio-Economic Studies

- *Delivery Models and Adoption:* The effectiveness studies conducted in Mozambique and Uganda evaluated the impact of two delivery models (one providing more intensive training on nutrition and best agronomics practices than the other) on OSP adoption, vitamin A intake, and vitamin A status of participating households. The studies found no significant differences in these outcomes between the two delivery models, providing crucial evidence for cost-effective scaling[65,66,72]. Delivery models for OSP in several countries in Africa South of the Sahara are documented[73,] and lessons learned from these experiences are presented in several publications[74-77].

- *Consumer Acceptance:* Consumer acceptance studies conducted in both rural and urban areas of several countries showed that consumers liked OSP and OSP food products[78-81]. As with other biofortified crops, nutrition information on the benefits of consuming OSP resulted in higher consumer valuation thereof in Uganda[82].

- A study conducted in Uganda found that urban consumers' knowledge about this nutritious food increased significantly from 2014 to 2017, and consumers in all socioeconomic segments were consuming vitamin A sweet potato because of its increased availability[78].

Zinc-Biofortified Crops

Zinc biofortification increases the amount of zinc absorbed by the body[83]. Studies show 8-25 percent more zinc is absorbed from meals made with zinc biofortified staple foods (polished rice, whole or refined wheat flour, or whole maize meal)[84-87].

A meta-analysis on the effects of zinc supplementation on risk factors for non-communicable diseases showed that low-dose and long-duration supplementation—akin to how zinc is delivered by food-based interventions like biofortified staples—reduces risk factors for type II diabetes and cardiovascular disease[88]. Recent research supports an expanded recognition of the relevance of zinc deficiency across the life course, including its role in the global burden of diabetes and cardiovascular disease in adulthood[89]. This provides a compelling case for a novel study to examine whether type II diabetes and cardiovascular disease could also be a target for food-based zinc interventions like biofortification.

Measuring the impact of interventions designed to increase zinc intake is challenging—a reliable measurement tool (a biomarker) is elusive. HarvestPlus and its partners are committed to conducting research into novel ways to assess zinc interventions to spur on actions needed to reduce zinc deficiency[90].

Zinc Rice

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- Zinc from biofortified rice is absorbed as well as zinc provided through commercial fortification and provides more bioavailable zinc than conventional rice[91,92].
- In Bangladesh, eating zinc rice daily for nine months did not change the prevalence of zinc deficiency among young children (12-36 months old). However, by the end of the study, the children attained a greater height for age than the children consuming conventional rice[93].
- Nutrient retention studies show that zinc rice (and zinc wheat) should be eaten as whole grains to maximize zinc intake. Polishing to white rice or milling to refined white flour removes the nutritious out layers and germ of the grain where zinc (and iron) are contained[94].
- Nutrient retention studies also indicate parboiling rice lowers its zinc concentration, whether the rice is biofortified or not; yet, despite zinc losses during processing, biofortified rice retains a higher zinc concentration over non-biofortified rice and, when eaten as a staple, can provide over 50 percent of the daily zinc needs for children[95,96].

Socio-Economic Evidence

- *Productivity:* Field trials in several countries showed that agronomic biofortification of some varieties of both rice and wheat with zinc can be associated with enhanced grain yield/crop productivity[62,97].
- *Farmer Adoption:* A nationally representative zinc rice adoption study conducted in 2018 in Bangladesh found that, despite the fact that zinc rice was in early stages of delivery, 16 percent of all farmers had heard about zinc rice varieties, while a quarter of a million farming households had already grown them. Zinc rice growing farmers liked zinc rice varieties' high yield[98].
- *Consumer Acceptance:* In Bolivia and Colombia, consumer acceptance studies for zinc rice showed that consumers liked zinc rice varieties as much, if not more than, local rice varieties[99].

Zinc Wheat

Nutrition and Health Evidence

- In New Delhi, India, over 3,000 preschool children (4-6 years old) and their mothers consumed either conventional wheat or agronomically biofortified wheat (i.e., wheat treated with zinc fertilizer) daily for six months. Biofortified wheat reduced time spent ill: children spent 17 percent fewer days sick with pneumonia and 40 percent fewer days vomiting than children who ate foods prepared with conventional wheat. Their mothers (nonpregnant, non-lactating) reported spending significantly fewer days (9 percent) with fever[100].

- Studies show significantly more zinc is absorbed by the body from biofortified wheat than from conventional wheat [84, 85, 101], and fermentation can be used to further enhance mineral absorption[102].

- In Pakistan, an effectiveness study showed that eating zinc biofortified wheat flour for six weeks increased adolescent girls' intake of zinc by 21%, but did not increase plasma zinc[103].

Socio-Economic Evidence

- *Livelihoods:* A projected (ex-ante) cost-benefit analysis of a zinc wheat variety that is resistant to wheat blast and other diseases in Bangladesh found a 5-8 percent higher yield when compared with popular varieties. Potential economic benefits of delivering this zinc wheat variety were found to far exceed the anticipated cost of the delivery, resulting in USD 0.23-1.6 million of net benefits even in a limited dissemination scenario[104].

- *Farmer Adoption:* Studies assessed farmers' and consumers' evaluation of zinc wheat varieties and their willingness to adopt them with positive results, a prerequisite to scaling up[105,106].

- Ex-ante impact assessment of scaling of zinc wheat and rice in Pakistan found that replacement of all wheat and rice varieties consumed in this country with zinc biofortified varieties by 2035 could result in a 12 percentage-point reduction in inadequate zinc intake and 4.9 percent reduction in stunting[107].

More on Biofortification

How Biofortification Works

The process of biofortification by conventional breeding methods begins by screening hundreds of thousands of staple crop varieties in CGIAR genebanks around the world to identify varieties that are high in vitamin A, iron, and zinc. Plant breeders spend five to seven years crossing these with the latest improved (i.e., high-yielding and climate-smart) varieties of the same crop to develop new varieties that can be adapted to grow in various agro-ecologies in LMICs.

These micronutrient-dense, high-yielding and climate-smart varieties are multiplied and made available to countries as public goods through their national agricultural research systems (NARS). NARS then test and develops these varieties further with farmers through multi-location trials and in farmers' fields for several planting seasons, comparing the performance of the biofortified varieties with the most popular varieties grown in each agro-ecology. The best-performing varieties are then officially released for planting by farmers in the country and are made available to the public and private sector for multiplication and delivery.

Crop development is an ongoing process. The next generations of biofortified varieties in the pipeline will not only have higher levels of micronutrients but will be higher yielding, better adapted to ever-changing climatic and other environmental conditions and meet preferences of value chain actors.

Equity benefits: Young children, adolescent girls, and women are the primary targets of biofortification. These populations' relatively high micronutrient needs from rapid periods of growth and development predispose them to deficiencies. These needs are often unmet because of dietary habits, cultural norms, lack of access to micronutrient-dense foods, and other factors that increase their biological vulnerability to infections.

Interventions that improve nutrition early in life are key to tackling the intergenerational cycle of malnutrition[108]. An advantage of delivering micronutrients through staple foods is that—unlike with micronutrient-dense animal-sourced foods, fruits, and vegetables—inequitable food allocation within a household does not usually occur with staple foods. Staples are consumed by all members of a household as their primary, everyday source of food[109], making biofortification an inclusive solution for improving micronutrient intake.

Cost-effectiveness: The Copenhagen Consensus ranks interventions that reduce micronutrient deficiencies among the highest value-for-money investments for economic development; it estimated that every USD invested in biofortification yields an average of USD 17 of benefits in reducing disease burden associated with micronutrient deficiencies[110]. Ex ante cost-effectiveness analyses of several biofortification interventions[111,112] as well as meta- analysis thereof[112] found most biofortification interventions to be highly cost-effective, according to the World Bank criteria of cost (in USD) per Disability-Adjusted Life Year (DALY) saved. Many country-crop-micronutrient combinations ranked more cost-effective than supplementation and/or fortification programs for a given micronutrient[111-113,] for example for iron in India[114], vitamin A in Zambia[115], and zinc in Bangladesh[116].

Climate resilience: Climate change is not only creating greater fluctuations and uncertainties in productivity (often resulting in local or national food insecurity), it is also affecting the nutrient content of commonly consumed staples as increasing CO2 emissions decrease the nutrient density of most plants[117-119]. Coupled with changes in population and incomes, the gap between the demand for and supply of micronutrients is widening[120]. Biofortified staple crop varieties are developed by piggybacking on the CGIAR's latest varieties which are more resilient to the effects of climate change (i.e., drought and flood resistant, heat tolerant), and have high micronutrient density; this increased nutrient density can help compensate for nutrient losses resulting from CO_2 emissions.

Scaling Up Biofortification Through Food Supply Chains

HarvestPlus and our partners have developed tools to bring biofortified seeds, grains, and processed foods to commercial markets. This will extend their benefits to millions of consumers in need of better nutrition and boost livelihood opportunities for small-scale farmers. Sustainable, commercial supply chains are the route to anchoring biofortification in the food system.

Publicly Available Specifications for zinc-, iron-, and vitamin A-enriched grains are available that set out nutritional targets for biofortified grains. They include requirements for sampling, packaging, and labeling of biofortified grains to support business enterprises in their procurement of biofortified raw materials.

Adoption and application of these standards by food market participants and governments provides assurance for buyers that they are receiving quality biofortified products, increasing market confidence, and spurring growth in trade.

Guidelines for integrating biofortification in the food industry have also been established to ensure regulatory compliance with food legislation and standard food labeling requirements. Regulatory compliance and consumer protection is essential for good business practice.

About HarvestPlus

As the global thought leader in biofortification science, technology, and policy, HarvestPlus provides strategic guidance, technical assistance, research expertise, and capacity strengthening to more than 750 partners worldwide in the public, private, NGO and humanitarian sectors.

HarvestPlus works across CGIAR as part of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). Worldwide, 445 biofortified varieties of 12 staple crops have been released for farmers to grow them in over 40 countries. As a result of HarvestPlus-led delivery efforts, at the end of 2023, over 100 million people in farming households were growing and consuming biofortified crops across Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Millions more are benefitting from biofortified crops purchased at markets.

The goal of HarvestPlus and its partners is to rapidly scale up production and consumption of biofortified crops and foods, to reach hundreds of millions more people who can benefit from them. The HarvestPlus strategy for enabling rapid scale includes:

- mainstreaming biofortification in global and national crop breeding programs;
- working with value chain actors to facilitate the ''biofortification'' of seed-to-food value chains for key staples;
- providing technical assistance and evidence-based advocacy for the integration of biofortification in international finance institutions' loans and national/regional policies and programs;
- establishing and growing a network of partnerships and country-specific implementing organizations to enhance the demand and supply of biofortified crops and foods;
- and facilitating a global platform for knowledge exchange and learning among stakeholders—while also continuing current efforts to expand the evidence base and product portfolio.

Contact HarvestPlus: harvestplus@cgiar.org

References

1. Victora, C. G. et al. Revisiting maternal and child undernutrition in low-income and middle-income countries: variable progress towards an unfinished agenda. Lancet 397, 1388–1399 (2021).
2. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2022. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022. Repurposing food and agricultural policies to make healthy diets more affordable. Rome, FAO. https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0639en
3. HarvestPlus and FAO. Biofortification: a food-systems solution to help end hidden hunger. 2019. Rome, Italy.
4. Micronutrient Forum. The Way Forward: A road to resilience to protect and accelerate nutrition progress in an era of crises. 2023. https://micronutrientforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/mnf_way-forward_v6a.pdf
5. Africa Union. 2022. AU Declaration on Scaling-up Food Fortification and Biofortification {Assembly/AU/Decl. 2(XXXV). https://au.int/sites/default/files/decisions/42725-Assembly_AU_Dec_813-838_XXXV_E.pdf
6. Finkelstein, J. L. et al. Iron biofortification interventions to improve iron status and functional outcomes. Proc. Nutr. Soc. 78, 197–207 (2019).
7. Petry, N. et al. Phytic Acid concentration influences iron bioavailability from biofortified beans in Rwandese women with low iron status. J. Nutr. 144, 1681–1687 (2014).
8. Kodkany, B. S. et al. Biofortification of pearl millet with iron and zinc in a randomized controlled trial increases absorption of these minerals above physiologic requirements in young children. J. Nutr. 143, 1489–1493 (2013).
9. Cercamondi, C. I. et al. Total iron absorption by young women from iron-biofortified pearl millet composite meals is double that from regular millet meals but less than that from post-harvest iron-fortified millet meals. J. Nutr. 143, 1376–1382 (2013).
10. Bechoff, A. et al. Micronutrient (provitamin A and iron/zinc) retention in biofortified crops. African J. Food, Agric. Nutr. Dev. 17, 11893–11904 (2017).
11. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology. Food Biofortification—Reaping the Benefits of Science to Overcome Hidden Hunger. CAST Issue Pap. 69, (2020).
12. Haas, J. D. et al. Consuming Iron Biofortified Beans Increases Iron Status in Rwandan Women after 128 Days in a Randomized Controlled Feeding Trial. J. Nutr. 146, 1586–1592 (2016).
13. Murray-Kolb, L. E. et al. Consumption of iron-biofortified beans positively affects cognitive performance in 18- to 27-year-old Rwandan female college students in an 18-week randomized controlled efficacy trial. J. Nutr. 147, 2109–2117 (2017).
14. Wenger, M. J. et al. Changes in iron status are related to changes in brain activity and behavior in Rwandan female University students: Results from a randomized controlled efficacy trial involving iron-biofortified beans. J. Nutr. 149, 687–697 (2019).
15. Luna, S. V, et al. Increased iron status during a feeding trial of iron-biofortified beans increases physical work efficiency in Rwandan women. J. Nutr. Jan 31, (2020).
16. Finkelstein, J. L. et al. A randomized feeding trial of iron-biofortified beans in school children in Mexico. Nutrients 11, 381 (2019).
17. Asare-Marfo, D. et al. Assessing the adoption of high iron bean varieties and their impact on iron intakes and other livelihood outcomes in Rwanda. Main Survey Report. Available upon request. (2016).
18. Vaiknoras, K. & Larochelle, C. The impact of iron-biofortified bean adoption on bean productivity, consumption, purchases and sales. World Dev. 139, (2021).
19. HarvestPlus. Rwanda Outcome Monitoring Survey Report. Available upon request. (2018).
20. Mulambu J., Andersson M. & Palenberg M. Chapter 10: Iron Beans in Rwanda: Crop Development and Delivery Experience. Afr. J. Food Agric. Nutr. Dev 17, 12026–12050 (2017).
21. Vaiknoras, K., et al. Promoting rapid and sustained adoption of biofortified crops: What we learned from iron-biofortified bean delivery approaches in Rwanda. Food Policy 83, 271–284 (2019).
22. Oparinde, A., et al. Demand-pull creation, public officer's endorsement, and consumer willingness-to-pay for nutritious iron beans in rural and urban Rwanda. HarvestPlus Working Paper. (2017).
23. Beintema, J. J. S., et al. Scaling up biofortified beans high in iron and zinc through the school feeding program: A sensory acceptance study with schoolchildren from two departments in southwest Colombia. Food Sci. Nutr. 6, 1138–1145 (2018).
24. Pérez, S. et al. Identifying socioeconomic characteristics defining consumers' acceptance for main organoleptic attributes of an iron-biofortified bean variety in Guatemala. Int. J. Food Syst. Dyn. 8, 222–235 (2017).

25. Pérez S., et al. The role of respondents' market participation in consumer acceptance of seeds and grains of an iron-enriched bean variety in Guatemala. J. Agric. Stud. 6, 36–53 (2018).

26. Pérez, S., et al. Consumer acceptance of an iron bean variety in Northwest Guatemala: the role of information and repeated messaging. Agric. Food Econ. 2018 61 6, 1–23 (2018).

27. Lividini, K. & Diressie, M. Outcomes of biofortification: High iron beans in Rwanda. Available upon request. (2019).

28. HarvestPlus. Innovative delivery models for iron beans resulted in adoption by an estimated 442,000 households in Rwanda. CGIAR Outcome Impact Case Reports, 2019: Study #3293. (2019).

29. Finkelstein, J. L. et al. A randomized trial of iron-biofortified pearl millet in school children in India. J. Nutr. 145, 1576–1581 (2015).

30. Scott, S. P. et al. Cognitive performance in Indian school-going adolescents is positively affected by consumption of iron-biofortified pearl millet: a 6-month randomized controlled efficacy trial. J. Nutr. 148, 1462 (2018).

31. Wenger, M. J., et al. Modeling relationships between iron status, behavior, and brain electrophysiology: evidence from a randomized study involving a biofortified grain in Indian adolescents. BMC Public Health, 22(1), 1299 (2022).

32. Pompano, L. M. et al. Iron-biofortified pearl millet consumption increases physical activity in Indian adolescent schoolchildren after a 6-month randomised feeding trial. Br. J. Nutr. 1–8 (2021).

33. Karandikar, B., Birol, E. & Tedla-Diressie, M. Farmer feedback study on high iron pearl millet delivery, distribution and diffusion in India. In AAEA & CAES Joint Annual Meeting (2013).

34. HarvestPlus. India Iron Pearl Millet Outcome Monitoring Survey Report. Available upon request. (2018).

35. Banerji, A., et al. Information, branding, certification, and consumer willingness to pay for high-iron pearl millet: Evidence from experimental auctions in Maharashtra, India. Food Policy 62, 133–141 (2016).

36. Huey, S. et al. Nutrient-dense meal delivery in partnership with small-scale producers in Mumbai urban slums: implementation considerations within a randomized controlled feeding trial. Curr. Dev. Nutr. 4, 844–844 (2020).

37. Bouis, H. E. & Saltzman, A. Improving nutrition through biofortification: A review of evidence from HarvestPlus, 2003 through 2016. Glob. Food Sec. 12, 49–58 (2017).

38. Palmer, A. C. et al. Provitamin A carotenoid-biofortified maize consumption increases pupillary responsiveness among Zambian children in a randomized controlled trial. J. Nutr. 146, 2551–2558 (2016).

39. Palmer, A. C. et al. Impact of biofortified maize consumption on serum carotenoid concentrations in Zambian children. Eur. J. Clin. Nutr. 72, 301–303 (2018).

40. Taleon, Víctor, et al. "Carotenoid retention in biofortified maize using different post-harvest storage and packaging methods." Food Chemistry 232, 60-66 (2017).

41. Gannon, B. et al. Biofortified orange maize is as efficacious as a vitamin A supplement in Zambian children even in the presence of high liver reserves of vitamin A: A community-based, randomized placebo-controlled trial. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 100, 1541–1550 (2014).

42. Palmer, A. C. et al. Provitamin A-biofortified maize increases serum -carotene, but not retinol, in marginally nourished children: A cluster-randomized trial in rural Zambia. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 104, 181–190 (2016).

43. Palmer, A. C. et al. Short-term daily consumption of provitamin a carotenoid-biofortified maize has limited impact on breast milk retinol concentrations in Zambian women enrolled in a randomized controlled feeding trial. J. Nutr 146, 1783–1792 (2016).

44. Palmer, A. C.. et al. Biofortified and fortified maize consumption reduces prevalence of low milk retinol, but does not increase vitamin A stores of breastfeeding Zambian infants with adequate reserves: a randomized controlled trial. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 113, 1209–1220 (2021).

45. Tedla Diressie, M., et al. An assessment of the vitamin A maize seed delivery efforts to date: Agro-dealer sales and farmer production in Zambia. SUNFUND Project Report. (2016).

46. HarvestPlus. Zambia Outcome Monitoring Survey Report. Available upon request. (2018).

47. Meenakshi, J. V. et al. Using a discrete choice experiment to elicit the demand for a nutritious food: Willingness-to-pay for orange maize in rural Zambia. J. Health Econ. 31, 62–71 (2012).

48. Munkhuwa, V., Masamba, K., & Kasapila, W. Beta-carotene retention and consumer acceptability of selected products made from two provitamin-A maize varieties. Int. J. Food Sci. 2023 (2023).

49. Banerji, A. et al. Eliciting willingness-to-pay through multiple experimental procedures: evidence from lab- in-the-field in rural Ghana. Can. J. Agric. Econ. Can. d'agroeconomie 66, 231–254 (2018).

50. Talsma, E. F. et al. Biofortified yellow cassava and vitamin A status of Kenyan children: A randomized controlled trial. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 103, 258–267 (2016).

51. Afolami, I. et al. Daily consumption of pro-vitamin A biofortified (yellow) cassava improves serum retinol concentrations in preschool children in Nigeria: a randomized controlled trial. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 113, 221-231 (2021).

52. Taleon, V., et al. Carotenoids retention in biofortified yellow cassava processed with traditional African methods. J. Sci. Food Agric. 99, 1434–1441 (2019).

53. Bechoff, A., et al. Carotenoid stability during storage of yellow gari made from biofortified cassava or with palm oil. J. Food Compos. Anal., 44, 36–44 (2015).

54. HarvestPlus Monitoring and Evaluation Team. Nigeria outcome monitoring: Main survey report 2018. Available upon request. (2018).

55. Oparinde, A., et al. Information and consumer willingness to pay for biofortified yellow cassava: Evidence from experimental auctions in Nigeria. Agric. Econ. (United Kingdom) 47, 215–233 (2016).

56. Bechoff, A., et al. 'Yellow is good for you': Consumer perception and acceptability of fortified and biofortified cassava products. PLoS One 13, (2018).

57. Talsma, E. F. et al. Biofortified cassava with pro-vitamin A is sensory and culturally acceptable for consumption by primary school children in Kenya. PLoS One 8, e73433 (2013).

58. Esuma, W., et al. Men and women's perception of yellow-root cassava among rural farmers in eastern Uganda. Agric. Food Secur. 8, 10 (2019).

59. Ayodeji Sunday, O. Profitability of investment and farm level efficiency among groups of vitamin A cassava farmers in Oyo State Nigeria. Economics 8, 14 (2019).

60. Olaosebikan, O. et al. Gender-based constraints affecting biofortified cassava production, processing and marketing among men and women adopters in Oyo and Benue States, Nigeria. Physiol. Mol. Plant Pathol. 105, 17–27 (2019).

61. Ilona, P., et al. Vitamin A cassava in Nigeria: Crop development and delivery. Afr. J. Food, Agric. Nutr. Dev. 17, 12000–12025 (2017).

62. Bouis, H. E., Saltzman, A. & Birol, E. Improving nutrition through biofortification introduction: exploring the potential of biofortification. In agriculture for improved nutrition: seizing the momentum. 47–57, International Food Policy Institute (IFPRI) and CABI. (2019).

63. Van Jaarsveld, P. J. et al. Carotene-rich orange-fleshed sweet potato improves the vitamin A status of primary school children assessed with the modified-relative-dose- response test. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 81, 1080–1087 (2005).

64. Low J.W., et al. A food-based approach introducing orange-fleshed sweet potatoes increased vitamin A intake and serum retinol concentrations in young children in rural Mozambique.J. Nutr 137, 1320–1327 (2007).

65. Hotz, C. et al. Introduction of -carotene–rich orange sweet potato in rural Uganda resulted in increased vitamin A intakes among children and women and improved vitamin A status among children. J. Nutr. 142, 1871–80 (2012).

66. Hotz, C. et al. A large-scale intervention to introduce orange sweet potato in rural Mozambique increases vitamin A intakes among children and women. Br. J. Nutr. 108, 163–176 (2012).

67. Jones, K. M. & de Brauw, A. Using agriculture to improve child health: Promoting orange sweet potatoes reduces diarrhea. World Dev. 74, 15–24 (2015).

68. Bengtsson, A., et al. Effects of various traditional processing methods on the all-trans-β-carotene content of orange-fleshed sweet potato. J. Food Compos. Anal. 21.2 (2008): 134-143.

69. Bechoff, A., et al. Effect of drying and storage on the degradation of total carotenoids in orange-fleshed sweetpotato cultivars. J. Sci. Food Agric., 90: 622-629 (2010).

70. Bechoff, A., et al. "Relationship between the kinetics of β-carotene degradation and formation of norisoprenoids in the storage of dried sweet potato chips." Food Chem. 121.2 (2010): 348-357.

71. De Brauw, A., Moursi, M. & Munhaua, A. B. Vitamin A intakes remain higher among intervention participants 3 years after a biofortification intervention in Mozambique. Br. J. Nutr. 122, 1175–1181 (2019).

72. De Brauw, A. et al. Biofortification, crop adoption and health information: Impact pathways in Mozambique and Uganda. Am. J. Agric. Econ. 100, 906–930 (2018).

73. Arimond, M. et al. Reaching and engaging end users (REU) orange fleshed sweet potato (OFSP) in East and Southern Africa. HarvestPlus Report.(2010).

74. Low, J. et al. Sweet potato development and delivery in Sub-Saharan Africa. Afr. J. Food Agric. Nutr. Dev 17, 11955–11972 (2017).

75. HarvestPlus. Developing and delivering biofortified crops in Uganda: Annual report 2015-Achievements, Lessons learned, and Way forward. Available upon request. (2015).

76. Low, J. W., et al. Tackling vitamin A deficiency with biofortified sweetpotato in sub-Saharan Africa. Glob. Food Sec. 14, 23–30 (2017).

77. Okello, J. J., et al. Effect of intensive agriculture-nutrition education and extension program adoption and diffusion of biofortified crops. J.Agric. Food. Info. 20, 254–276 (2019).

78. Birol, E., et al. Developing country consumers' acceptance of biofortified foods: a synthesis. Food Secur. 7, 555–568 (2015).

79. Brouwer, R. Adoption of orange-fleshed sweetpotato varieties by urban consumers in Maputo, Mozambique. African J. Agric. Food Secur. (2019).

80. Hummel, M. et al. Sensory and cultural acceptability tradeoffs with nutritional content of biofortified orange-fleshed sweetpotato varieties among households with children in Malawi. PLoS One 13, e0204754 (2018).

81. Naico, A. T. A. & Lusk, J. L. The value of a nutritionally enhanced staple crop: Results from a choice experiment conducted with orange-fleshed sweet potatoes in Mozambique. J. Afr. Econ. 19, 536–558 (2010).

82. Chowdhury, S., et al. Are consumers in developing countries willing to pay more for micronutrient-dense biofortified foods? Evidence from a field experiment in Uganda. Am. J. Agric. Econ. 93, 83–97 (2011).

83. Gomes, M. J. C., Martino, H. S. D., & Tako, E. Zinc-biofortified staple food crops to improve zinc status in humans: a systematic review. Crit. Rev. Food Sci., 63 (21), 4966-4978 (2023).

84. Rosado, J. L. et al. The quantity of zinc absorbed from wheat in adult women is enhanced by biofortification. J. Nutr. 139, 1920–1925 (2009).

85. Signorell, C. et al. Zinc absorption from agronomically biofortified wheat is similar to post-harvest fortified wheat and is a substantial source of bioavailable zinc in humans. J. Nutr. 149, 840–846 (2019).

86. Chomba, E. et al. Zinc absorption from biofortified maize meets the requirements of young rural zambian children. J. Nutr. 145, 514–519 (2015).

87. Zyba, S. J. et al. A moderate increase in dietary zinc reduces DNA strand breaks in leukocytes and alters plasma proteins without changing plasma zinc concentrations. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 105, 343–351 (2017).

88. Pompano, L. M. & Boy, E. Effects of dose and duration of zinc interventions on risk factors for type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Adv. Nutr. (2020).

89. Lowe, N. M., et al.. Preventing and controlling zinc deficiency across the life course: A call to action. Adv. Nutr., 100181 (2024).

90. Knez, M., & Boy, E. Existing knowledge on Zn status biomarkers (1963–2021) with a particular focus on FADS1 and FADS2 diagnostic performance and recommendations for further research. Front. Nutr., 9, 1057156 (2023).

91. Brni, M. et al. Zinc absorption by adults is similar from intrinsically labeled zinc-biofortified rice and from rice fortified with labeled zinc sulfate. J. Nutr. 146, 76–80 (2016).

92. Islam, M. M., et al. Absorption of zinc from mixed diets containing conventional or zinc- biofortified Bangladeshi rice, or conventional Bangladeshi rice with added zinc, among young children in a peri-urban community. Faseb J. 96-7 (2011).

93. Jongstra, R. et al. The effect of zinc-biofortified rice on zinc status of Bangladeshi pre-school children: a randomized, double-masked, household-based controlled trial. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 115(3), 724-737 (2022).

94. Huey, S. L., et al. A systematic review of the impacts of post-harvest handling on provitamin A, iron and zinc retention in seven biofortified crops. Nature Food, 4 (11), 978-985 (2023).

95. Taleon, V.,et al. Retention of Zn, Fe and phytic acid in parboiled biofortified and non- biofortified rice. Food Chem. X 8, 100105 (2020).

96. Taleon, V., et al. Effect of parboiling conditions on zinc and iron retention in biofortified and non-biofortified milled rice. J. Sci. Food Agric. 102(2), 514-522 (2021).

97. Rehman, A. et al. Agronomic biofortification of zinc in Pakistan: status, benefits, and constraints. Front. Sustain. Food Syst. 4, 276 (2020).

98. HarvestPlus. Bangladesh zinc rice adoption study. Available upon request. (2018).

99. Woods et al., 2020: The acceptance of zinc biofortified rice in Latin America: A consumer sensory study and grain quality characterization.

100. Sazawal, S. et al. Efficacy of high zinc biofortified wheat in improvement of micronutrient status, and prevention of morbidity among preschool children and women - a double masked, randomized, controlled trial. Nutr. J. 17, 86 (2018).

101. Hussain, S., et al. Estimated Zinc Bioavailability in Milling Fractions of Biofortified Wheat Grains and in Flours of Different Extraction Rates. Int. J. Agric. Biol. Int. J. Agric. Biol 15, 921–926 (2013).

102. Houssni, I. EL., et al. Review of processes for improving the bioaccessibility of minerals by reducing the harmful effect of phytic acid in wheat, Food Chem. Adv., 4, 100568 (2024).

103. Ohly, H. et al. The BiZiFED project: Biofortified zinc flour to eliminate deficiency in Pakistan. Nutr. Bull. 44, 60–64 (2019).

104. Mottaleb, K. A. et al. Economic benefits of blast-resistant biofortified wheat in Bangladesh: The case of BARI Gom 33. Crop Prot. 123, 45–58 (2019).

105. Gupta, S., et al. The impact of consuming zinc-biofortified wheat flour on haematological indices of zinc and iron status in adolescent girls in rural Pakistan: a cluster-randomised, double-blind, controlled effectiveness trial. Nutrients, 14 (8), 1657 (2022).

106. Ceballos-Rasgado, M., et al. Acceptability of zinc biofortified wheat and flour among farmers in Pakistan: experiences from the BiZiFED2 project. Proc. Nutr. Soc., 81(OCE5), E178 (2022).

107. Zeller., L. K.. Reductions in inadequate zinc intake with zinc biofortification of rice and wheat. HarvestPlus, International Food Policy Research Institute. Available upon request. (2015).

108. Barker, M. et al. Intervention strategies to improve nutrition and health behaviours before conception. Lancet 391, 1853–1864 (2018).

109. Gittelsohn, J. & Vastine, A. E. Sociocultural and household factors impacting on the selection, allocation and consumption of animal source foods: current knowledge and application. J. Nutr. 133, (2003).

110. Horton, S., Alderman, H. & Rivera, J. A. Copenhagen Consensus 2008 Challenge Paper Malnutrition and Hunger. 2008. https://copenhagenconsensus.com/sites/default/files/CP_Malnutrition_and_Hunger_-_Horton.pdf

111. Meenakshi, J. V. et al. How cost-effective is biofortification in combating micronutrient malnutrition? An ex-ante assessment. World Dev. 38, 64–75 (2010).

112. Birol, E., Asare-Marfo, D. & Fieldler, J. Cost-effectiveness of biofortification. Biofortification Progress Briefs: Progress Brief #25. (2014).

113. Lividini, K., et al. Biofortification: A review of ex-ante models. Glob. Food Sec. 17, 186–195 (2018).

114. Fiedler J, and L. K. An analysis of Rajasthan's iron program portfolio options, 2014-2043. Available upon request. (2015).

115. Fiedler, J. L. & Lividini, K. Managing the vitamin A program portfolio: a case study of Zambia, 2013-2042. Food Nutr. Bull. 35, 105–125 (2014).

116. HarvestPlus. Assessing Bangladesh's zinc program portfolio options, 2013-2042. Available upon request. (2014).

117. Debela, C. & Tola, M. Effect of elevated CO2 and temperature on crop-disease interactions under rapid climate change. Int. J. Environ. Sci. Nat. Resour. 13, 1–7 (2018).

118. Smith, M. R. & Myers, S. S. Impact of anthropogenic CO2 emissions on global human nutrition. Nat. Clim. Chang. 8, 834–839 (2018).

119. Loladze, I. Hidden shift of the ionome of plants exposed to elevated CO2 depletes minerals at the base of human nutrition. Elife 2014, (2014).

120. Nelson, G. et al. Income growth and climate change effects on global nutrition security to mid-century. Nat. Sustain. 1,

HarvestPlus improves nutrition and public health by developing and promoting biofortified food crops that are rich in vitamins and minerals, and providing global leadership on biofortification evidence and technology.

HarvestPlus works across CGIAR as part of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).

HarvestPlus

IFPRI
INTERNATIONAL
FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

CGIAR