# Serious Objections to Biosafety Trials of DMH-11 with special reference to Agronomic Data

#### **Kapil Shah**

[M.Sc. (Agri) in Plant Breeding and Genetics]

**JATAN: A Mission for Organic Farming** 

National Secretary, Organic Farming Association of India, Goa

Address: Vinoba Ashram, Gotri, Vadodara, Gujarat

Presentation to GEAC, New Delhi on 20th June, 2016

#### Reported higher than actual MSY of DMH-11 (Kg/ha)

Trial	Location	Reported by DRMR 1	Reported by Developer <sup>2</sup>	Comments
	Kumher	2285	2285	
BRL-I, 1st Year	Alwar	2516	2515	
(2010-11)	SGnagar	3000	3000	
	Average	2600	2600	
BRL-I,	Kumher	2892	3332	Developer reported
2nd Year	Alwar	3157	3638	15.2% higher than actually obtained yield for all
(2011-12)	Average	3024	3485	cultivars in this year trials*
	Delhi	1879	1879	
BRL-II (2014-15)	Bhatinda	2734	2734	
	Ludhiana	2543	2543	
	Average	2385	2386	
Actual Average of 8 Trials		2626		Overall Yield Increase of 7.5% notched up!
Average of A	Average		2824	7.3 /6 Hotelied up:

Ref: 1) BRL Trial Reports 2) Bio safety summary Report to GEAC

#### Low Yielder Checks used in Zone II

Check	No. of years of testing	No. of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	Note
<b>National Check</b>				
Varuna (Used under BRL)	5	28	1907	Compared with 15%
Kranti (Recommended and used under AICRP)	11	67	2245	Varuna was abandoned as NC before BRL testing started.
<b>Zonal Check</b>				
RL-1359 (Used under BRL)	7	41	2291	Compared with 1.3 %
NRCDR-2 (Recommended and used under AICRP)	5	32	2321	and 10.3% low yielder
RH-749 (Recommended under AICRP trials) (Karieky Trials)	<b>3</b> HT and AHT	<b>20</b> Trials	2553	

#### Low Yielder Checks used in Zone III

Check	No. of years of testing	No. of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	Note
National Check				
Varuna (Used under BRL)	5	38	1646	Compared with 10% low yielder.
Kranti (Recommended and used under AICRP)	11	79	1834	Varuna was abandoned as NC before BRL testing started.
Zonal Check				
Maya (Used under BRL)	5	38	1814	Compared with 9.8%
RGN-73 (Recommended and used under AICRP)	6	34	2012	low yielder.

Ref: AICRP data for IHT and AHT Trials

## False claims of "proper checks"

GEAC should tell the nation, which out of 8 trials is conducted with proper check?

- 1. DMH-11, being a hybrid, must be compared with hybrid as per standard protocol. As per the data presented, **hybrid is never used** for comparison during any of the trials.
- 2. During BRL trials, comparisons in both the zones for all three years were done with variety, which is neither a zonal check nor a national check as recommended by AICRP-RM for Hybrid Trials.
- 3. GEAC and developer's claim that "national check is used" is untrue.
- 4. BRL trials **violate the protocol as well as conditions** for Permission.
- 5. Without using proper comparators, claims of yield gains are scientifically not valid.

## A billion dollar question

Why hybrid was removed from comparison in BRL trials?

During non-BRL trials in 2006-07
 DMH-1 (Non-transgenic Hybrid) out yielded
 3 out of 4 locations in Zone II
 and

3 out of 5 locations in Zone III.

Even Mean of earlier hybrid is also higher in both the Zones.

#### :Worth to note:

 Hybrids were removed as comparators from all subsequent DMH-11 (BRL) trials, even though it is used in other hybrid trials. WHY?

#### **DMH-11** compared with existing Varieties (Zone III)

Cultivar	Year of Trials	Number of trial years	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Difference in MSY of DMH-11 over respective cultivar
Varieties (M	ISY based on AICRP trials)				
RH-749	2009-10, 2013-14, 2014-15	3	14	1851	39.9
DRMRIJ-31	2010-11	1	6	2322	11.5
NRCDR-2	2003-04, 2004-05	2	12	2106	22.9
Transgenic	Hybrid (MSY based on BRL	trials)			
DMH-11 (Only BRL Trials)	2010-11, 2011-12	2	2	2589	

#### **Comments:**

1. Yield advantage of DMH 11 over existing varieties is considerably high, but the data of MSY of DMH-11 is just from one location-Kumher

#### DMH-11 compared with existing Hybrids (Zone III)

Cultivar	Year of Trials	Number of trial years	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Difference in MSY of DMH-11 over respective cultivar
Hybrids (MS	SY based on AICRP trials)				
DMH-1	2004-05, 2007-08 to 2014-15	9	48	2074	24.8
NRCHB-506	2005-06, 2006-07, 2009-10 to 2014-15	8	41	2010	28.8
CORAL -437	2006-07 to 2008-09	3	17	1900	36.3
Transgenic	<b>Hybrid (MSY based on BRL</b>	trials)			
DMH-11 (Only BRL Trials)	2010-11, 2011-12	2	2	2589	

#### **Comments:**

1. Yield advantage of DMH 11 over two existing hybrids is considerably high, but the BRL trial was conducted at only one location-Kumher.

# Mean Seed Yield (Kg/ha) DOCTORED during BRL trials (Kumher)? "Derived Yield vs. Reported Yield"

	201	0-11	2011-12		
Entries	As per Pod- seed-test weight Calculation	Actually Reported after harvest	As per Pod- seed-test weight Calculation	Actually Reported after harvest	
Varuna Barnase (bn 3.6)	4284	1986	7541	2484	
EH2 Barstar (modbs 2.99)	2984	1730	4231	1640	
Varuna	4525	1866	7750	2375	
EH2	3160	1793	4752	1874	
DMH-11	4462	2285	6712	2892	
RL 1359/ Maya	4830	2057	5913	2196	

#### Mean Seed Yield (Kg/ha) DOCTORED during BRL trials (Alwar)?

	201	0-11	2011-12		
Entries	As per Pod- seed-test weight Calculation	Actually Reported after harvest	As per Pod- seed-test weight Calculation	Actually Reported after harvest	
Varuna Barnase (bn 3.6)	5758	1789	7596	2098	
EH2 Barstar (modbs 2.99)	5211	1842	8391	1582	
Varuna	5548	1741	9226	2169	
EH2	6194	1716	4659	1609	
DMH-11	5612	2516	15342	3158	
RL 1359/ Maya	4488	1767	7109	1837	

## Harvest Index during BRL Trials

Entry/ Location	Kumher		A	Sgnagar	
Year	2010-11	2011-12	2010-11	2011-12	2010-11
Varuna Barnase (bn 3.6)	3.79	2.74	13.74	1.80	1.92
EH2 Barstar (modbs 2.99)	3.94	1.86	15.31	1.16	1.68
Varuna	4.18	3.15	14.88	1.72	2.08
EH2	4.88	2.63	12.21	1.57	1.55
DMH-11	3.32	3.40	15.91	1.29	2.04
Maya/RL1359	3.93	2.81	11.88	0.99	1.51

## **Year-Wise Comparison**

#### DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone II) 2010-11

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Difference in MSY of DMH-11 over respective cultivar			
Varieties (MSY based on AIC	CRP trials)					
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	7	2757	0			
NRCDR-2 (IVT-AVT)	14	2392	15.3			
NRCDR-2 (IHT-AHT)	11	2337	18			
Hybrid (MSY based on AICR	RP trials)					
DMH-1 (IHT-AHT)	12	2729	1.1			
NRCHB-506 (IHT-AHT)	5	2407	14.6			
CORAL- 437 (IHT-AHT)	6	2656	3.8			
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based on BRL trials)						
DMH-11 (Alwar-SGnagar)	2	2758				

#### **DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone II) 2011-12**

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Difference in MSY of DMH-11 over respective cultivar	
Varieties (MSY based on AICRP trials)			Using DRMR Data	Using Developer Data
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	7	2414	30.8	50.7
NRCDR-2 (IVT-AVT)	14	2254	40.1	61.4
NRCDR-2 (IHT-AHT)	5	2480	27.3	46.7
Hybrid (MSY based on AICF	RP trials)			
DMH-1 (IHT-AHT)	5	2684	17.6	35.5
NRCHB-506 (IHT-AHT)	5	2427	30.1	49.9
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY ba	sed on BRL	trials)		
DMH-11(Alwar) DRMR Data	1	3157	15.2	
DMH-11 (Alwar) Developer Data	1	<b>3638</b> Ref: Al	- CRP Reports and	BRL Reports

#### **DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone II) 2014-15**

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Increase of DMH- 11, over respective cultivar
Varieties (MSY based on AICRP to	rials)		
RH-749 (IVT-AVT)	9	2329	2.4
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	9	2450	-2.6
Hybrid (MSY based on AICRP tri	als)		
DMH-1 (IHT-AHT)	7	2035	17.2
NRCHB-506 (IHT-AHT)	7	2315	3.1
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based o	n BRL trials	)	
DMH-11 (Delhi-Bathinda-Ludhiana)	3	2386	

#### **DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone III) 2010-11**

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Increase of DMH-11 over respective cultivar			
Varieties (MSY based on AIC	CRP trials)					
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	6	2322	-1.6			
Hybrid (MSY based on AICR	RP trials)					
DMH1 (IHT-AHT)	6	2167	5.4			
NRCHB506 (IHT-AHT)	6	2179	4.6			
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based on BRL trials)						
DMH-11 (Kumher)	1	2285				

#### **DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone III) 2011-12**

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Differ MSY of over res cult	DMH-11 spective
Varieties (MSY based on AICRP	trials)		Using DRMR Data	Using Developer Data
Hybrid (MSY based on AICRP trials)				
DMH1 (IHT-AHT)	6	1922	50.5	73.4
NRCHB506 (IHT-AHT)	6	2294	26.1	45.2
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based on BRL trials)				
DMH-11 (Kumher) Based DRMR data	1	2892	15	5.2
DMH-11 (Kumher) Based on Developer Data	1	3332		

# DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone II+Zone III) 2010-11

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Difference in MSY of DMH-11 over respective cultivar	
Varieties (MSY based on Ale	CRP trials)			
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	13	2556	1.7	
NRCDR-2 (IVT-AVT)	14	2392	8.7	
NRCDR-2 (IHT-AHT)	11	2337	11.3	
Hybrid (MSY based on AICI	RP trials)			
DMH-1 (IHT-AHT)	18	2541	2.3	
NRCHB-506 (IHT-AHT)	11	2282	13.9	
CORAL-437 (IHT-AHT)	6	2656	-2.1	
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based on BRL trials)				
DMH-11 (Kumher- Alwar-SGnagar)	3	2600		

# DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone II+Zone III) 2011-12

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	MSY of 1	ference in DMH-11 over tive cultivar
Varieties (MSY based on AICRP trials)			Using DRMR Data	Using Developer Data
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	7	2414	25.3	44.4
NRCDR-2 (IVT-AVT)	14	2254	34.2	54.6
NRCDR-2 (IHT-AHT)	5	2480	21.9	40.5
Hybrid (MSY based on AICRP trials)	Hybrid (MSY based on AICRP trials)			
DMH-1 (IHT-AHT)	11	2269	33.3	53.6
NRCHB-506 (IHT-AHT)	11	2354	28.5	48
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based on Etrials)	BRL			
DMH-11 (Kumher and Alwar) as reported by DRMR)	2	3024		
DMH-11 (Kumher and Alwar) as reported by developer	2	3485		

# DMH-11 compared with Existing Cultivars (Zone II+Zone III) 2014-15

Cultivar	Number of Trials	MSY (Kg/ha)	% Difference in MSY of DMH-11 over respective cultivar		
Varieties (MSY based on AICR	RP trials)				
RH-749 (IVT-AVT)	12	2201	8.4		
DRMRIJ-31 (IVT-AVT)	9	2450	-2.7		
NRCDR-2 (IVT-AVT)	0	-			
Hybrid (MSY based on AICRE	Hybrid (MSY based on AICRP trials)				
DMH1 (IHT-AHT)	11	2106	13.2		
NRCHB506 (IHT-AHT)	11	2375	0.4		
CORAL 437 (IHT-AHT)	0	-			
Transgenic Hybrid (MSY based on MLT and BRL trials)					
DMH-11 (Delhi- Bathinda- Ludhiana)	<b>3</b> Ref	<b>2385</b> : AICRP Repo	rts and BRL Reports		

## Other Issues related to Quality of Trials

- Issues with Protocols and permissions
- Issues with data collection
- Issues with data analysis
- Issues with reporting of results

#### **Observations related to susceptibility to Major diseases**

Trial	Location	Alternaria Leaf	White Rust	Powdery Mildew	Sclerotini a	Downy mildew	Orobanch e
	Kumher	All Nil	All Nil	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
BRL-I, 1st Year	Alwar	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	All Nil	$\checkmark$
	SG nagar	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
	Kumher	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
BRL-II, 2nd Year	Alwar	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	$\checkmark$
	SG nagar	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
BRL-III,	Delhi	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	-	$\checkmark$	0	0
3rd Year	Bhatinda	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	0	0	0	0
(2014-15)	Ludhiana	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	0	$\checkmark$	0	0

## A case of Reporting for Sclerotinia Rot

- January 2012 Temp. ranged from 5.5 degree C to 18.9 degree C and rainfall was 24.3 mm on one rainy day. The climatic conditions were very much convenient for the incidence of sclerotinia rot (stem rot) in Indian Mustard and almost all entries under AICRP trial were infected with the disease incidence (at 100 DAS) with range of 4.1% to 94.9% under artificial conditions and similar infections were reported in field conditions. It is surprising that BRL-1, 2nd year trial conducted at KVK, Kumher, just 10 kms away from AICRP trials records NIL for all entries in all replications.
- This is an illustration, amongst several others that creates doubts on the accuracy and competence of the team involved in recording data.

Ref: AICRP Report on Rapeseed and Mustard - 2011-12

#### Observations related to susceptibility to insect pests

Trial	Location	Mustard Aphid	Painted Bug	Leaf Miner	Cabbage Butterfly	Mustard Sawfly	Termites
	Kumher	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
BRL-I, 1st Year	Alwar	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
(2010-11)	SG nagar	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
	Kumher	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
BRL-II, 2nd Year	Alwar	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
(2011-12)	SG nagar	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil
BRL-III,	Delhi	$\checkmark$	0	0	0	0	0
3rd Year	Bhatinda	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2014-15)	Ludhiana	0	0	0	0	0	0

Ref: BRL Trial Reports IS THIS POSSIBLE & WILL GEAC DEPEND ON SUCH DATA?

#### **Observations related to beneficial insect**

Trial	Location	Coccinelids	Chryso- pherla	Syrphid Fly	Honeybee
	Kumher	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	√?
BRL-I, 1st Year	Alwar	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	√?
(2010-11)	SG nagar	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	√?
	Kumher	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	√?
BRL-II, 2nd Year	Alwar	$\checkmark$	All Nil	All Nil	√?
(2011-12)	SG nagar	All Nil	All Nil	All Nil	√?
BRL-III,	Delhi	$\checkmark$	0	0	√?
3rd Year	Bhatinda	0	0	0	√?
(2014-15)	Ludhiana	0	0	0	√?

WILL THE REGULATORS BELIEVE THIS KIND OF DATA?
IS IT A CASE OF INSECTS NOT BEING PRESENT OR NO OBSERVATIONS MADE AT ALL?

Ref: BRL Trial Reports

## Inconsistencies in Data related to Biomass & estimated harvest index

Trial	Location	Range of reported biomass production at maturity (g)	Note
	Kumher	362.5 -687.5	Plants were cut from the ground,
BRL-I, 1st Year	Alwar	110 - 150	estimated at KVK
(2010-11)	SGnagar	1206.6 – 1430.1	No information
BRL-II,	Kumher	685 - 870	?
2nd Year (2011-12)	Alwar	660 - <mark>1400</mark>	?
	Delhi	188.5 – 244.2	Whole Plant was uprooted
BRL-III,	Bhatinda	108.0 – 184.0	
3rd Year (2014-15)	Ludhiana	0.7 - 0.8	"Incorrect data" as mentioned in the Report. Observations seems to have been taken in Kg.

## **Thanks**

### Which is REAL DMH-11?

#### Until 2006-07:

F1 of EH-2 (Barnase) X Varuna (barstar)

#### **During BRL:**

F1 of Varuna (Barnase) X EH-2 (Barstar)
 Technically this can be considered as reciprocal cross- not exactly.

#### **Critical Objection:**

- When the parents are swapped, the offspring is bound to be different in terms of cytoplasmic inheritance
- This also has implications for event selection and stability
- Has this swapping happened with regulatory clearance or ignorance?
- Has GEAC discussed this?
- Is maintenance of one biosafety dossier under the name of DMH-11 acceptable?
- Has separate Event Selection process of applying, being permitted and testing happened?