Summary & Conclusion

A report was commissioned from Dr. Tyrone Bowes ("author"), through his commercial English Origenes website, by Mark Grace ("commissioner") in May 2017. The report cost €370. The purpose of the report was to use Dr. Bowes expertise to review the YSearch database to determine the geographical location for the established genetic haplotype of Jeremiah Grace, the commissioner’s 3x great grandfather, whose family origins and genetic surname are unknown. Dr. Bowes was approached following review of several online genealogical presentations that showed his approach may benefit the understanding of the GRACE family geographical origins. This critique is written by the commissioner who has a scientific degree and commercial background, who has commissioned, reviewed, approved, authored and presented several detailed reports and papers throughout a 35-year business and technical career.

The overall report did not meet expectations, in the opinion of the commissioner, in that it was poorly written and out of context for the original commission. The report also contained speculative statements that did not need to be included, since other information was available through 35 years of research by the commissioner, that the author purposefully chose to ignore. This is despite the author’s explicit statement that the focus was to be purely on the genetic results. Additionally, the author included unsubstantiated references from the 1841 census which cannot be independently corroborated (the original 1841 census being available from several online sources), which undermines the rigorousness and veracity of both the report and author. The author was requested twice, in writing, to provide this specific reference and did not do so. The lack of a thorough academic approach to the report’s writing is probably indicative that it is a commercial venture and less applicable to English surnames. The author was given the right to reply to concerns and his replies are included below, however they did not address the concerns about the report’s content and therefore demonstrates a lack of professionalism.

In conclusion, for all the reasons outlined in detail below, the report is considered disappointing and not what may have been expected from the holder of a Ph.D. and who may have reputation that is important to maintain. It did not match the apparent rigorousness indicated in his public presentations. Taken on face value, the report can mislead the reader who has no knowledge of previous research done, so does not compliment work already done. A draft report was not provided for review and the commissioner’s commentary was not incorporated. The author was only prepared to provide a report in his own style that did not to meet the requirements of the customer. On this basis, it is not considered value for money. While Dr. Bowes’ approach appears to have some validity in Irish & Scottish ancestry, where clan names are involved, however English Origenes and Dr. Bowes’ lack of client interaction should be viewed with caution when used with English surnames.
General Commentary

- Report was written in the form of a Case Study, rather than a report for a paying client. The use of this term is misleading and inappropriate.
- Report appears rushed and does not read well. It would be better served with a more traditional structure for a technical or scientific report, i.e.
  - Executive Summary – Reason for commission, research approach taken and conclusions
  - Introduction – About DNA testing and the methodology
  - Summary of available research and observations made by the client that led to this methodology being commissioned and importantly, in this commission, that the surname might not be GRACE
  - Using the 1841 census for surname distribution, if the ancestral surname is GRACE
  - Geographical distributions of related surnames using Y-DNA
  - Full Summary & Conclusions
  - Bibliography & References
- Cost vs. value for money (billed in US$, actual cost was €370), perhaps equivalent to €50/hr, if author dedicated about one full working day to research and writing. Time for expert opinion is probably reasonable, if that amount of time taken, but little apparent time taken in delivering a good final product. Overall price valuation is up to the consumer.
- Report could have been more tailor-made to the client’s requirements, integrating information already derived from 35 years of research and supplied to the author and available in the public domain. Report does not standalone as it includes speculative statements and misleading information that have already been discussed and discounted elsewhere through scientific and genealogical research:
  - Lack of birth records for the patriarch, Jeremiah Grace
  - Apart from the 3rd cousin, there is no match to anyone else of the Grace surname having tested (ref. Grace Study group on FTDNA)
  - Tested GRACEs in FTDNA tend to be haplotype I (most common with GRACE’s of Irish/Norman descent), rather than the subject's R
  - The lineage of the Buckinghamshire GRACEs, who had a branch near Chelmsford in Essex, the reported origins of the patriarch, had been investigated over many years on paper (comprehensive family tree built) and descendant males identified also testing haplotype I. The report identifies Buckinghamshire/Oxfordshire (BKM/OXF) as one concentration of the GRACE name and does support the subject's own research as not likely to be the genetic roots for the patriarch, if surname GRACE
  - The Grace’s geographical references in Essex are associated with the C13th Grace’s Manor, just outside Chelmsford (the Norman de Gras family from Queen's County, Ireland), whose lineage is documented by antiquarian Sheffield Grace, therefore not relevant to the subject’s genetics
  - The GRACE family of the subject have no evidence that their ancestry prior to Jeremiah is necessarily GRACE. Research evidence suggests no knowledge by the patriarch of any ancestral family circle and that he appears to be an orphan, hence the genetic approach.
• An interim report could have been issued to the client for discussion and amended prior to finalization. Dr. Bowes was quick to interact with a prospective client and conduct the case study once commissioned, but was not quick to interact once the report had been issued, *fait accompli*. There is a significant difference between academic and commercial reporting and Dr. Bowes does not respect the difference.

**Specific Commentary**

Cover page:

• Original title “Case Study: Pinpointing the Grace English Paternal Ancestral Genetic Homeland” is misleading. “Pinpointing the Ancestral Genetic Homeland of the Family of Jeremiah Grace” would be a better reflection of the actual commission.

Introduction (Page 1):

• General discussion on Y-DNA techniques and surnames can be relegated behind the Executive Summary. There was no expected upfront Executive Summary.

Interpreting the Y-DNA Results (Pages 2/3/4):

• The use of the term “test subject” is inappropriate in a paid client report - “client” is the correct relationship.

• The interpretation in the 2nd paragraph ignores that the “single named Grace with a genetic distance of 1” was information already provided as the client’s 3rd cousin and therefore the author speculates incorrectly about the origins of the match. This could have been avoided by summarizing what is known about the client's ancestral origins and DNA research already undertaken. Dr. Bowes was provided with the location of all current information but deliberately chose to ignore this, as indicated in his response as “DNA never lies”. However, equally, Dr. Bowes should appreciate it can also mislead if referenced inappropriately.

• A review of the geographical distribution of the English GRACE surname on page 2 is appropriate, however it should be prefaced by the assumption if the surname is GRACE by family, and not an adoptive one.

• The recognition of BKM/OXF being one centre of the GRACE surname is important and information about this family group is DNA-researched and available on the client’s research pages. It is strange that Dr. Bowes did not take the opportunity to match the findings of the client (the established Y-DNA of this group) and his geographical analysis as supporting each other, i.e. the client’s genetic heritage is not one related to this group and can be discounted.

• The map on page 3 & discussion on page 4 discusses a GRACE farmer on the 1841 census in NE Cambridgeshire. The client has access to the original 1841 census records, and disturbingly this person cannot be found. The source reference was requested twice, and Dr. Bowes declined to provide it, one may expect in a rigorous academic report. There are no references at all in the report. The 1841 census is badly transcribed, however the location given by Dr. Bowes can be reviewed household by household on the original
documents. There are only two families on the 1841 census in Cambridgeshire – a John GRACE, butcher at Wisbeach, who is surname indexed as PLACE and a James GRACE who is surname indexed as GRANT; GRACE is clearly written on the original returns. Identification of this person is important as it is used by Dr. Bowes to potentially tie the GRACE surname (Note: if GRACE) to the area of genetic matches. Without a reference, the person appears to be an invention.

- Figure 4 on page 4 shows Essex places related to the Norman family of de Gras “C14th Grace’s Manor”, and illustrates Dr. Bowes approach only, rather than relevance to the commission. This can be included in the report but ought to be clarified.

**Y-DNA, Surnames & Land (page 5/6/7)**

- Continues to focus as if the historical surname was GRACE. It is not stated that perhaps the link to the Norman family, who had lands in Essex & Buckinghamshire (haplotype I), and the R haplotype of the client’s family is probably unlikely, therefore looking at the closest matching surnames is the technique to be applied. The client has commissioned a report that was independent of the GRACE name.

- Nearest surnames are minimum GD6 (genetic distance 6). In addition to the separate concern that these surround an 1841 GRACE farmer that cannot be found, these are indicated in Figures 5 & 6. It is a distraction if the name is not GRACE. The overall distribution is otherwise interesting and could stand alone. If the name of GRACE is disregarded the geographical focus would be less distinct, even though it pinpoints to the eastern side of England in general, possibly Cambridgeshire, Lincolnshire & East Anglia for the paternal origins of Jeremiah Grace.

**Dr. Tyrone Bowes**

LinkedIn profile: Dr. Tyrone Bowes - Company CEO Irish, Scottish and English Origenes

From Irish Genealogy: “Day Job - I am a Full time Genetic Genealogist doing mainly personalized Irish, Scottish, and English Y-DNA Case Study Reports for my customers!”

“I am Dr. Tyrone Bowes and I am originally from Dublin City. I am an experienced Biotechnologist with a 1st Class honours Degree in Biotechnology and a Ph.D. in Neuroimmunology. Prior to founding my own business (Irish Origenes) in July 2011, I had worked extensively as a Scientist in both Academia and Industry. Since 2011, I have also founded the Scottish and English Origenes websites and hope to launch a Welsh Origenes website later this year. I am a member of ISOGG and have given numerous presentations on pinpointing ones’ origins using commercial DNA testing.”

Response by email from Dr. Bowes to the concerns expressed about the report (links removed):

“I am not a traditional genealogist and I have no professional interest in genealogical papertrails. I would stress that I deal exclusively with the DNA results. I also try my best to avoid reading any family history and never request it up front before an analysis as prior knowledge can bias an
analysis (even subconsciously). Also keep in mind that the timeframe I identify is 1,000 years ago which was when surnames began to appear within Britain and Ireland, hence there is often considerable timeframe gap between a persons earliest recorded ancestor (Essex) and the area identified by the DNA (Cambridgeshire/Suffolk and Norfolk borderlands). But, this is a DNA approach so if a later migration occurred into Essex, then as more and more people test you will eventually see closer genetic matches appear which reflect relationships that developed in each location, depending on how close they match one should be able to put a timeframe to the ancestral link with the area (that timeframe works best at the 67 marker level). Also, it is possible to confirm a link to a location by test males with the surnames of interest (that appear as ones closest matches) ... In this instance it would be best to test in the area where the earliest ancestor is recorded (as genetic distance as detailed in the table would allow you to estimate how long they have been there).

I very very rarely include any ancestral information detailed from individual matches from the Search database in the types of report that I did for you. I only ever use that ancestral information when its used to reconstruct more ancient paternal ancestral journeys. Given the early industrial revolution in Great Britain, the earliest recorded locations are very rarely from farming based communities and more likely from towns and cities due to migration.”