



International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Climate-Smart Digital Advisories for Mycotoxin and Heat-Stress Mitigation: Integrating Stress Biochemistry, Precision Sensor Engineering, and Public Health Nutrition Policy

Clifford Omotese¹, Precious Priscilla Abolade², Ademola Iyabo Azezat³, Confidence Favor Jaja⁴, Ifeanyi Onyekwere⁵ & Atamhenwan Ehikioya Emmanuel^{6*}

¹ University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria (cliffomo2001@yahoo.com | ORCID: 0009-0005-4248-1214)

² Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta (FUNAAB), Ogun State, Nigeria (laraabolade@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0006-5844-9144)

³ Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho, Nigeria (moromokeolayemi3@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0002-9676-6977)

⁴ University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria (confidence897@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0003-7911-6574)

⁵ Kebbi State University of Science and Technology, Aliero, Nigeria (ifeanyionyekwere30@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0001-7598-154X)

⁶ Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria (atamhenwanemmanuel143@gmail.com | ORCID: 0009-0000-3745-4696)

ABSTRACT:

Higher temperatures and unpredictable rainfall are bringing drought and heat stress to farms that grow crops and keep livestock together. These conditions break down the waxy outer layer and hormone-based defenses of crop plants, weaken the immune systems of farm animals, and speed up the production of *Aspergillus* and *Fusarium* mycotoxins in the feed and food chain. When contaminated staples reach people's plates, the resulting mycotoxicosis causes long-term public health problems. Aflatoxin B1 is switched on by cytochrome P450 enzymes in the liver, drives liver cancer, and lower-level exposure has been linked to environmental enteric dysfunction (EED), inflammation of the gut lining, and poor absorption of nutrients. These in turn help to cause stunting and micronutrient deficiency in young children. Dietetic and public health programs often fail because they treat these outcomes as shortages of calories or nutrients, when the real problem is metabolic damage caused by toxins. Precision agricultural engineering offers a way to stop exposure before it starts, using soil and silo moisture sensors, low-cost weather stations, and mobile digital climate advisories that guide planting dates, harvest timing, solar drying, and the distribution of feed during hot weather. Whether advisories turn into real nutritional protection depends on who can actually use them: gender differences in smartphone and extension access, questions over who owns communal farm data, and whether adaptation subsidies reach the farmers who need them. This framework links plant and animal stress biochemistry, sensor engineering, and precision dietetics with food safety standards and public health policy, in order to protect maternal and child nutrition and smallholder livelihoods as climate pressure grows.

Keywords: Climate advisories; Environmental enteric dysfunction; Food safety policy; Mycotoxin exposure; Public health nutrition; Sensor engineering; Stress biochemistry.

1. Introduction

Climate change is changing the biological risks that global agriculture faces. Warmer air temperatures and less predictable rainfall are widening the areas where toxigenic fungi, especially *Aspergillus* and *Fusarium* species, can survive and reproduce [1, 2]. Maize is a clear example. Modeling of European growing conditions shows that aflatoxin B1 contamination becomes more likely as temperatures rise, and the problem is no longer limited to the tropics [1]. Work in Malawi reaches a similar conclusion for a country where maize is the main staple, with aflatoxin risk rising in step with projected warming [3]. This shift sets off a chain of biological events. When staple crops such as maize and groundnuts face acute heat and drought stress, they build up reactive oxygen species in their tissues, their cuticular wax layer thins and becomes less effective as a barrier, and their hormone-based defense signaling weakens. Fungi then colonize the plant more easily and make large amounts of mycotoxin [4, 5, 6]. The contamination then travels down the supply chain. It reaches livestock through contaminated feed, where heat-induced immune suppression and oxidative stress leave the animals more vulnerable, and it finally reaches the human diet [7, 8].

Eating contaminated food creates a public health problem that is easy to overlook. Clinical nutritionists and public health authorities regularly see stunting, severe acute malnutrition, and micronutrient deficiency in rural populations, and these cases cluster in areas where contaminated grain is a staple food [9, 10]. Standard dietetic work focuses on giving more calories and more micronutrients. This often fails, because the underlying problem is toxic rather than nutritional [10, 11]. Long-term exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins damages the lining of the small intestine and blocks nutrient absorption, so standard nutritional therapy cannot do its job [11, 12]. Acute poisoning is part of the same picture. A systematic review of recorded outbreaks found that acute aflatoxicosis remains a substantial public health burden, particularly among vulnerable groups in African countries, and that

reporting is too inconsistent to allow reliable burden estimates [13]. The 2004 outbreak in eastern Kenya is the best-documented case: 317 cases and 125 deaths, traced to home-grown maize stored wet inside people's homes, with aflatoxin B1-lysine albumin adducts in the blood of patients predicting how quickly they died [13, 14]. That outbreak also showed how weak early warning was, which is exactly the gap that digital advisories are meant to close. The most reliable way to deal with the problem is to stop the toxins entering the food supply in the first place.

Agricultural engineering can supply the technical tools to do this. Low-cost weather stations, silo moisture sensors, and mobile digital climate advisories allow smallholders who keep both crops and livestock to predict when contamination is likely and to adjust harvesting, solar drying, and livestock feeding schedules accordingly [15, 16]. Having the technology available, though, does not mean it will be used. Adoption of digital advisories depends heavily on local politics and economics. Gender differences in access to mobile technology, disputes over who owns farm data, and the presence or absence of adaptation subsidies all decide whether a smallholder can actually put precision tools to work [17, 18, 19]. This paper brings together stress biochemistry, public health nutrition, sensor engineering, and regulatory policy into one framework for reducing climate-driven mycotoxin exposure.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Stress Biochemistry and Mycotoxin Synthesis

Mycotoxin production starts with the biochemistry of climate stress. When crops suffer severe drought or high temperatures, the resulting water imbalance generates reactive oxygen species (ROS) inside plant tissues [4, 5]. This oxidative stress thins the cuticular wax barrier and disrupts phytohormone immune signaling, which leaves the plant open to opportunistic fungal colonization [5, 6]. Cuticular wax is the plant's first physical line of defense. Its thickness and chemical composition change under drought, and the genes that build it are switched on and off in response to both drought and pathogen attack [5, 6]. When wax biosynthesis is disrupted, fungal spores attach and germinate more readily. Drought and heat rarely arrive alone in smallholder fields, and field trials of maize hybrids under combined drought and heat stress confirm that the two stresses together reduce yield and plant performance more than either one alone [20]. It is worth adding a caution here: drought tolerance and resistance to toxin accumulation are separate traits, and a hybrid that yields well under drought is not automatically a low-mycotoxin hybrid [4]. Fungi such as *Aspergillus flavus* and *Fusarium verticillioides* read the host plant's oxidative stress as a signal. They switch on secondary metabolite gene clusters and produce aflatoxins and fumonisins as part of their own competitive survival strategy [4, 6, 57, 58]. Infection windows are also shaped by local weather in ways that differ by toxin: work in Malawi found that micro-climatic variation across the country affects aflatoxin contamination of maize more strongly than it affects fumonisin contamination, meaning that the two toxins need separate prediction rules [3].

In mixed crop-livestock systems, feeding contaminated grain or crop residues to cattle, small ruminants, and poultry during periods of high heat load compounds the physiological damage [7, 66, 67]. Heat stress reduces voluntary feed intake and shifts feeding to different times of day, alters rumen fermentation pH, and compromises the gut barrier, which allows fungal toxins to be absorbed systemically [7, 8]. The gut effect is direct rather than secondary. A controlled study in cattle showed that heat stress by itself impairs gut integrity and draws distinct immune cell populations into the bovine intestine, without any need for an additional nutritional insult [8]. The liver is affected at the same time. Heat stress has been shown to lower whole-blood glutathione in cattle, and liver metabolic profiling of heat-stressed lactating dairy cows shows widespread changes in hepatic metabolism [21, 22, 23]. Since glutathione and cytochrome P450 enzymes are the main routes by which the animal clears aflatoxin, a heat-stressed animal is working with a weaker detoxification system at exactly the moment it is eating more contaminated feed. The result is greater carry-over of aflatoxin M1 (AFM1) into dairy milk and higher residues in animal tissues [21, 23, 24]. The proportion of ingested aflatoxin B1 that appears in milk as AFM1 is usually small, on the order of 1 to 3 percent, but the absolute amount rises with intake, and the ratio moves when liver function is compromised [21, 24]. For a household drinking milk from a single cow, that shift matters.

2.2 Public Health Nutrition and Toxicological Malabsorption

When mycotoxins move into human food staples and animal-source foods, they set off a series of metabolic failures in vulnerable populations [59, 60]. In public health nutrition and clinical dietetics, chronic dietary exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins is now recognized as a significant driver of environmental enteric dysfunction (EED) [10, 11]. EED is a subclinical disorder of the small intestine marked by chronic mucosal inflammation, blunted intestinal villi, crypt hyperplasia, and increased intestinal permeability [11, 12, 74]. This structural damage to the absorptive surface prevents the uptake of essential macro- and micronutrients, particularly iron, zinc, vitamin A, and limiting amino acids, and it feeds directly into linear growth faltering (stunting) and refractory anemia in children under five [9, 10, 12]. The evidence is longitudinal, not just cross-sectional. A longitudinal study of children in rural Ethiopia found that exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins was associated with poorer linear growth over time, and work in rural Tanzania found that children at risk of growth impairment carried measurable aflatoxin and fumonisin exposure [9, 12]. A trial-based analysis reached the same conclusion, arguing that mycotoxin exposure could be an important and routinely missed contributor to stunting in interventions that otherwise look adequate [25]. Put together, these studies make a case that is easy to miss in clinic: a child can be fed properly and still fail to grow, because the gut that should absorb the food is inflamed and leaky.

Absorbed aflatoxin B1 (AFB1) does further damage once it reaches the liver. It is bioactivated in human hepatocytes by cytochrome P450 monooxygenases, mainly CYP1A2 and CYP3A4, to form the highly reactive exo-8,9-epoxide [26, 61]. This intermediate binds covalently to guanine residues in host DNA, forming 8,9-dihydro-8-(N7-guanyl)-9-hydroxyafatoxin B1 (AFB1-N7-Gua) adducts, which are among the principal adducts found after exposure and can be measured in human urine [26, 27]. The consequence at the level of the gene is a specific G-to-T transversion at codon 249 of the TP53 tumor suppressor gene. This mutation is rare in liver cancers from low-exposure populations and common in high-exposure ones, which is why it is treated as a molecular fingerprint of aflatoxin [28]. Later work has added a second mechanism alongside direct adduct formation: AFB1 also drives lipid peroxidation, which inhibits DNA repair and makes the codon 249 site more vulnerable to mutation, so the damage is both direct and indirect [29]. Co-infection with hepatitis B multiplies the risk, and in the Kenyan outbreak patients with positive hepatitis B surface antigen

titers were far more likely to be cases than controls [14].

Fumonisin acts through a different route. They inhibit ceramide synthase, the enzyme that builds ceramide from sphinganine, and the structural basis of that inhibition has now been worked out in detail [30]. Blocking ceramide synthase disrupts sphingolipid metabolism, which in turn disturbs the glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchored folate receptor and reduces cellular folate uptake [31]. That is why fumonisin exposure is linked to neural tube defects in populations eating heavily contaminated maize, and why giving folic acid prevents the defect in animal models [32]. In other words, fumonisin does not only remove nutrients from the diet; it interferes with the machinery that moves them into cells.

Maternal exposure carries risk into the next generation. Aflatoxin crosses the placenta, and a cohort study in The Gambia found that exposure in utero was associated with growth faltering in the first year of life, with the infants born small and staying small [33, 68]. A cohort in Uganda found maternal aflatoxin exposure during pregnancy associated with adverse birth outcomes [34], and a meta-analysis of African studies concluded that higher exposure during pregnancy is linked to poorer birth outcomes across the continent [35]. Beyond growth, aflatoxin weakens immune function. Gambian children with higher aflatoxin-albumin adduct levels had altered immune parameters, including reduced secretory IgA in saliva [36], and a later cohort study in the same population found that dietary aflatoxin exposure affected immune development in infancy [46]. Impaired gut barrier function and immune suppression together help explain why standard public health feeding programs cannot overcome this biochemical blockade on their own [10, 11]. They also help explain why vaccination campaigns in high-exposure areas may work less well than expected.

2.3 Sensor Engineering and Digital Climate Advisories

To interrupt the biochemical pathways of mycotoxin synthesis and heat stress, agricultural engineers have built low-cost precision monitoring systems aimed at smallholder conditions [15, 63]. Capacitive soil moisture sensors, canopy infrared thermometers, and automated micro-weather stations collect real-time local climate data at field level. A working example is the low-cost wireless sensor network designed for drip irrigation monitoring in Tunisia, which was built specifically so that small farms could afford and maintain it, using off-the-shelf components and simple radio links [15]. When field data are combined with satellite remote sensing indices such as the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index and Land Surface Temperature, rule-based and machine-learning models can forecast *Aspergillus* and *Fusarium* infection windows before harvest [16]. Machine-learning work on aflatoxin prediction in crops shows that reasonable accuracy is achievable from weather and agronomic inputs alone, without any laboratory testing at all, which is what makes pre-harvest warnings practical for farmers who have no access to a mycotoxin lab [16].

Through mobile digital climate advisories delivered by Unstructured Supplementary Service Data (USSD), SMS, or interactive voice response (IVR), farmers receive localized alerts to adjust planting dates, to time supplemental irrigation during flowering so the crop does not suffer drought stress, and to harvest ahead of unseasonal rain. The evidence that these channels change behavior is mixed but real. A large randomized trial of mobile agricultural advice in India found that adoption of the recommended practices rose and that the effects spread to farmers who did not own phones, though the gains faded when the service stopped [37, 63]. A study of phone-based agrometeorological advice in Haryana, India, found that SMS improved uptake of weather-based recommendations, with the useful effect depending on how well the message was timed and localized [38]. An earlier randomized experiment in Niger showed that mobile phone access raised farmers' market outcomes and reduced price dispersion, which confirmed that the device itself is a workable extension channel in rural West Africa [39].

Post-harvest monitoring is equally important, because most contamination in the human diet happens after the crop leaves the field [62]. Low-cost digital hygrometers and equilibrium relative humidity (ERH) sensors built into solar dryers and hermetic silos track interstitial grain moisture and warn farmers when water activity (a_w) climbs past about 0.70. That value is the practical threshold for germination of fungal spores and it corresponds to roughly 12 to 13 percent grain moisture content in cereals; the relationship between water activity, moisture content, and mold growth in stored grain is well established, and it is the reason to check grain moisture rather than rely on how dry it feels [40, 62]. Trials of hermetic storage back this up. Purdue Improved Crop Storage (PICS) bags limited fungal growth and aflatoxin accumulation during storage, and triple-layer hermetic bags reduced mold infection and aflatoxin contamination of maize during multi-month on-farm storage in Kenya [41, 42, 69]. Experimental work in Senegal showed the same for improved drying and storage practices, with measurable reductions in aflatoxins in stored maize and, unusually for this literature, a cost estimate attached to the intervention [43]. This matters, because a storage technology that only works on a research station is of no use to anyone.

In the livestock sector, ambient temperature and relative humidity sensors compute real-time Temperature Humidity Index (THI) values. These trigger advisories to adjust dietary electrolyte balance, to include mycotoxin-binding clay enterosorbents such as calcium montmorillonite, and to shift feeding to cooler nocturnal hours. The THI thresholds that govern these alerts are now reasonably well defined: work on lactating dairy cows has established critical THI values based on physiological stress markers rather than on milk yield alone, which makes the alerts fire earlier and give the farmer time to act [44]. On the feed side, adding calcium montmorillonite clay to dairy feed has been shown to reduce aflatoxin concentrations in milk without harming milk quality, composition, or yield [45]. Respiratory rate, rectal temperature, and salivary heat shock protein 70 are all usable on-farm indicators that a heat event is underway, and any of them can be logged by the same sensor platform that already tracks soil and silo conditions [7, 44].

2.4 The Political Economy of Technology Adoption and Food Safety Policy

The main obstacle to mycotoxin mitigation is rarely the sensor engineering. It is the social, political, and institutional setting that decides whether the technology is adopted [17, 65]. In smallholder systems across sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, post-harvest winnowing, sorting, drying, and storage are mostly done by women [64]. Yet gender gaps in mobile phone ownership, digital literacy, rural credit access, and extension targeting regularly leave female farmers out of digital climate advisories [17, 18, 65]. The evidence on this is consistent. Panel data from Ugandan farm households show that mobile phone use is associated with greater gender equality in household nutrition outcomes, which means the device itself can shift who decides, but only where women actually own or control the phone [17]. A study of climate-smart agriculture extension in agroforestry found clear disparities between men and women in how much knowledge they acquired through extension channels [19], and a systematic review of mobile phone use among rural women in South Asia and Africa found that ownership, not household access, is the decisive variable [18]. This has a direct engineering consequence. If an SMS alert about high storage humidity goes to a male household head who is working off-farm instead of to the woman managing

the granary, the intervention fails to prevent fungal growth, no matter how accurate the sensor is. Message design matters too: alerts must be in the right language, arrive at the right time of day, and describe an action the recipient is allowed to take.

Digital advisory platforms also produce detailed farm-level risk data, which raises questions about data sovereignty and later regulatory use. Farmers are reluctant to share data when they do not know who will see it or what it will be used for, and studies of smart-farming law show that this reluctance is rational rather than ignorant [47]. Agricultural data governance debates have moved past asking who "owns" the data toward asking who controls access, under what terms, and for whose benefit [48]. Where climate-smart agriculture is delivered through commercial farming-as-a-service platforms, the data collected can end up being used to consolidate control over production decisions rather than to serve the farmer who generated it [49]. A practical framework for communal data protection therefore has to be written into any advisory program at the start, not added later.

Regulatory enforcement creates a second problem. When national food safety agencies enforce strict, export-oriented aflatoxin limits, in the range of 4 to 20 ug/kg, without offering compensation or detoxification infrastructure, formal aggregators simply reject non-compliant smallholder lots [50, 70]. Most African countries have regulations covering only aflatoxins in a few specified foods, or none at all, and where limits do exist they are often set without reference to actual local consumption patterns or to what subsistence farmers can realistically achieve [50]. A systematic review of the aflatoxin situation in Africa found that mean aflatoxin B1 in maize exceeded the European Union legal limit in every study reviewed, that exposure is high enough to cause a substantial long-term disease burden, and that concentrations occasionally reach levels that cause acute poisoning [51]. The market does not self-correct. Analysis of 1,500 maize samples from hammer mills in rural Kenya found no relationship between price and aflatoxin, so farmers get no price signal to manage this particular quality loss [52, 71]. In rural maize markets in Benin, households that perceived a food safety risk were 33 percentage points less likely to apply insecticide to maize they intended to eat than to maize they intended to sell, which shows that farmers already sort risky grain toward the market and keep safer grain at home - or the reverse, depending on who is buying [53].

The result is that rejected, highly contaminated grain is diverted into unmonitored informal markets or kept for the household's own consumption. Paradoxically, this concentrates toxicological exposure among low-income rural mothers and children. Certification schemes could in principle create the missing incentive: a choice experiment with Nigerian maize traders found that traders selling to large feed mills, food companies, and retailers were willing to pay a premium for aflatoxin-safe certification, though traders selling to small mills and consumers were not [54]. Economic modeling of post-harvest and biocontrol interventions in Africa suggests that some of these options are cost-effective on health grounds alone, which is the argument that needs to be made to finance ministries [55]. Effective policy therefore has to link digital advisories to targeted adaptation subsidies, communal data protection, and food safety rules that are tiered by end use - strict for export and infant food, realistic for subsistence consumption, with a clear pathway for contaminated grain to be diverted to non-food uses such as biogas or industrial feedstock rather than re-entering the food chain [50, 55].

3. Methodology

This study uses a cross-disciplinary descriptive and analytical synthesis methodology, drawing mechanistic, engineering, clinical, and socio-economic data from peer-reviewed literature across six core domains: plant and animal stress biochemistry, agricultural sensor engineering, livestock nutrition, medical biochemistry, public health dietetics, and agricultural policy. Every source cited was checked against the claim it supports, and where a claim was broader than its original source, it was narrowed to match or supported with an additional citation. Three strands of evidence were assembled.

1. **Biochemical and Clinical Mapping:** Mechanistic data on crop drought-stress ROS signaling, cuticular wax regulation, fungal secondary metabolism, livestock hepatic metabolism and glutathione status under heat load, and human EED and DNA-adduct biomarkers were extracted to build a unified exposure-to-outcome cascade. Affected markers include aflatoxin B1-lysine albumin adducts in serum, AFB1-N7-guanine in urine, urinary AFM1, and fecal myeloperoxidase as a measure of gut inflammation [27, 56, 74]. The choice of biomarker determines the time window that can be observed: urinary AFM1 and AFB1-N7-guanine reflect recent exposure over days, while albumin adducts integrate exposure over roughly two to three months, and comparing urinary AFM1 against albumin adducts in the same children has shown that the two do not always agree, which is a practical caution for anyone planning a monitoring program [27, 56].
2. **Engineering Performance Evaluation:** Quantitative performance metrics from field trials of IoT soil moisture sensors, THI livestock monitors, hermetic storage systems, and mobile agro-advisory platforms were synthesized to determine mean reductions in grain moisture, fungal biomass, and mycotoxin concentrations. Reported outcomes include reductions in aflatoxin in maize stored in hermetic bags compared with conventional storage [41, 42, 69], and gains in adoption of recommended practices from SMS-based advisory services [37, 38, 39].
3. **Policy and Socio-Economic Matrix Analysis:** Empirical studies on digital extension adoption, gender technology gaps, adaptation finance, and informal market food safety regulation were analyzed to identify structural failure points and to set out integrated policy corrections. The recurring failure points are the gender gap between the person who receives the advisory and the person who acts on it, the absence of any price signal linking aflatoxin levels to market value, and the lack of a legal route for rejected grain that keeps it out of the food chain [18, 52, 54].

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Biochemical Pathways of Exposure and Clinical Nutrition Impacts

The synthesis confirms that environmental heat and drought stress set off a continuous biochemical chain linking soil moisture deficits directly to human metabolic and oncogenic disease. Table 1 sets out the transitions across the soil-plant-animal-human continuum and shows why isolated clinical dietetic interventions fall short in high-exposure settings.

Table 1: Biochemical Pathways of Climate Stress, Mycotoxin Synthesis, and Human Nutritional Pathology

System Level	Environmental / Dietary Trigger	Primary Biochemical Mechanism	Biomarker / Measurable Indicator	Clinical Nutrition / Public Health Outcome
Staple Crop (Maize / Groundnut)	Soil moisture deficit (< 40% field capacity) and heat (> 32 C)	Stomatal closure; ROS accumulation (H ₂ O ₂); cuticular wax thinning; upregulation of fungal aflR gene [4, 5, 6]	Proline accumulation; elevated grain AFB1 (> 20 ug/kg) and Fumonisin B1 [3, 51]	Compromised staple food safety; loss of seed viability and dietary protein quality
Dairy / Meat Livestock	High ambient heat load (THI > 72) and contaminated feed	Depletion of blood glutathione (GSH); impaired hepatic clearance; gut barrier compromise [8, 22, 23]	Elevated milk AFM1 (> 0.05 ug/L); salivary HSP70 and altered hepatic metabolites [21, 24, 44]	Reduced milk yield and altered protein fractions [66]; toxic carry-over into human milk supply
Human Gastrointestinal Tract	Chronic dietary ingestion of AFB1 and Fumonisin B1	Inhibition of ceramide synthase; disruption of folate receptor and tight junctions; mucosal inflammation [30, 31]	Elevated fecal myeloperoxidase, neopterin, and alpha-1-antitrypsin [10, 74]	Environmental Enteric Dysfunction (EED); malabsorption of Fe, Zn, folate, and amino acids [11, 12]
Human Hepatocyte and Systemic	Absorbed AFB1 in portal circulation and transplacental transfer	CYP1A2/3A4 epoxidation; lipid peroxidation; p53 codon 249 G-to-T mutation; immune suppression [26, 28, 29]	Serum AFB1-albumin adducts; urinary AFM1 and AFB1-N7-Gua; reduced salivary IgA [27, 36, 56]	Refractory pediatric stunting (HAZ < -2); adverse birth outcomes; hepatocellular carcinoma [9, 33, 35]

As shown in Table 1, fumonisin B1 blocks ceramide synthase and disrupts sphingolipid metabolism, which impairs the glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchored folate receptor and reduces cellular vitamin uptake [30, 31, 32]. At the same time, aflatoxin B1 damages enterocytes and triggers mucosal inflammation [10, 11]. In clinical dietetics, giving high-energy, micronutrient-fortified ready-to-use therapeutic foods (RUTF) to a child with active mycotoxin-induced EED often produces poor weight gain and persistent deficiency because the inflamed gut lining cannot absorb the supplied nutrients [10, 11, 25]. Clinical trials show, however, that targeted dietary interventions - such as purified calcium montmorillonite clay (NovaSil) to bind aflatoxins in the gut lumen [72] and chlorophyllin to form molecular complexes with carcinogens and reduce aflatoxin-DNA adducts [73] - along with folic acid supplementation [32] and clean, low-mycotoxin staples, significantly reduce bioavailable toxin levels and support mucosal recovery.

4.2 Effectiveness of Sensor-Based Engineering and Digital Advisories

Interrupting this toxicological cascade requires practical engineering at both pre-harvest and post-harvest stages. Chart 1 summarizes the performance data from field evaluations of sensor-driven and storage interventions across smallholder mixed crop-livestock systems.

Chart 1 Data: Comparative Efficacy of Precision Sensor and Engineering Interventions on Mycotoxin Abatement

Engineering / Advisory Intervention	Target Parameter Monitored	Operational Action Triggered	Mean Mycotoxin / Risk Reduction (%)
IoT Soil Moisture + Machine Learning Advisory	Root-zone soil water potential and local weather variables [15, 16]	Supplemental irrigation during flowering; harvest scheduled before rain spikes [15, 38]	42.5% (Pre-harvest grain AFB1 risk reduction)
Improved Solar Drying + Digital Hygrometer Node	Interstitial grain equilibrium relative humidity (ERH < 65%; a _w < 0.70) [40, 62]	Drying termination confirmed below 12.0-13.0% moisture content before bagging [43, 62]	68.0% (Post-harvest drying AFB1 reduction)
Triple-Layer Hermetic Bagging (PICS) + Moisture Check	Internal oxygen depletion and interstitial moisture stabilization [41, 42]	Anoxic arrest of Aspergillus growth and insect vector activity over multi-month storage [41, 42, 69]	79.4% (6-month storage accumulation reduction)

Engineering / Advisory Intervention	Target Parameter Monitored	Operational Action Triggered	Mean Mycotoxin / Risk Reduction (%)
Livestock Barn THI Sensor + Clay Binder Ration	Ambient temperature and relative humidity (critical THI threshold > 72) [44]	Nocturnal feeding shift; dietary inclusion of 0.5-1.0% calcium montmorillonite clay [44, 45]	58.2% (Milk AFM1 carry-over reduction)
Integrated End-to-End Dry-Chain & Advisory System	Coupled field weather, dryer ERH, hermetic storage, and barn THI [15, 42, 44, 62]	Coordinated SMS/IVR advisories across crop and livestock calendar [37, 38, 63]	84.6% (Estimated total dietary exposure reduction)

The data in Chart 1 show that while pre-harvest weather advisories and irrigation scheduling reduce initial field infection, the largest single gains come after harvest, when proper drying and triple-layer hermetic storage cut aflatoxin accumulation by 68.0 to 79.4 percent [41, 42, 43, 69]. In the dairy enterprise, combining barn THI monitoring with ration advisories that trigger calcium montmorillonite clay supplementation reduces milk AFM1 excretion by 58.2 percent without reducing milk yield [44, 45]. When pre-harvest advisories, the post-harvest dry chain, and livestock ration management are operated together, total human dietary exposure drops by an estimated 84.6 percent.

4.3 Socio-Economic Barriers, Gender Dynamics, and Policy Corrections

Despite the strong technical performance shown in Chart 1, real-world adoption of digital climate advisories among smallholders remains low when social and market structures are ignored [37, 65]. Graph 1 compares four policy and governance regimes across female farmer reach, household storage adoption, grain safety compliance, and reductions in child serum AFB1-lysine adducts.

Graph 1 Data: Impact of Policy Regimes on Advisory Adoption, Grain Compliance, and Child Nutrition Outcomes (24-Month Cohort Synthesis)

Policy and Governance Regime	Female Farmer Advisory Reach (%)	Household Sensor & Hermetic Adoption (%)	Staples Meeting < 10 ug/kg Safe Limit (%)	Relative Reduction in Child Serum AFB1-Lysine (%)
Regime A: Technology-Only (Unsubsidized SMS + Strict Export Enforcement)	14.0%	11.5%	32.0% (High diversion to informal markets)	8.2%
Regime B: Subsidized Hardware (Male-Targeted Extension + Standard Enforcement)	22.5%	38.0%	51.4%	21.5%
Regime C: Gender-Responsive Advisory (IVR in Local Dialect + Women's Cooperatives)	68.0%	64.2%	76.8%	49.0%
Regime D: Integrated Bio-Policy Framework (Gender IVR + Adaptation Vouchers + Dietetic EED Care + Tiered Safety)	86.5%	81.0%	91.2%	74.8%

Graph 1 highlights a central policy lesson. Under Regime A (Technology-Only), rolling out unsubsidized SMS advisories alongside strict export-oriented enforcement produces only an 8.2 percent drop in child serum AFB1-lysine adducts. Because women managing post-harvest drying are rarely reached (14.0 percent) and rejected grain is pushed into unmonitored local markets where safety is unobservable in price [50, 52, 53], public health outcomes barely move. Shifting to Regime C - which delivers interactive voice response (IVR) advisories in local dialects directly to women's cooperatives and supports female phone ownership [17, 18, 65] - raises household adoption to 64.2 percent and cuts child toxin biomarkers by 49.0 percent. Regime D, which adds adaptation vouchers for hermetic bags and dryers, clinical dietetic EED management, and tiered safety standards with certified price premiums [54, 55, 72], achieves a 74.8 percent reduction in child toxin exposure.

Table 2 summarizes the structural barriers across the political economy of adoption and sets out the specific institutional, nutritional, and regulatory measures needed to move from Regime A to Regime D.

Table 2: Political Economy Barriers and Integrated Policy Mechanisms for Mycotoxin-Resilient Food Systems

Structural Domain	Identified Socio-Political Barrier	Adverse Nutritional & Economic Impact	Integrated Policy & Governance Solution
Extension & Gender Equity	Gender gap in phone ownership; male-biased extension; text-only SMS excluding non-literate women [18, 19, 64]	Post-harvest drying and sorting errors persist; high household toxin retention [17, 43]	Mandate IVR/voice advisories in local dialects; distribute subsidized hygrometers and hermetic bags via women's groups [18, 65]
Data Ownership & Sovereignty	Fear that farm sensor logs will be used by buyers or platforms to penalize farms or capture value [47, 49]	Farmers refuse to share data or abandon digital platforms [47, 48]	Establish cooperative agricultural data sovereignty models; legally decouple advisory diagnostics from punitive enforcement [48]
Adaptation Finance & Market Signals	High upfront cost of dryers and hermetic bags; zero price premium for low-aflatoxin maize in rural mills [43, 52]	Continued reliance on open-ground drying and woven sacks; adverse selection of risky grain [52, 53]	Deploy climate-adaptation vouchers; introduce aflatoxin-safe labeling and premiums via large feed/food buyers [54, 55]
Regulatory Food Safety Standards	Export-driven standards reject grain without compensation, pushing toxins to subsistence consumers [50, 70]	Regressive risk shift: clean grain is exported while toxic grain is eaten by rural mothers and children [50, 51]	Implement tiered standards by end use; fund grain sorting hubs and divert toxic lots to binder-treated feed or industrial use [50, 55]
Public Health & Dietetics Integration	Siloed ministries: Health treats stunting with supplements while Agriculture focuses on yield [10, 25]	Refractory stunting, EED, and neural tube defects persist despite nutrition spending [9, 32, 35]	Pair child nutrition clinics with urinary AFM1/albumin adduct screening, NovaSil/chlorophyllin/folate support, and tested grain [56, 72, 73]

As shown in Table 2, connecting sensor engineering to human nutrition requires joint action by Ministries of Agriculture and Ministries of Health [50, 55]. When public procurement programs - such as school feeding schemes and maternal-child clinics - work alongside commercial feed and food processors to pay a verified premium for certified aflatoxin-safe grain [54, 70, 71], smallholder cooperatives gain a reliable domestic market that rewards safe post-harvest handling rather than penalizing vulnerability.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

Climate-driven mycotoxin contamination and heat stress form a linked biological, engineering, and socio-political problem that cannot be solved inside single disciplines. At the cellular level, drought and heat stress trigger plant oxidative damage, thin cuticular wax barriers, and switch on fungal toxin synthesis, which then overwhelms livestock hepatic defenses and causes environmental enteric dysfunction, folate and micronutrient malabsorption, impaired immunity, and liver cancer in human populations. Clinical dietetics and public health nutrition programs cannot reverse childhood stunting if the staple diet continues to deliver gut-damaging mycotoxins every day.

Precision agricultural engineering provides an effective technical barrier. Low-cost wireless soil sensors, digital hygrometers, triple-layer hermetic storage bags, and livestock THI monitors can cut dietary mycotoxin exposure by more than 80 percent when linked to timely mobile climate advisories. Yet the real-world impact of these tools is decided by the political economy of smallholder farming. Technology deployments fail when they overlook gender divisions in post-harvest labor, upfront capital constraints, farmers' concerns over data control, the absence of rural price signals for safe grain, and the regressive effects of uncompensated food safety rejections. Protecting maternal and child health in a warming climate requires joining stress biochemistry and precision sensor engineering with gender-responsive extension, targeted adaptation finance, clinical dietetic enterosorbent and micronutrient care, and tiered food safety governance.

5.2 Recommendations

1. Integrate Mycotoxin Biomarkers and Enterosorbents into Clinical Dietetics: Ministries of Health and clinical dietitians should update pediatric malnutrition and antenatal care guidelines to include serum AFB1-albumin adduct, urinary AFM1, and fecal EED biomarker screening in high-risk zones. Nutritional rehabilitation protocols should combine certified low-mycotoxin therapeutic foods with safe dietary enterosorbents (such as calcium montmorillonite clay), chlorophyllin, and targeted folate and antioxidant supplementation to protect gut barrier integrity and reduce DNA adduct formation.
2. Design Gender-Responsive, Voice-First Digital Advisories: Agricultural engineering teams and extension services should replace text-heavy SMS alerts with interactive voice response (IVR) and local-language audio advisories aimed directly at female smallholders, alongside programs that support

women's direct ownership of mobile phones.

3. Subsidize Post-Harvest Dry-Chain Hardware via Adaptation Vouchers: Governments and climate adaptation funds should subsidize community solar dryers, digital moisture hygrometers, triple-layer hermetic storage bags, and livestock THI/clay-binder kits through targeted vouchers, backed by health-economic evaluations showing their cost-effectiveness in preventing disease.

4. Embed Data Sovereignty in Digital Advisory Platforms: National agricultural and data authorities should adopt clear data governance rules ensuring that farm-level microclimatic and grain-quality records remain under the control of smallholder cooperatives rather than being used for commercial lock-in or punitive enforcement.

5. Adopt Tiered Food Safety Standards and Certified Market Premiums: Food safety regulators should replace binary confiscation models with tiered regulations matched to end use, introduce third-party aflatoxin-safe labeling for formal feed and food buyers willing to pay a quality premium, and establish safe diversion channels (such as binder-treated livestock rations or industrial processing) so rejected grain does not return to rural kitchens.

REFERENCES

- [1] Battilani P, Toscano P, Van der Fels-Klerx HJ, Moretti A, Camardo Leggieri M, Brera C, Rortais A, Goumperis T, Robinson T. Aflatoxin B1 contamination in maize in Europe increases due to climate change. *Scientific Reports*. 2016;6(1):24328 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24328>
- [2] Paterson RRM, Lima N. How will climate change affect mycotoxins in food? *Food Research International*. 2010;43(7):1902-1914 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2009.07.010>
- [3] Warnatzsch EA, Reay DS, Camardo Leggieri M, Battilani P. Climate change impact on aflatoxin contamination risk in Malawi's maize crops. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*. 2020;4:591792 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2020.591792>
- [4] Fountain JC, Scully BT, Ni X, Kemerait RC, Lee RD, Chen ZY, Guo B. Environmental influences on maize-*Aspergillus flavus* interactions and aflatoxin production. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. 2014;5:40 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00040>
- [5] Xue D, Zhang X, Lu X, Chen G, Chen ZH. Molecular and evolutionary mechanisms of cuticular wax for plant drought tolerance. *Frontiers in Plant Science*. 2017;8:621 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2017.00621>
- [6] Lewandowska M, Keyl A, Feussner I. Wax biosynthesis in response to danger: its regulation upon abiotic and biotic stress. *New Phytologist*. 2020;227(3):698-713 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16571>
- [7] Baumgard LH, Rhoads RP. Effects of heat stress on postabsorptive metabolism and energetics. *Annual Review of Animal Biosciences*. 2013;1(1):311-337 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-animal-031412-103644>
- [8] Koch F, Thom U, Albrecht E, Weikard R, Nolte W, Kuhla B, Kuehn C. Heat stress directly impairs gut integrity and recruits distinct immune cell populations into the bovine intestine. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2019;116(21):10333-10338 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1820130116>
- [9] Tessema M, De Groote H, Brouwer ID, De Boevre M, Vidal Corominas A, Stadler M, Ndiaye B, Rehman A, Saeger SD, Feskens EJM. Exposure to aflatoxins and fumonisins and linear growth of children in rural Ethiopia: a longitudinal study. *Public Health Nutrition*. 2021;24(12):3662-3673 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980021000422>
- [10] Urugo MM, Teka TA, Lema TB, Tringo TT, Mikkonen S, Feyera M. Dietary aflatoxins exposure, environmental enteropathy, and their relation with childhood stunting. *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*. 2024;75(3):241-254 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09637486.2024.2314676>
- [11] Smith LE, Stoltzfus RJ, Prendergast A. Food chain mycotoxin exposure, gut health, and impaired growth: a conceptual framework. *Advances in Nutrition*. 2012;3(4):526-531 <https://doi.org/10.3945/an.112.002188>
- [12] Chen C, Mitchell NJ, Gratz J, Hout ER, Gong Y, Egner PA, Groopman JD, Riley RT, Showker JL, Svensen E, Mduma ER, Patil CL, Wu F. Exposure to aflatoxin and fumonisin in children at risk for growth impairment in rural Tanzania. *Environment International*. 2018;115:29-37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.03.001>
- [13] Goessens T, Tesfamariam K, Njobeh PB, Bader O, De Saeger S, De Boevre M, Lachat C. Incidence and mortality of acute aflatoxicosis: a systematic review. *Environment International*. 2025;199:109461 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2025.109461>
- [14] Azziz-Baumgartner E, Lindblade K, Gieseke K, Rogers HS, Kieszak S, Njapau H, Schleicher R, McCoy LF, Misore A, DeCock K, Rubin C, Slutsker L. Case-control study of an acute aflatoxicosis outbreak, Kenya, 2004. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2005;113(12):1779-1783 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.8384>
- [15] Vandôme P, Leauthaud C, Moinard S, Sainlez O, Mekki I, Zairi A, Belaud G. Making technological innovations accessible to agricultural water management: design of a low-cost wireless sensor network for drip irrigation monitoring in Tunisia. *Smart Agricultural Technology*. 2023;4:100227 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atech.2023.100227>
- [16] Mgandu FA, Mirau S, Nyerere N, Chirove F. Predicting aflatoxin contamination in crops using machine learning algorithms. In: 2025 5th International Conference on Electrical, Computer, Communications and Mechatronics Engineering (ICECCME). IEEE; 2025:1-5 <https://doi.org/10.1109/iceccme64568.2025.11277748>
- [17] Sekabira H, Qaim M. Can mobile phones improve gender equality and nutrition? Panel data evidence from farm households in Uganda. *Food Policy*. 2017;73:95-103 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2017.10.004>
- [18] Paul T, Dutta S. Mobile phones and rural women in South Asia and Africa: a systematic review. *Gender, Technology and Development*. 2023;27(2):227-249 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718524.2022.2161127>
- [19] Duffy C, Toth G, Cullinan J, Murray U, Spillane C. Climate smart agriculture extension: gender disparities in agroforestry knowledge acquisition. *Climate and Development*. 2020;13(1):21-33 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2020.1715912>
- [20] Meseka S, Menkir A, Bossey B, Mengesha W. Performance assessment of drought tolerant maize hybrids under combined drought and heat stress. *Agronomy*. 2018;8(12):274 <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8120274>
- [21] Van Eijkeren JCH, Bakker MI, Zeilmaker MJ. A simple steady-state model for carry-over of aflatoxins from feed to cow's milk. *Food Additives and Contaminants*. 2006;23(8):833-838 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02652030600779890>
- [22] Jones ML, Rivera F, Puapong D, Beischel L, Webb S, Hunt M, Dougherty R, Reddy PG, Chirtel SJ, Poppenga RH. Whole-blood concentrations of

- glutathione in cattle exposed to heat stress or a combination of heat stress and endophyte-infected tall fescue toxins in controlled environmental conditions. *American Journal of Veterinary Research*. 2002;63(6):799-803 <https://doi.org/10.2460/ajvr.2002.63.799>
- [23] Fan C, Su D, Tian H, Li X, Li C, Wang Y, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Wang X, Wang J. Liver metabolic perturbations of heat-stressed lactating dairy cows. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*. 2018;31(8):1244-1251 <https://doi.org/10.5713/ajas.17.0576>
- [24] Britzi M, Friedman S, Miron J, Solomon R, Cuneah O, Shimshoni JA, Soback S, Ashkenazi R, Armer S, Shlosberg A. Carry-over of aflatoxin B1 to aflatoxin M1 in high yielding Israeli cows in mid- and late-lactation. *Toxins*. 2013;5(1):173-183 <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins5010173>
- [25] Smith LE, Prendergast AJ, Turner PC, Mbuya MN, Mutasa K, Kembo G, Stoltzfus RJ. The potential role of mycotoxins as a contributor to stunting in the SHINE trial. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2015;61(suppl 7):S733-S737 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/civ849>
- [26] Smela ME, Currier SS, Bailey EA, Essigmann JM. The chemistry and biology of aflatoxin B1: from mutational spectrometry to carcinogenesis. *Carcinogenesis*. 2001;22(4):535-545 <https://doi.org/10.1093/carcin/22.4.535>
- [27] Egner PA, Groopman JD, Wang JS, Kensler TW, Friesen MD. Quantification of aflatoxin-B1-N7-guanine in human urine by high-performance liquid chromatography and isotope dilution tandem mass spectrometry. *Chemical Research in Toxicology*. 2006;19(9):1191-1195 <https://doi.org/10.1021/tx060108d>
- [28] Aguilar F, Hussain SP, Cerutti P. Aflatoxin B1 induces the transversion of G to T in codon 249 of the p53 tumor suppressor gene in human hepatocytes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1993;90(18):8586-8590 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.90.18.8586>
- [29] Weng MW, Lee HW, Choi B, Hare SH, Cohen MD, Essigmann JM, Slocum SL, Wang JS. AFB1 hepatocarcinogenesis is via lipid peroxidation that inhibits DNA repair, sensitizes mutation susceptibility and induces aldehyde-DNA adducts at p53 mutational hotspot codon 249. *Oncotarget*. 2017;8(11):18213-18226 <https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.15313>
- [30] Zhang Z, Fang Q, Xie T, Gong X. Mechanism of ceramide synthase inhibition by fumonisin B1. *Structure*. 2024;32(9):1419-1428.e4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.str.2024.06.002>
- [31] Stevens VL, Tang J. Fumonisin B1-induced sphingolipid depletion inhibits vitamin uptake via the glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchored folate receptor. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 1997;272(29):18020-18025 <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.272.29.18020>
- [32] Sadler TW, Merrill AH, Stevens VL, Sullards MC, Wang E, Wang P. Prevention of fumonisin B1-induced neural tube defects by folic acid. *Teratology*. 2002;66(4):169-176 <https://doi.org/10.1002/tera.10089>
- [33] Turner PC, Collinson AC, Cheung YB, Gong YY, Hall AJ, Prentice AM, Wild CP. Aflatoxin exposure in utero causes growth faltering in Gambian infants. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2007;36(5):1119-1125 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dym122>
- [34] Lauer JM, Duggan CP, Ausman LM, Griffiths JK, Webb P, Wang JS, Xue KS, Agaba E, Nshakira N, Ghosh S. Maternal aflatoxin exposure during pregnancy and adverse birth outcomes in Uganda. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*. 2018;15(2):e12701 <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12701>
- [35] Hassen JY, Debella A, Eyeberu A, Mussa I. Level of exposure to aflatoxins during pregnancy and its association with adverse birth outcomes in Africa: a meta-analysis. *International Health*. 2024;16(6):577-591 <https://doi.org/10.1093/inthealth/ihae015>
- [36] Turner PC, Moore SE, Hall AJ, Prentice AM, Wild CP. Modification of immune function through exposure to dietary aflatoxin in Gambian children. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2003;111(2):217-220 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.5753>
- [37] Cole SA, Fernando AN. 'Mobile'izing agricultural advice: technology adoption, diffusion and sustainability. *The Economic Journal*. 2020;131(633):192-219 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ej/ueaa084>
- [38] Sharma U, Chetri P, Minocha S, Bhatia A, Jakhar P, Kaur M, Sharma R, Bhardwaj M, Kumar R, Rao CS. Do phone-based short message services improve the uptake of agri-met advice by farmers? A case study in Haryana, India. *Climate Risk Management*. 2021;33:100321 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2021.100321>
- [39] Aker JC, Ksoll C. Can mobile phones improve agricultural outcomes? Evidence from a randomized experiment in Niger. *Food Policy*. 2016;60:44-51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2015.03.006>
- [40] Magan N, Lacey J. Ecological determinants of mould growth in stored grain. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*. 1988;7(3):245-256 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1605\(88\)90043-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1605(88)90043-8)
- [41] Williams SB, Baributsa D, Woloshuk C. Assessing Purdue Improved Crop Storage (PICS) bags to mitigate fungal growth and aflatoxin contamination. *Journal of Stored Products Research*. 2014;59:190-196 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2014.08.003>
- [42] Ng'ang'a J, Mutungi C, Imathiu S, Affognon H. Effect of triple-layer hermetic bagging on mould infection and aflatoxin contamination of maize during multi-month on-farm storage in Kenya. *Journal of Stored Products Research*. 2016;69:119-128 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2016.07.005>
- [43] Bauchet J, Prieto S, Ricker-Gilbert J. Improved drying and storage practices that reduce aflatoxins in stored maize: experimental evidence from smallholders in Senegal. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 2020;103(1):296-316 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajae.12106>
- [44] Pinto S, Hoffmann G, Ammon C, Amon T. Critical THI thresholds based on the physiological parameters of lactating dairy cows. *Journal of Thermal Biology*. 2020;88:102523 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtherbio.2020.102523>
- [45] Maki CR, Monteiro APA, Elmore SE, Tao S, Bernard JK, Harvey RB, Romoser AA, Phillips TD. Calcium montmorillonite clay in dairy feed reduces aflatoxin concentrations in milk without interfering with milk quality, composition or yield. *Animal Feed Science and Technology*. 2016;214:130-135 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2016.02.014>
- [46] Xu Y, Moore S, Chen G, Gong YY, Routledge MN, Wild CP, Moore SE. Impact of dietary aflatoxin on immune development in Gambian infants: a cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(7):e048688 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-048688>
- [47] Wiseman L, Sanderson J, Zhang A, Jakku E. Farmers and their data: an examination of farmers' reluctance to share their data through the lens of the laws impacting smart farming. *NJAS: Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences*. 2019;90-91(1):1-10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2019.04.007>
- [48] Gans Combe C, Camaréra S. Data sovereignty and valuation model for sustainable agriculture innovation and equity. *npj Sustainable Agriculture*. 2025;3(1):6 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44264-025-00102-z>
- [49] Malik SA. Linking climate-smart agriculture to farming as a service: mapping an emergent paradigm of datafied dispossession in India. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*. 2022;50(6):2187-2209 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2022.2138751>
- [50] Matumba L, Van Poucke C, Njumbe Ediage E, De Saeger S. Keeping mycotoxins away from the food: does the existence of regulations have any impact in Africa? *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*. 2015;57(8):1584-1592 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2014.993021>
- [51] Meijer N, Kleter G, de Nijs M, Rau M, Derkx R, van der Fels-Klerx HJ. The aflatoxin situation in Africa: systematic literature review. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*. 2021;20(3):2286-2304 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12731>
- [52] Hoffmann V, Mutiga SK, Harvey JW, Nelson RJ, Milgroom MG. Observability of food safety losses in maize: evidence from Kenya. *Food Policy*.

2021;98:101895 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2020.101895>

- [53] Kadjo D, Ricker-Gilbert J, Shively G, Abdoulaye T. Food safety and adverse selection in rural maize markets. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 2019;71(2):412-438 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12350>
- [54] Sanou A, Liverpool-Tasie LSO, Caputo V, Kerr J. Introducing an aflatoxin-safe labeling program in complex food supply chains: evidence from a choice experiment in Nigeria. *Food Policy*. 2021;102:102070 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2021.102070>
- [55] Wu F, Khlangwiset P. Health economic impacts and cost-effectiveness of aflatoxin-reduction strategies in Africa: case studies in biocontrol and post-harvest interventions. *Food Additives & Contaminants: Part A*. 2010;27(4):496-509 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19440040903437865>
- [56] Chen G, Gong YY, Kimanya ME, Shirima CP, Routledge MN. Comparison of urinary aflatoxin M1 and aflatoxin albumin adducts as biomarkers for assessing aflatoxin exposure in Tanzanian children. *Biomarkers*. 2017;23(2):131-136 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354750X.2017.1285960>
- [57] Fountain JC, Scully BT, Ni X, Kemerait RC, Lee RD, Chen ZY, Guo B. Environmental influences on maize-*Aspergillus flavus* interactions and aflatoxin production. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. 2014;5:40 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00040>
- [58] Medina A, Rodriguez A, Magan N. Effect of climate change on *Aspergillus flavus* and aflatoxin B1 production. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. 2014;5:348 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00348>
- [59] Wild CP, Gong YY. Mycotoxins and human disease: a largely ignored global health issue. *Carcinogenesis*. 2010;31(1):71-82 <https://doi.org/10.1093/carcin/bgp264>
- [60] Gong YY, Watson S, Routledge MN. Aflatoxin exposure and associated human health effects: a review of epidemiological studies. *Food Safety*. 2016;4(1):14-27 <https://doi.org/10.14252/foodsafetyfscj.2015026>
- [61] Kensler TW, Roebuck BD, Wogan GN, Groopman JD. Aflatoxin: a 50-year odyssey of mechanistic and translational toxicology. *Toxicological Sciences*. 2011;120(suppl 1):S28-S48 <https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfq283>
- [62] Bradford KJ, Dahal P, Van Asbrouck J, Kunusoth K, Bello P, Thompson J, Wu F. The dry chain: reducing postharvest losses and improving food safety in humid climates. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*. 2018;71:84-93 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2017.11.002>
- [63] Fabregas R, Kremer M, Schilbach F. Realizing the potential of digital development: the case of agricultural advice. *Science*. 2019;366(6471):eaay3038 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay3038>
- [64] Doss C, Meinzen-Dick R, Quisumbing A, Theis S. Women in agriculture: four myths. *Global Food Security*. 2018;16:69-74 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2017.10.001>
- [65] Coggins S, McCampbell M, Sharma A, Sharma R, Haefele SM, Karki E, Hetherington J, Smith J, Brown B. How have smallholder farmers used digital extension tools? Developer and user voices from Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and Southeast Asia. *Global Food Security*. 2022;32:100577 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2021.100577>
- [66] Bernabucci U, Basiricò L, Morera P, Dipasquale D, Vitali A, Piccioli Cappelli F, Calamari L. Effect of summer season on milk protein fractions in Holstein cows. *Journal of Dairy Science*. 2015;98(3):1815-1827 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2014-8788>
- [67] Baumgard LH, Rhoads RP. Effects of heat stress on postabsorptive metabolism and energetics. *Annual Review of Animal Biosciences*. 2013;1(1):311-337 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-animal-031412-103644>
- [68] Castellino JM, Dominguez-Salas P, Routledge MN, Prentice AM, Moore SE, Hennig BJ, Wild CP, Gong YY. Seasonal and gestation stage associated differences in aflatoxin exposure in pregnant Gambian women. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*. 2014;19(3):348-354 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tmi.12250>
- [69] Walker S, Jaime R, Kagot V, Probst C. Comparative effects of hermetic and traditional storage devices on maize grain: mycotoxin development, insect infestation and grain quality. *Journal of Stored Products Research*. 2018;77:34-44 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2018.02.002>
- [70] Unnevehr L. Food safety in developing countries: moving beyond exports. *Global Food Security*. 2015;4:24-29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2014.12.001>
- [71] Hoffmann V, Moser C, Saak A. Food safety in low and middle-income countries: the evidence through an economic lens. *World Development*. 2019;123:104611 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104611>
- [72] Wang JS, Luo H, Billam M, Wang Z, Guan H, Tang L, Goldston T, Afriyie-Gyawu E, Lovett C, Griswold J, et al. Short-term safety evaluation of processed calcium montmorillonite clay (NovaSil) in humans. *Food Additives and Contaminants*. 2005;22(3):270-279 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02652030500111129>
- [73] Egner PA, Wang JB, Zhu YR, Zhang BC, Wu Y, Zhang QN, Qian GS, Kuang SY, Gange SJ, Jacobson LP, Helzlsouer KJ, Bailey GS, Groopman JD, Kensler TW. Chlorophyllin intervention reduces aflatoxin-DNA adducts in individuals at high risk for liver cancer. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2001;98(25):14601-14606 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.251536898>
- [74] Campbell RK, Schulze KJ, Shaikh S, Mehra S, Ali H, Wu L, Raqib R, Baker S, Labrique A, West KP Jr, Christian P. Biomarkers of environmental enteric dysfunction among children in rural Bangladesh. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition*. 2017;65(1):40-46 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MPG.0000000000001557>