LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1	Summary of Current U.S. Legislation Related to Ocular Health	1-2
Table 1-2	In Vivo Ocular Irritancy Classification Systems	
Table 2-1	Evaluation of Corneal Irritation.	
Table 2-2	Fluorescein Penetration Scoring System	2-12
Table 2-3	Overall Scoring System for Corneal Damage and Irritation	
Table 3-1	Chemical Classes Tested in the IRE Test Method.	3-4
Table 3-2	Product Classes Tested in the IRE Test Method	3-4
Table 4-1	Scale of Weighted Scores for Grading the Severity of Ocular Lesions	4-2
Table 4-2	Test Guidelines for <i>In Vivo</i> Ocular Irritation Test Methods	
Table 4-3	Criteria for Classification of Rabbits According to the GHS	
	Classification System	4-11
Table 4-4	Criteria for Classification of Substances According to the GHS Classification System (Modified from UN 2003).	4-12
Table 4-5	Criteria Required for Classification of Rabbits According to the EPA Classification System (EPA 1996).	4-13
Table 4-6	Criteria for Classification of Substances According to the EU Classification System (EU 2001)	
Table 6-1	Evaluation of the Performance of the IRE Test Method In Predicting Ocular Corrosives and Severe Irritants Compared to the <i>In Vivo</i> Rabbit Eye Test Method, as Defined by the GHS Classification	4-13
Table 6-2	System, by Study	6-5
	Expanded Data Set)	6-7
Table 6-3	False Positive and False Negative Rates of the IRE Test Method by Chemical Class and Properties of Interest, for the GHS	
Table 6-4	Classification System (Analysis Based on the Pooled Data Set)	6-9
	System, by Study	6-11
Table 6-5	False Positive and False Negative Rates of the IRE Test Method, by Chemical Class and Properties of Interest, for the EPA Classification System (Analysis Based on the Expanded Data	
Table 6-6	False Positive and False Negative Rates of the IRE Test Method, by Chemical Class and Properties of Interest, for the EPA Classification System (Analysis Based on the	
	Pooled Data Set)	6-14

Table 6-7	Evaluation of the Performance of the IRE Test Method in Predicting	
	Ocular Corrosives and Severe Irritants Compared to <i>In Vivo</i>	
	Findings, as Defined by the EU Classification	
	System, by Study	6-16
Table 6-8	False Positive and False Negative Rates of the IRE Test Method,	0 10
14010 0 0	by Chemical Class and Properties of Interest, for the EU	
	,	
	Classification System (Analysis Based on the Expanded Data	(10
T 11 60	Set)	6-19
Table 6-9	False Positive and False Negative Rates of the IRE Test Method,	
	by Chemical Class and Properties of Interest, for the EU	
	Classification System (Analysis Based on the	
	Pooled Data Set)	6-20
Table 7-1	Interlaboratory Variability of Balls et al. (1995) for Substances	
	Classified as Ocular Corrosives/Severe Irritants or Nonsevere Irritants/	
	Nonirritants Using the GHS Classification System	7-4
Table 7-2	Interlaboratory Variability of Balls et al. (1995) for Substances	
	Classified as Ocular Corrosives/Severe Irritants or Nonsevere	
	Irritants/Nonirritants Using the EPA Classification System	7-5
Table 7-3	Interlaboratory Variability of CEC Collaborative Study (1991)	/ 0
14010 / 3	for Substances Classified as Ocular Corrosives/Severe	
	Irritants or Nonsevere Irritants/Nonirritants Using the EU	
	_	77
T 11 7 4	Classification System	/-/
Table 7-4	Interlaboratory Variability of Balls et al. (1995) for Substances	
	Classified as Ocular Corrosives/Severe Irritants or Nonsevere	
	Irritants/Nonirritants Using the EU Classification System	7-8
Table 7-5	Quantitative Evaluation of the Interlaboratory Variability of the IRE	
	Test Method (CEC 1991).	7-11
Table 7-6	Quantitative Evaluation of the Interlaboratory Variability of the IRE	
	Test Method (Balls et al. 1995)	7-13
Table 7-7	Interlaboratory Correlation Ranges Determined for Various	
14010 / /	Subsets of Tested Substances in Balls et al. (1995)	7-18
Table 9-1	In Vitro/In Vivo Correlation Coefficients from Balls et al. (1995)	
Table 9-2	Relationship Between MAS <i>In Vitro</i> and the Ability to Cause More)-3
1 autc 3-2	•	0.4
Table 0.2	Than 15% Corneal Swelling <i>In vitro</i> (Chamberlain et al. 1997)	9-4
Table 9-3	Comparison of IRE Test Method Results With <i>In Vivo</i> Data	0.4
T 11 0 4	(Cooper et al. (2001).	
Table 9-4	The Results of the CTFA Evaluation of <i>In Vitro</i> Alternatives to the Dra	ıze
	Primary Eye Irritation Test (Phase III): Surfactant-Based Formulations	
	(Gettings et al. 1996)	9-5
Table 9-5	Comparison of IRE In Vitro Irritancy Grades to In Vivo Rabbit	
	Eye Test Irritancy Classifications (Koëter and Prinsen 1985)	9-9
Table 9-6	Irritancy of Surfactant-Based Products Using P&G In Vivo	
	and ExRET In Vitro Confocal Microscopy Test Methods	9-15
Table 9-7	Irritancy of General Chemicals Using P&G In Vivo and	
	ExRET In Vitro Confocal Microscopy Test Methods	9-16

Table 9-8	Irritancy of Surfactant-Based Liquid Dishwashing Formulations	
	Using LVET and Histopathology In Vivo and P&G ExRET	
	Confocal Microscopy In Vitro Test Method	9-17
Table 9-9	Irritancy of Bleach-Containing Laundry Additive Products	
	Using LVET In Vivo and P&G ExRET In Vitro Confocal	
	Microscopy Test Methods	9-17