



# The Future of Lab-Grown Meat: Ethical and Environmental Considerations

Wambui Kibibi J.

School of Natural and Applied Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

## ABSTRACT

The advent of lab-grown meat, or cultured meat, presents a transformative opportunity to address the environmental degradation, ethical concerns, and resource inefficiencies associated with conventional animal agriculture. Derived from the in vitro cultivation of animal muscle cells, lab-grown meat offers the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, conserve biodiversity, and eliminate animal suffering. However, despite these promising benefits, the technology is fraught with complexities. This paper explores the ethical dimensions of lab-grown meat, including issues around fetal bovine serum use, the moral status of bioengineered organisms, and unintended consequences on animal agriculture systems. It further investigates the environmental implications, analyzing the carbon footprint and sustainability of cultured meat production in comparison to traditional methods. The analysis also addresses public health impacts, regulatory uncertainties, technological limitations, economic barriers, and public acceptance. Case studies and global regulatory frameworks are examined to understand the sociocultural factors influencing consumer trust and market viability. While lab-grown meat is not a panacea, it may serve as a complementary solution toward a more sustainable and ethical global food system.

**Keywords:** Lab-grown meat, cultured meat, cellular agriculture, food sustainability, animal ethics, environmental impact, biotechnology, consumer acceptance.

## INTRODUCTION

Raising animals demands significant resources, leading to environmental issues like soil degradation, excessive water use, greenhouse gas emissions, and fish stock depletion. Annually, billions of animals endure intensive breeding, suffering, and slaughter, highlighting an urgent need for sustainable food sources. One promising solution is in vitro cultivation of animal parts, or lab-grown meat, which may reduce animal cruelty and environmental strain. This method, also known as cultured or cell-cultured meat, involves growing meat from skeletal muscle cells, aiming to replicate the taste and health profile of conventional meat. If successful, lab-grown meat could alleviate many existing problems by eliminating traditional animal farming, conserving resources, and allowing for ecosystem restoration. The need for extreme packaging would likely diminish as lab-grown meat is sold fresh, and biodiversity impacts could be reduced by avoiding wild-caught fish or fish meal in production. However, despite the potential advantages, lab-grown meat cannot be viewed as a complete solution to the challenges posed by animal agriculture [1, 2].

### Understanding Lab-Grown Meat

The technology behind lab-grown meat consists of muscle cells sampled from an animal. The cells are then cultured and grown in a nutrient-rich medium produced from animal fetal serum, which is harvested too. This is a large bottleneck, both ethically and economically. Intensive research is directed toward producing vegan options to feed cultured meat and thus shifting the focus to ethical considerations. The capital-intensive process is far from the fuel-efficient industrial field bioreactors required for scale-up costs. Similar to biotechnology, lab-grown meat research is primarily driven by high-capital capital intellectual property-intensive industries. The notion of shredding advanced bioregulations, rushing superior industry regulations, and adopting biotech-compatible systems is record-confirmed. Technologies, supporter corps, and bioreactor industries upfront are keen on plunging into the moral This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

deterrent lab-grown meat market pressures. Herein, after a preface on ethical concerns and technological prospects, a virtue-oriented funding scheme proposal is presented. It suggests an alternative platform where funding would develop processing facilitators pre-germ-free, best technologically feasible bioreactors that would build factories to manufacture alternative substitutes of conventional textures on an industrial scale. There are many methods for simulating the production of lab-grown products that do not involve animal suffering. Many multinationals are involved in this research, and projects are underway. Moreover, advocates are pressing for international regulations to ban any animal-derived physiologically active compound used in their production, and attempts are being made to get on board and control many marketed products on the fringe of whaling. Thus, adequate bioprocessing for biogenesis-free synthetic alternatives of lab-grown meat will explore grey areas of this case dynamics [3, 4].

### **Ethical Considerations**

Lab-grown meat has the potential to reduce environmental harms caused by animal meat, but various ethical issues may arise. There may be a sense that a “good enough” technological solution is possible to eliminate animal suffering and reduce the environmental effects of animal agriculture as lab-grown meat is refined and marketed. However, the case is not this simple. There are ethical issues surrounding lab-grown meat beyond whether it reduces animal suffering and environmental harms. The advent of lab-grown meat is another moral status issue. Current technological developments are such that the moral status of lab-grown meat is radically different than conventional animal meat. Conventional meat is produced from larger animals; as a result, the level of animal suffering is greater, and there are severe issues related to conventional animal agriculture. Lab-grown meat derived from smaller animals would significantly reduce many conventional animal agriculture concerns. However, lab-grown meat derived from larger animals could also be produced. Furthermore, there will likely be incentives to try and breed and grow ever-larger animals, increasing returns to scale. Another ethical issue with lab-grown meat as compared to conventional animal agriculture may be conception. Conventional animal agriculture takes advantage of their gestation periods, which contribute to conventional production's high throughput. The advantage in production rate may be lost if alternative developing techniques cannot produce a crop at an equivalent rate. This throughput would be a concern for any animal agriculture system, with lab-grown meat simply being a different medium. It may take longer to produce, resulting in similar or higher net consumption of substrates. Even under current technological developments, the routes, systems, and substrates for producing lab-grown meat with significantly lower throughput rates than conventional animal meat are plausible [5, 6].

### **Environmental Impact**

Lab-grown meat (cultured meat or clean meat) refers to “animal muscle tissue produced outside an animal, widely regarded as a solution with the potential to feed a growing global population while reducing the negative environmental impact of raising animals for food”. Potentially, the onset of lab-grown meat would reduce forest destruction to raise livestock for meat, methane emissions, animal cruelty based on mass killings, etc. These features of lab-grown meat alone can cast a positive ethical profile on this technology. Nevertheless, some essential ethical aspects must also be taken into consideration. Most importantly, the strong-willed intent to “promote” lab-grown meat must not ignore the possibly negative aspects of this technology. Environmental degradation is just one of the other ethical aspects, such as long-term public health, society, and animal welfare. Even if lab-grown meat tastes the same as its traditionally farmed counterparts, it remains meat and thus an unhealthy food source for humanity. Instead of fighting the consumption of meat (the problem), such technologies are being developed to promote its consumption (the solution). Vegan diets and excessively eating quantities of lab-grown meat might be the two outcomes of this technology on consumption trends. Another serious concern is that lab-grown meat might trick people into believing traditional meat is healthier and cruelty-free. It is the technology of cultured meat, not animals, that comes first. Thus, it is entirely plausible that cultured meat (another term for lab-grown meat) will coexist with farmed meat. Presumably, lab-grown meat would never completely replace traditional animal-farming techniques, but instead would be just another option [7, 8].

### **Health Implications**

Many countries are engaged in the development, production, and sale of cultured meat. The involvement of various stakeholders has led to public policy debates spread across different departments. For instance, the research and development of cultured meat for pet food primarily occurs in Europe, the USA, and some Asian nations where pet ownership is rising. In the USA, the main food safety agency regulates cultured meat as food for human consumption, while its animal biotechnology counterpart supervises

hybrid products. The future health impacts of lab-grown meat remain largely uncertain. Another major issue is consumer acceptance; without public approval, investment in cultured meat could diminish. Like other food products, cultured meat must be tested and certified before release. However, its novelty raises questions about the adequacy of existing regulations. In the 1970s, research funding for cultured meat was minimal, but advancements in technology have made development possible. Moreover, there are challenges from animal agriculture and animal rights groups opposing cultured meat. Traditional meat contains several essential nutrients, while in vitro-cultured muscle tissue is expected to have a nutrient profile similar to conventional meat. Slaughtered carcasses undergo numerous processes that can create potentially harmful compounds like HAAs, LOPs, nitrosamines, and PAHs. Consequently, lab-grown meat that undergoes minimal processing may have lower levels of these harmful substances, potentially benefiting public health [9, 10].

### **Economic Factors**

Cultured meat is perceived to be more costly compared to conventionally produced meat and also owing to soaring demand for meat and partly a latent increase in production cost. Barriers to the large-scale commercialization of cultured meat involve reduced product price and scaling production. Cultured meat is recognized as a high-risk and high-capital venture. Different pricing strategies could counteract regulatory and economic risks after the product enters the market. Several factors determine a product's perceived value-chain price range, which is the span of values compared to the lowest and highest alternatives. These include the stated desired gross margin, the competitive price levels, the demand elasticity and/or market growth rate, and exit costs, which are set out as dependency charts. Initial sales must cover highly nonlinear median production fixed costs and are expected to be in the range of EUR 9.95 to EUR 12.99 for 100 g of product. Starting wholesale cultured meat production falls at about the 1,000 m<sup>2</sup> mark, from smaller side 500 m<sup>2</sup> plants to larger 3,000 m<sup>2</sup> plants. The implicit price may be higher than desired gross margins, and phase 1 negative regional profit impacts may weaken the exit margin and offer investment loss potential, presenting a challenge for cultured meat ventures. The value-chain price range for the global cultured meat generation of the meat 2082 m<sup>3</sup> demand. Notes indicated numbers of each meat, each item ff between 0 and 1, together valued in EUR, totaling amount, the desired net profit level, scaling protocol, and error margins. Forecasted grobat meat demand indicates an oil price gradient in 2015 of 882, 694, 8387, and 3444 m<sup>3</sup> with accompanying departures. Variation in total absorption over pasture efficiency predicts a static effect on gross margins. To scale down exit costs or absorb unexpected market behaviour, the smaller, higher upfront stages should mostly lead to target exit margins. High risk for consumer acceptance impacts cultural and ethnic adaptation, and gross margin shifting due to the value chain price range could create intended negative profit asymmetries. Further gradual initial pricing for prevention and security in targeting numbering may help at-risk phases; pricing order could also be influenced by IP and adjust production capacity start-ups [11, 12].

### **Technological Innovations**

Innovations in technology are regenerating pathways for meat production that do not involve sacrificing animals or working in rotating stockyards, slaughterhouses, and other industrialized production facilities. There are at least three paths towards non-animal meat production, with foundational advances in cellular agriculture or cultured meats representing the latest innovations. Cellular agriculture is the use of agricultural cells and tissues cultured outside of the organism from which they are taken to produce animal products. While the technology bases for cellular agriculture have appeared in hobbies as the kitchen culturing of cheese, yogurt, and beer for thousands of years, consumer awareness of cultured meat products is relatively new, growing co-products of cellular and metabolic engineering in academia for use as feedstocks for meat-production cooperatives. Just as cultured cheeses identify the dairy species, the cultured meat sector invites jawbones, claws, hooves, hearts, livers, tongues, and more, composing cow ribs, chunks, steaks, and hamburger meat. The first restaurant-selling cultured meat was expected to open in Asia in late 2021, sourcing not of church-raised lamb, but of beef from which meat-processors drew muscle- as well as fat-stem cells. These stem cells are then seeded into media-rich, pillow-sized scaffolding, endowing remarkably similar textures to filet and burger equivalent offerings. There is a current-production-container analogy, setting flavour-neutral containers within the production tank to the exact recipe of the cultured starter, and fixings parts of the veggie-meat-equivalent process, and harvesting thickness to measure 'bite', mouth-feel, and umami of seared, roasted, and grilled preparations [13, 14].

### **Regulatory Framework**

The world meat market is both a European and a global phenomenon. Meat is produced and consumed in every country of the world. In a globalising economy, where international economic relationships grow

increasingly important, access to foreign meat production and meat markets bears weight on countries' economies. As a consequence, countries have adapted their meat marketing strategies to a changing global environment. At the same time, meat marketing remains a national affair, where the local socio-cultural context and institutions affect outcomes of global and national meat marketing strategies on the community and firm level. Other important dilemmas for these countries involve animal welfare, food safety, and food security. To deal with these dilemmas, a collective international regulatory body operates food safety and quality policies, whereas the animal welfare regulations differ widely across countries and even regions within countries, resulting in different production practices and marketing opportunities. Regulatory risks are fears surrounding the possibility of unplanned events due to product-price faux pas or price increase related to rules and regulations. Risks of legislation/regulation changes impact faith in a product, product quality perception, and transparency about legislation. Fake news, tensions regarding technical feasibility, and intellectual property are regarded as attacks on the product, which lead to an undefined medium-term change in availability. As cultured meat is a recent product, regulation is unclear due to novelty and uncertainty regarding definitions and standards. AMPs involve validation of labelling and health claims, food safety, and establishment of data/facts bodies. Other regulations involve environmental, welfare, and patent issues. Discussions on regulations are led by producers, corporations, academics, and NGOs; however, consumers' perspectives appear to be underrepresented, leading to reluctance of governments to engage in regulatory discussions. The Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) offer a roadmap for establishing regulatory frameworks and criteria; however, these lack a consumer perspective and would benefit from the involvement of other stakeholders. Free and open discussions involving all stakeholders are needed to prevent industry-driven solutions, which might suppress consumer needs, resulting in hesitance towards the product and negative effects [15, 16].

#### **Public Perception and Acceptance**

To have a successful product that addresses the ethical, environmental, and public health issues associated with conventional meat, producers and advocates of cultured meat must consider a range of consumer issues. This is because cultured meat, grown in vitro from pre-existing animal cells rather than by raising and slaughtering animals, is likely to be of marginal acceptability to consumers unless key concerns can be averted. Within contexts where expectations of cultured meat coalesce with associated consumer issues, consumers' perception will be shaped at least in part by the extent to which there is social engagement with cultivated meat products. At the same time, a wide range of issues are independently important to the potential trajectories of the cultured meat industry – foreseeing and addressing these issues is vital in fostering an industry that is both ethical and potentially lucrative. It may be that consumer acceptance matters even more at present to the cultured meat industry, in the sense that it is more likely to threaten the industry's viability than would media coverage or regulation of the industry. Consumer issues fundamentally affect how the reality of cultured meat would establish, as opposed to reinforcing or transforming, cultural phenomena and institutions. Given these dynamics, it may be strategically optimal for actors within the industry to focus on consumer issues first; however, there is also merit in building a broad and flexible strategy that incorporates tailored interventions to shape cultural phenomena and institutions more broadly [17, 18].

#### **Case Studies**

In vitro meat, also called lab-grown meat, is a novel product made by taking animal cells from biopsies and cultivating them to form muscle and fat tissue outside an animal. It has been touted as the next step in food production as it can be made identical to conventionally produced meat, relying on animals or the slaughtering process. Also, it should increase food security. The moral legitimacy of vegetarianism as a choice is challenged by a new process to cultivate animal cells in a lab. It is a condition present in the vice of an unexamined life, questioning lab-grown meat's desirability in itself and its relation to other options possible. When evaluating alternatives, choice procedures can enhance expectations about the action's moral standing. So far, lab-grown meat has been discussed primarily in terms of its predicted best consequences. However, this raises two problems, as demonstrated in the second case study of the 'vegginess' of lab-grown meat or its relation to veganism. The first problem is that it falls short of evaluating the process in itself. The second problem is orthogonality, or pragmatic indifference about actual processes that could bring a good outcome. Using a biotechnological method known as cell-tissue culture, cultured meat products should come to market all over the world. If this phenomenon takes place, all domesticated animals should be spared suffering and slaughter, reducing methane emissions from livestock farming, and mitigating social concerns, including land use disruption and global inequity in meat consumption. Food exerts an important cultural and symbolic role in society as it mediates the relationship between individuals, communities, and the other-than-human world. Meat symbolizes the

core of human culture, identity, and nature. Hence, laboratory meat products should trigger questions and concerns such as the place of these products in food culture or diets, their sociability and conviviality, the creation of trustworthy relationships among production, commercialization, and consumption, the link with a 'real' life, and quality issues [19, 20].

### Global Perspectives

Culture is an important aspect of human societies. Some definitions of 'culture' include worship, training in the arts, cultivation of the soil, and production and acquisition of knowledge. Culture has produced some of the most profoundly beautiful edifices and productions imaginable in terms of art and architecture, literature, drama, music, religion, and monuments. However, culture is also responsible for manifestations such as warfare, banishment, competition, slavery, and cruelty. These aspects of culture vary in intensity across countries, economies, religions, and subcultures. Although the term 'cultural meat' has not received much scholarly attention, cultured meat (also referred to as lab-grown or in vitro meat) has been the topic of news articles, documentaries, and films recently. It consists of meat that is generated from muscle cells and other animal cells in an artificial environment. For several years, researchers and innovators have been striving to make cultured meat palatable to the masses. Globally, meat demand is forecasted to increase rapidly over the coming decades due to population growth and cultural phenomena. Because livestock farming is associated with a range of ethical, environmental, and public health issues, advancements have been made in producing cultured meat. Following a range of ethical, environmental, and public health criticisms levied against conventional livestock farming, researchers and innovators have, in turn, worked on the technological advancements required to produce cultured meat, muscle tissue grown in vitro from animal cells. Cultured meat is fully cooked muscle tissue grown in vitro from muscle cells. Cultured meat is grown from muscle and other animal cells using tissue engineering technology in vitro. Provided that the technological advances necessary have been made, cultured meat is the most credible alternative to conventional meat. This article aims to bring attention to one particular facet of potential advances in cultured meat technology. Producers and advocates need to be mindful of a range of issues outside of these spheres, including cultural as well as ethical matters. It will be argued that, if the technology advances, the associated potential gains are vast, but a range of cultural phenomena and institutions must be navigated deftly for this nascent sociotechnical industry to be capable of meeting this potential [21, 22].

### Future Outlook

Synthetic meat is a revolutionary technology that holds an incredibly promising prospect for future protein production. A wide variety of synthetic meat products and applications are expected to emerge, changing the nature of the livestock protein production system and meat supply chain as a whole. As with the advent of any new large-scale agricultural system, the production of lab-grown meat can be expected to have socio-technical and environmental implications. However, lab-grown meat is fundamentally different from agriculture-derived protein production methods. In addition to drawing from the traditions and structures of existing agricultural systems, synthetic meat technology is a domestication technology. As such, it is a multi-faceted and multi-scalar socio-technical system. As a product, there are implications for future manufactured protein production and consumption itself, but also with ramifications for societal structures, market functions, trade relationships, and environmental considerations. The dominant narrative surrounding lab-grown meat has been one of inevitability and future benefit. Modeled on the domino-fall analogy of the revolutionary impact of the mechanized plant model on inedible soy, optimism abounds regarding the ability of lab-grown meat to not only meet and satisfy future protein demand and changing taste and ethics but also do so in a way that is sustainable, humane, and risk-free. Lab-grown meat is being framed as a silver bullet, both in terms of climate-changing impact, equivalent to many factors for an order of magnitude reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and as an unobjectionable form of meat. As such, it will rival conventional beef, chicken, and pork production models, bringing them into obsolescence. The rise of the global, 3D holographically-connected community of techno-optimists, who simultaneously mold the future of synthetic meat through investment, development, and advocacy, all suggesting that products will be available by 2025, is reflective of such a narrative. Alternative narratives that modestly question lab-grown meat's place within the 21st-century meat supply chain, or skeptically review the imagined cheeseburger, are ignored or met with emotion-driven rebuttal. These dismissals reassert and perpetuate the dominant monoculture Narrative, fixing expectations for all relevant actors and forcing an urgent pace [23, 24].

### CONCLUSION

Lab-grown meat represents a groundbreaking innovation at the intersection of food technology, ethics, and environmental stewardship. As the global population continues to rise, pressure intensifies to develop

sustainable protein sources that minimize ecological damage and animal exploitation. Cultured meat offers a compelling alternative, yet it is neither free of ethical dilemmas nor operational hurdles. Challenges such as the use of animal-derived growth media, high production costs, unclear regulatory frameworks, and skepticism from consumers and traditional agriculture sectors must be addressed to realize its potential. Furthermore, lab-grown meat should not be seen as a silver bullet but as part of a broader strategy to diversify and humanize food systems. Holistic approaches, including promotion of plant-based diets, equitable food policies, and transparent stakeholder engagement, are essential. The success of lab-grown meat will depend on continued technological innovation, ethical integrity, and the cultivation of trust through inclusive dialogue. Its future lies in harmonizing scientific progress with societal values, ensuring that it enhances rather than disrupts the ecological and moral fabric of global food production.

## REFERENCES

1. Hedberg T. Animal Suffering, Environmental Impact, and Lab-Cultured Meat. In *Animals and Business Ethics* 2022 Apr 25 (pp. 179-202). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
2. Anomaly J, Browning H, Fleischman D, Veit W. Flesh without blood: The public health benefits of lab-grown meat. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*. 2024 Mar;21(1):167-75. [springer.com](https://www.springer.com)
3. Roy B, Hagappa A, Ramalingam YD, Mahalingam N. A review on lab-grown meat: Advantages and disadvantages. *Quest International Journal of Medical and Health Sciences*. 2021 Jul 18;4(1):19-24. [qiu.edu.my](http://qiu.edu.my)
4. Siddiqui SA, Pandith JA, Yunusa BM, Ayivi RD, Castro-Muñoz R. A Comparative Assessment of the Economic, Technological, Sustainability and Ethical Aspects of Lab-Grown Beef and Traditional Beef. *Food Reviews International*. 2025 May 2:1-39.
5. DaVault JB, Sinha MS. Meat, The Future: The Role Of Regulators In The Lab-Grown Revolution. *American Journal of Law & Medicine*. 2025 Mar;51(1):69-99.
6. Singh V, Kushwaha R, Kumar S. Lab-grown meat—a review: The next cellular agricultural revolution. *International Journal on Nutraceuticals, Functional Foods and Novel Foods*. 2025 Apr 30.
7. Jiménez-Islas D, Pérez-Romero ME, Álvarez-García J, Simonetti B. Bibliometric insights into the science of lab-grown meat as alternative protein. *British Food Journal*. 2025 May 1.
8. Behera R, Adhikary L. Review on cultured meat: ethical alternative to animal industrial farming. *Food Res*. 2023 Apr;7(2):42-51.
9. Bryant CJ. Culture, meat, and cultured meat. *Journal of Animal Science*. 2020 Aug;98(8):skaa172.
10. Alvaro C. Lab-grown meat and veganism: a virtue-oriented perspective. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*. 2019 Feb 15;32(1):127-41.
11. Taheri M, Amalnick MS, Taleizadeh AA, Mardan E. A fuzzy programming model for optimizing the inventory management problem considering financial issues: A case study of the dairy industry. *Expert Systems with Applications*. 2023 Jul 1;221:119766. [\[HTML\]](#)
12. Pereira DF, Oliveira JF, Carravilla MA. Design of a sales plan in a hybrid contractual and non-contractual context in a setting of limited capacity: A robust approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 2023 Jun 1;260:108867. [\[HTML\]](#)
13. Dupuis JH, Cheung LK, Newman L, Dee DR, Yada RY. Precision cellular agriculture: The future role of recombinantly expressed protein as food. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*. 2023 Mar;22(2):882-912. [\[HTML\]](#)
14. Nyssölä A, Suhonen A, Ritala A, Oksman-Caldentey KM. The role of single-cell protein in cellular agriculture. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*. 2022 Jun 1;75:102686. [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)
15. Nagaraj P, Deepalakshmi P. An intelligent fuzzy inference rule-based expert recommendation system for predictive diabetes diagnosis. *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology*. 2022 Jul;32(4):1373-96. [\[HTML\]](#)
16. Yeung K, Bygrave LA. Demystifying the modernized European data protection regime: Cross-disciplinary insights from legal and regulatory governance scholarship. *Regulation & Governance*. 2022 Jan;16(1):137-55.
17. Sugii S, Wong CY, Lwin AK, Chew LJ. Alternative fat: redefining adipocytes for biomanufacturing cultivated meat. *Trends in Biotechnology*. 2023 May 1;41(5):686-700.
18. Cedeno FR, Olubiyo OJ, Ferreira S. From microbial proteins to cultivated meat for alternative meat-like products: a review on sustainable fermentation approaches. *Journal of Biological Engineering*. 2025 Dec;19(1):1-28.

19. Garcez de Oliveira Padilha L, Malek L, Umberger WJ. Food choice drivers of potential lab-grown meat consumers in Australia. *British Food Journal*. 2021 Sep 30;123(9):3014-31. [\[HTML\]](#)
20. Soleymani S, Naghib SM, Mozafari MR. An overview of cultured meat and stem cell bioprinting: How to make it, challenges and prospects, environmental effects, society's culture, and the influence of religions. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*. 2024 Jul 22:101307.
21. Soleymani S, Naghib SM, Mozafari MR. An overview of cultured meat and stem cell bioprinting: How to make it, challenges and prospects, environmental effects, society's culture, and the influence of religions. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*. 2024 Jul 22:101307. [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)
22. Ahmad K, Lim JH, Lee EJ, Chun HJ, Ali S, Ahmad SS, Shaikh S, Choi I. Extracellular matrix and the production of cultured meat. *Foods*. 2021 Dec 15;10(12):3116. [mdpi.com](https://www.mdpi.com)
23. Wilkinson J. The Innovation Ecosystems of Novel Foods: Sustainable Transition or Hype and Incumbent Hijacking?. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*. 2024 Dec 22;30(2):49-65. [ijisaf.org](https://www.ijisaf.org)
24. Cockburn A. A short, meat-oriented history of the world. From Eden to the Mattole. *New Left Review*. 1996 Jan 1:16-42.

**CITE AS: Wambui Kibibi J. (2025). The Future of Lab-Grown Meat: Ethical and Environmental Considerations. Research Output Journal of Biological and Applied Science 5(3):112-118. <https://doi.org/10.59298/ROJBAS/2025/53112118>**