

Comments on the Draft NTP Brief on Bisphenol A (CAS NO. 80-05-7)

April 14, 2008

Peer Review Date: June 11, 2008

by

Marek Banasik, M.D., Ph.D.

Institute of Public Health and Environmental Protection, Warsaw, Poland

E-mail address: iphep.banasik@gmail.com

On page 28 of the *Draft NTP Brief on Bisphenol A (CAS NO. 80-05-7)*, the authors briefly describe results from Newbold *et. al. (1)* and conclude that “Replication of these findings and further study of the linkage of early and late occurring events will be important in establishing a better understanding of any long-term consequences of exposures of the developing organism to bisphenol A.” Thus, it seems that a fundamental problem with Newbold *et. al.’s (1)* study design was not identified. Newbold *et. al. (1)* stated the following about their experimental design: “At delivery, pups from all litters were pooled, then separated by sex, and randomly standardized to 8 female pups per dam.” Therefore, their design failed to control for the “litter effect”, *i.e.*, the tendency of littermates to respond similarly to one another relative to non-litter mates (2-5).

The importance of controlling for litter effects in developmental studies is well-documented. For a recent published discussion on this problem see: (6-8). A failure to control for litter effects increases the potential for false positive results (9). Multiple sources are

available from various agencies that specify the importance of controlling for the litter effect. For instance, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development state the following in their developmental neurotoxicity (DNT) study guidance (10): “The statistical unit of measure should be the litter (or dam) and not the pup.” Further, Holson *et. al.* (5) stated: “Treating multiple offspring from the same litter as independent subjects is a fundamental violation of assumptions that can severely inflate alpha levels [references omitted]. The current DNT practice sometimes recognizes this principle in young preweaning animals, but not always in adults, on the false assumption that litter effects do not extend beyond infancy or weaning. This is, however, a mistaken assumption.” Though Newbold *et. al.* (1) did not evaluate DNT endpoints, litter effects are not limited to the developing nervous system, and Newbold *et. al.*'s (1) failure to control for the litter effect may have influenced the endpoints measured and reported as being affected by bisphenol A.

Despite the important role that the NTP Brief is destined to play in future policy-making at the national level, the above experimental design flaw was not identified during NTP's peer review process. This is troubling because the NTP is a well-recognized, well-respected entity, and the conclusions drawn in the Brief, once finalized, will very likely be taken at face value without further inspection of the works cited therein. A failure to critically review studies cited in a document of this magnitude raises concerns over the quality of the process used to produce the NTP Brief, and the conclusions drawn.

Disclaimer

The author declares he has no competing financial interests.

References

1. Newbold RR, Jefferson WN, Padilla Banks E (2007) *Reprod Toxicol*. Long-term adverse effects of neonatal exposure to bisphenol A on the murine female reproductive tract. 24(2): 253-258.
2. US EPA (1991) Guidelines for developmental toxicity risk assessment. EPA/600/FR-91/001.
3. US EPA (2000) Benchmark dose technical guidance document. External review draft. EPA/630/R-00/001.
4. Festing MFW (2006) *ILAR J*. Design and statistical methods in studies using animal models of development. 47(1): 5-14.
5. Holson RR, Freshwater L, Maurissen JPJ, Moser VC, Phang W (2007) *Neurotoxicol Teratol*. Statistical issues and techniques appropriate for developmental neurotoxicity testing. A report from the ILSI Risk Science Institute Expert Panel on neurodevelopmental endpoints. DOI: 10.1016/j.ntt.2007.06.001.
6. Hardy M, Stedeford T (2008) *Neurotoxicol*. Developmental neurotoxicity: when research succeeds through inappropriate statistics. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuro.2008.02.002.
7. Hardy M, Stedeford T (2008) *Toxicol Sci*. Use of the pup as the statistical unit in developmental neurotoxicity studies: overlooked model or poor research design? 103(2): 409-410.
8. Hardy ML, Stedeford T (2008) *Toxicology*. Developmental neurotoxicity in neonatal mice following co-exposure to PCB 153 and methyl mercury: interaction or false positive? DOI: 10.1016/j.tox.2008.03.021.

9. Holson RR, Pearce B (1992) *Neurotoxicol Teratol*. Principles and pitfalls in the analysis of prenatal treatment effects in multiparous species. 14(3): 221-228.
10. OECD (2007) OECD guideline for the testing of chemicals. Developmental neurotoxicity study. OECD/OCDE 426.