Rapporteurs initial response

Prof Jim Bridges

CHAIR IDEA SUPERVISORY GROUP

IDEA Workshop on the replacement of animal testing in QRA for skin sensitisation

Brussels, May 16-17, 2018

AREAS OF GENERAL AGREEMENT

- Tests favoured and demonstration of dose response
- Assumptions made in developing the various assessment schemes are very similar
- General agreement on the sources of data that need to be used but differences in the order in which they are applied and their relative importance
- Weight of evidence cited in each case as the tool for bringing the data together, but the details of how the weight of evidence is actually conducted were lacking

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS

- There is a single AOP for fragrance initiated sensitisation in humans that provides a sound basis for in vitro test design for characterising sensitisers
- The critical steps for the AOP are the initial ones (KE1-KE4)
- KE1 →KE2 → KE3 → KE4 considered as a linear pathway
- LLNA and HRIPT test data are sufficiently robust data bases to be used for bench mark fragrances for in vitro test suitability
- Potency assessment for these early stages is a valuable indication of human sensitisation potency.

Weight of evidence approaches used

- Formalised predetermined protocols.

Concern: discourages innovation and may exclude important other data

- Built in to a specific data evaluation tool eg Baysian, neural networks

Concern: weight of evidence application not transparent

* Case by case.

Concern: Transparency and time commitment

Dealing with uncertainty

- What is an acceptable level of predictability and how is it decided?
- Can potentially problematic fragrances be identified early on based on structural and read across data?
- What procedures do we need to characterise uncertainty in the overall assessment? (how to take into account already built in conservatism?)
- How to address those uncertainties deemed of concern?
- Should there be guidelines on how to identify and address uncertainty?

Impact of other ingredients

The impact of other ingredients was not really addressed here.

- Is the assumption that this is not generally an issue in terms of in vitro testing?
- Should it be considered as an additional aspect of the overall assessment?

Way ahead??

- What can we learn from previous work on non animal testing for risk assessment purposes e.g. Genotoxicity testing?
- Should we formulate priorities for further development of the non animal based QRA framework and how a suitable levels of coordination can be achieved?
- Is our approach specific to fragrances or should we make more effort to collaborate with other industrial groups who also are developing non animal testing strategies?
- How do we proceed organisationally with any/all of the above