

Maize 4114

Organisation: The European GMO-free Citizens (De Gentechvrije Burgers)

Country: The Netherlands

Type: Others...

a. Assessment:

b. Food Safety Assessment:

Toxicology

More news on 5 February 2018: Bayer to withdraw authorisation for Basta and Finale. Bayer recently announced that it would be actively withdrawing European registration of the active substance glufosinate-ammonium. This means the end of authorisation for Basta and Finale in Europe, and hence in the Netherlands. It also means that no more GMOs which have been made resistant to it may be authorised.

<https://www.greenity.nl/nieuws/bayer-gaat-toelating-van-basta-en-finale-intrekken>

We find it ethically unacceptable to ban the use of glufosinate-ammonium based herbicides due to health and environmental concerns, while supporting its use in GMOs. This represents an unacceptable double standard.

Others

How can we keep abreast of all the facts if there are gaps in the available information, e.g. in the Register of questions,

<http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/wicket/page?4>

The link to the EFSA doesn't work.

<http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/wicket/page?4> Go to his address and click the "Question Documents" tab. The first link on the page is wrong: it takes the user to cotton, rather than maize. The same goes for the second link, which takes the reader to GHB614 x T304-40 x GHB119 (cotton). The seventh link is wrong, too: again, it takes the reader to GHB614 x T304-40 GHB119.

5. Others

We will come back to this issue later, in a supplementary comment. We hope that the links will have been corrected by then, otherwise it will be impossible to make further comments, and authorisation will have to be cancelled.

The European GMO-free Citizens are supported by Stichting Natuurwetmoeders, Bussum and Stichting Ekopark, Lelystad. More information can be found at <https://www.gentechvrij.nl/bezwaren-2018/>

Organisation: The European GMO-free Citizens (De Gentechvrije Burgers) i.o. van St. Ekopark

Country: The Netherlands

Type: Non Profit Organisation

a. Assessment:

Comparative analysis (for compositional analysis and agronomic traits and GM phenotype)

New Meta-Analysis: Extensive Phenotypic Differences Between GMO and non-GMO in Cultivated Plants.

The myth of “substantial equivalence” between GMOs and non-GE crops (called “isolines”) takes yet another hard science hit. A team of researchers in Mexico City has published their meta-analysis of genetic data on rice, canola, maize, sunflower, and pumpkin. They looked at wild, GMO, and non-GMO cultivated varieties of these five crops, analyzing phenotypic change.

Unexpected Phenotypic Changes in Human-Modified Plant Populations – Changes in Non-target Traits

As mentioned before, given that the GE constructs start from isogenic lines (represented here as domNGE), and that the modifications are allegedly directed to modify specific phenotypic traits not included in the present analysis, it was expected that the phenotypic variation of the domGE would be a subgroup of that in the domNGE group. This expectation is based on the premise that GE works usually with foreign DNA in order to introduce traits that are not present in the species, and this is

performed in isogenic hybrid lines; thus, theoretically, the only differences between a Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) and its isogenic line will be the added trait(s) (Cellini et al., 2004). However, we did not find evidence that supports this expectation, suggesting unintended phenotypic effects of GE modifications. Specifically, we identified the most dramatic cases in rice, pumpkin, and MAIZE, where almost all analyzed traits differ statistically between domNGE and domGE categories.

Alejandra Hernández-Terán, Ana Wegier, Mariana Benítez, Rafael Lira, and Anna E. Esclaante, “Domesticated, Genetically Engineered, and Wild Plant Relatives Exhibit Unintended Phenotypic Differences: A Comparative Meta-Analysis Profiling Rice, Canola, Maize, Sunflower, and Pumpkin,” *Plant Science*, December 5, 2017.

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpls.2017.02030/full#B24>

<https://hygeia-analytics.com/2018/05/30/new-meta-analysis-extensive-phenotypic-differences-between-gmo-and-non-gmo-in-cultivated-plants/#.Ww8ImaHMUh0.twitter>

b. Food Safety Assessment: Toxicology

Food/ feed assessment

“COGEM abstains from giving advice on the potential risks of incidental consumption since a food/feed assessment is already carried out by other organisations. This application is submitted under Regulation (EC) 1829/2003, therefore a food/feed assessment is carried out by EFSA and national organisations involved in the assessment of food safety. In the Netherlands, a food and/or feed assessment for Regulation (EC) 1829/2003 applications is carried out by RIKILT. Regarding the risks for food and feed, the outcome of the assessment by other organisations (EFSA, RIKILT) was not known when this advice was completed. COGEM advice CGM/150528-01” The European GMO-free Citizens did not find applications by RIKILT regarding Maize 4114 on the internet.

Numerous reports state that the formula for the pesticide glufosinate-ammonium (with a St. Andrew's Cross) is more dangerous than the active substance. In fact, the same phenomenon occurs in Roundup and *Bacillus thuringiensis*, to which EPA is clearly referring in its documentation. EPA does NOT take responsibility for the safety of

children and adults who are exposed to these herbicides in places where the substances are used for non-food purposes (railway embankments, parks, etc.), even though the same substances are used in food production on agricultural land.

The EPA stated the following about *Bacillus thuringiensis* in August 1998: "Several reports under FIFRA have been made for various Bac. Th. products, claiming allergic reactions. However, the Agency determined these reactions were NOT due to Bac. Th. itself (i.e. there are various other excipients to choose from). It's a crazy situation when the man in the street has to play detective in order to keep environmentally damaging effects at bay. Shed a tear for human health protection.

The herbicides may well be highly effective (at "killing things") but still not be in the consumer's interest. Writing about glufosinate-ammonium in the Federal Register of February 1997 (p. 5335), the EPA states: "...there is dermal absorption of GLA.... has no qualitative data on dermal absorption..... Without these data the Agency cannot determine the aggregate risk from exposure to children and adults, nor determine the aggregate risk to the public exposed by these non-food uses of this pesticide" (in parks, etc.)

Others

"Furthermore, a poultry feeding study has been conducted over a 42-day period with diets containing 4114 maize untreated or treated with glufosinate." That is much too short a period and cannot possibly have been decided on by an independent researcher.

3. Environmental risk assessment

Cauliflower Mosaic Virus

"Probably the greatest threat from genetically altered crops is the insertion of modified virus and insect virus genes into crops. It has been shown in the laboratory that genetic recombination will create highly virulent new viruses from such constructions. Certainly the widely used cauliflower mosaic virus is a potentially dangerous gene. It is a pararetrovirus meaning that it multiplies by making DNA from RNA messages. It is very similar to the Hepatitis B virus and related to HIV." Dr.

Joseph Cummins, professor emeritus in genetics from the university of West-Ontario
The use of Cauliflower Mosaic Virus, Joseph Cummins.

There is no discussion by COGEM of the risks associated with 35S cauliflower mosaic virus promoter. COGEM recommendation CGM/150528-01: The dangers inherent in this promoter are possible epidemics of new recombinant (plant) viruses which could affect future harvests.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

We, the European GMO-free Citizens and Stichting Ekopark (who are acting on our behalf), both established in Lelystad, demand the rejection of an application for review of market authorisation decisions for maize 4114 – Concept of 'environmental law' – Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1367/2006”, and a new, independent study (not to be performed by Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc.) to explore the human and animal health issues associated with the toxicity of the pesticides glufosinate-ammonium and the various strains of *Bacillus thuringiensis* which were used. And then there are the health consequences of the changes in the maize DNA. We refer the reader to:

InfoCuria – Case-law of the Court of Justice, JUDGMENT OF THE GENERAL COURT (Seventh Chamber) 14 March 2018 (Environment — Genetically modified products — Regulation (EC) No 1367/2006 — Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 — Genetically modified soybeans MON 87769, MON 87705 and 305423 — Rejection of an application for internal review of market authorisation decisions — Concept of ‘environmental law’ — Article 10 of Regulation No 1367/2006) in Case T-33/16.
<http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=200243&pageIndex=0&doclang=NL&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1&cid=533861>

5. Others

Stichting EKOPARK's address is: Donaustraat 152, 8226 LC Lelystad.

Organisation: Testbiotech
Country: Germany
Type: Non Profit Organisation

a. Assessment:

Molecular characterisation

Maize 4114 was genetically engineered with the help of *Agrobacterium tumefaciens*. It expresses truncated versions of the Cry toxins Cry1F, Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1, as well as the PAT protein that confers tolerance to the active herbicide ingredient glufosinate-ammonium. The DNA sequences used for the expression of these proteins have previously been used for maize 1507 (Cry1F and PAT) and maize 59122 (Cry34Ab1, Cry35Ab1 and PAT).

Insertion of this construct creates several new open reading frames. In addition, a gene with similarities to a hypothetical glutaredoxin-like (GRX-like) protein sequence was identified in the flanking downstream position. GRX proteins are involved in many cellular functions, including DNA synthesis, signal transduction and defence against oxidative stress.

EFSA did not assess unintended gene products, such as miRNA, that can emerge from the insertion of the transgenes. Some comparisons were made, but only between the intended proteins produced in the plants with known allergens and toxins. No detailed consideration was undertaken regarding the extent to which the truncation of the Bt proteins will change its biological characteristics.

EFSA only assessed a few of the relevant issues. Therefore, in order to enable further independent risk assessment, the full DNA sequence inserted into the plants should be made available, including all open reading frames.

In addition, EFSA did not request any detailed analysis based on so-called -omics (transcriptomics, metabolomics, proteomics) to investigate changes in the overall metabolism in the plants. EFSA assumed that the data from phenotypic characteristics and compositional analysis would not indicate any need for further investigations. However, these data did show many significant changes (see below). In general, data on phenotypic characteristics and compositional analysis can be used as complementary data, but these are not as sensitive as -omics data and cannot replace them.

Expression data were provided on the new intended proteins. These data show rather wide ranges for the Bt toxins that require further investigation. It is known that the Bt content in the plants depends on environmental impact. For example, environmental stress can cause unexpected patterns of expression in the newly introduced DNA (see, for example, Trtikova et al., 2015). Therefore, the plants should have been subjected to a much broader range of defined environmental conditions and stressors in order to gather reliable data on gene expression and functional genetic stability.

Further, the method used to determine the amount of Bt toxins (ELISA) is known to be dependent on the specific protocols used. The data are not sufficiently reliable without further evaluation by independent labs. For example, Shu et al. (2018) highlight difficulties in measuring the correct concentration of Bt toxins produced by the genetically engineered plants (see also Székács et al., 2011).

Without fully evaluated test methods to measure the expression and the concentration of the Bt toxins, risk assessment will suffer from substantial methodological gaps. This is also a problem for food safety. Despite EFSA mostly ignoring the data, there are indications that Bt toxins can impact human and animal health (see below). Furthermore, based on such poor and inconclusive data, the dietary exposure to Bt toxins within the food chain cannot be determined as required by Regulation (EU) No 503/2013.

Consequently, the risk assessment of molecular characteristics is not conclusive and is not sufficient to show food and feed safety.

Shu, Y., Romeis, J., Meissle, M. (2018) No interactions of stacked Bt maize with the non-target aphid *Rhopalosiphum padi* and the spider mite *Tetranychus urticae*. *Front. Plant Sci.* 9: 39. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2018.00039

Székács, A., Weiss, G., Quist, D., Takács, E., Darvas, B., Meier, M., Swain, T., Hilbeck, A., (2011) Interlaboratory comparison of Cry1Ab toxin quantification in MON 810 maize by enzyme-immunoassay. *Food and Agricultural Immunology*, 23(2): 99-121.

Trtikova, M., Wikmark, O.G., Zemp, N., Widmer, A., Hilbeck, A. (2015) Transgene expression and Bt protein content in transgenic Bt maize (MON810) under optimal and stressful environmental conditions. *PloS One*, 10(4): e0123011.

Comparative analysis (for compositional analysis and agronomic traits and GM phenotype)

Field trials were only performed in the US and Canada and not in other maize producing regions.

Interestingly, two varieties were introgressed with the event. Data from more than one genetically engineered variety can help to investigate potential interactions of the gene constructs with the genetic background of the plants. However, as explained by EFSA, the data from these two varieties were pooled for statistical analysis. Therefore, the additional data might not be of additional value and only increase what is known as data noise.

A large part of the parameters measured for plant composition and phenotypic characteristics were significantly different. For example, in plant composition, more than one third of the parameters were different, with an increasing tendency for the plants sprayed with glufosinate: 71 parameters were evaluated showing 27 significant differences for the untreated maize, and 33 significant differences for maize 4114 treated with glufosinate. Taken as isolated data these differences might not directly raise safety concerns, nevertheless, the large number of effects should have led to further investigations.

Therefore, EFSA should have requested further studies e.g. data from omics (proteomics, transcriptomics, metabolomics), data representing more extreme environmental conditions such as those caused by climate change, data representing more areas of commercial maize cultivation, more data on stress reactions under controlled conditions, and impact of the dosage of the complementary herbicide sprayed onto the plants.

Instead, EFSA has relied solely on the newly introduced statistical method known as the “test of equivalence”. This method can be helpful to make some assumptions on the relevance of the significant findings. However, it cannot replace a detailed assessment of the high number of significant differences.

Based on the available data, no final conclusions can be drawn on the safety of the plants.

b. Food Safety Assessment: Toxicology

Pioneer conducted a 90-day feeding trial with maize 4114. In this feeding trial only one dosage of maize (33 %) was included as part of the diet, instead of several dosages as requested by existing guidance. Nevertheless, EFSA still accepted the data.

The feeding trial findings were alarming: two male animals fed with maize 4114 (unsprayed) were diagnosed with renal tubule adenomas and/or carcinoma associated with tubule hyperplasia. These findings led to a further 90 day-feeding study to assess the original findings. In this second study, the findings could not be confirmed.

There may be several reasons why findings from a study may, or may not, be repeated, and so uncertainties remain. The feeding studies with maize 1507 (see Dona & Arvanitoyannis, 2009) and maize 59122 (see EFSA 2007) also led to significant findings. Therefore, we conclude the need for more detailed investigation. Further, more detailed (e.g. using several dosages) and long-term feeding studies would be necessary to assess potential health impacts. These studies should include -omics data from animals, as well as detailed assessment of the impact of higher dosages of glufosinate sprayed on the plants (as can be expected under practical conditions). Besides the renal system, the immune system should also have been investigated in more detail (see below).

The need for more detailed assessment is underlined by publications showing that Bt toxins raise further questions in regard to feed and food safety:

(1) There are several partially diverging theories about the exact mode of action of the Bt toxins at the molecular level (see Then, 2010; Hilbeck & Otto, 2015). Thus, it cannot be excluded a priori that the toxins are inert in regard to human and animal health as considered under risk assessment for food and feed.

(2) There are further uncertainties regarding the specificity of Bt toxins (Venter and Bøhn, 2016). Changes in specificity may emerge from structural modifications performed to render higher efficacy. For example, the proteins are truncated to become activated (see Hilbeck and Schmidt, 2006).

(3) In addition, there are findings in mammalian species showing that Bt toxicity is a relevant topic for detailed health risk assessment: some Cry toxins are known to bind to epithelial cells in the intestines of mice (Vázquez-Padrón et al., 1999).

(4) As far as potential effects on health are concerned, several publications (Thomas and Ellar 1983; Shimada et al., 2003; Mesnage et al., 2013; Huffman et al., 2004; Bondzio et al., 2013) show that Cry proteins may indeed have an impact on the health of mammals. For example, de Souza Freire et al., (2014) confirm haematotoxicity of

several Cry toxins. Some of these effects seem to occur where there are high concentrations and tend to become stronger over longer periods of time.

(5) Further, the toxicity of Bt toxins can be enhanced through interaction with other compounds, such as plant enzymes (Zhang et al., 2000, Zhu et al., 2007; Pardo-López et al., 2009); other Bt toxins (Sharma et al., 2004; Tabashnik et al., 2013; Bøhn et al. 2016, Bøhn 2018); gut bacteria (Broderick et al., 2009); residues from spraying with herbicides (Bøhn et al. 2016, Bøhn 2018) and other (Kramarz et al., 2007; Kramarz et al., 2009; Khalique and Ahmed, 2005; Singh et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2005; Mason et al., 2011; Reardon et al., 2004).

In this context, it is relevant that Bt toxins can survive digestion to a much higher degree than has been assumed by EFSA. Chowdhury et al., (2003) and Walsh et al. (2011) have found that when pigs were fed with Bt maize, Cry1A proteins could frequently and successfully still be found in the colon of pigs at the end of the digestion process. This means that Bt toxins are not degraded quickly in the gut and can persist in larger amounts until digestion is completed; and that there is enough time for interaction between various food compounds.

Further, as far as the exposure of the food chain with Bt toxins is concerned, EFSA should have requested data on the overall combined exposure to Bt toxins caused by the introduction of Bt plants in the EU. Currently, there are already 30 events that produce Bt toxins authorised for import. The exposure stemming from these imports should have been added to that of maize 4114.

Consequently, the toxicological assessment carried out by EFSA is not sufficient to show food and feed safety.

Bøhn, T., Rover, C.M., Semenchuk, P.R. (2016) *Daphnia magna* negatively affected by chronic exposure to purified Cry-toxins. *Food Chem. Toxicol.*, 91: 130–140.

Bøhn, T. (2018) Criticism of EFSA's scientific opinion on combinatorial effects of 'stacked' GM plants. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278691517306907>

Bondzio, A., Lodemann, U., Weise, C., Einspanier, R. (2013) Cry1Ab Treatment Has No Effects on Viability of Cultured Porcine Intestinal Cells, but Triggers Hsp70 Expression. *PLOS ONE* 8, e67079. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0067079>

Broderick, N.A., Robinson, C.J., McMahon, M.D., Holt, J., Handelsman, J., Raffa, K.F. (2009) Contributions of gut bacteria to *Bacillus thuringiensis*-induced mortality

vary across a range of Lepidoptera. *BMC Biol.* 7: 11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7007-7-11>

Chowdhury, E.H., Kuribara, H., Hino, A., Sultana, P., Mikami, O., Shimada, N., ... & Nakajima, Y. (2003) Detection of corn intrinsic and recombinant DNA fragments and Cry1Ab protein in the gastrointestinal contents of pigs fed genetically modified corn Bt11. *Journal of animal science*, 81(10): 2546-2551.

Dona, A., Arvanitoyannis I.S. (2009) Health Risks of Genetically Modified Foods. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 49: 164-175.

de Souza Freire, I., Miranda-Vilela, A.L., Barbosa, L.C.P., Martins, E.S., Monnerat, R.G., Grisolia, C.K. (2014) Evaluation of Cytotoxicity, Genotoxicity and Hematotoxicity of the Recombinant Spore-Crystal Complexes Cry1Ia, Cry10Aa and Cry1Ba6 from *Bacillus thuringiensis* in Swiss Mice. *Toxins* 6, 2872–2885. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins6102872>

EFSA (2007) Comments from the experts of Member States to Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Genetically Modified Organisms on an application (Reference EFSA-GMO-NL-2005-12) for the placing on the market of insect-resistant genetically modified maize 59122, for food and feed uses, import and processing under Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003, from Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc. And Mycogen Seeds, c/o Dow Agrosiences LLC. , *The EFSA Journal* (2007) 470, 1-25, accessed via the register of questions at EFSA

Hilbeck, A., Otto, M. (2015) Specificity and Combinatorial Effects of *Bacillus Thuringiensis* Cry Toxins in the Context of GMO Environmental Risk Assessment. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2015.00071>

Hilbeck, A., Schmidt, J.E.U. (2006) Another View on Bt Proteins – How Specific are They and What Else Might They Do?

Huffman, D.L., Abrami, L., Sasik, R., Corbeil, J., Goot, F.G. van der, Aroian, R.V. (2004) Mitogen-activated protein kinase pathways defend against bacterial pore-forming toxins. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 101, 10995–11000. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0404073101>

Khalique, F. & Ahmed, K. (2005) Compatibility of bio-insecticide with chemical insecticide for management of *Helicoverpa armigera* Huebner. *Pak. J. Biol. Sci.* 8, 475-478.

Kramarz, P., de Vaufleury, A., Gimbert, F., Cortet, J., Tabone, E., Andersen, M.N., Krogh, P.H. (2009) Effects of Bt-maize material on the life cycle of the land snail *Cantareus aspersus*. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* 42, 236–242.

Kramarz, P.E., de Vaufleury, A., Zygmunt, P.M.S., Verdun, C. (2007) Increased response to cadmium and *Bacillus thuringiensis* maize toxicity in the snail *Helix aspersa* infected by the nematode *Phasmarhabditis hermaphrodita*. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 26: 73–79.

Mason, K.L., Stepien, T.A., Blum, J.E., Holt, J.F., Labbe, N.H., Rush, J.S., Raffa, K.F., Handelsman, J. (2011) From commensal to pathogen: translocation of *Enterococcus faecalis* from the midgut to the hemocoel of *Manduca sexta*. *mBio* 2: e00065-00011. <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.00065-11>

Mesnage, R., Clair, E., Gress, S., Then, C., Székács, A., Séralini, G.-E. (2013) Cytotoxicity on human cells of Cry1Ab and Cry1Ac Bt insecticidal toxins alone or with a glyphosate-based herbicide. *J. Appl. Toxicol.* 33, 695–699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jat.2712>

Pardo-López, L., Muñoz-Garay, C., Porta, H., Rodríguez-Almazán, C., Soberón, M., Bravo, A., (2009). Strategies to improve the insecticidal activity of Cry toxins from *Bacillus thuringiensis*. *Peptides, Invertebrate Neuropeptides, IX* 30: 589–595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.peptides.2008.07.027>

Reardon, B.J., Hellmich, R.L., Sumerford, D.V., Lewis, L.C. (2004) Growth, Development, and Survival of *Nosema pyrausta* -Infected European Corn Borers (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) Reared on Meridic Diet and Cry1Ab. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 97: 1198-1201. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/97.4.1198>

Sharma, H.C., Sharma, K.K., Crouch, J.H., 2004. Genetic Transformation of Crops for Insect Resistance: Potential and Limitations. *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.*, 23: 47-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352680490273400>

Shimada, N., Kim, Y.S., Miyamoto, K., Yoshioka, M., Murata, H. (2003) Effects of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ab Toxin on Mammalian Cells. *J. Vet. Med. Sci.* 65, 187–191. <https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.65.187>

Singh, G., Rup, P.J., Koul, O., (2007) Acute, sublethal and combination effects of azadirachtin and *Bacillus thuringiensis* toxins on *Helicoverpa armigera* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) larvae. *Bull. Entomol. Res.*, 97: 351–357. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007485307005019>

Tabashnik, B.E., Fabrick, J.A., Unnithan, G.C., Yelich, A.J., Masson, L., Zhang, J., Bravo, A., Soberón, M. (2013) Efficacy of genetically modified Bt toxins alone and in combinations against pink bollworm resistant to Cry1Ac and Cry2Ab. *PloS One* 8: e80496.

Thomas, W.E., Ellar, D.J. (1983) *Bacillus thuringiensis* var *israelensis* crystal delta-endotoxin: effects on insect and mammalian cells in vitro and in vivo. *J. Cell Sci.* 60, 181–197.

Vázquez-Padrón, R.I., Moreno-Fierros, L., Neri-Bazán, L., de la Riva, G.A., López-Revilla, R. (1999) Intragastric and intraperitoneal administration of Cry1Ac protoxin from *Bacillus thuringiensis* induces systemic and mucosal antibody responses in mice. *Life Sci.* 64, 1897–1912. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3205\(99\)00136-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3205(99)00136-8)

Venter, H.J., Bøhn, T. (2016) Interactions between Bt crops and aquatic ecosystems: A review. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 35, 2891–2902. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3583>

Walsh, M.C., Buzoianu, S.G., Gardiner, G.E., Rea, M.C., Gelencsér, E., Jánosi, A., ... & Lawlor, P. G. (2011) Fate of transgenic DNA from orally administered Bt MON810 maize and effects on immune response and growth in pigs. *PLoS One*, 6(11): e27177. <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0027177>

Zhang, J., Wang, C., Qin, J. (2000) The Interactions between Soybean Trypsin Inhibitor and δ -Endotoxin of *Bacillus thuringiensis* in *Helicoverpa armigera* Larva. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* 75: 259-266. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jipa.2000.4936>

Zhu, Y.C., Adamczyk, J.J., West, S. (2005) Avidin, a Potential Biopesticide and Synergist to *Bacillus thuringiensis* Toxins Against Field Crop Insects. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 98: 1566-1571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/98.5.1566>

Zhu, Y.C., Abel, C.A., Chen, M.S. (2007) Interaction of Cry1Ac toxin (*Bacillus thuringiensis*) and proteinase inhibitors on the growth, development, and midgut proteinase activities of the bollworm, *Helicoverpa zea*. *Pestic Biochem Phys* 87(1): 39-46.

Allergenicity

Bt toxins are known to be immunogenic. They seem to act as allergens and adjuvant effects are likely to occur. In regard to immunogenicity (non-IgE-mediated immune

adverse reactions), it is generally acknowledged that Bt toxins are immunogenic (Rubio-Infante & Moreno-Fierros, 2016; Adel-Patient et.al., 2011; Andreassen et.al., 2015a,b; Andreassen et.al., 2016; see also Then & Bauer-Panskus, 2017). Thus, there are some substantial reasons for concern that reactions to allergens can be enhanced. This is relevant since in food/feed the Bt toxins can be mixed with allergens from soybeans, amongst others. Mixing with soybeans can also substantially prolong the degradation of the Bt toxins in the gastric system (Pardo-López et al., 2009).

New findings (Santos-Vigil et al., 2018) now indicate the allergenic potential of Cry toxins after intra-gastric administration in a murine model. Thus, the EFSA assumption that a detailed assessment of the allergenic potential of Cry toxins is not necessary is simply wrong.

Consequently, the assessment on allergenicity cannot be regarded as conclusive.

Adel-Patient, K., Guimaraes, V.D., Paris, A., Drumare, M.F., Ah-Leung, S., Lamourette, P., ... & Créminon, C. (2011) Immunological and metabolomic impacts of administration of Cry1Ab protein and MON 810 maize in mouse. *PloS one*, 6(1): e16346. <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0016346>

Andreassen, M., Rocca, E., Bøhn, T., Wikmark, O.G., van den Berg, J., Løvik, M., ... & Nygaard, U. C. (2015a) Humoral and cellular immune responses in mice after airway administration of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ab and MON810 cry1Ab-transgenic maize. *Food and agricultural immunology*, 26(4): 521-537. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09540105.2014.988128>

Andreassen, M., Bøhn, T., Wikmark, O.G., Van den Berg, J., Løvik, M., Traavik, T., & Nygaard, U. C. (2015b) Cry1Ab Protein from *Bacillus thuringiensis* and MON810 cry1Ab-transgenic Maize Exerts No Adjuvant Effect After Airway Exposure. *Scandinavian journal of immunology*, 81(3): 192-200. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/sji.12269/full>

Andreassen, M., Bøhn, T., Wikmark, O. G., Bodin, J., Traavik, T., Løvik, M., & Nygaard, U.C. (2016) Investigations of immunogenic, allergenic and adjuvant properties of Cry1Ab protein after intragastric exposure in a food allergy model in mice. *BMC immunology*, 17(1): 10. <https://bmcimmunol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12865-016-0148-x>

Pardo-López, L., Muñoz-Garay, C., Porta, H., Rodríguez-Almazán, C., Soberón, M., Bravo, A., (2009). Strategies to improve the insecticidal activity of Cry toxins from *Bacillus thuringiensis*. *Peptides, Invertebrate Neuropeptides*, IX 30: 589–595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.peptides.2008.07.027>

Rubio-Infante, N., & Moreno-Fierros, L. (2016) An overview of the safety and biological effects of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry toxins in mammals. *Journal of Applied Toxicology*, 36(5): 630-648. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jat.3252/full>

Santos-Vigil, K., Ilhuicatzi-Alvarado D., García-Hernández, A.L., Herrera-García, J.S., Moreno-Fierros, L. (2018) Study of the allergenic potential of *Bacillus thuringiensis* Cry1Ac toxin following intra-gastric administration in a murine model of food-allergy, *International Immunopharmacology* 61 (2018) 185–196

Then, C., & Bauer-Panskus, A. (2017) Possible health impacts of Bt toxins and residues from spraying with complementary herbicides in genetically engineered soybeans and risk assessment as performed by the European Food Safety Authority EFSA. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 29(1): 1. <https://enveurope.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s12302-016-0099-0>

Others

(1) In its risk assessment, EFSA refers several times to previous experience with the Bt proteins (as expressed in maize 1507 and maize 59122) to explain why further data are not needed. However, EFSA rejected the request from experts of Member States to also take into account the data from these other events, such as that on the expression rate of the Bt proteins. Further, EFSA did not request a literature review, including those other events. Instead, EFSA concluded, that a systematic literature review would not be justified because of the low number of specific publications on the event maize 4114: “A systematic literature review as referred to in Regulation EU No 503/2013 has not been provided in support of the risk assessment of application EFSA-GMO-NL-2014-123, because of the limited number of relevant publications available on maize 4114.”

This clearly is a violation of the requirements of Regulation (EU) No 503/2013 and cherry-picking of information in regard to experience with similar events already on the market.

(2) According to Regulation (EU) No 503/2013, the applicant has to ensure that post-market monitoring is developed to collect reliable information with respect to the detection of indications of whether any (adverse) effects on health may be related to genetically modified food or feed consumption. Some experts from Member States have made appropriate demands regarding the implementation this obligation. Accordingly, the monitoring report should deliver detailed information on i) actual

volumes of maize 4114 imported into the EU, ii) the ports and silos where shipments of maize 4114 were unloaded, iii) the processing plants where maize 4114 was transferred to, iv) the amount of maize 4114 used on farms for feed, and v) transport routes of maize 4114.

The applicant is further requested to explain how the PMM of maize 4114 in mixed GMO commodities imported, processed or used for food/feed is put into practice. Since traders may co-mingle maize 4114 with other imported commercial GM maize that is processed or used for food/feed, the applicant is requested to explain how the monitoring will be designed to distinguish between potential adverse effects caused by maize 4114 and those caused by other GM maize.

The monitoring should be run in regions where viable maize 4114 will be transported, stored, packaged, processed or used for food/feed. In case of substantial losses and spread of maize 4114, all receiving environments need to be monitored.

3. Environmental risk assessment

EFSA acknowledges that potential gene transfer between maize and weedy *Zea* species, such as teosintes and/or maize-teosinte hybrids can occur (Trtikova et al., 2017).

However, EFSA only vaguely considers the consequences of potential hazards associated with the potential gene flow from maize to teosinte and from teosinte to maize. Much more detailed investigation would be needed to assess the introgression of wild teosinte populations with gene constructs inserted in maize 4114 and its effects on fitness of any progenies.

Further, as shown by Pascher (2016), EFSA is also underestimating the risks posed by the occurrence of volunteers from maize plants.

Consequently, environmental risk assessment carried out by EFSA is not acceptable.

Pascher, K. (2016) Spread of volunteer and feral maize plants in Central Europe: recent data from Austria. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 28(1): 30.

Trtikova, M., Lohn, A., Binimelis, R., Chapela, I., Oehen, B., Zemp, N., Widmer, A., Hilbeck, A. (2017) Teosinte in Europe – Searching for the Origin of a Novel Weed. *Scientific Reports*, 7: 1560.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The EFSA risk assessment should be rejected.

When making his decision the risk manager should also take into account issues that are related to pesticide regulation. In this case, glufosinate-ammonium is about to be prohibited in the European Union.
