ORIGINAL RESEARCH & COMPARATIVE REGULATORY ANALYSIS

The Edible Seed and Its Toxic Twin

What the October 2026 Xuta Dossier Reveals About Genetic Identity, Phorbol-Ester Control and the Limits of Novel-Food Authorisation

José M. López, BSc, MD, PhD, LLD (C)

ABSTRACT

A newly listed EFSA opinion on roasted and ground Xuta kernels, published on 28 October 2026, reopens an unusually instructive question in alternative-protein safety: how can a food business distinguish edible Jatropha curcas from visually indistinguishable toxic material? The answer is not a cultivar name, a heat-treatment claim or a favourable scientific opinion alone. The European Union already authorises narrowly specified hydrothermally treated edible-variety kernels, with extended flour and paste uses introduced in July 2026, but the Union-list conditions require segregation, defined processing and batch-level phorbol-ester testing. Earlier objections to a different traditional-food notification demonstrate why history of consumption cannot replace exposure characterisation. This article integrates plant genetics, analytical chemistry, protein technology, toxicology and comparative food law to examine what evidence actually travels from seed to finished product. It distinguishes the authorised product from newly assessed roasted preparations and proposes a testable, dual-verification approach combining genetic provenance, chemical release testing and process validation.

KEYWORDS: *edible Jatropha; Xuta; phorbol esters; novel foods; plant proteins; analytical validation; genetic traceability; comparative food law*

CATEGORY: Biotechnology & Regulatory Affairs / Emerging Research

SEO SLUG: edible-jatropha-xuta-phorbol-esters-novel-food-safety

META DESCRIPTION: Xuta and edible Jatropha reveal why genetic identity, phorbol-ester testing and EU novel-food authorisation need separate assessment for protein innovation.

INTERNAL TAGS: Novel Foods; Alternative Proteins; Phorbol Esters; Food Safety; Regulatory Affairs; Analytical Chemistry; Traceability; Emerging Research

01 | A timely opinion, but not an automatic market permission

On 28 October 2026, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) listed a scientific opinion entitled ‘Safety of roasted and ground kernels of an edible variety of Jatropha curcas L. (Xuta) as a traditional food from a third country’. Its subject is the use of roasted and ground Xuta in grain-based products and soups, supported by a history of consumption in Mexico. The appearance of that opinion is the immediate news event. The full technical text was not reliably retrievable from the publisher during preparation of this article; consequently, this analysis does not attribute an unverified numerical exposure estimate or final safety conclusion to the October 2026 opinion. The publication's existence and stated scope can be checked against EFSA's current novel-food listing and its DOI record. [1]

That evidentiary restraint is material, not cosmetic. A scientific assessment is not a Commission implementing act, and a traditional-food notification is not interchangeable with an authorisation obtained through the ordinary novel-food route. More importantly, the same plant species already has a different, legally operative Union-list entry. Regulation (EU) 2026/1378, published on 24 June and effective from 14 July 2026, amended the conditions for hydrothermally treated kernels of the edible variety. The regulatory question is therefore not whether ‘Jatropha has been approved’ in the abstract, but which precise preparation, process, applicant, food category and use level are covered by which legal route. [2–5]

02 | One botanical species, two profoundly different risk profiles

Jatropha curcas L. is an oil-rich species of the Euphorbiaceae family, historically investigated for biodiesel and other industrial uses. Certain Mexican provenances have a history of culinary use; many other provenances contain toxic phorbol esters. The commercially dangerous fact is that edible and non-edible forms cannot be reliably distinguished by external appearance. Species identification establishes botanical identity but does not establish the chemical phenotype needed for food safety. EFSA's authorised specification explicitly recognises this phenotypic indistinguishability and requires safeguards against mixing. [2,6,7]

The common adjective ‘non-toxic’ should be read as shorthand for a defined risk profile, not a promise that the raw seed lacks every antinutritional substance. Edible kernels can contain curcin, trypsin inhibitors, lectin activity and phytate, while other hazards may arise from contamination, storage or processing. Conversely, a toxic genotype does not become an edible cultivar simply because one laboratory reports low levels after an extraction. For industrial procurement, the unit of assurance is a specified and traceable food ingredient produced under controlled conditions, not the species name on an invoice. [6–9]

03 | The three regulatory histories that must not be collapsed

The first relevant history is the 2022 traditional-food notification for roasted and ground Xuta. EFSA's technical report of 8 March 2022 raised duly reasoned safety objections. The report cited insufficient intended-use and intake information, uncertainty over possible low residual phorbol esters and the inability to derive an adequate margin of exposure. It did not declare that every edible Jatropha product must always be unsafe; it concluded that the submitted evidence was insufficient for that particular traditional-food route. [4]

The second history is a successful ordinary novel-food dossier. EFSA assessed hydrothermally treated edible kernels in a scientific opinion published in January 2022; the Commission then authorised the specified novel food under Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/965. A subsequent EFSA opinion, published in October 2025, evaluated extensions to flour and paste and increased incorporation levels. The Commission enacted those changes through Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1378. The third history is the newly published October 2026 opinion on roasted and ground Xuta as a traditional food. Until the relevant conclusion and any

subsequent Commission action are checked, its appearance must not be treated as a retroactive extension of the 2022 or July 2026 authorisations. [1–5]

04 | A safety opinion is evidence; the Union list creates the permission

Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 establishes the Union's novel-food framework. Its Article 10 route permits a full application; Articles 14–20 provide a distinct route for traditional foods from third countries, based in part on a documented history of safe food use. Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2468 details the administrative and scientific requirements for the latter. EFSA assesses risk; the European Commission manages the authorisation and amends the Union list under Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2470. Neither a positive scientific opinion nor a food's traditional reputation is itself a substitute for an operative listing. [3,10,11]

The legal precision matters especially when several preparations share a botanical source. Roasting, hydrothermal treatment, defatting, milling, solvent extraction and protein isolation may change composition, residual toxicants, antinutritional activity and intended exposure. A permission covering one form cannot silently be expanded to all the others. Any manufacturer planning a concentrated Jatropha protein ingredient or a new beverage format should first determine whether the exact product and its intended use are within an existing entry, rather than starting with marketing claims about the plant's culinary history.

05 | The July 2026 authorisation is operationally unusually specific

The amended Union-list specification requires kernels from an edible variety, cleaning and dehusking, seed drying, debris removal, mechanical deshelling and hydrothermal treatment above 120 °C for 40 minutes to reduce antinutrients and microbial load. It also requires a segregation system preventing edible/non-edible mixing and analytical phorbol-ester controls on every seed batch after drying and before deshelling. Five laboratory samples taken from each aggregate sample must be tested by a validated UHPLC-UV-MS procedure; only batches in which phorbol esters are undetectable in all five may proceed. Sampling intensity depends on batch size. [2]

The entry specifies phorbol esters at no more than the stated detection-limit threshold of 0.75 micrograms TPA-equivalent per gram of kernel, with the operative requirement that batches are below the method's LOD. It also specifies moisture not exceeding 3%, fat 54–64%, protein 21–32%, fibre 6–10%, lead and cadmium each no more than 0.20 mg/kg, total aflatoxins no more than 4.0 micrograms/kg and defined microbiological criteria. These numbers belong to this particular authorised preparation. They must not be presented as generic safe thresholds for arbitrary Jatropha oils, extracts or feed meals. [2]

06 | The detection-limit paradox: non-detect is not chemical absence

A result reported below the limit of detection (LOD) is a method-specific statement: the analytical procedure did not detect the target under validated conditions. It is not proof of zero molecules, and it is not automatically equivalent to a limit of quantification (LOQ). The statutory requirement is nevertheless operationally meaningful because it defines a testable release gate for the authorised material. The interpretation depends on extraction efficiency, target coverage, calibration, matrix effects, recovery, blank controls and whether the procedure resolves relevant phorbol-ester congeners. [2,6]

A laboratory must not convert a screening result into an unsupported toxicological conclusion. For example, a nominal threshold of 0.75 micrograms/g is equivalent to 0.75 mg/kg, but that unit conversion does not establish the biological potency of a mixture of different congeners. Reporting as 12-O-tetradecanoylphorbol-13-acetate equivalents makes analytical comparison possible under the method; it does not prove that every congener has

identical toxicodynamics. For disputes or supplier qualification, method identity and measurement performance are as important as the printed number.

07 | Genetic markers can strengthen provenance, not replace release chemistry

Genetic work has identified a locus associated with phorbol-ester biosynthesis on linkage group 8, and later research identified SNP markers associated with low-toxicity phenotypes. These findings support marker-assisted breeding and the design of provenance controls. They do not establish that a single SNP assay will classify every commercial accession without error. The published marker associations depend on studied populations, genetic backgrounds and linkage; genotype–phenotype correspondence must be tested in the intended breeding and supply-chain populations. [12,13]

A scientifically credible system could combine authenticated mother-plant records, genetic checks at nursery or harvest level, physical segregation, chain-of-custody records and mandatory chemical testing of the specified seed batches. The first layers reduce the probability of wrong-source material entering production; the final analytical gate detects chemically relevant failure, including inadvertent mixing. Treating genetic verification as a substitute for the legally required phorbol-ester analysis would be both scientifically weak and inconsistent with the present Union-list specification. [2,12,13]

08 | Curcin, lectins and trypsin inhibitors require a different control logic

Curcin is a type-I ribosome-inactivating protein found in Jatropha material, including some edible provenances. Lectin and trypsin-inhibitor activities, as well as phytate, present additional nutritional or safety considerations. These are not the same hazards as lipophilic phorbol esters. In EFSA's 2022 assessment of hydrothermally treated kernels, curcin-related peptide signals were below the method's detection threshold in treated batches, while untreated material showed measurable curcin. A 2025 study involving three Xuta cultivars reported reductions in antinutritional factors following hydrothermal treatment and no genotoxic or mutagenic signals in its specified assays. These findings are product- and method-specific, not a universal certificate for all treatments. [6,8,9]

The distinction is technologically decisive. Heating can reduce the activity of certain protein antinutrients, but it should not be presumed to eliminate chemically different, more heat-stable phorbol esters. The authorised process therefore combines selection and testing for phorbol esters with hydrothermal reduction of other hazards. An industrial team that optimises only the heating step may achieve excellent microbiological or trypsin-inhibitor results while leaving the key cultivar-contamination risk unresolved. [2,8,14]

09 | What the nutritional composition does, and does not establish

The authorised material is predominantly lipid and protein, with a stated protein range of 21–32% and fat range of 54–64%. These are nutritionally interesting values for seeds, snacks and composite foods, but they do not make the material equivalent to a 70–90% protein isolate or guarantee desirable amino-acid digestibility. Processing can alter digestibility, sensory attributes, lipid oxidation and the activity of residual antinutrients. The 2025 experimental work provides an encouraging technical basis for further study, while its findings remain limited to the tested cultivars and treatment conditions. [2,9]

A product developer should quantify true protein content, amino-acid composition, digestibility, oxidation indices, allergenic potential, flavour and textural performance in the intended food matrix. A simple nitrogen-to-protein conversion and a single in-vitro antioxidant test are insufficient to establish nutritional superiority. Likewise, the existence of an authorised seed ingredient does not establish that an extracted protein fraction,

oil or defatted meal shares its legal identity. Such products may have different composition and exposure characteristics and need their own status and safety assessments.

10 | An illustrative exposure calculation—and its limits

Consider a hypothetical food containing 20 g of authorised kernels per 100 g finished product. A 40 g portion would contain 8 g of kernels. If the kernels were at a nominal concentration of 0.75 micrograms TPA-equivalent/g, the arithmetic upper-bound contribution would be 6 micrograms TPA-equivalent per portion. This is an illustrative multiplication, not a measured exposure estimate, not a claim that the legal entry permits that food category, and not a toxicological safety threshold. Actual exposure depends on the legally permitted category, the final concentration, analytical results, consumption distributions, body weight and the toxicological reference point. [2,5]

The exercise reveals why traditional-use evidence and a non-detect certificate answer different questions. History of use may support a pattern of preparation and consumption, but it does not automatically quantify modern high-percentile exposure in an unfamiliar product. Conversely, an analytically low batch does not establish the safety of unlimited intake. A defensible assessment links specific concentration data to the intended use and relevant population, with transparent assumptions and uncertainty ranges.

11 | Sampling is a process-control problem, not a paperwork exercise

The Union-list annex specifies different numbers of incremental samples for different batch masses, including 10 for batches at or below 0.1 tonne, 30 for batches above 0.1 and up to 1 tonne, and 100 for batches above 10 tonnes. It requires separate sampling of sublots in specified larger batches and a minimum aggregate-sample mass of 3.5 kg. These requirements address heterogeneity and the possibility of localised mixing with toxic seeds. A small convenience sample cannot legitimately be treated as a representative substitute for the prescribed sampling design. [2]

In practice, the operator needs an auditable chain from field and seed dryer to aggregate sample, five laboratory subsamples, analytical results, release decision and finished-product genealogy. An AI-assisted dashboard may help flag anomalies or missing records, but it cannot repair a non-representative sampling plan or convert unverified sensor data into chemical evidence. The objective is not merely to trace a rejected batch after the event; it is to prevent a hazardous batch from entering the food process.

12 | The original route and the extended route have different exclusivity

Regulation (EU) 2026/1378 distinguishes the original 2022 conditions from the extended conditions introduced in 2026. The new Article 2 grants the extended uses to Chuta Nut GmbH for five years from 14 July 2026, unless another applicant obtains an independent authorisation without reliance on protected data or acts with the holder's agreement. The annex also identifies the original 2022 data-protection period ending on 12 July 2027. A distributor must not mistake the approaching end of one period for the immediate availability of every later extension. [2]

This is a concrete market-access issue. A technically equivalent ingredient can still face protected-data or authorisation restrictions, depending on the intended use and legal basis. Conversely, data protection is not a perpetual monopoly over the plant species: a subsequent applicant can pursue an authorisation supported by lawfully obtained independent evidence. Commercial diligence should therefore examine the specific entry, its protected uses, the identity of the authorised operator, the contemplated food category and the date of sale.

13 | Spain: direct EU law, national controls and defensible documentation

The Union novel-food rules and implementing authorisations apply directly in Spain. The European Commission is responsible for the Union-list decision, EFSA provides scientific risk assessment, and Spanish competent authorities -including AESAN within its coordination remit and the relevant regional authorities- participate in official control under the applicable food-law framework. Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 continues to impose food-safety and traceability duties; Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 governs hygiene; and Regulation (EU) 2017/625 provides the framework for official controls. [3,15–17]

An importer or ingredient manufacturer should retain the botanical and cultivar dossier, supplier authorisation evidence, applicable Union-list entry, validated phorbol-ester analyses, segregation and sampling records, hydrothermal process data, contaminant results and label review. If a supplier offers ‘food-grade Jatropha protein’ without identifying the legal form, process and protected authorisation conditions, the correct response is not to infer permission from the seed's protein content. It is to request the exact regulatory and analytical dossier before commercial commitments.

14 | Great Britain and Northern Ireland: one kingdom, distinct legal questions

Great Britain operates a separate regulated-products system for novel foods. The Food Standards Agency maintains a register of authorised novel foods, with authorisations determined by the relevant ministers; Food Standards Scotland participates in the Scottish system. Its guidance recognises both full applications and traditional-food notifications. A post-Brexit EU implementing act is not automatically a new GB authorisation merely because the scientific dossier was evaluated by EFSA. The destination-specific GB register and any relevant current alignment arrangements must be checked at the date of sale. [18,19]

Northern Ireland must be considered separately under the applicable EU-linked food-law arrangements and movement rules. A company selling from Spain to both GB and Northern Ireland cannot rely on a single undifferentiated statement that the product is ‘UK-approved’. A regulatory matrix should record the exact territory, legal route, register entry, use category, maximum inclusion, labelling and any protected-data limitations.

15 | The United States: the warning remains highly relevant

The US Food and Drug Administration issued an industry notification in July 2012, updated in April 2014, warning that Jatropha-derived oils, glycerin and proteins can contain toxic constituents and may enter overlapping food, feed and industrial supply chains. The agency recommended supply-chain auditing, compositional verification and risk assessment. That warning is not a US authorisation for edible Xuta, nor does an EU authorisation displace US food-additive, GRAS, dietary-supplement or feed rules for a specific intended use. [20,21]

The comparative lesson is not that one jurisdiction is necessarily more permissive. The EU has a detailed authorisation for a defined hydrothermally treated edible cultivar and a distinct history of concern about a traditional preparation; the FDA has emphasised cross-sector contamination risks. A US importer would need an independent lawful route and a robust safety dossier for its actual product. An EU certificate alone cannot resolve the US regulatory question.

16 | Feed and the biodiesel supply chain are adjacent, not interchangeable

Jatropha attracted attention as a biofuel crop because its seeds are oil-rich, but fuel-oriented processing creates glycerin, meal and other streams that are not automatically suitable for food or animal feed. Research has investigated detoxification and animal feeding of Jatropha meal, yet study-specific reductions in phorbol

esters cannot be generalised to all commercial coproducts. Feed authorisation and safety requirements are distinct from human novel-food permissions. [20–23]

The supply-chain boundary matters for both accidental substitution and commercial temptation. A food-grade edible-cultivar programme should have dedicated identity preservation, segregated storage, change-control procedures and supplier audits capable of distinguishing it from industrial Jatropha flows. No food or feed claim should be based merely on the fact that a solvent or thermal process has been described in a patent or a laboratory paper.

17 | Patent disclosures show the problem is established; integration may still improve practice

Patent publications have long described detoxification of phorbol esters and Jatropha meal, including WO2013137822A1 and US20110311710A1. Genetic mapping and marker-assisted breeding research also predates 2026. These records rule out a credible claim that detoxification, genetic discrimination or batch testing was invented by the present article. Patent disclosures are evidence of proposed technical approaches, not proof of commercial validation, regulatory acceptance or freedom to operate. [12,13,22,23]

The potentially useful research gap lies instead in validated integration: can independent genetic provenance checks, legally required chemistry, representative sampling and processing records reduce false acceptance, unnecessary rejection and investigative delay? A meaningful contribution would be a demonstrably more reliable qualification protocol, not another broad promise of ‘detoxified plant protein’. Any protectability assessment would require a separate claims-level search, legal-status review and jurisdiction-specific freedom-to-operate analysis.

18 | Research & Innovation Opportunity

UNRESOLVED PROBLEM. The edible and toxic phenotypes are difficult to separate visually, while chemical testing of heterogeneous seed batches is costly and vulnerable to sampling errors. Genetic markers are informative but imperfect; heat treatment targets different hazards; and the legal authorisation ties these controls to a defined product and process. Industry lacks widely published, prospective multi-site evidence showing the incremental value of combining these evidence streams in one auditable release system. [2,12,13]

WHAT IS ESTABLISHED. The 2026 Union-list entry already mandates seed-batch phorbol-ester testing and process controls. Published genetic studies identify toxicity-associated loci and markers; peer-reviewed work documents hydrothermal reductions in selected antinutrients; prior patents describe detoxification approaches. The proposed research must build on this prior art rather than rename it. [2,8,9,12,13,22,23]

PROPOSED HYPOTHESIS (NOT ESTABLISHED FACT). A ‘Dual-Verification Seed Passport’ that combines authenticated cultivar provenance and genetic screening with legally compliant representative sampling, orthogonal phorbol-ester testing, validated hydrothermal processing and finished-lot genealogy will detect misclassification and process deviations earlier than a chemistry-only release workflow, without weakening mandatory chemical testing. The passport is a research architecture, not a regulatory certificate or a claim of patentable novelty.

VALIDATION PATHWAY. Recruit several growing regions and processing facilities, including genuine edible and toxic reference populations. Blindly introduce controlled admixture scenarios at pre-specified levels; compare the protocol against the legally required baseline; measure sensitivity, specificity, false-acceptance and false-rejection rates, interlaboratory reproducibility, cost per tonne and time to release. Record the performance of SNP markers outside their discovery populations and test matrix effects in oil-rich kernels and processed flour. Use preregistered statistical analysis and an independent reference laboratory.

REGULATORY AND INDUSTRIAL CONSTRAINTS. The study must not replace the sampling or UHPLC-UV-MS obligations of the current Union-list entry, and experimental material that fails release criteria must not enter food. New processing forms, isolated proteins, animal-feed uses and different jurisdictions require separate legal assessments. If validated, the system could improve supplier qualification, high-value seed-protein development, audit readiness and the separation of food and biofuel supply chains. Until validated, these remain prospective benefits.

19 | Practical decisions for ingredient developers

A supplier evaluating edible Jatropha should begin with the target market and exact intended product, not with a broad procurement offer. For EU foods, identify the current Union-list entry, its protected uses and the required process; verify that the applicant or supplier is entitled to market under those conditions. Then obtain source authentication, batch sampling records, validated phorbol-ester results, antinutrient reduction evidence, compositional specifications, microbiological data and stability results. If the concept involves defatted flour, protein isolate, oil, beverages or supplements, commission a separate identity-and-status assessment before promising launch dates. [2,3]

For INTABIOTECH's interests in innovative proteins, food ingredients and analytical qualification, the immediate opportunity is primarily methodological and advisory: evaluate ingredient safety dossiers, matrix-specific functionality and legally defensible sourcing. There is no basis in the reviewed sources to claim that any existing INTABIOTECH product detoxifies Jatropha, that Jatropha is approved for all protein applications, or that this article creates a new proprietary process. The industrial value lies in reducing avoidable development and compliance errors.

20 | Evidence classification: five conclusions that must remain distinct

ESTABLISHED LEGAL FACT: Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1378 is in force and amends the authorised edible-Jatropha entry with specified process, sampling, analytical and use conditions, subject to defined data-protection rules. [2]

ESTABLISHED SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE: Edible and toxic Jatropha provenances exist; phorbol esters are a major hazard; genetic markers have been associated with the trait; and specified hydrothermal treatments can reduce selected antinutrients. These findings do not validate every genotype or process. [6–9,12,13]

EMERGING OR RECENT EVIDENCE: A 2025 experimental study evaluated Xuta genotoxicity and antinutrients, while EFSA listed a new opinion on roasted and ground traditional Xuta on 28 October 2026. The latter's full conclusion must be checked in the complete opinion before being used to support a market decision. [1,9]

EXPERT INTERPRETATION: Reliable commercial qualification requires botanical identity, chemically relevant batch evidence, validated processing, exposure analysis and jurisdiction-specific permission to be assessed together, without treating any one as a substitute for the others.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS: An integrated genetic–chemical–process passport could improve decisions beyond the existing release baseline. Its added value, cost and failure modes require prospective blinded validation.

21 | Conclusions: a safe seed is a controlled system

The October 2026 Xuta publication arrives at a moment when the EU already has a carefully delimited authorisation for a different edible-Jatropha preparation. That juxtaposition makes the case especially instructive for the next generation of plant proteins. A species can contain both edible and toxic material; a

traditional history can coexist with unresolved exposure questions; a scientific opinion can coexist with a narrower binding market authorisation; and a promising genotype can still require chemical release testing. [1–5]

For industry, the defensible sequence is to establish legal identity and intended use, protect botanical provenance, apply representative batch chemistry, validate the specified process and document the final exposure and label. The best innovation opportunity is not to advertise an unfamiliar crop as inherently safe, but to make the evidence chain stronger, cheaper and more reproducible without diluting the law's safeguards. In this field, safety is not a property that a product name can confer; it is a conclusion supported by a controlled and inspectable system.

Related Knowledge Areas

Food Safety; Biotechnology; Nutrition; Regulatory Affairs; Functional Ingredients; Processing Technologies; AI & Food; Emerging Research.

References and primary-source links

[1] European Food Safety Authority. Novel food topic page; listing dated 28 October 2026 for the scientific opinion on roasted and ground Xuta kernels. DOI 10.2903/j.efsa.2026.10389. https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/novel-food

[2] European Commission. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2026/1378 of 23 June 2026; OJ L, 24 June 2026. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32026R1378

[3] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 on novel foods. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2015/2283/oj

[4] EFSA. Technical report on the notification of roasted and ground Xuta as a traditional food from a third country. EFSA Supporting Publications. 2022;19(3):EN-7197. DOI: 10.2903/sp.efsa.2022.EN-7197. https://doi.org/10.2903/sp.efsa.2022.EN-7197

[5] EFSA NDA Panel. Safety of changes in the conditions of use and specifications of edible Jatropha curcas L. (Chuta). EFSA Journal. 2025;23:e9706. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2025.9706. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2025.9706

[6] EFSA NDA Panel. Safety of hydrothermally treated kernels from edible Jatropha curcas L. (Chuta). EFSA Journal. 2022;20:e6998. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2022.6998. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2022.6998

[7] EFSA CONTAM Panel. Risks for human and animal health related to the presence of phorbol esters in Jatropha kernel meal. EFSA Journal. 2015;13(12):4321. DOI: 10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4321. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4321

[8] He W et al. Analysis of seed phorbol-ester and curcin content together with genetic diversity in multiple Jatropha provenances. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry. 2011. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21835630/

[9] Grünwald M, Francis G, Esatbeyoglu T. Evaluation of genotoxic potential and minimisation of antinutrients in edible Xuta kernels. Food and Chemical Toxicology. 2025;204:115624. DOI: 10.1016/j.fct.2025.115624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2025.115624

[10] European Commission. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/2468 on administrative and scientific requirements for traditional foods from third countries. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2017/2468/oj

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

[12] King AJ et al. Linkage mapping in Jatropha curcas reveals a locus controlling phorbol-ester biosynthesis. Plant Biotechnology Journal. 2013. DOI: 10.1111/pbi.12092. https://doi.org/10.1111/pbi.12092

[13] Trebbi D et al. Identification and validation of SNP markers linked to seed toxicity in Jatropha curcas. Scientific Reports. 2019. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-019-46698-4. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-46698-4

[14] European Commission. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/965 authorising edible-variety Jatropha kernels as a novel food. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2022/965/oj

[15] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 laying down general food-law principles. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2002/178/oj

[16] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 on hygiene of foodstuffs. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2004/852/oj

[17] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) 2017/625 on official controls. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2017/625/oj

[18] UK Food Standards Agency. Novel foods authorisation guidance; current GB regulatory routes and register. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/novel-foods-authorisation-guidance/novel-foods-authorisation-guidance

[19] Food Standards Scotland. Novel foods: traditional-food notifications and full authorisation routes in Great Britain. https://www.foodstandards.gov.scot/business-guidance/industry-specific-advice/novel-foods

[20] US Food and Drug Administration. Industry notification: Jatropha-derived oils, glycerin and proteins may have toxic effects (6 July 2012). https://www.fda.gov/industry/industry-notices-and-guidance-documents/fda-notification-industry-products-using-oils-glycerin-or-protein-were-derived-jatropha-plant-may

[21] US Food and Drug Administration. Updated Jatropha industry notification (April 2014). https://www.fda.gov/industry/industry-notices-and-guidance-documents/notification-industry-products-using-oils-glycerin-or-protein-derived-jatropha-plant-may-have-toxic

[22] WIPO. WO2013137822A1, Methods and systems for detoxifying phorbol esters in plant products (patent disclosure). https://patents.google.com/patent/WO2013137822A1/en

[23] US Patent Publication US20110311710A1, Detoxification of Jatropha curcas meal for feeding to farm animal species and fish (patent disclosure). https://patents.google.com/patent/US20110311710A1/en

[24] European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on food information to consumers. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2011/1169/oj

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

Editorial source-status note: The 28 October 2026 EFSA opinion was confirmed in EFSA's publication listing and by DOI, but its complete publisher text was not accessible for full verification during preparation. No unverified conclusion from that opinion is represented as established. Legal conclusions regarding the existing authorisation are grounded in the published 2026/1378 implementing act.

© 2026 José M. López. All rights reserved.