



# JRC VALIDATED METHODS, REFERENCE METHODS AND MEASUREMENTS REPORTS

# Report on the Verification of the Performance of MS8, RF3 and GT73 Event-specific PCR-based Methods Applied to DNA Extracted from GM Stack MS8xRF3xGT73 Oilseed Rape

Validation Report

Elena Nardini Marco Mazzara Joachim Kreysa

pean Union Reference Labora



2014

Report EUR 26926 EN

European Commission Joint Research Centre Institute for Health and Consumer Protection

#### **Contact information**

Molecular Biology and Genomics Unit Address: Joint Research Centre, Via Enrico Fermi 2749, TP 201, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy E-mail: eurl-gmff@jrc.ec.europa.eu Tel.: +39 0332 78 5165 Fax: +39 0332 78 9333

https://ec.europa.eu/jrc

This publication is a Validated Methods, Reference Methods and Measurements Report by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission.

#### Legal Notice

This publication is a Validated Methods, Reference Methods and Measurements Report by the Joint Research Centre, the European Commission's in-house science service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policy-making process. The scientific output expressed does not imply a policy position of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

JRC91061

EUR 26926 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-44019-9 (PDF)

ISSN 1831-9424 (online)

doi: 10.2788/356575

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2014

© European Union, 2014

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Printed in Italy



Institute for Health and Consumer Protection

Molecular Biology and Genomics Unit



# Report on the Verification of the Performance of MS8, RF3 and GT73 Event-specific PCRbased Methods Applied to DNA Extracted from GM Stack MS8xRF3xGT73 Oilseed Rape

21 October 2014

# **European Union Reference Laboratory for GM Food and Feed**

# **Executive Summary**

A joint application was submitted by Bayer CropScience AG and Monsanto Company to request the authorisation of genetically modified stack (GM stack) MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape (tolerant to glufosinate ammonium and glyphosate) and all sub-combinations of the individual events as present in the segregating progeny, for food and feed uses, and import and processing, in accordance with articles 5 and 17 of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on GM Food and Feed. The unique identifier assigned to GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape is ACS-BNØØ5-8xACS-BNØØ3-6xMON-ØØØ73-7.

The GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape has been obtained by conventional crossing between three genetically modified oilseed rape events: MS8, RF3 and GT73, without any new genetic modification.

The EU-RL GMFF has previously validated individually, and declared fit for purpose, the detection methods for the single events MS8, RF3 and GT73 (see http://gmocrl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx). In line with the approach defined by the ENGL (http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/doc/Min Perf Requirements Analytical methods.pdf) the EU-RL GMFF has carried out only an *in-house* verification of the performance of each validated method when applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

The results of the *in-house* verification led to the conclusion that the individual methods meet the ENGL performance criteria also when applied to genomic DNA extracted from the GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

This report is published at <u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>.

## Content

| EXECL         | JTIVE SUMMARY  | 1  |
|---------------|--|----|
| 1. IN         |  | 4  |
| 2. STE        | P 1 (DOSSIER RECEPTION AND ACCEPTANCE)   | 4  |
| 3. STE        | P 2 (DOSSIER SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT)  | 4  |
| 4. STI        | EP 3 (EU-RL GMFF EXPERIMENTAL TESTING)   | 6  |
| 4.            | .5 DEVIATIONS FROM THE VALIDATED METHODS                                       |    |
| AN<br>6. COI  | MPARISON OF METHOD PERFORMANCE ON MS8XR<br>D ON THE SINGLE EVENTS<br>NCLUSIONS | 11 |
| <b>7. REF</b> | ERENCES  |    |

### **Quality assurance**

The EU-RL GMFF is ISO 17025:2005 accredited [certificate number: ACCREDIA 1172 (Flexible Scope for DNA extraction and qualitative/quantitative PCR) - Accredited tests are available at <a href="http://www.accredia.it/accred

The original version of the document containing evidence of internal checks and authorisation for publication is archived within the EU-RL GMFF quality system.

The EU-RL GMFF is also ISO 17043:2010 accredited (proficiency test provider) and applies the corresponding procedures and processes for the management of ring trials during the method validation.

The EU-RL GMFF conducts its activities under the certification ISO 9001:2008 of the Institute for Health and Consumer Protection (IHCP) provided by CERMET.

#### Address of contact laboratory:

European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC) Institute for Health and Consumer Protection (IHCP) Molecular Biology and Genomics Unit (MBG) European Union Reference Laboratory for GM Food and Feed Via E. Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra (VA) – Italy Functional mailbox: <u>eurl-gmff@jrc.ec.europa.eu</u>

EURL-VL-08/09VR

#### 1. Introduction

The EU legislative system <sup>(1, 2)</sup> for genetically modified food and feed provides that any GMO for food and feed use shall undergo the authorisation process before it can be placed on the market. This holds true also for a GMO containing more than one single GM event obtained by conventional crossing, co-transformation or re-transformation (genetically modified stack).

Consequently, the application for authorisation of a GM stack shall be accompanied, among others, by an event-specific method for detection, identification and quantification for each GM event composing the stack, and by samples of the stack and food and feed derived from it. The EU-RL GMFF shall validate the event specific methods of detection proposed by the applicant with regard to their performance when applied to DNA extracted from the stack, and shall report to the European Food Safety Authority, who will include the EU-RL GMFF report in its overall opinion concerning the risk assessment and potential authorisation of the assessed stack. In line with the approach defined bv the ENGL (http://gmocrl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/doc/Min Perf Requirements Analytical methods.pdf) the EU-RL GMFF carries out an *in-house* verification of the performance of each event-specific method if this method has previously been validated by the EU-RL GMFF for the parental single-line event and these events have been stacked by conventional crossing. These criteria are met for the GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

Upon reception of methods, samples and related data (step 1), the EU-RL GMFF carried out the assessment of the documentation (step 2) and the *in-house* verification of the methods (step 3) according to the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 641/2004 (Annex I).

The results of the *in-house* verification study were evaluated with reference to ENGL method performance requirements <sup>(3)</sup> and to the validation results on the individual events.

## 2. Step 1 (dossier reception and acceptance)

Bayer CropScience AG and Monsanto Company submitted the detection methods, data demonstrating their adequate performance, and the corresponding control samples DNA extracted from GM stack oilseed rape MS8xRF3xGT73 and from non GM oilseed rape.

The dossier was found to be complete and thus was moved to step 2.

#### 3. Step 2 (dossier scientific assessment)

The data provided by the applicant were assessed against the method acceptance criteria set out by the  $ENGL^{(3)}$  and with regard to their documentation and reliability.

Table 1 shows values of trueness (expressed as bias %) and precision (expressed as RSDr %) calculated by the applicant for the three methods on the stack DNA. Means are the average of eighteen replicates obtained through three runs performed with ABI Prism® 7900HT Fast sequence detection system. Percentages are expressed in copies as GM DNA / total DNA x 100 (total DNA = GM DNA + non-GM DNA).

Note: Numerical values presented in the tables of this report were rounded keeping two digits for values  $\leq$  1, one digit for values between 1 and 10 and no digit for values  $\geq$  10. The calculations in the MS Excel files however were done over not rounded data. This approach might create generate small inconsistencies in the numerical values reported in the tables but it allows a higher precision in the final results.

The EU-RL GMFF verified the data and concluded that they were reliable and seemed to confirm that the methods meet the ENGL performance criteria <sup>(3)</sup>.

| MS8                    |                        |             |       |  |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------|--|
| Unknown sample GM%*    | Expected value (GMO %) |             |       |  |
|                        | 0.08                   | 0.9         | 4.5   |  |
| Mean                   | 0.073                  | 0.83        | 4.8   |  |
| RSD <sub>r</sub> (%)   | 14                     | 11          | 6.8   |  |
| Bias (%)               | - 8.5                  | - 8.2       | 8.3   |  |
|                        | RF3                    |             |       |  |
| Unknown comple CM04    | Expected value (GMO %) |             |       |  |
| Unknown sample GM%     | 0.08                   | 0.9         | 4.5   |  |
| Mean                   | 0.074                  | 0.89        | 4.8   |  |
| RSD <sub>r</sub> (%)   | 11                     | 5.8         | 7.2   |  |
| Bias (%)               | - 11                   | - 6.7       | 6.4   |  |
|                        | GT73                   |             |       |  |
| University comple CM0/ | Expecte                | ed value (G | MO %) |  |
| Unknown sample GM%     | 0.08                   | 0.9         | 4.5   |  |
| Mean                   | 0.074                  | 0.87        | 4.73  |  |
| RSD <sub>r</sub> (%)   | 17                     | 5.6         | 6.2   |  |
| Bias (%)               | - 8.5                  | - 3.3       | 5.8   |  |

Table 1. Trueness (expressed as bias %) and precision (expressed as relative repeatability standard deviation, RSDr %) for the MS8, RF3 and GT73 methods applied to GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73.

\* Unknown samples are DNA samples containing different levels of GM DNA (expressed in copy number) from stack material and non-GM DNA from conventional material.

Two requests for complementary information regarding methods, control samples and DNA sequences were addressed to the applicant. The applicant adapted the previously validated methods introducing small modifications in the reaction volume, primers concentration and in the method of calculation of data (see Section 4.5 for details); the applicant justified these

modifications with the need to improve method's practicability and submitted test results showing that the ENGL method's acceptance criteria were fully satisfied. The EU-RL GMFF verified the data and the complementary information received and accepted the received clarifications as satisfactory.

The dossier was therefore moved to step 3.

### 4. Step 3 (EU-RL GMFF experimental testing)

In step 3 the EU-RL GMFF implemented the three methods in its own laboratory and performed a verification of their performance when applied to DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

#### 4.1 Materials

The following control samples were provided by the applicant:

- genomic DNA extracted from leaves of GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape
- genomic DNA extracted from leaves of non GM oilseed rape

The EU-RL GMFF prepared test samples of different GMO concentrations by mixing genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape and genomic DNA extracted from non GM oilseed rape in a constant amount of total oilseed rape DNA. Table 2 shows the five GM concentrations used in the verification of the MS8, RF3 and GT73 methods when applying them to genomic DNA extracted from the GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape. These are the same concentrations used in the validation of these methods for the parental single line GMOs.

| MS8 GM%                | RF3 GM%                | GT73 GM%               |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| (GM DNA / Non-GM DNA x | (GM DNA / Non-GM DNA x | (GM DNA / Non-GM DNA x |
| 100)                   | 100)                   | 100)                   |
| 0.1                    | 0.1                    | 0.1                    |
| 0.4                    | 0.4                    | 0.4                    |
| 0.9                    | 0.9                    | 0.9                    |
| 1.8                    | 1.8                    | 4.0                    |
| 3.6                    | 3.6                    | 8.0                    |

Table 2. Percentage of MS8, RF3 and GT73 in MS8xRF3xGT73 verification samples.

The in-house verification followed the protocols already published as validated methods for the individual MS8, RF3 and GT73 events (available at <u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>).

# 4.2 DNA extraction

A method for DNA extraction from oilseed rape seeds was previously evaluated by the EU-RL GMFF with regard to its performance characteristics and was considered valid, i.e. fit the purpose of providing oilseed rape DNA of appropriate quality and amount for being used in subsequent PCR experiments. The protocol for the DNA extraction method is available at http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/summaries/OSR DNAExtr sampl correctedversion1 CRL VL 07 04.pdf.

Consequently, the EU-RL GMFF did not verify the DNA extraction method proposed by the applicant.

# 4.3 Experimental design

Eight PCR runs were carried out for each method. In each run, samples were analysed in parallel with both the GM-specific system and the reference system *CruA (Cruciferin A)*. Five GM levels were examined per run, each GM level in duplicate. PCR analysis was performed in triplicate for all samples. In total, for each method (MS8, RF3 and GT73), the quantification of the five GM levels was performed as an average of sixteen replicates per GM level (8 runs x 2 replicated levels per run). An Excel spreadsheet was used for the determination of GM%.

# 4.4 PCR methods

During the verification study, the EU-RL GMFF carried out parallel tests on DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape using the single detection methods previously validated for the respective single GM events MS8, RF3 and GT73.

For detection of GM oilseed rape events MS8, RF3 and GT73, DNA fragments of 130-bp, 139bp and 108-bp respectively are amplified using specific primers. PCR products are measured during each cycle (real-time) by means of target-specific oligonucleotide probes labelled with two fluorescent dyes: FAM (6-carboxyfluorescein) as reporter dye at their 5'-end and TAMRA (6-carboxytetramethylrhodamine) as a quencher dye at their 3'-end.

For quantification of GM oilseed rape events MS8, RF3 and GT73, a taxon-specific reference system amplifies a 101-bp fragment of *CruA (Cruciferin A)* an oilseed rape endogenous gene (GenBank X14555), using two *CruA* gene-specific primers and a *CruA* gene-specific probe labelled with VIC and TAMRA.

For quantification of events MS8 and RF3 DNA in a test sample, the normalised  $\Delta$ Ct values of calibration samples are used to calculate, by linear regression, a standard curve (plotting  $\Delta$ Ct values against the logarithm of the amount of MS8 and RF3 events DNA, respectively). The normalised  $\Delta$ Ct values of the unknown samples are measured and, by means of the regression formula, the relative amount of MS8 and RF3 events, respectively, is estimated.

For quantification of GM soybean event GT73, standard curves are generated both for the GT73, and for the *CruA* specific system by plotting Ct values of the calibration standards against the logarithm of the DNA copy numbers and by fitting a linear regression into these data. Thereafter, the standard curves are used to estimate the copy numbers in the test sample DNA by interpolation from the standard curves. For relative quantification of event GT73 DNA in a test sample, the GT73 copy number is divided by the copy number of the taxon-specific (*CruA*) reference gene and multiplied by 100 to obtain the percentage value (GM% = GT73/*CruA* x 100).

For detailed information on the preparation of the respective standard curve calibration samples please refer to the protocols of the validated methods at <u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>.

## 4.5 Deviations from the validated methods

For MS8 and RF3 events, the methods used by the applicant to generate the data submitted to the EU-RL GMFF in this application were based on the 'two standard curves' approach (one calibration curve for the GM system and one for the reference system). This approach was not substantially affecting the method and produced results well within the ENGL the acceptance criteria. It is however different from the  $\Delta$ Ct approach adopted by the EU-RL GMFF during the validation of the single lines. The applicant asked to the EU-RL GMFF to perform the verification of the MS8 and RF3 methods applied to MS8xRF3xGT73 DNA using the validated methods with no modifications (available at <u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>).

Also for GT73, the method used by the applicant to generate the data submitted to the EU-RL GMFF in the application dossier presented some deviations from the originally validated method (i.e. decrease of reaction volumes from 50uL to 25uL and increase in the final concentration of primers from 150nM to 160nM). These deviations were applied due to availability of different Real Time PCR instruments and did not impact the performance of the method (the results were all within the ENGL limits). The verification study performed by the EU-RL GMFF for GT73 applied to MS8xRF3xGT73 DNA, has been carried out using the method validated for the single line with no modifications (available at <a href="http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx">http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</a>).

# 4.6 Results

Tables 3, 4 and 5 present the values of the slopes of the different standard curves generated by the EU-RL GMFF when using DNA extracted from the GM stack, from which the PCR efficiency is calculated using the formula  $[10^{(-1/slope)} - 1] \times 100$ , and of the R<sup>2</sup> (expressing the linearity of the regression) reported for all PCR systems in the eight runs, for GM oilseed rape events MS8, RF3 and GT73.

| Table 3. Values of standa | d curve slope, | , PCR efficiency | and linearity | (R <sup>2</sup> ) for th | e MS8 method on GM |
|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilse  | ed rape.       |                  |               |                          |                    |

|      | MS8                            |     |                                |  |  |  |
|------|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Run  | Slope PCR<br>Efficiency<br>(%) |     | Linearity<br>(R <sup>2</sup> ) |  |  |  |
| 1    | -3.32                          | 100 | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 2    | -3.38                          | 98  | 0.99                           |  |  |  |
| 3    | -3.53                          | 92  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 4    | -3.53                          | 92  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 5    | -3.30                          | 101 | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 6    | -3.36                          | 98  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 7    | -3.71                          | 86  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 8    | -3.38                          | 98  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| Mean | -3.44                          | 96  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |

Table 4. Values of standard curve slope, PCR efficiency and linearity ( $R^2$ ) for the RF3 method on GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

|      | RF3                            |     |                                |  |  |  |
|------|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Run  | Slope PCR<br>Efficiency<br>(%) |     | Linearity<br>(R <sup>2</sup> ) |  |  |  |
| 1    | -3.45                          | 95  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 2    | -3.23                          | 104 | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 3    | -3.46                          | 95  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 4    | -3.58                          | 90  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 5    | -3.49                          | 94  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 6    | -3.47                          | 94  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 7    | -3.51                          | 93  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| 8    | -3.51                          | 93  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |
| Mean | -3.46                          | 95  | 1.00                           |  |  |  |

|      | GT73  |                          |                                | CruA  |                          |                                |  |
|------|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Run  | Slope | PCR<br>Efficiency<br>(%) | Linearity<br>(R <sup>2</sup> ) | Slope | PCR<br>Efficiency<br>(%) | Linearity<br>(R <sup>2</sup> ) |  |
| 1    | -3.46 | 94                       | 1.00                           | -3.60 | 90                       | 1.00                           |  |
| 2    | -3.53 | 92                       | 1.00                           | -3.48 | 94                       | 1.00                           |  |
| 3    | -3.56 | 91                       | 1.00                           | -3.48 | 94                       | 0.99                           |  |
| 4    | -3.40 | 97                       | 1.00                           | -3.53 | 92                       | 1.00                           |  |
| 5    | -3.61 | 89                       | 1.00                           | -3.60 | 90                       | 0.99                           |  |
| 6    | -3.49 | 94                       | 1.00                           | -3.51 | 93                       | 1.00                           |  |
| 7    | -3.35 | 99                       | 1.00                           | -3.49 | 94                       | 1.00                           |  |
| 8    | -3.51 | 93                       | 1.00                           | -3.52 | 92                       | 1.00                           |  |
| Mean | -3.49 | 94                       | 1.00                           | -3.53 | 92                       | 1.00                           |  |

Table 5. Values of standard curve slope, PCR efficiency and linearity ( $R^2$ ) for the GT73 method on GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

The mean PCR efficiencies of the calibration curves for each of the three event-specific methods were above 90% (96% for MS8, 95% for RF3, and 94% and 92% for GT73, respectively). The calibration curves for GT73 and CruA assays were both linear as estimated by the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), giving a value of 1 for both assays. The data presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5 confirm the appropriate performance characteristics of the three methods when tested on MS8xRF3xRGT73 in terms of PCR efficiency and linearity.

The EU-RL GMFF also assessed the values of trueness (expressed as bias %) and precision (expressed as relative repeatability standard deviation, RSDr %) of the three methods applied to samples of DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xRGT73 oilseed rape, see tables 6, 7 and 8.

| MS8                        |      |                       |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|------|------|--|
| Unknown                    |      | Expected value (GMO%) |      |      |      |  |
| sample GM% 0.1 0.4 0.9 1.8 |      |                       |      |      | 3.6  |  |
| Mean                       | 0.10 | 0.40                  | 0.96 | 1.76 | 3.63 |  |
| SD                         | 0.02 | 0.04                  | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.19 |  |
| RSD <sub>r</sub> (%)       | 18   | 11                    | 6.3  | 8.5  | 5.1  |  |
| Bias (%)                   | 3.3  | 1.2                   | 7.2  | -2.4 | 0.8  |  |

Table 6. Estimates of trueness (expressed as bias %) and relative repeatability standard deviation (RSD<sub>r</sub> %) of the MS8 method applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

| RF3                  |                     |                       |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------|------|------|--|
| Unknown              |                     | Expected value (GMO%) |      |      |      |  |
| sample GM%           | 0.1 0.4 0.9 1.8 3.6 |                       |      |      |      |  |
| Mean                 | 0.11                | 0.43                  | 0.94 | 1.80 | 3.83 |  |
| SD                   | 0.01                | 0.04                  | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.25 |  |
| RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) | 9.3                 | 8.7                   | 8.4  | 4.5  | 6.5  |  |
| Bias (%)             | 7.4                 | 7.4                   | 4.0  | -0.2 | 6.4  |  |

Table 7. Estimates of trueness (expressed as bias %) and relative repeatability standard deviation ( $RSD_r$  %) of the RF3 method applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

Table 8. Estimates of trueness (expressed as bias %) and relative repeatability standard deviation (RSD<sub>r</sub> %) of the GT73 method applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

| GT73                 |                              |      |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Unknown              | Expected value (GMO%)        |      |      |      |      |  |
| sample GM%           | ample GM% 0.1 0.4 0.9 4.0 8. |      |      |      |      |  |
| Mean                 | 0.10                         | 0.44 | 0.97 | 4.23 | 8.41 |  |
| SD                   | 0.02                         | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.25 | 0.40 |  |
| RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) | 16                           | 12   | 9.0  | 6.0  | 4.8  |  |
| Bias (%)             | 4.5                          | 9.5  | 7.9  | 5.8  | 5.2  |  |

The trueness of the method is estimated using the measurements of the method bias for each GM level. According to the ENGL acceptance criteria and method performance requirements, the trueness of the method should be  $\pm$  25% across the entire dynamic range. As shown in Tables 6, 7 and 8, the values range from -2.4% to 7.2% for MS8, from -0.2% to 7.4% for RF3, and from 4.5% to 9.5% for GT73. Therefore, the three methods satisfy the above mentioned requirement throughout their respective dynamic ranges, also when applied to DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 also show the relative repeatability standard deviation ( $RSD_r$ ) as estimated for each GM level. According to the ENGL acceptance criteria and method performance requirements, the EU-RL GMFF requires  $RSD_r$  values to be below 25%. As the values range between 5.1% and 18% for MS8, between 4.5% and 9.3% for RF3, and between 4.8% and 16% for GT73, the three methods satisfy this requirement throughout their respective dynamic ranges when applied to DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

# 5. Comparison of method performance on MS8xRF3xGT73 and on the single events

An indicative comparison of the performance (bias, RSDr %) of the three methods applied to GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape and to the single line events is shown in Tables 9, 10 and 11. The performance of the methods on the single lines was previously validated through international collaborative trials (<u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>).

Note: the comparison of data generated in different testing conditions and different times is intended to be only of qualitative nature; differences in the figures reported are not necessarily statistically significant.

Table 9. Qualitative comparison of the performance of the MS8 detection method applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape and to genomic DNA extracted from the single line event MS8.

| Trueness and repeatability of MS8<br>quantification on MS8xRF3xGT73 |          |                      |     |          |                      |
|---|----------|----------------------|-----|----------|----------------------|
| GM%   | Bias (%) | RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) | GM% | Bias (%) | RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) |
| 0.1   | 3.3      | 18                   | 0.1 | 7.4      | 22                   |
| 0.4   | 1.2      | 11                   | 0.4 | -3.5     | 18                   |
| 0.9   | 7.2      | 6.3                  | 0.9 | -1.0     | 14                   |
| 1.8   | -2.4     | 8.5                  | 1.8 | -1.0     | 17                   |
| 3.6   | 0.8      | 5.1                  | 3.6 | -7.5     | 11                   |

\*method validated in inter-laboratory study (<u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>)

Table 10. Qualitative comparison of the performance of the RF3 detection method applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape and to genomic DNA extracted from the single line event RF3.

| Trueness and repeatability of RF3<br>quantification on MS8xRF3xGT73 |          |                      |     | ess and repeatabil<br>ication on single e | -                    |
|---|----------|----------------------|-----|---|----------------------|
| GM%   | Bias (%) | RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) | GM% | Bias (%)                                  | RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) |
| 0.1   | 7.4      | 9.3                  | 0.1 | 6.9                                       | 13                   |
| 0.4   | 7.4      | 8.7                  | 0.4 | 4.4                                       | 12                   |
| 0.9   | 4.0      | 8.4                  | 0.9 | 4.5                                       | 14                   |
| 1.8   | -0.2     | 4.5                  | 1.8 | -2.5                                      | 12                   |
| 3.6   | 6.4      | 6.5                  | 3.6 | -5.2                                      | 13                   |

\*method validated in inter-laboratory study (<u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx</u>)

Table 11. Qualitative comparison of the performance of the GT73 detection method applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape and to genomic DNA extracted from the single line event GT73.

| Trueness and repeatability of GT73<br>quantification on MS8xRF3xGT73 |          |                      | Trueness and repeatability of GT73<br>quantification on single event GT73* |          |                      |
|--|----------|----------------------|--|----------|----------------------|
| GM%  | Bias (%) | RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) | GM%  | Bias (%) | RSD <sub>r</sub> (%) |
| 0.1  | 4.5      | 16                   | 0.1  | -25      | 23                   |
| 0.4  | 9.5      | 12                   | 0.4  | -13      | 17                   |
| 0.9  | 7.9      | 9.0                  | 0.9  | -6.0     | 17                   |
| 4.0  | 5.8      | 6.0                  | 4.0  | 5.8      | 14                   |
| 8.0  | 5.2      | 4.8                  | 8.0  | 4.5      | 14                   |

\*method validated in inter-laboratory study (http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx)

## 6. Conclusions

The performance of the three event-specific methods for the detection and quantification of oilseed rape events MS8, RF3 and GT73, when applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape, meets the ENGL performance requirements, as assessed on the control samples provided by the applicant.

The method verification has demonstrated that the PCR efficiency, linearity, trueness and repeatability of the methods were within the limits established by the ENGL.

In conclusion, the verification study confirmed that the three methods are capable to detect, identify and quantify each of the GM events when applied to genomic DNA of suitable quality, extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

Therefore these methods, developed and validated to detect and quantify the single events, can be equally applied for the detection and quantification of the respective events combined in GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

#### 7. References

- Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2003 on genetically modified food and feed (Text with EEA relevance). OJ L 268, 18.10.2003, p. 1–23.
- 2. Commission Regulation (EC) No 641/2004 of 6 April 2004 on detailed rules for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the application for the authorisation of new genetically modified food and feed, the notification of existing products and adventitious or technically

unavoidable presence of genetically modified material which has benefited from a favourable risk evaluation (Text with EEA relevance). OJ L 102, 7.4.2004, p. 14–25.

3. European Network of GMO Laboratories: Definition of minimum performance requirements for analytical methods of GMO testing. 13 October 2008. <u>http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/doc/Min Perf Requirements Analytical methods.pdf</u>.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union Freephone number (\*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (\*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server http://europa.eu/.

#### How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

European Commission EUR 26926 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for Health and Consumer Protection

Title: Report on the Verification of the Performance of MS8, RF3 and GT73 Event-specific PCR-based Methods Applied to DNA Extracted from GM Stack MS8xRF3xGT73 Oilseed Rape

Author(s): Elena Nardini, Marco Mazzara, Joachim Kreysa

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2014 – 18 pp. – 21.0 x 29.7 cm

EUR - Scientific and Technical Research series -ISSN 1831-9424 (online)

ISBN 978-92-79-44019-9 (PDF)

doi: 10.2788/356575

#### Abstract

A joint application was submitted by Bayer CropScience AG and Monsanto Company to request the authorisation of genetically modified stack (GM stack) MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape (tolerant to glufosinate ammonium and glyphosate) and all subcombinations of the individual events as present in the segregating progeny, for food and feed uses, and import and processing, in accordance with articles 5 and 17 of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on GM Food and Feed. The unique identifier assigned to GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape is ACS-BNØ05-8xACS-BNØ03-6xMON-ØØ073-7.

The GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape has been obtained by conventional crossing between three genetically modified oilseed rape events: MS8, RF3 and GT73, without any new genetic modification.

The EU-RL GMFF has previously validated individually, and declared fit for purpose, the detection methods for the single events MS8, RF3 and GT73 (see http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/StatusOfDossiers.aspx). In line with the approach defined by the ENGL (http://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/doc/Min\_Perf\_Requirements\_Analytical\_methods.pdf) the EU-RL GMFF has carried out only an inhouse verification of the performance of each validated method when applied to genomic DNA extracted from GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

The results of the in-house verification led to the conclusion that the individual methods meet the ENGL performance criteria also when applied to genomic DNA extracted from the GM stack MS8xRF3xGT73 oilseed rape.

#### **JRC** Mission

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new methods, tools and standards, and sharing its know-how with the Member States, the scientific community and international partners.

Serving society Stimulating innovation Supporting legislation

