

## **Erratum to the Second Report of the GM Science Review (page 19)**

The text of Section 2.2.9 of the Second Report of the GM Science Review is a revised version of that originally published in January 2004. The authors of the paper considered in this Section had pointed out that the text in the original report did not properly reflect the content of their paper and it was agreed with the Secretariat that it should be changed. This revision does not, however, change any of the overall conclusions or the conclusions on allergenicity in the Report.

The revised text now reads as follows:

**'2.2.9 Kleter GA & Peijnenburg AACM (2003) Presence of potential allergy-related linear epitopes in novel proteins from conventional crops and the implication for the safety assessment of these crops with respect to the current testing of genetically modified crops. *Plant Biotech. J.* 1, 371-380.**

This paper by Kleter and Peijnenburg indicates that there may be allergy-related linear epitopes in proteins in the mitochondria of non-GM male sterile plants due to rearrangements within the mitochondrial genome. Most of the protein sequences used in this paper had been predicted based on DNA sequences. In mitochondria, however, many messenger RNAs (mRNAs) are modified ('edited') so that the sequence of the DNA does not at all represent the actual sequence of the mRNA and the protein. The authors therefore also included protein sequences derived from the edited forms of the corresponding mRNAs that had previously been described in literature. If one analyses the sequences of the DNA of the mitochondria of the male sterile plants examples can be found of stretches of six or seven amino acids that are identical to linear epitopes in some recognised allergic proteins. Essentially, the paper makes the point that these potential proteins are not subject to the same scrutiny as GM transgenic proteins. Furthermore, in our First Report we did indicate that conventionally bred crops are not subject to the same degree of scrutiny as GM ones. So, this paper does not appear to shed new light on the allergenicity issue.'

March 2004