Protein from Hydrogen: The Scientific and Regulatory Threshold for Gas-Fermented Biomass

An expanded examination of EFSA's November 2026 Xanthobacter assessment: digestible amino acids, endotoxins, gastrointestinal biology, allergenicity, fermentation engineering, life-cycle evidence and global regulatory routes

José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C)

Abstract

On 9 November 2026, the European Food Safety Authority published its assessment of powdered Xanthobacter sp. SoF1 biomass, a hydrogen-oxidising microbial ingredient developed for use in several food categories. The Panel concluded that the material was safe under the proposed conditions of use, while expressly recognising uncertain allergenic potential and relatively modest protein quality. This combination is more instructive than an uncomplicated innovation success story. It exposes the distance between high protein concentration, nutritional value, microbiological safety and legally authorised market access. This article examines the organism, gas-based cultivation, processing, compositional controls, dietary exposure, toxicology and allergen assessment, then places the findings within European, British, American and other regulatory pathways. It argues that the next competitive frontier in microbial proteins is not merely higher fermentation yield but reproducible evidence linking organism identity, process conditions, nutritional function, contaminant control and intended consumption. A proposed comparative validation programme is outlined as research, not as an established technology.

Keywords: *hydrogen-oxidising bacteria; single-cell protein; Xanthobacter; novel food; protein quality; endotoxins; allergenicity; regulatory science*.

1. A timely decision that is not yet a market authorisation

On 9 November 2026, EFSA published a scientific opinion on powdered Xanthobacter sp. SoF1 biomass following an application by Solar Foods Oy submitted in October 2021. The NDA Panel concluded that the novel food was safe under the proposed conditions of use. The opinion is a scientific assessment, not itself an implementing regulation adding the ingredient to the Union list of authorised novel foods. In the EU, market access depends on the subsequent Commission-led authorisation procedure and the precise conditions ultimately adopted. That distinction matters to ingredient suppliers, formulators and investors: a favourable safety opinion does not eliminate the legal gate between research-grade feasibility and commercial sale [1–3].

The publication arrives alongside a specific EFSA initiative offering pre-submission advice to novel-food SMEs, with expressions of interest due by 18 November 2026. The programme focuses on two unusually consequential points in development: before pivotal studies are commissioned and near dossier completion. Its relevance is methodological. The costliest regulatory mistake often occurs when an otherwise promising ingredient is studied

under a protocol that does not adequately represent the final manufacturing process, specification or exposure scenario [4].

The industrial significance of the SoF1 opinion is therefore broader than one bacterial strain. It offers a contemporary test case for assessing proteins produced from hydrogen and carbon dioxide, and for asking whether the vocabulary of “alternative protein” has obscured differences among microbial biomass, purified proteins and conventional plant ingredients.

2. The organism and the process: a distinct route to edible biomass

2.1 Chemoautotrophy is not conventional sugar fermentation

The organism is a Gram-negative, hydrogen-oxidising bacterium assigned to Xanthobacter sp. SoF1. According to the EFSA assessment, the production process uses carbon dioxide as carbon source, hydrogen as energy source, ammonia as nitrogen source and a mineral nutrient solution under controlled micro-aerobic conditions. This is not simply yeast grown on glucose, nor is it a purified protein expressed in a recombinant host. The edible material is inactivated and processed microbial biomass, containing a broad spectrum of cellular proteins and other constituents [1].

In principle, gas-based fermentation can decouple protein production from some agricultural land and carbohydrate feedstock requirements. That is a plausible systems advantage, not a demonstrated universal sustainability outcome. Hydrogen provenance, electricity carbon intensity, oxygen generation, gas transfer efficiency, reactor utilisation, drying energy, nutrient manufacture and downstream logistics determine the real environmental balance. A lifecycle comparison must use a declared functional unit and transparent boundaries, not a headline about the carbon source.

2.2 Organism identity is part of the safety case

EFSA reports that SoF1 represents a novel species within the genus Xanthobacter and was characterised by whole-genome sequencing and phylogenomic analysis. The strain is deposited in recognised culture collections. A genus name alone was not sufficient for a qualified presumption of safety assessment: the opinion notes that an earlier consideration of Xanthobacter spp. could not progress because species-level identification was lacking. The case illustrates why taxonomic resolution, genomic integrity and production-strain traceability are operational safety controls rather than academic formalities [1].

The dossier addressed antimicrobial resistance and potential virulence-associated sequences. Initial genomic searches identified candidate genes, but updated analysis did not identify antimicrobial-resistance genes above the thresholds applied in EFSA’s assessment. This is an example of iterative evidence development, not proof that genomic screening can replace phenotypic and process controls. The final ingredient was also examined for viable production organisms after heat inactivation. A non-viable product and a harmless organism are different propositions; the dossier must support the former independently of assumptions about the latter.

3. High protein concentration is not equivalent to high nutritional quality

The reported biomass composition was approximately 79.3% protein on a dry-matter basis, with dietary fibre, fat, ash and other components also present. The proposed specification requires at least 73% protein on a dry-matter basis. These figures describe nitrogen-based compositional protein, not the fraction of indispensable amino acids that will be digested and absorbed in a particular food matrix [1].

EFSA expressly described the protein quality as rather low. The Panel nevertheless did not expect the proposed uses to compromise protein nutrition because the ingredient would contribute modestly to overall protein intake

within mixed diets. This distinction is commercially critical. A high-protein powder can be a useful formulation component without being a nutritionally interchangeable substitute for whey, egg, soy isolates or a carefully optimised plant-protein blend.

A manufacturer should distinguish four quantities: total nitrogen-derived protein, true protein, digestible indispensable amino acids and the amino acids available after processing and consumption. Non-protein nitrogen and the choice of nitrogen-to-protein conversion factor can affect compositional estimates. Digestibility can be altered by cell-wall structure, thermal processing, particle disruption and food-matrix interactions. The protein-quality question therefore cannot be answered by proximate analysis alone.

The appropriate research design would include validated amino-acid composition, digestibility and, where justified, an indispensable-amino-acid scoring approach such as DIAAS, with transparent limitations for the chosen model. Protein claims in consumer communications must be evaluated under applicable nutrition-claims rules, independently of whether the ingredient itself has received novel-food authorisation. Nutritional positioning is a separate substantiation exercise.

3.1. A quantitative reading of the EFSA protein data

EFSA reported a mean crude-protein concentration of 79.3 g per 100 g of the dry material, obtained from Kjeldahl nitrogen using the conventional factor of 6.25. That is a compositional result, not a direct measurement of absorbed amino acids. The opinion also describes a conversion factor of 5.5 when estimating true protein from the amino-acid sum relative to total nitrogen. These two conventions answer different questions. Nitrogen in microbial biomass may be distributed among proteins and other nitrogenous constituents, including nucleic acids. Consequently, a label-ready protein figure, a chemically estimated true-protein figure and a physiologically available indispensable-amino-acid supply must not be treated as synonyms. An ingredient developer should report the basis, conversion factor, dry-matter correction and analytical uncertainty for each protein figure. [1]

3.2. Digestible indispensable amino acids and formulation consequences

The reported digestible indispensable amino acid scores were 54% for the powdered biomass and 57% for an extruded form. The limiting component differed: tryptophan in the powder, and sulphur-containing amino acids in the extrudate. These findings are more informative than a single percentage because they identify where nutritional improvement may be possible. They also show why processing does not automatically increase protein quality. A modest increase in one score cannot be extrapolated to all extrusion conditions or matrices. The opinion used a simulated gastrointestinal system and the FAO reference pattern for children aged six months to three years; comparability with other ingredients depends on method, reference pattern and matrix. For formulation, the relevant question is how a realistic inclusion rate changes the digestible indispensable amino acid content of the complete food, not whether the isolated powder can be described as protein-rich. [1]

3.3. Complementarity must be demonstrated in the finished food

Combining proteins can theoretically compensate for limiting amino acids, but the arithmetic is not a substitute for experimental evidence. A formulation using a cereal, legume and microbial ingredient may have a more balanced total amino-acid profile while retaining limited bio-accessibility because of matrix structure, processing damage or interactions with fibre. A robust programme would measure amino-acid composition before and after processing, estimate digestibility under a specified validated method, and then test the finished formulation rather than summing supplier certificates. Specific care is needed when claiming nutritional equivalence to dairy, egg or meat proteins. Such comparisons require consistent serving sizes, digestibility metrics and legally supportable consumer claims. The EFSA safety conclusion does not certify superiority, nutritional interchangeability or suitability as a sole protein source. [1,9]

4. The difficult microbiological questions are not confined to live cells

4.1 Endotoxins and Gram-negative biomass

Because SoF1 is Gram-negative, lipopolysaccharides and their associated endotoxin activity are legitimate characterisation questions. EFSA reports measurements of lipopolysaccharide-related material and additional endotoxin analyses, including results below 32.8 endotoxin units per gram for the additional testing described. The Panel considered the available information sufficient in the context of the proposed food and exposure assessment [1].

These results should not be misread as a universal oral endotoxin threshold applicable to all microbial proteins. Endotoxin assays are method- and matrix-sensitive, and biological interpretation differs sharply between parenteral exposure and ingestion. The relevant question is whether the material, at its intended oral exposure, has a substantiated safety profile. An industrial specification should therefore identify the analytical method, interference controls, acceptance criteria and rationale for monitoring rather than borrow a limit from an unrelated pharmaceutical application.

4.2 Process validation beyond thermal inactivation

The production sequence described to EFSA includes heat inactivation, concentration, pH adjustment, homogenisation and drying. Each step affects different hazards. Thermal inactivation addresses viable cells but does not necessarily eliminate every heat-stable component or process contaminant. Drying improves stability but can introduce its own quality concerns if thermal history, oxygen exposure or water activity are uncontrolled. Scale-up should preserve validated process windows and demonstrate that the commercial product is analytically comparable to material used in pivotal safety studies.

This is especially important in continuous fermentation, where steady-state assumptions can be disrupted by gas-supply variability, contamination, nutrient limitation or biofilm development. A robust control strategy requires upstream strain assurance, calibrated sensors, critical process parameter limits, documented deviations and batch-to-batch compositional comparability. The fact that the underlying metabolism is innovative does not make conventional food-safety engineering optional.

4.3. Endotoxin quantification is an analytical and biological question

The organism is Gram-negative and therefore its envelope biology merits direct examination. EFSA reported lipopolysaccharide measurements across fourteen samples of 0.04–9.57 ng/mg and further endotoxin measurements below 32.8 endotoxin units per gram. These values are not interchangeable without method-specific assumptions: chemical mass and biological activity are different measurands, and assay interference can be matrix dependent. The presence of a cell-envelope component is not equivalent to demonstrating adverse effects from oral consumption at the proposed dose. Conversely, an absence of viable cells does not imply the absence of all microbial constituents. A competent safety dossier should state the analytical method, recovery, limits of quantification, batch variation, biological relevance of the exposure route and why the finished product remains controlled after scale-up. [1]

4.4. Genomic screening, cell-free metabolites and production drift

EFSA describes whole-genome screening and additional tests addressing possible genotoxic metabolites in cell-free fermentation supernatant. This distinction matters because a microorganism can be adequately inactivated while soluble products formed during cultivation persist. The scientific unit of evaluation is therefore the manufactured biomass and its process-associated constituents, not the taxonomic name alone. Continuous cultivation may be stable under validated controls, but a change in feed-gas purity, trace nutrients, oxygen

availability or harvest conditions could alter physiological stress and metabolite production. The proposed control strategy is to define strain identity, genome-monitoring triggers, relevant metabolite screens and representative worst-case batches. Such a strategy should be proportional to demonstrated hazards and should not imply that every uncharacterised compound is toxic. [1]

5. What the toxicology establishes and what it leaves open

In the 90-day oral toxicity study reviewed by EFSA, no adverse effects were identified at doses up to 1,500 mg/kg body weight per day, the highest tested dose. The Panel reported estimated high-percentile intakes under proposed conditions and a lowest margin of exposure of 212, for other children. Its conclusion was that the resulting margins were sufficient in the assessed context [1].

A margin of exposure is the ratio between a toxicological point of departure and an exposure estimate. It is not an intrinsic property of a product, nor a general permission to raise concentrations indefinitely. If intended food categories, serving patterns or maximum inclusion levels change, exposure estimates and the corresponding margins may change. An authorisation dossier therefore needs a defensible consumption model and must distinguish intended from foreseeable cumulative uses.

The opinion also examined gastrointestinal fermentation of the biomass. The reported colonic fermentation generated branched short-chain fatty acids and ammonia, consistent with the material's modest protein quality; a Caco-2 model showed a modest increase in epithelial permeability without cytotoxicity or reduced viability. These observations are not, by themselves, evidence of clinical harm. Equally, they should not be omitted from the nutritional narrative. They identify a plausible translational question: how does the ingredient behave under realistic digestion, colonic fermentation and repeated consumption in different dietary contexts?

Genotoxicity and subchronic toxicity results are important components of a safety dossier, but they do not establish every possible long-term, immunological or nutritional effect. Regulatory science is an assessment of whether the available evidence supports a particular use, not a claim that all uncertainty has been abolished.

5.1. The meaning of a margin of exposure

In the ninety-day study EFSA found no adverse effects up to 1,500 mg/kg body weight per day, the highest dose tested. The opinion reported a lowest margin of exposure of 212 in other children, based on estimated intake under proposed uses. This is a comparison of an experimental reference dose with modelled exposure, not a universal safe dose for any conceivable formulation. It depends on the study material, specifications, target populations and assumed inclusion levels. In particular, the assessment cannot be repurposed to justify unlimited substitution of conventional protein in all food categories. A manufacturer contemplating higher inclusion rates or a substantially different ingredient specification would need to revisit the exposure calculation and determine whether the existing toxicological evidence remains applicable. [1]

5.2. The gut model produces a more nuanced signal than a binary safety label

The opinion reports that fermentation of predigested biomass increased short-chain fatty acids, including acetate, propionate and butyrate, but also branched-chain fatty acids and ammonium associated with proteolytic fermentation. A Caco-2 model showed a modest increase in epithelial permeability without cytotoxicity or loss of cell viability. EFSA judged the observed changes within an acceptable context for the assessed uses. It would nevertheless be scientifically unsound to recast these observations as proof of a prebiotic effect, a harmful microbiome disruption or a clinical outcome. The experimental systems do not establish long-term human gut effects. For future product development, controlled comparisons with conventional proteins at equal digestible-protein doses, together with validated gastrointestinal endpoints, would be more informative than broad microbiome marketing claims. [1]

6. Allergenicity: the most consequential unresolved biological boundary

EFSA concluded that the allergenic potential of the SoF1 biomass is unknown and that cross-reactivity to known allergens cannot be excluded. The applicant performed literature searches, bioinformatics and proteomic analyses. EFSA did not regard a basophil activation test with 50 participants as providing a decisive conclusion. The dossier's sequence and proteomic comparisons identified possible relationships to known allergens; the applicant indicated that cross-reactivity with fish, chicken and yeast allergens could not be excluded [1].

The distinction between sequence homology and clinical allergy is essential. Bioinformatic matches are screening signals, not proof that a person allergic to a named food will react to the novel ingredient. Conversely, the absence of documented reactions during limited commercial experience does not establish absence of risk across populations. The proper industrial response is a risk-based allergen assessment and an accurate account of residual uncertainty, not an invented certainty in either direction.

Formulators should assess possible allergen cross-contact at manufacturing sites, the scope of mandatory allergen labelling, the precise conditions of any eventual novel-food authorisation and whether additional product-specific warnings are required. A supplier specification that simply says "allergen free" would be scientifically difficult to defend without an appropriately defined analytical and regulatory basis.

6.1. Unknown is a defined evidence state, not a finding of allergenicity

EFSA concluded that the allergenic potential remains unknown and that cross-reactivity with known allergens cannot be excluded. The applicant's bioinformatics and proteomic investigations yielded potential homologies, including proteins relevant to fish, chicken and yeast allergen comparisons. Sequence similarity is a screening signal, not clinical proof of cross-reactivity; equally, a lack of published reactions to a relatively unfamiliar food does not establish an absence of risk. The basophil activation study described in the opinion was not considered sufficient to resolve the question. An industrial assessment should distinguish intrinsic sensitisation potential, elicitation in previously sensitised individuals, exposure magnitude and processing effects on protein structure. No single in-silico threshold can settle all four. [1]

6.2. A staged post-market evidence programme

A proportionate research pathway would begin with improved proteomic identification and quantification of proteins implicated by homology searches, followed by scientifically justified targeted immunological experiments and, when ethical and feasible, clinically supervised investigations. Any post-market surveillance must avoid the false reassurance created by passive reporting in a small or poorly characterised exposed population. The denominator matters: without reliable estimates of consumption, absence of reports has limited inferential value. Product traceability, formulation records and adverse-event classification would help interpret any future signal. Regulatory allergen-labelling obligations and voluntary warnings must be assessed for the exact jurisdiction and evidence, rather than assumed from a sequence match. This is a proposed research and governance pathway, not an EFSA-imposed universal testing sequence. [1]

7. Exposure, specifications and the industrial meaning of an EFSA opinion

The application covered uses including cereal bars, fortified waters or protein drinks, dairy alternatives, ice cream analogues and mayonnaise-type products, with maximum levels depending on category. EFSA modelled intake using European consumption data and assessed the resulting exposure. It also reviewed compositional specifications, heavy metals, microbial indicators, stability and commercial-scale batch data. In several instances the Panel revised proposed specification limits to better reflect the production and analytical evidence [1].

This matters because a specification is a safety and identity boundary, not merely a purchasing convenience. The legally relevant product is not “any Xanthobacter powder”. It is a particular inactivated biomass, from a characterised production strain, manufactured through a described process, meeting defined composition and contaminant limits, for defined food uses. Changing the organism, feedstock, processing sequence or maximum use can change the scientific and legal basis of the assessment.

For procurement, the practical file should include strain and manufacturer identity, production-process summary, certificate of analysis, contaminant and microbiological limits, nutritional characterisation, stability, traceability, change-control commitments and applicable legal status. For R&D, formulation trials should assess taste, colour, viscosity, oxidation, protein digestibility, shelf life and compatibility with intended processing conditions. Commercial feasibility depends on sensory and technological performance as well as toxicological acceptance.

7.1. Specifications are part of the safety boundary

EFSA did not simply accept every specification initially proposed by the applicant. The opinion records revisions to proposed limits for composition, contaminants and microbiological indicators, as well as the addition of certain hygiene-related parameters. This matters commercially because an EFSA assessment is anchored to a bounded product definition. Protein concentration, ash, moisture, metals, microbiological criteria and manufacturing process must be considered together. If a producer changes drying conditions or raw-material sourcing and thereby shifts a relevant impurity distribution, meeting a marketing description such as “microbial protein” is not enough. The production specification is a bridge between the evidence submitted and the product that may be placed on the market. [1]

7.2. Stability is not an unrestricted shelf-life guarantee

The applicant proposed twelve months of ambient storage; EFSA considered the submitted evidence sufficient for stability up to eleven months. The dossier also included selected finished-food matrices such as non-dairy cheese, yoghurt, dessert, meat analogues, cereal bars and rice cereals under specific conditions. Those results should not be generalised to every packaging format, water activity, oxygen exposure or thermal history. Commercial validation should define critical quality attributes, including microbiological status, oxidation, sensory changes, protein functionality and relevant nutrient retention. An ingredient can remain microbiologically compliant while losing technological performance in a beverage or extrusion process. Shelf-life claims should be supported by the actual matrix, packaging and distribution conditions. [1]

8. Comparative legal analysis: one ingredient, multiple regulatory routes

European Union and Spain

Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 establishes the EU novel-food framework, with Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2469 governing application requirements and Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2470 establishing the Union list. EFSA conducts the scientific risk assessment, while the European Commission and Member States manage authorisation. Spain applies the directly applicable EU framework, with national and regional authorities participating in controls and enforcement. The 9 November 2026 EFSA opinion is not a substitute for a Commission authorising measure [1–3, 5].

Any eventual Union-list entry must be read for the authorised description, food categories, maximum levels, specifications, labelling and any data-protection provisions. The SoF1 applicant sought protection of proprietary data under Article 26; EFSA reported that certain proprietary data were necessary to reach its conclusion. The

scientific opinion should not be mistaken for the Commission's eventual decision on exclusive reliance or the precise legal scope of market access.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Great Britain has a separate regulated-products and novel-food framework, administered through the Food Standards Agency and Food Standards Scotland with applicable domestic legal provisions. An EFSA safety opinion may be scientifically relevant but does not automatically grant British authorisation. Northern Ireland requires a distinct territorial assessment under the relevant EU-linked arrangements. Exporters should verify the current applicable rules and lists rather than assume that "UK approval" is a single uniform status [6].

United States

US market access requires analysis of the ingredient's intended use under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Depending on the facts, the relevant route may involve food-additive authorisation or a substantiated generally recognised as safe conclusion for specific conditions of use. The FDA's 2026 programme includes proposals to reform GRAS notification; a policy priority or proposed rule must not be represented as already-effective law. Neither an EFSA opinion nor authorisation in Singapore automatically establishes US compliance [7].

Singapore and other jurisdictions

EFSA records that the ingredient has been authorised in Singapore since September 2022. That is useful evidence of regulatory experience but does not replace the receiving jurisdiction's own identity, use, labelling and safety requirements. A global launch strategy should use a common scientific dossier with separate, date-controlled legal modules for each destination market.

8.1. A favourable EFSA opinion is not a Commission authorisation

The legal sequence under Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 distinguishes the scientific safety assessment from the Commission decision to amend the Union list of authorised novel foods under Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2470. At the time of this article, the 9 November opinion is evidence of EFSA's conclusion, not by itself proof that the ingredient may be marketed in the Union. Any authorising measure may define identity, specifications, permitted categories, maximum levels, labelling requirements and conditions related to protected proprietary data. Before launch, operators should check the current Union list and the exact authorising act, rather than relying on headlines or the existence of a favourable scientific opinion. Spain applies the directly applicable Union framework, with national and regional authorities participating in enforcement. [1–3]

8.2. Data protection and freedom to operate are separate

The opinion states that certain proprietary data were necessary for EFSA to reach its conclusion, engaging the data-protection mechanism under Article 26 of the Novel Foods Regulation. This should not be confused with a patent monopoly, ownership of the organism, trade-secret protection or permission for a second manufacturer to rely on the same dossier. A competing producer would need to establish its own legal route, any applicable data-access rights and comparability of its manufactured material. A purchaser likewise should not assume that a generic specification makes two microbial biomasses interchangeable. Regulatory exclusivity, intellectual-property rights, strain access and supply contracts are distinct questions requiring separate diligence. [1,2]

9. Sustainability and economics: the boundaries of the claim

The possibility of converting hydrogen, carbon dioxide and mineral nutrients into edible biomass has strategic appeal for food security, land-use efficiency and supply-chain diversification. Yet a credible comparison with animal or plant protein must use consistent functional units. A kilogram of dry biomass, a kilogram of crude protein and a kilogram of digestible indispensable amino acids are not interchangeable units of nutritional service.

The energy balance is equally decisive. Hydrogen produced with high-emission electricity may erase some anticipated climate benefits; low-carbon electricity may strengthen them. Reactor gas transfer, oxygen management, heat removal, downstream concentration and drying can dominate cost and environmental burden. Industrial economics should be reported through scenarios that vary electricity prices, plant utilisation, gas purity, capital intensity and final protein quality. Claims of universal environmental superiority are not supported by the safety opinion alone.

A further market question concerns value capture. Biomass can be sold as a protein-rich ingredient, but its commercial value also depends on flavour, pigment profile, functionality and consumer acceptance. An ingredient that performs well in a bar may behave differently in a clear beverage, cultured analogue or high-moisture extrudate. Platform versatility should be demonstrated category by category rather than inferred from protein content.

9.1. The hydrogen supply is part of the product footprint

A hydrogen-oxidising fermentation system shifts the resource base away from agricultural sugar but does not eliminate resource requirements. Its environmental profile depends on how hydrogen is produced, the electricity mix, carbon-dioxide source, nitrogen and mineral inputs, process-gas recycling, heat integration, downstream separation and drying. An electrolyser supplied with low-carbon electricity has a different climate profile from hydrogen produced using fossil energy without effective emissions management. A credible life-cycle assessment must identify the functional unit and system boundary, quantify energy and material flows, and avoid counting carbon dioxide consumption as permanent sequestration when carbon is later metabolised by consumers. Claims about land savings, water use or greenhouse-gas reductions must be comparative and scenario-specific. [11,12]

9.2. Gas-transfer engineering and process safety

Gas fermentation requires simultaneous management of hydrogen, oxygen and carbon dioxide availability. Gas–liquid mass transfer, mixing, residence time and dissolved-gas gradients affect both productivity and culture physiology. Hydrogen and oxygen also create an engineering safety problem that must be managed through validated process design, suitable equipment, monitoring and applicable industrial safety standards. No universal optimum gas composition or operating setpoint follows from the published safety opinion; such parameters belong to facility-specific engineering. Scale-up studies should report volumetric productivity, substrate conversion, off-gas composition, energy consumption and batch consistency, while distinguishing pilot performance from commercial operation. A process that is biologically feasible may remain economically uncompetitive if electricity, gas purification or drying dominates cost. [1,11,12]

9.3. A fair nutritional functional unit

Comparing the climate footprint of one kilogram of dry microbial powder with one kilogram of meat, milk or pea isolate may create misleading rankings because moisture, protein content, digestibility and intended function differ. At minimum, comparisons should consider a kilogram of edible product and a kilogram of digestible indispensable amino acid delivered in a realistic food. Technological performance matters as well: an ingredient

that requires extensive texturization, flavour masking or supplementation has additional processing burdens. The purpose is not to prejudge which protein is preferable, but to prevent environmental claims from being detached from the nutrition and function consumers may purchase. [1,12]

10. Research & Innovation Opportunity

A cross-platform benchmark for microbial protein quality and evidence transfer

The emerging research opportunity is not to claim that hydrogen-based protein production or microbial biomass is newly invented. Both have substantial prior literature and industrial development. The narrower unresolved problem is whether a standardised, independently validated evidence framework can compare gas-fermented biomass, other microbial proteins and plant-protein ingredients on a combined basis of nutritional quality, safety, functionality, energy demand and regulatory transferability. The 2026 SoF1 opinion makes the gap unusually visible because a high protein fraction coexists with modest protein quality and unresolved allergenic potential.

A testable hypothesis is that an integrated benchmark using digestible indispensable amino acids, product-specific process performance and uncertainty-weighted safety endpoints will rank candidate ingredients differently from conventional crude-protein-per-kilogram metrics. This is a proposed hypothesis, not an established finding. A defensible project would begin with a systematic review of existing methods and patents, followed by a preregistered comparison of representative commercial and pilot materials.

The first work package would establish common analytical methods: nitrogen and true-protein estimates, amino-acid profiles, validated digestibility measures, microbiological quality, endotoxin-method suitability, contaminant panels and relevant allergen-screening protocols. The second would test food applications under matched processing conditions, including beverage dispersibility, thermal stability, oxidation, texture and sensory performance. The third would construct lifecycle and techno-economic models using transparent electricity and hydrogen scenarios, with uncertainty ranges rather than point estimates.

A fourth work package would map each tested material to the EU, British, US and selected Asian regulatory routes. The key question is which scientific data can be reused, and which remain strain-, process- or use-specific. Blind external review should test whether the framework reduces erroneous claims of equivalence, identifies missing decisive studies earlier and improves the quality of procurement decisions. Failure criteria should include systematic underestimation of allergen uncertainty, misleading protein-quality equivalence and environmental rankings that reverse under realistic energy assumptions.

The industrial output would be a reproducible assessment protocol, benchmark dataset and evidence-gap map. Patentability or freedom to operate would require separate examination; no proprietary invention or validated performance advantage is asserted here. For biotechnology companies, the commercial value would lie in better formulation choices and more defensible market-entry decisions, not in replacing EFSA, FDA or other competent authorities.

10.1. Research question: can process optimisation improve nutritional quality without eroding safety?

The key translational hypothesis is that selected cultivation, cell-disruption and food-processing conditions could improve indispensable-amino-acid bio-accessibility or the nutritional performance of finished formulations without materially increasing process-related hazards. This is a hypothesis, not a demonstrated property of the SoF1 product. An experimental programme should first establish reproducible baseline digestibility, amino-acid availability and analytical composition across industrial batches. It should then compare carefully selected interventions against an unmodified control, measuring not only protein scores but also oxidation, sensory acceptability, microbial constituents and possible changes in allergen-relevant protein profiles. A process that

improves digestibility but increases unwanted residuals or energy demand may not constitute a net innovation. [1,12]

10.2. Study design and predefined failure conditions

A credible multicentre study would include blinded analysis of representative batches, validated analytical methods, matrix-matched controls and external replication. Outcomes should include digestible indispensable amino acids, protein utilisation proxies, selected gastrointestinal fermentation products, finished-food functionality, and batch-to-batch variance. If a clinical nutrition claim is envisaged, appropriate human evidence may be necessary. Failure conditions should be declared in advance: no meaningful improvement over control; improvement confined to one unrepresentative batch; unacceptable sensory deterioration; increased relevant impurities; loss of production reproducibility; or environmental burdens exceeding the benefit under realistic energy assumptions. Regulatory assessment must be revisited if a materially altered process changes the product identity or specification. [1,2,12]

10.3. Industrial opportunity beyond a single branded ingredient

The broader opportunity for ingredient developers, analytical laboratories and research institutions is an independent benchmarking service for emerging microbial proteins. Such a service would compare nutrient availability, safety-relevant manufacturing attributes, food functionality, process economics and jurisdiction-specific market access on a common evidence basis. It should not claim that a particular platform, strain or treatment is superior before controlled testing. Its initial deliverables could be a harmonised testing protocol, reference formulations and a transparent uncertainty framework. Commercial differentiation would then arise from reliable evidence and formulation expertise rather than from an unsupported claim of technological novelty. [1,12]

11. Management implications for ingredient developers and food manufacturers

The most useful strategic lesson is that microbial protein programmes need coordinated ownership across fermentation engineering, analytical chemistry, nutrition, toxicology, regulatory affairs, quality assurance and commercial application development. Treating these as sequential departments creates late-stage surprises: a promising reactor yield may produce an ingredient with weak nutritional positioning, an uncertain allergen story or a narrow legally permitted use.

Before committing to large-scale supply contracts, management should require an evidence map distinguishing what has been demonstrated for the exact commercial material, what has been inferred from related materials and what remains untested. Qualification should connect batch genealogy and process change control to the data used in safety assessment. Customer-facing claims should separate “protein-rich”, “nutritionally high quality”, “sustainable” and “authorised”: each has its own evidentiary and legal test.

For companies supplying functional ingredients, the immediate opportunity is not to imitate one specific fermentation platform. It is to become better at comparing technologies and specifying the properties that matter in real food systems. That includes the ability to tell a customer when a protein is technologically attractive but nutritionally incomplete, when a regulatory opinion does not yet permit marketing, and when an apparently favourable sustainability result depends on assumptions that have not been independently tested.

11.1. A board-level qualification checklist

A purchasing or investment committee should request five connected evidence packages: organism and process identity; controlled product specifications and batch analyses; nutrition and functionality in target matrices; toxicology, allergenicity and exposure justification; and jurisdiction-specific legal status. The documents should

identify which statements are observed facts, which are applicant claims and which are forward-looking assumptions. Procurement should establish whether supply-chain changes trigger requalification. Product developers should calculate the contribution to total dietary protein at proposed inclusion levels, rather than extrapolating from the powder's composition. Legal review should confirm authorisation before commercial sale in each territory. Sustainability teams should require independently reviewable life-cycle assumptions. These are practical governance recommendations, not additional statutory requirements. [1–3,12]

12. Conclusions

The November 2026 EFSA opinion on Xanthobacter sp. SoF1 marks a substantive development in the regulatory assessment of gas-fermented microbial biomass. Its importance is not captured by a single positive safety conclusion. The opinion simultaneously demonstrates the feasibility of a detailed, strain-specific safety assessment, the importance of industrial-scale composition and contaminant control, the limits of crude protein content as a nutritional metric and the persistence of allergen uncertainty.

The defensible path for the industry is to connect organism identity, production process, nutritional performance, oral exposure, toxicology, allergenicity, legal authorisation and application-specific functionality. A shared scientific vocabulary can accelerate development, but it must preserve distinctions between evidence, inference and hypothesis. The future of alternative proteins will be shaped as much by the quality of these connections as by the efficiency of the bioreactor.

References and primary sources

[1] EFSA NDA Panel (2026). Safety of powdered Xanthobacter sp. SoF1 biomass as a novel food pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2015/2283. EFSA Journal. Published 9 November 2026. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10327

[2] Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 on novel foods. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2015/2283/oj

[3] Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2470 establishing the Union list of novel foods. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2017/2470/oj

[4] EFSA (16 September 2026). Call for expressions of interest in EFSA's advice for Novel Food SMEs—2026 edition; deadline 18 November 2026. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/call/call-expressions-interest-efsas-advice-novel-food-smes-2026-edition

[5] Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2469 laying down administrative and scientific requirements for novel food applications. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2017/2469/oj

[6] UK Food Standards Agency. Regulated products guidance; verify current territorial requirements. https://www.food.gov.uk/business-guidance/regulated-products

[7] US Food and Drug Administration. Human Foods Program 2026 Priority Deliverables, including proposed GRAS reform. https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/human-foods-program/human-foods-program-2026-priority-deliverables

[8] EFSA. Novel food topic and recent opinions, including Xanthobacter and other November 2026 assessments. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/novel-food

[9] Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2006/1924/oj

[10] European Commission. Novel food consultation process and status determinations. https://food.ec.europa.eu/food-safety/novel-food/consultation-process-novel-food-status_en

[11] Hydrogen-oxidizing bacteria: A promising contributor to environmental sustainability and resource recycling. Green Carbon 3 (2025), 398–406. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.greenca.2025.02.004

[12] Sharifian, P., et al. (2026). Single-cell proteins: fermentation pathways, nutritional quality and digestibility, and a techno-economic and environmental outlook for sustainable scale-up. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2025.2598807

Evidence note: Numerical findings attributed to EFSA are specific to the evaluated powdered Xanthobacter sp. SoF1 biomass and proposed conditions of use. Engineering, benchmarking and innovation pathways are analytical proposals unless explicitly supported by the cited studies.

Related INTABIOTECH Knowledge Areas: Biotechnology · Functional Ingredients · Nutrition · Food Safety · Regulatory Affairs · Processing Technologies · Sustainability · Emerging Research

© 2026 José M. López. All rights reserved.