

Appendix F2
Summary Minutes of Independent Scientific Review Panel Meeting
March 4–6, 2008

[This Page Intentionally Left Blank]

Summary Minutes

Independent Scientific Peer Review Panel Meeting

Validation Status of New Versions and Applications of the Murine Local Lymph Node Assay (LLNA): A Test Method for Assessing the Allergic Contact Dermatitis Potential of Chemicals and Products

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), Headquarters

Bethesda, MD

March 4 – 6, 2008

8:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Peer Review Panel Members:

Michael Luster, Ph.D. (Peer Review Panel Chair)	Senior Consultant to the NIOSH Health Effects Laboratory, Morgantown, WV, U.S.
Nathalie Alépée, Ph.D.	Associate Research Fellow, Pfizer PDRD MCT Laboratory, France
Anne Marie Api, Ph.D.	Vice President, Human Health Sciences, Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, U.S.
Nancy Flournoy, M.S., Ph.D.	Professor and Chair, Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO, U.S.
Thomas Gebel, Ph.D.	Regulatory Toxicologist, Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Dortmund, Germany
Kim Headrick, B. Admin., B.Sc.	International Harmonization Senior Policy Advisor, Health Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
Dagmar Jírová, M.D., Ph.D.	Toxicologist, Research Manager, Head of Reference Center for Cosmetics, Head of Reference Laboratory for Experimental Immunotoxicology, National Institute of Public Health, Czech Republic
David Lovell, Ph.D.	Reader in Medical Statistics, Postgraduate Medical School, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, U.K.
Howard Maibach, M.D.	Professor, Dept. of Dermatology, University of California-San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, U.S.
James McDougal, Ph.D.	Professor and Director of Toxicology Research, Dept. of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, U.S.

Peer Review Panel Members:

Michael Olson, Ph.D.	Director of Occupational Toxicology, Corporate Environment Health and Safety, GlaxoSmithKline, RTP, NC, U.S.
Raymond Pieters, Ph.D.	Associate Professor, Immunotoxicology Group Leader, Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands
Jean Regal, Ph.D.	Professor, Dept. of Pharmacology, University of Minnesota Medical School, Duluth, MN, U.S.
Peter Theran, V.M.D.	Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Novato, CA, U.S.
Stephen Ullrich, Ph.D.	Dallas/Ft. Worth Living Legends Professor & Professor of Immunology, Post-graduate School of Biomedical Science, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, U.S.
Michael Woolhiser, Ph.D.	Technical Leader - Immunotoxicology, Toxicology and Environmental Research and Consulting Immunology, Dow Chemical, Midland, MI, U.S.
Takahiko Yoshida, M.D., Ph.D.	Professor, Dept. of Health Science, Asahikawa Medical College, Hokkaido, Japan

ICCVAM and ICCVAM IWG Members:

Paul Brown, Ph.D.	FDA, Silver Spring, MD, U.S.
Ruth Barratt, Ph.D., D.V.M.	FDA, Rockville, MD, U.S.
Karen Hamernik, Ph.D.	EPA, Washington, DC, U.S.
Masih Hashim, Ph.D.	EPA, Washington, DC, U.S.
Abigail Jacobs, Ph.D. (IWG Co-Chair)	FDA, Silver Spring, MD, U.S.
Kristina Hatlelid, Ph.D.	CPSC, Bethesda, MD, U.S.
Joanna Matheson, Ph.D. (IWG Co-Chair)	CPSC, Bethesda, MD, U.S.
Tim McMahon, Ph.D.	EPA, Washington, DC, U.S.
Amy Rispin, Ph.D.	EPA, Washington, DC, U.S.
William Stokes, D.V.M., D.A.C.L.A.M.	NIEHS, RTP, NC, U.S.
Raymond Tice, Ph.D.	NIEHS, RTP, NC, U.S.
Ron Ward, Ph.D.	EPA, Washington, DC, U.S.
Marilyn Wind, Ph.D. (ICCVAM Chair)	CPSC, Bethesda, MD, U.S.
Jiaqin Yao, Ph.D.	FDA, Silver Spring, MD, U.S.

ECVAM Observer:

David Basketter, Ph.D.	DABMEB Consultancy Ltd., Bedfordshire, U.K.
------------------------	---

Invited Experts:

George DeGeorge, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.	MB Research Laboratories, Spinnerstown, PA, U.S.
Kenji Idehara, Ph.D.	Daicel Chemical Industries, Hyogo, Japan
Masahiro Takeyoshi, Ph.D.	Chemicals Evaluation and Research Institute, Saitama, Japan

Public Attendees:

Odette Alexander	Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., Greensboro, NC, U.S.
Nancy Beck, Ph.D.	PCRM, Washington, DC, U.S.
Ann Blacker, Ph.D.	Bayer CropScience, RTP, NC, U.S.
Stuart Cagan, Ph.D.	Shell Oil Company, Houston, TX, U.S.
Joan Chapdelaine, Ph.D.	Calvert Laboratories, Inc., Olyphant, PA, U.S.
Adriana Doi, Ph.D.	BASF Corporation, RTP, NC, U.S.
Carol Eisenmann, Ph.D.	Personal Care Products Council, Washington, DC, U.S.
Charles Hastings, Ph.D.	BASF Corporation, RTP, NC, U.S.
Kailash Gupta, D.V.M., Ph.D.	Retired CPSC, Bethesda, MD, U.S.
John Lyssikatos	Hill Top Research, Miamiville, OH, U.S.
Laurence Musset, Ph.D.	OECD, Paris, France
Carol O'Neil	NuPathe, Conshohocken, PA, U.S.
Kui Lea Park, Ph.D.	National Institute of Toxicological Research, KFDA, Seoul, Korea
Rafael Rivas	AFRRI/USHUS, Bethesda, MD, U.S.
Terri Sebree	NuPathe, Conshohocken, PA, U.S.
Libby Sommer	EPA, Washington, DC, U.S.
Merrill Tisdell	Syngenta Crop Protection Inc., Greensboro, NC, U.S.
Jeffrey Toy, Ph.D.	FDA, Rockville, MD, U.S.

NICEATM:

William Stokes, D.V.M., D.A.C.L.A.M.	Director
Raymond Tice, Ph.D.	Deputy Director
Debbie McCarley	Special Assistant to the Director
Support Contract Staff— Integrated Laboratory Systems, Inc. (ILS)	
David Allen, Ph.D.	Michael Paris
Thomas Burns, M.S.	Eleni Salicru, Ph.D.
Linda Litchfield	Judy Strickland, Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
Douglas Winters, M.S.	ILS, Inc.

Abbreviations: AFFRI = Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute; CPSC = U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission; ECVAM = European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods; EPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; FDA = U.S. Food and Drug Administration; ICCVAM = Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods; ILS = Integrated Laboratory Systems; IWG = Immunotoxicology Working Group; KFDA = Korea Food and Drug Administration; NICEATM = National Toxicology Program Interagency Center for Evaluation of Alternative Toxicological Methods; NIEHS = National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences; NIOSH = National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health; OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; PCRM = Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine; USDA = U.S. Department of Agriculture; USHUS = Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

Tuesday, March 4, 2008

Call to Order and Introductions

Dr. Michael Luster (Peer Review Panel Chair) called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. and introduced himself. He then asked all Peer Review Panel (hereafter Panel) members to introduce themselves and to state their name and affiliation for the record. He then asked all the National Toxicology Program Interagency Center for the Evaluation of Alternative Toxicological Methods (NICEATM) staff, the Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods (ICCVAM) members, the ICCVAM Immunotoxicity Working Group (IWG) members, the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM) observer, and members of the public to also introduce themselves. Dr. Luster stated that there would be opportunity for public comments during each of the seven local lymph node assay (LLNA)-related topics. He asked that all those interested in making a comment, register at the registration table and provide a written copy of their comments, if available, to NICEATM staff. Dr. Luster emphasized that the comments would be limited to seven minutes per individual and that, while an individual would be welcome to make comments during each commenting period, repeating the same comments at each comment period would be inappropriate. He further stated that the meeting was being recorded and that Panel members should speak directly their microphone. Finally, Dr. Luster noted that if the Panel finished early with the assigned topics on the agenda for that day, they would proceed to the next day's topics if time permitted.

Welcome from the ICCVAM Chair

Dr. Marilyn Wind, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) and Chair of ICCVAM, welcomed everyone to CPSC and to the Panel meeting. Dr. Wind stressed the importance of this Panel's efforts especially considering recent reports that allergies and asthma have increased markedly over the past number of years and that contact dermatitis is the most common occupational illness in the United States. Dr. Wind thanked the Panel members for giving their expertise, time, and effort and acknowledged their important role to the ICCVAM test method evaluation process. Dr. Wind also emphasized the important role of the public and their comments in this process.

Welcome from the Director of NICEATM, and Conflict of Interest Statements

Dr. William Stokes, Director of NICEATM, stated the Panel meeting was being convened as a National Institutes of Health (NIH) special emphasis panel and was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act regulations. As such, Dr. Stokes indicated that he would serve as the Designated Federal Official for this public meeting. He reminded the Panel that they had signed a conflict-of-interest statement when they were selected for the Panel, in which they identified any potential conflicts of interest. He then read this statement to provide another opportunity for members of the Panel to identify any conflicts not previously declared. Dr. Luster asked the Panel members to declare any direct or indirect conflicts based on Dr. Stokes statements and to recuse themselves from discussion and voting on any aspect of the

meeting where there might be a conflict. None of the Panel members declared a conflict of interest.

Overview of the ICCVAM Test Method Evaluation Process

Dr. Stokes provided an overview of the ICCVAM test method evaluation process. He stated that the Panel was made up of 19 different scientists from eight different countries (Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Japan, The Netherlands, United Kingdom, and the United States). Dr. Stokes thanked the Panel members for the significant amount of time and effort that they had devoted to prepare for and attend the meeting. He explained that the purpose of the Panel was to assist ICCVAM by carrying out an independent scientific peer review of the information provided on a series of proposed new versions of the LLNA and some expanded applications of the assay. Dr. Stokes mentioned that the original LLNA peer review panel in 1998 considered the LLNA a valid substitute for the guinea pig-based test in most testing situations, but not all. He mentioned that three Panel members from the 1998 review are also on the current Panel (i.e., Drs. Howard Maibach, Jean Regal, and Stephen Ullrich). Dr. Stokes also reviewed the nomination that was received from CPSC in January 2007²¹, which provides the basis for the current evaluation.

Dr. Stokes then identified the 15 Federal agencies that comprise ICCVAM and summarized ICCVAM's mission. He noted that ICCVAM, as an interagency committee, does not carry out research and development or validation studies. Instead, ICCVAM, in conjunction with NICEATM, carries out the critical scientific evaluation of proposed test methods with regard to their usefulness and limitations for regulatory testing and then makes formal recommendations to ICCVAM agencies.

Dr. Stokes provided a brief review of ICCVAM's history and summarized the ICCVAM Authorization Act of 2000²², detailing the purpose and duties of ICCVAM. He noted that one of ICCVAM's duties is to review and evaluate new, revised, and alternative test methods applicable to regulatory testing. He stated that all of the reports produced by NICEATM are available on the NICEATM-ICCVAM website or can be obtained upon request from NICEATM. He also mentioned that ICCVAM provides guidance on test method development, validation criteria, and processes, and helps to facilitate not only the acceptance of scientifically valid alternative methods, but also encourages international harmonization.

Dr. Stokes then described the ICCVAM test method evaluation process, which begins with a test method nomination or submission. NICEATM conducts a prescreen evaluation to summarize the extent to which the proposed submission or nomination addresses the ICCVAM prioritization criteria. A report of this evaluation is then provided to ICCVAM, which in turn develops recommendations regarding the priority for evaluation. ICCVAM then seeks input on their recommendations from the Scientific Advisory Committee on Alternative Toxicological Methods (SACATM) and the public. Given sufficient regulatory applicability, sufficient data, resources, and priority, a test method will move forward into a formal evaluation. A draft

²¹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/llnadsocs/CPSC_LLNA_nom.pdf

²² http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/about_docs/PL106545.pdf

background review document (BRD), which provides a comprehensive review of all available data and information, is prepared by NICEATM, in conjunction with an ICCVAM working group designated for the relevant toxicity testing area (e.g., the IWG). In addition, ICCVAM considers all of the available information and makes draft test method recommendations on the proposed usefulness and limitations of the test methods, test method protocol, performance standards, and future studies. The BRD and the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations are made available to the Panel and the public for review and comment. The Panel peer reviews the BRD and evaluates the extent to which it supports the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations. A Panel report is published, which is then considered, along with public and SACATM comments by ICCVAM in making final recommendations. These final recommendations are forwarded to the ICCVAM member agencies for their consideration and possible incorporation into relevant testing guidelines.

Dr. Stokes reviewed the ICCVAM criteria for adequate validation. He stated that validation is defined by ICCVAM as the process by which the reliability and relevance of a procedure are established for a specific purpose, and that adequate validation is a prerequisite for consideration of a test method by U.S. Federal regulatory agencies. Dr. Stokes listed the ICCVAM acceptance criteria for test method validation and acceptance. He concluded by summarizing the timeline of the review activities beginning with CPSC's nomination in January 2007 and ending with the present Panel meeting.

ICCVAM Charge to the Panel

Dr. Stokes reviewed the charge to the Panel, which was to: (1) review the draft BRDs, the draft Addendum to the traditional²³ LLNA, and the draft performance standards for completeness and identify any errors or omissions; (2) determine the extent to which each of the applicable criteria for validation and regulatory acceptance had been addressed for the proposed revised or modified versions of the LLNA; and (3) consider and provide comment on the extent to which the ICCVAM draft test method recommendations including the proposed use, standardized protocols, performance standards, and additional studies are supported by the information provided in the draft BRDs and draft Addendum.

Dr. Stokes thanked the IWG and ICCVAM for their contributions to this project, and acknowledged the contributions from the participating liaisons from ECVAM and JaCVAM (Japanese Center for the Validation of Alternative Methods). He also acknowledged the NICEATM staff for their support and assistance in organizing the Panel meeting and preparing the materials being reviewed.

²³ For the purposes of this document, the radioactive LLNA test method, which was first evaluated by ICCVAM in 1999, and subsequently recommended to U.S. Federal agencies as a valid substitute for currently accepted guinea pig test methods to assess the allergic contact dermatitis potential of many, but not all, types of substances, is referred to as the traditional LLNA.

Current Regulatory Testing Requirements and Hazard Classification Schemes for Allergic Contact Dermatitis and the Traditional LLNA Procedure

Dr. Joanna Matheson, Chair of the IWG, briefly reviewed the regulatory testing requirements of U.S. Federal agencies for skin-sensitization hazard identification and provided a brief description of the LLNA protocol.

Overview of the Agenda

Dr. Luster provided a brief synopsis of the agenda. He stated that there were six test methods and applications, along with the draft LLNA performance standards for review and that the same agenda would be followed for each: (1) introductory summary of the draft ICCVAM recommendations from one of the NICEATM staff members; in addition, test method developers would provide a brief description of the methodology for each of the three non-radioactive tests, (2) presentation of the Evaluation Group draft comments by the Evaluation Group leader, (3) Panel discussion, (4) public comments, (5) recommendations and conclusions by the Panel.

Overview of the Draft LLNA Limit Dose Procedure²⁴, BRD and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Dr. David Allen, Integrated Laboratory Systems, Inc., the NICEATM support contractor, presented an overview of the draft ICCVAM BRD for the LLNA limit dose procedure. He mentioned that the draft ICCVAM BRD provided a comprehensive review of the available data and information regarding the usefulness and limitations of the LLNA limit dose procedure. The method was reviewed for its accuracy in correctly identifying sensitizers and non-sensitizers, when compared to the traditional LLNA.

NICEATM published a series of *Federal Register (FR)* notices, including an *FR* notice (72FR27815, May 17, 2007) requesting original data from the LLNA. This *FR* notice was also sent to over 100 potentially interested stakeholders for their input and comment. As a result, data on 255 substances tested in the LLNA were received. The resulting LLNA database consisted of 471 studies of 466 unique substances, 211 of which were included in the original ICCVAM 1999 evaluation. Dr. Allen briefly summarized the performance characteristics of the LLNA limit dose procedure test method, which is detailed in the draft ICCVAM BRD²⁵, and briefly summarized the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for the LLNA limit dose procedure²⁶

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. Michael Olson led the Panel discussion on the LLNA limit dose procedure and specifically thanked the members of his Evaluation Group (i.e., Drs. James McDougal, Raymond Pieters, Jonathan Richmond [not present], and Takahiko Yoshida) for their collegial review of the information presented in the draft ICCVAM LLNA Limit Dose Procedure BRD. Dr. Olson also

²⁴ Also known as the reduced LLNA (rLLNA).

²⁵ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/LLNA-LD/LLNAldBRD07Jan08FD.pdf>

²⁶ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/LLNA-LD/TWGreLLNA-LD07Jan08FD.pdf>

thanked the NICEATM staff for their technical support during the BRD review process. He then presented the draft responses to ICCVAM's questions to the Panel for consideration by the entire Panel. The focus was on review of the BRD for errors and omissions, assessment of the validation status of the test method, and review of draft ICCVAM test method recommendations. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM BRD and recommendations are reflected in the *Validation Status of New Versions and Applications of the Murine Local Lymph Node Assay: A Test Method for Assessing the Allergic Contact Dermatitis Potential of Chemicals and Products*, published in May 2008 (hereafter, the Panel report²⁷).

During the Panel's evaluation, discussion arose regarding what might have resulted in the inverted-U-shaped dose response that was seen with the false-negative substances in the LLNA limit dose procedure. Dr. Olson responded that although it was difficult to understand what the cause might have been, he speculated that the top dose was either toxic at a systemic-effect level or that those substances were immunosuppressive at the highest dose level. He also stated that there did not seem to be any structural features of the substances that could be attributed for the false negative response in the LLNA limit dose procedure.

The Panel also discussed the use of concurrent versus intermittent positive controls in the LLNA limit dose procedure. Dr. Olson indicated that the Evaluation Group had discussed the possibility to allow intermittent positive controls for laboratories that exhibited repeatable and adequate performance with the LLNA but he indicated that it would be important to describe a set of performance criteria that would determine when this practice would be acceptable. Clearly, if the laboratory was not performing the assay routinely or if there were other reasons to suspect variability in response with any substance, the positive control would be necessary. Dr. Stokes indicated that this discussion was pertinent and indicated that the Panel's suggestions for what the performance criteria might be for intermittent positive control testing would be of interest to the IWG. Dr. Stokes also wanted to clarify that the OECD TG, is consistent with the EPA TG and the ICCVAM-recommended test method protocol for the LLNA although the OECD TG allows additional latitude in how tests are run (i.e., four animals per dose group, use of pooled data, and the option to not run a positive concurrent positive).

Public Comments:

Dr. Amy Rispin, EPA

Dr. Rispin stated that the ICCVAM LLNA report (1999²⁸) and standardized protocol (2001²⁹) recommends the use of a concurrent positive control in addition to the concurrent negative control required for each study. Subsequently, the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) Test Guideline (TG) 429 (Skin Sensitisation: Local Lymph Node Assay) was finalized (2002). She said that originally, OECD TG 429 was drafted without a concurrent positive control but that language was added to include the recommended use of a concurrent positive control until laboratories demonstrate competence. Subsequent to that, EPA

²⁷ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRpt2008.pdf

²⁸ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/llna/llnarep.pdf

²⁹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/llna/LLNAProt.pdf

put forth its LLNA guideline for sensitization³⁰, which states that concurrent positive and negative controls are to be included in each study. Dr. Rispin then added that U.S. Federal regulatory agencies, most notably the EPA and FDA, received LLNA data from studies in which the positive control did not achieve the appropriate limits of performance (i.e., the control values were not in the appropriate range) and therefore the studies were deemed unacceptable, underscoring the importance of a concurrent positive control for regulatory acceptance in the United States.

In response to Dr. Rispin's public comment, Drs. Ullrich and Theran asked how competence is determined and if laboratories have difficulties reaching a level of competence, respectively. Dr. Abby Jacobs responded by stating that the FDA has seen large data variations in laboratories that conduct the LLNA. It is often difficult to determine what the variations might be due to (e.g., new technicians, tail vein injection, lymph node removal) and these variations have been seen both in laboratories that are established and those that are not.

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter said that the main point he wanted to address is that efforts should be made to harmonize the LLNA protocol with that described in OECD TG 429. He stated that although there is referral to the "ICCVAM protocol" throughout the BRDs under consideration, OECD TG 429 is more globally recognized for regulatory use of the LLNA and therefore should be the referenced protocol. Dr. Basketter further stated that if the LLNA limit dose procedure followed the ICCVAM protocol using five animals per group instead of following OECD TG 429, which allows using four animals per group, there would only be a savings of one animal for substances that were negative. He stated that the goal of ECVAM was actually to halve the number of animals by omitting the mid- and low-dose groups and that this would achieve significant animal savings since the likely prevalence of non-sensitizers is approximately two-thirds of chemicals tested and non-sensitizers would not require further testing even if dose response information for sensitizers was needed.

Dr. Basketter also mentioned that the retrospective evaluation of the LLNA being presented to the Panel analyzed whether the top dose could identify a substance as a sensitizer and how that compares to the traditional LLNA's performance. Since the traditional LLNA assay was determined to be positive or negative based on a stimulation index (SI) of three, it is problematic if the focus is on statistics when using the five-animal model as this would require also going back and re-evaluating all the preceding data using the statistical approach.

Dr. McDougal responded to Dr. Basketter's comment by stating that one wouldn't have to go back and retrospectively re-evaluate previous data but that new data generated could be analyzed statistically. This approach would include determining if the treatment group was statistically different from the vehicle control group and then determining the biological relevance. This might help to eliminate irritants.

³⁰ http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/publications/OPPTS_Harmonized/870_Health_Effects_Test_Guidelines/Revised/870r-2600.pdf

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to review the conclusions and recommendations for the LLNA limit dose procedure they had discussed earlier and to make any revisions, if necessary. One particular question that was asked during the Panel's conclusions and recommendations was whether an OECD TG existed for the LLNA limit dose procedure. Dr. Stokes indicated that the OECD TG would need to be updated to allow for the provision of a limit dose procedure and that's why the Panel's conclusions and recommendations are even more relevant. Dr. Stokes indicated that ICCVAM has already submitted a proposal to update the OECD TG based on the outcome of these deliberations and recommendations from the IWG.

The Panel agreed to use the term weight-of-evidence to refer to existing information that would aid the LLNA limit dose procedure in identifying a substance as a sensitizer or a non-sensitizer. The Panel also discussed the use of concurrent positive controls and recommended that a laboratory that is proficient at conducting the limit dose procedure can test a positive control at routine intervals rather than concurrently (although the Panel did not identify what constituted routine intervals). The Panel also discussed the use of individual versus pooled data and agreed with the ICCVAM-recommended protocol that individual animal data should always be collected. The Panel concluded that individual animal response data are necessary in order to allow for statistical analyses of any differences between treated and control data. In addition, having data from individual animals also allows for identification of technical problems and outlier animals within a dose group. Dr. Luster asked the Panel if they agreed with the changes and revisions made at this point and with the Panel conclusions and recommendations as presented and revised. The Panel unanimously agreed. The Panel's detailed recommendations and conclusions on the LLNA limit dose procedure are included in their final Panel report³¹.

Overview of the Draft Addendum for the Applicability Domain of the LLNA and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Dr. Eleni Salicru, Integrated Laboratory Systems, Inc. (the NICEATM support contractor), summarized the information provided in the draft ICCVAM Addendum to the ICCVAM LLNA report (1999). This Addendum provided an updated assessment of the validity of the LLNA for testing the sensitizing potential of mixtures, metals, and aqueous solutions. The database used for this evaluation contained traditional LLNA data submitted as part of the original LLNA evaluation (ICCVAM 1999), data extracted from peer-reviewed articles published after the original evaluation, and data submitted to NICEATM in response to the *FR* notice (72 FR 27815, May 17, 2007) requesting such data. Dr. Salicru then summarized the performance characteristics of the LLNA when used to test mixtures, metals, and aqueous solutions³², as well as the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for each of the three categories of test substances³³.

³¹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPREpt2008.pdf

³² <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/LLNA-app/LLNAappADD19Jan08FD.pdf>

³³ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/LLNA-app/LLNAappRecs19Jan08FD.pdf>

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. McDougal, on behalf of his Evaluation Group, presented for consideration by the entire Panel the draft responses to the questions asked of the Panel by ICCVAM. The Panel then discussed the completeness of the draft ICCVAM Addendum, identified any errors and omissions, and reviewed the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations with regard to the ability of the LLNA to be used to test the sensitizing potential of mixtures, metals, and aqueous solutions. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM Addendum are reflected in the Panel report, published in May 2008³⁴. During the Panel's evaluation of the LLNA's applicability domain, the difficulty of testing metals in the LLNA was discussed and Dr. Woolhiser asked if testing metals was also problematic in the guinea pig. Dr. Api indicated that with the metals, most of the data has come from the clinical experience because animal studies are not predicting accurately what is happening in the clinic. Dr. Maibach indicated that metals have been tested in the guinea pig and that they are sensitized easily. Dr. Maibach further commented that metals in man need to be patch-tested for clinical relevance at a level close to the irritant dose and that a thoughtful series of algorithms is necessary to determine this. He also pointed out that patch test results to some metals (e.g., nickel, palladium) may indicate that a cell mediated reaction is occurring (i.e., contact allergy) but it needs to be sorted out if this cell mediated reaction actually results in a disease (i.e., allergic contact dermatitis) and this is where the LLNA could prove useful.

With regard to mixtures, Dr Api commented that based on her experience, when the mixture tested in the LLNA contains a predominant material (loosely defined that as greater than 70 percent) then the LLNA for the mixture mirrors what occurs for that one material. When evidence indicates that the substance is a true mixture, some times the LLNA does what is expected and other times the results are unexpected. In those cases, a weight-of-evidence approach (e.g., structure-activity relationships, clinical evidence) is employed.

Public Comments:

Dr. Charles Hastings, BASF Corporation

Dr. Hastings, representing CropLife America (an industry association of companies in the crop protection business), provided an overview of current activities in industry related to the use of the LLNA to detect dermal sensitizers and the global issues that are of importance. Dr. Hastings mentioned that CropLife America's primary concern is the testing of pesticide mixtures and formulations. He stated that they support the use of the LLNA for testing the dermal sensitization of mixtures and formulations as well as single ingredients.

Dr. Hastings mentioned that in the United States, EPA OPPTS (Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances) Guideline 870.2600³⁵ allows for the use of the LLNA as the preferred alternative to the standard guinea pig test. Based on this recommendation, member companies of CropLife America conducted a large number of LLNA studies for both active ingredients

³⁴ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPrept2008.pdf

³⁵ http://www.epa.gov/opptsfrs/publications/OPPTS_Harmonized/870_Health_Effects_Test_Guidelines/Revised/870r-2600.pdf

and formulations in the European Union (E.U.) and were at the point of submitting data in the United States, as well. Then, in early 2007, they were informed that EPA had concerns about the validity of using the LLNA to test mixtures and formulations, and were advised to discontinue using this test method for that purpose until it had been adequately validated. Dr. Hastings stated that, in contrast to the EPA, E.U. regulators consider the LLNA acceptable for testing pesticide formulations and actually prefer it to a guinea pig test.

Dr. Pieters asked if the E.U. has conducted any evaluations of the validity of the LLNA for testing mixtures and formulations. Dr. Hastings replied that he was not certain if they had performed an extensive evaluation or not but that the E.U. considered the LLNA a validated method and therefore likely considered it appropriate to test not only the active ingredient but also the formulation or mixture.

Dr. Hastings mentioned that one concern in terms of using the LLNA for testing mixtures or formulations, particularly in the E.U., is the testing of aqueous substances. Many of the industry formulations are aqueous-based and may be incompatible with traditional LLNA vehicles. The European Crop Protection Association sponsored a study that evaluated the use of an aqueous vehicle known as Pluronic L92, which helps adhere the test material to the mouse ear. In the study, they tested three aqueous pesticide formulations that contained known sensitizers, using Pluronic L92 as the vehicle. As expected, the test results demonstrated sensitizing activity. Regarding global considerations, Dr. Hastings mentioned that if the LLNA is not accepted for mixture/formulation testing in the United States, industry will have no choice but to conduct both the LLNA, with 18 to 24 animals, and a guinea pig test, with 20 to 30 animals, for each formulation they may develop for global distribution. This scenario counters the ICCVAM goal of “reducing, refining, and replacing” animal use in regulatory safety testing.

Dr. Hastings ended with the following conclusions:

- CropLife America believes the LLNA test can be used for pesticide formulations.
- CropLife America supports the efforts of EPA and ICCVAM to confirm the validity of the LLNA for testing mixtures/formulations and encourages a quick evaluation.
- CropLife America is willing to help, as needed.
- If and, when, it is determined that the LLNA is acceptable, CropLife America requests that EPA notify them so they can then begin conducting the LLNA again for the United States.

Dr. Api asked if CropLife America has data comparing pesticides that have been evaluated in the LLNA and in guinea pigs and/or humans. Dr. Hastings replied that they do and that generally there is not much discrepancy with guinea pig test results. Occasionally they might see a false positive compared to a guinea pig test, but he did not recall ever seeing a false negative. In most cases, they would feel comfortable accepting an occasional false positive because human health is still protected.

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter stated that he had personal reservations about testing complex mixtures and formulations in assays that were designed for testing substances (e.g., the LLNA) since no single test has ever been validated for testing mixtures. On another point, he stated that most of the metals of importance have been tested in both the guinea pig and the LLNA and the “right” answers have been generated. Thus, it does not seem worthwhile to produce new tests with revised protocols for hazard and potency categorization for testing metals.

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel if they agreed with the comments and recommendations that were made earlier during the Panel discussion. The Panel agreed with the draft ICCVAM recommendation for continued collection of information from traditional LLNA evaluations of mixtures, metals, and aqueous solutions with comparative data for guinea pig (i.e., guinea pig maximization test [GPMT] or Buehler test [BT]) and human (i.e., human maximization test [HMT] or human repeat insult patch test [HRIPT]) tests. However, the Panel suggested that, given resource limitations, it would be important to organize the recommendations based on relative priority. Dr. Luster asked the Panel if they agreed with this suggestion about prioritization of activities; all members of the Panel agreed with one abstention. Dr. Howard Maibach abstained from voting stating that he hoped this public meeting and the subsequent Panel report would emphasize to industry the need for them to submit more data on mixtures, metals, and aqueous substances in order to provide a clearer evidence of the validity of the LLNA in testing these types of substances. The Panel’s detailed recommendations and conclusions on the applicability domain of the LLNA are included in their final Panel report³⁶.

Method Description and Overview of the LLNA: Daicel Adenosine Triphosphate (LLNA: DA) Test Method

Dr. Kenji Idehara, Daicel Chemical Industries, Ltd. (private limited company), summarized the technical aspects of the LLNA: DA test method. He described the LLNA: DA as a non-radioisotopic version of the LLNA method in which lymph node adenosine triphosphate (ATP) content is used as a measure of cell proliferation instead of radiolabeled thymidine incorporation. Dr. Idehara indicated that the LLNA: DA was developed six years ago at Daicel Chemical Industries, Ltd., and that they use the test method regularly for in-house assessments of the skin-sensitization potential of chemical materials, intermediates, or products. He summarized the protocol differences between the LLNA: DA and the traditional LLNA. In the LLNA: DA, the application site is treated with 1% sodium lauryl sulfate (SLS) one hour before each test substance (or vehicle control) application, and the test substance is applied to the test site on day 7 as well as on days 1, 2, and 3. The auricular lymph nodes are excised from individual animals on day 8 rather than on day 6 and the amount of ATP in the lymph nodes is measured with a luciferin-luciferase assay. Dr. Idehara mentioned that these modifications (i.e., 1% SLS pretreatment and additional application on day 7) enhance lymph node cell

³⁶ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRRept2008.pdf

proliferation in order to achieve an SI = 3 in the LLNA: DA, which allows for a more direct comparison to the traditional LLNA.

Dr. Idehara mentioned that after excision, ATP content gradually decreased with time. Therefore, the overall assay time for measuring ATP content needs to be similar (i.e., within approximately 30 minutes) among all test animals. He noted that this was an important point for this method and recommended that the LLNA: DA be conducted by at least two persons. Dr. Idehara mentioned that ATP content assays are conducted using commercially available kits, and his laboratory has experience with two different commercial sources in Japan, Kikkoman and Lonzar.

Overview of the Draft LLNA: DA BRD and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Dr. Allen then presented an overview of the draft ICCVAM BRD for the LLNA: DA test method. He mentioned that the draft ICCVAM BRD provided a comprehensive review of the available data and information regarding the usefulness and limitations of the LLNA: DA to distinguish between sensitizers and non-sensitizers, compared to the traditional LLNA. The objective of the BRD was to describe the current validation status of the LLNA: DA test method, including its relevance and reliability, scope of substances tested, and the availability of a standardized protocol.

Dr. Allen mentioned that the data analyzed in the BRD included data provided by Daicel Chemical Industries, Ltd., on 31 substances tested at their laboratories. In addition, data for 14 different coded substances were generated from a two-phased interlaboratory validation study that included 17 total labs. Taken together, the total database represented in the LLNA: DA BRD included 33 different substances. Dr. Allen briefly summarized the performance characteristics of the LLNA: DA test method, which is detailed in the draft ICCVAM BRD³⁷. Dr. Allen concluded by briefly summarizing the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for the LLNA: DA test method³⁸.

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. Michael Woolhiser thanked the Panel members of his Evaluation Group (i.e., Drs. Nathalie Alépeé, Thomas Gebel, Sidney Green [not present], and Jean Regal) for their tireless efforts in reviewing their Evaluation Group's assigned documents. He also thanked the NICEATM staff for their technical support during the review process. Dr. Woolhiser then presented the draft responses to ICCVAM's questions about this test method for consideration by the entire Panel. This included their review of the draft BRD for errors and omissions, their overall assessment of the validation status of the test method, and their comments on the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM BRD are reflected in the Panel report, published in May 2008³⁹.

³⁷ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/llna-DA/LLNA-DABrd07Jan08FD.pdf>

³⁸ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/llna-DA/LLNA-DAREcs07Jan08FD.pdf>

³⁹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPrept2008.pdf

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned for the day at 5:03 p.m., to reconvene at 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 5, 2008.

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Reconvening of the Panel Meeting

Dr. Luster reconvened the Panel Meeting at 8:30 a.m. He introduced himself and then asked that all Panel members, followed by all others in attendance, introduce themselves as well.

Overview of the Draft LLNA: DA BRD and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. Woolhiser continued his presentation from the previous day of the draft responses to ICCVAM's questions to the Panel, for consideration by the entire Panel. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM BRD are reflected in the Panel report, published in May 2008⁴⁰. Dr. Woolhiser indicated that the Evaluation Group had two main concerns with the LLNA: DA test method. The first concern related to pretreatment with 1% SLS and understanding how this impacted the biology of the response. Second, the time course of the study was different than the traditional LLNA because it extended the study by one day and included an additional challenge. This brought forth a question about the immunology of the response as it relates to the potential for elicitation and whether or not that is a significant change from the traditional LLNA, which is purely an induction model.

Public Comments:

Dr. George DeGeorge, MB Research Laboratories

In response to a question raised during the Panel discussion, Dr. DeGeorge commented that using lymph node weight as the readout to differentiate between sensitizers and non-sensitizers in the LLNA is problematic because although there are more lymph node cells packed into a node, each cell has less cytoplasm. The lymph nodes swell to a point, and then excrete water and become smaller lymphocytes that are countable. He cited examples from his laboratory with several different sensitizers, which demonstrate that lymphocytes in the node are smaller when a large SI (e.g., SI = 25) is obtained relative to when a smaller SI (e.g., SI = 3) is obtained.

Dr. DeGeorge also commented that he agreed with a point made during the Panel discussion that the LLNA: DA method and the LLNA: Bromodeoxyuridine Detected by ELISA (LLNA: BrdU-ELISA) method should be considered separately, because they are so dissimilar.

In his final comment, Dr. DeGeorge stated that in the traditional LLNA, in the LLNA: Bromodeoxyuridine Detected by Flow Cytometry (LLNA: BrdU-FC), and probably also in the LLNA: DA, strong sensitizing substances do not need to be administered three times. For instance, if one administers with a single, moderately high dose of dinitrochlorobenzene

⁴⁰ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRpt2008.pdf

(DNCB) (i.e., one that would induce an SI of 20 to 40) and then measure lymph node cell proliferation on day 1, 2, 3, or 4, an increase in the number of cells in the node and the number of cells that are positive for BrdU would likely be observed. Thus, administrations of additional applications have the potential to cause cumulative irritation. Dr. DeGeorge stated that the LLNA: DA method, which extends the assay to eight days instead of six days, should evaluate what happens to lymph node cell number at earlier sample times. In addition, if the animals receive just one application using a high dose, with or without the SLS, is there an increase in the SI? If so, that would lead to the possibility that the extra applications are not necessary and might lead to cumulative irritation.

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter made a statement that from a clinical perspective, substances are typically described as significant sensitizers or not significant sensitizers, and within that latter group some of the substances may indeed be non-sensitizing. Thus, just because a substance has been shown in an isolated case report to be a human sensitizer does not mean that there is sufficient evidence to consider it as positive for comparison with outcomes of predictive assays. It has to be of sufficient importance (i.e., potency) to trigger a positive classification. Dr. Basketter mentioned SLS, methyl salicylate, and isopropanol, as substances which will always be positive in some human cases although they shouldn't be positive in a predictive assay.

Dr. Basketter also commented that caution should be given to making sensitization assumptions based on chemical class references. As an example, eugenol and isoeugenol are structurally similar and have similar physical properties, but they act by different chemical reaction mechanisms and could fit into distinctly different chemical classes.

Dr. Basketter's last comment acknowledged that much work has been done in terms of validating the traditional LLNA. If one makes minor changes to the LLNA in terms of a different readout for proliferation, then they benefit from all the experience generated in validating the traditional LLNA and less effort is needed to prove that the minor modification is valid. In contrast, if more significant modifications are made, one cannot rely on that same experience. Dr. Basketter cautioned that more importance should be placed on distinguishing whether something has changed substantially enough such that you can no longer rely on the traditional LLNA as a reference.

Dr. Masahiro Takeyoshi, Chemicals Evaluation and Research Institute

Dr. Takeyoshi made a short presentation about differences in LLNA sensitization responsiveness among different strains of mice. He mentioned that this was an important issue when evaluating the modified LLNA methods being developed in Japan. He showed differences in responsiveness among three different mouse strains commonly used in Japan (i.e., BALB/cAnN, CBA/JN, and CD-1) tested with parabenzoquinone in his group's non-radioactive LLNA (i.e., LLNA: BrdU-ELISA). The data indicated that the CBA/JN mouse strain exhibited a higher responsiveness, as indicated by an increased SI, to parabenzoquinone than the other two mouse strains tested. Based on these results, CBA/JN mice were chosen for testing substances in the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method. Dr. Takeyoshi also indicated that based on evaluating different SI cutoffs in the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA, 2-

mercaptobenzothiazole, 3-(4-isopropylphenyl)isobutyraldehyde, and hydroxycitronellal, had low responsiveness (i.e., SI values). He noted that 2-mercaptobenzothiazole is an OECD TG 429 recommended positive control for the LLNA however repeat tests could not detect this substance as positive when using an SI value of 1.7 or more. Dr. Takeyoshi suggested that a substance-specific lower response might exist in the test system. Dr. Takeyoshi also summarized LLNA data by Dr. Ullmann and coworkers with the contract lab RCC, Ltd. in which they investigated the responsiveness of six different mouse strains (CBA/CaOlaHsd, CBA/Ca (CruBR), CBA/Jlbn (SPF), CBA/JNCrj, BALB/c and NMRI) to 25% 2-mercaptobenzothiazole. The data indicated that CBA/JNCrj mice showed markedly lower responsiveness compared to the other strains tested. These studies indicate that strain related differences would not be negligible with regard to measuring different endpoints of cellular proliferation in the LLNA because depending on the chemicals tested, responsiveness might be potentially impacted. For instance, some of the discordance seen in the LLNA: DA test method (e.g., 2-mercaptobenzothiazole) could be a strain specific effect.

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to review their conclusions and recommendations and discuss any revisions, if necessary. The Panel viewed the difference in treatment schedule between the LLNA: DA and the traditional LLNA to potentially be significant if the treatment schedule for the LLNA: DA corresponds to entering the elicitation phase of skin sensitization. The Panel was concerned that the 1% SLS pretreatment step in the LLNA: DA might modify the inherent sensitivity of the LLNA. They recommended that the test method developer (Daicel Chemical Industries, Ltd.) justify the use of 1% SLS or consider an alternative decision criterion (i.e., an SI threshold other than three) such that the 1% SLS pretreatment is no longer necessary. Dr. Luster asked the Panel if they agreed with the recommendations and conclusions that the Panel made along with the revisions; unanimously, the Panel agreed. The Panel's detailed recommendations and conclusions on the LLNA: DA test method are included in their final Panel report.⁴¹

Method Description and Overview of the LLNA: BrdU-FC Test Method

Dr. George DeGeorge, MB Research Laboratories, presented an overview of the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method. He stated that mice are dosed topically on the ears once daily for three consecutive days (i.e., days 1, 2, and 3), just like the traditional LLNA protocol. On day 6, the mice receive an intraperitoneal injection with bromodeoxyuridine (BrdU), and five hours later, the auricular lymph nodes are removed. The lymph nodes from individual animals are processed and, using flow cytometry, the number of BrdU-positive cells are counted from treated animals and compared to control animals as a measure of lymph node cell proliferation.

Dr. DeGeorge described in detail how the cells are processed and gated for flow cytometric analysis. He mentioned that the cells are also permeabilized and treated with propidium iodide which allows gates to be drawn around the G₀, G₁, S, and G₂M phases of the cell cycle. Dr.

⁴¹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRRept2008.pdf

DeGeorge projected specific examples of flow cytometry plots and histograms for DNCB, hexyl cinnamic aldehyde (HCA), and positive and negative control data.

Dr. DeGeorge also described the tiered protocol for the assessment of sensitization potential using the LLNA: BrdU-FC and how ear swelling measurements and additional immunophenotypic endpoints (i.e., the enhanced LLNA: BrdU-FC) aid in distinguishing skin irritants from an irritating sensitizer.

Overview of the Draft LLNA: BrdU-FC BRD and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Dr. Judy Strickland, Integrated Laboratory Systems, Inc. (the NICEATM support contractor), presented an overview of the draft ICCVAM BRD for the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method. She stated that the draft ICCVAM BRD provided a comprehensive review of the available data and information regarding the usefulness and limitations of the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method. Specifically, the test method was reviewed for its ability to distinguish between sensitizers and non-sensitizers compared with the traditional LLNA. The objective of the BRD was to describe the current validation status of the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method, including its relevance and reliability, scope of substances tested, and the availability of a standardized protocol.

Dr. Strickland indicated that MB Research Laboratories submitted data to NICEATM for the 48 substances analyzed in the BRD in response to an *FR* notice (72FR27815, May 17, 2007) that requested such data. Dr. Strickland briefly summarized the performance characteristics of the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method, which is detailed in the draft ICCVAM BRD⁴², and the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method⁴³.

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. Raymond Pieters, on behalf of his Evaluation Group, presented the Evaluation Group's review of the draft BRD and the draft test method recommendations for the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method. Specifically, he presented the draft responses to ICCVAM's questions to the Panel for consideration by the entire Panel. This included their review of the draft BRD for errors and omissions, their overall assessment of the validation status of this test method, and their comments on the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM BRD are reflected in the Panel report, published in May 2008⁴⁴. The applicability of the draft ICCVAM-recommended LLNA performance standards to the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method was discussed, particularly with regard to the number of substances tested in the LLNA: BrdU-FC method and whether more data would be necessary for review before the validation status of the assay could be determined. Dr. Stokes reminded the Panel that the proposed LLNA performance standards didn't exist when the studies for the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method were performed. The

⁴² <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/fcLLNA/FC-LLNAbrd07Jan08FD.pdf>

⁴³ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/fcLLNA/FCLLNAREcs07Jan08FD.pdf>

⁴⁴ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPrept2008.pdf

questions should be whether the adequacy of the substances that have been tested is sufficient or if more studies need to be done to cover any gaps that might exist (e.g., range of potencies or activity, chemical classes).

Public Comments

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter commented on the statement that Dr. DeGeorge made during his overview of the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method that HCA is irritating. He said that he is not convinced it is a significant irritant. Based on previous data, they had to use 50% HCA in a 48 hour occlusive application in the guinea pig in order to produce a mildly irritating response. Dr. Api added to Dr. Basketter's comment by stating that RIFM has also not found HCA to be an irritant when tested up to 20% in humans.

Dr. Basketter also commented that in the draft BRD for the LLNA: BrdU-FC, resorcinol was noted to be negative in the traditional LLNA and this is not correct. Dr. Basketter's group published results in 2007 in the journal *Contact Dermatitis* that resorcinol is clearly positive in the traditional LLNA when tested at higher concentrations and therefore this should be corrected for the record.

Dr. George DeGeorge, MB Research Laboratories

Dr. DeGeorge wanted to clarify that the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method was compared to the traditional LLNA to determine if the LLNA: BrdU-FC was more predictive of skin-sensitization potential. He stated that in some cases it was better while in others it wasn't, but overall, using human data as the gold standard reference, the LLNA: BrdU-FC exceeded the traditional LLNA predictivity values and accuracy. He also noted that the additional endpoints included in the LLNA: BrdU-FC allow for them to distinguish irritating substances that typically are considered false positives in the LLNA.

Dr. DeGeorge also noted that since the LLNA: BrdU-FC is so similar to the traditional LLNA the issue of refinement and reduction in animal use is not immediately apparent but if the assay is done in as few as four mice per group with a periodic positive control (e.g., every six months) this represents a significant decrease in animal numbers compared to guinea pig tests. Furthermore, there is a refinement since mice are phylogenetically lower than guinea pigs, and undergo less pain and distress during the assay than guinea pigs undergo.

With regard to the discussion of coefficients of variation (CVs) and the 0.5x to 2.0x EC₃ (i.e., the estimated concentration needed to produce a stimulation index of three) range, Dr. DeGeorge suggested that a larger range might be more reasonable because the current range is likely too restrictive.

Dr. George also noted that ICCVAM requires interlaboratory validation if a test method is to be transferred to other laboratories. With regard to the LLNA: BrdU-FC, it is a "me-too" assay and only has "minor" changes from the traditional LLNA and is currently only used in one laboratory. Therefore, the current dataset should suffice for determining the validity of the LLNA: BrdU-FC. In response to Dr. DeGeorge's comment, Dr. Stokes stated that if a method is only proposed to be used by one laboratory, having only intralaboratory data certainly would

suffice but if it was proposed for broader use (e.g., adopted or endorsed by regulatory authorities), then other laboratories would have to demonstrate interlaboratory reproducibility. Dr. Luster asked if there was any mechanism available so that a company or small laboratory could apply for funding to help support an inter-laboratory validation. Dr. Stokes indicated that they could nominate the test method for additional validation studies to ICCVAM. It would go through a nomination review process and a prioritization would be given to that. The nomination would then be considered by the member agencies as to whether funding would be provided.

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to review their conclusions and recommendations and discuss any revisions, if necessary. The Panel suggested that the utility of ear swelling or other methods to detect inflammation appeared warranted for inclusion in every variation of the LLNA (including the traditional LLNA), but should be further investigated before routine inclusion in the protocol is recommended. The Panel further agreed that the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for future studies highlighted the unanswered questions raised by the available data set. Specifically, conducting interlaboratory studies as a part of the validation process is important.

The Panel considered the immunological markers suggested for the LLNA: BrdU-FC to be appropriate, but noted that other immunological markers for discrimination of irritant versus sensitization phenomena were also available. In general, for any future work, efforts should be made to decrease the variability and to thereby increase the power of the test in order to ensure that more animals were not needed relative to the traditional LLNA or other modified LLNA protocols.

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to indicate if they agreed with the recommendations and conclusions that the Panel made along with the revisions; the Panel unanimously agreed. The Panel's detailed recommendations and conclusions on the LLNA: BrdU-FC test method are included in their final Panel report.⁴⁵

Method Description and Overview of the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA Test Method

Dr. Masahiro Takeyoshi, Chemicals Evaluation and Research Institute, presented an overview of the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method. He stated that the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method is very similar to the traditional LLNA test method. Unique to the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method, after test substance applications on days 1, 2, and 3, BrdU is injected interperitoneally on day 5. Approximately 24 hours after the BrdU injection, lymph nodes are collected, and detection of the amount of BrdU incorporated into the DNA of lymph node cells is conducted with an ELISA.

In the development process of this method, experiments were conducted to detect the most efficient injection schedule of BrdU. Based on the various injection schedules tested, a single injection protocol on day four was identified as the optimal injection schedule for BrdU administration.

⁴⁵ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRRept2008.pdf

Dr. Takeyoshi then showed a video of laboratory personnel preparing the lymph node cells for BrdU detection by ELISA. He went on to describe data for the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA compared to the traditional LLNA and how performance could be improved using alternative decision criteria (i.e., an SI other than three as the threshold for a positive response).

Overview of the Draft LLNA: BrdU-ELISA BRD and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Dr. Salicru presented an overview of the draft ICCVAM BRD for the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method. She noted that the draft ICCVAM BRD provided a comprehensive review of the available data and information regarding the usefulness and limitations of the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method. Specifically, the test method was reviewed for its ability to distinguish between sensitizers and non-sensitizers compared with the traditional LLNA and guinea pig test methods. The objective of the BRD was to describe the current validation status of the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method, including its relevance and reliability, scope of substances tested, and the availability of a standardized protocol.

Dr. Salicru stated that data from a total of 29 substances were considered in the accuracy analysis for the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA, and they were all tested in one laboratory. Dr. Salicru briefly summarized the performance characteristics of the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method, which are detailed in the draft ICCVAM BRD⁴⁶, and the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method⁴⁷.

Panel Evaluation:

Ms. Kim Headrick, presented her Evaluation Group's (Drs. Anne Marie Api, Howard Maibach, Peter Theran, and Stephen Ullrich), review of the draft BRD and draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method. Specifically, she presented the draft responses to ICCVAM's questions to the Panel for consideration by the entire Panel. This included their review of the draft BRD for errors and omissions, their overall assessment of the validation status of the test method, and their comments on the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM BRD are reflected in the Panel report, published in May 2008.⁴⁸

Public Comments:

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter noted that when the traditional LLNA was first suggested as an alternative to the guinea pig tests, it went through a comprehensive validation process, and one of the concerns was that it should perform reliably and distinctly better than the guinea pig assays. He emphasized that this point should be kept in mind when thinking about the modified LLNA protocols with alternative end points that are currently being reviewed. He stated that the current rigor of examination for the modified LLNA protocols being reviewed for validation is

⁴⁶ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/llna-ELISA/BrdUELISAbrd07Jan08.pdf>

⁴⁷ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/llna-ELISA/BrdUELISAREcs07Jan08FD.pdf>

⁴⁸ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPrept2008.pdf

higher than that for the traditional LLNA. He speculated that in the not-too-distant future, *in vitro* alternatives are likely to be going through a similar review process and it is going to become ever more difficult to put these alternatives in place, not because there is ill-will against the selections but because of the high standard of being good scientists. Thus, it is important that pragmatic decisions are made using the tools that are available.

Dr. George DeGeorge, MB Research Laboratories

Dr. DeGeorge commented that he agreed with Dr. Basketter's statements. He said that based on his experience in this peer review process, it is unlikely that he would bring any of the three *in vitro* test methods that MB Research Laboratories is developing for consideration by ICCVAM, given the many high hurdles that have to be negotiated.

In response to the comments by Drs. Basketter and DeGeorge, Dr. McDougal commented that it does not seem unreasonable to raise the bar for what is expected of new or modified tests. Dr. Luster added that understandably, the focus on animal refinement and reduction is paramount, but that as scientists we have to ensure that the bar is maintained sufficiently high so that as the years go by scientific quality is not compromised.

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to review their conclusions and recommendations and discuss any revisions, if necessary. The Panel concluded that the available data and test method performance for the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA support the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations that it may be useful for identifying substances as potential skin sensitizers and non-sensitizers, but that more information and existing data must be made available before the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA can be recommended for use. The Panel also stated that a detailed protocol was needed, in addition to sufficient quantitative data for broader analysis on a larger set of balanced reference substances that take into account physicochemical properties and sensitization potency, as well as an appropriate evaluation of interlaboratory reproducibility.

The Panel's main concern with this test method was that the accuracy of the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA at $SI \geq 3$ was inadequate and not equivalent to the traditional LLNA. Furthermore, although using a decision criterion of $SI \geq 1.3$ improved the test's performance in identifying sensitizers from non-sensitizers, it did not resolve concerns about the test method, particularly considering that power calculations suggest a much larger number of animals per group would be required to identify a positive response. Thus, the Panel also concluded that it might be more appropriate to use a statistically based decision criterion rather than a stimulation index to classify substances as sensitizers, and that this should be further investigated. Dr. Luster asked the Panel to indicate if they agreed with the recommendations and conclusions that the Panel made along with the revisions; unanimously, the Panel agreed. The Panel's detailed recommendations and conclusions on the LLNA: BrdU-ELISA test method are included in their final Panel report⁴⁹.

⁴⁹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRRept2008.pdf

Overview of the Draft ICCVAM Performance Standards for the LLNA

Dr. Allen presented an overview of the draft ICCVAM Performance Standards for the LLNA. He briefly summarized the overall purpose of performance standards (i.e., to provide a basis for evaluating the performance of a proposed test method that is mechanistically and functionally similar to the validated test method) and the three elements encompassed within such performance standards (i.e., essential test method components, a minimum list of reference substances, and accuracy/reliability values). He noted that the proposed applicability of these draft ICCVAM LLNA performance standards is for the evaluation of LLNA protocols that deviate from the ICCVAM-recommended LLNA protocol only with respect to the method for assessing lymphocyte proliferation (e.g., using non-radioactive instead of radioactive reagents). Dr. Allen then provided an overview of the essential test method components, the minimum list of reference substances, and the accuracy/reliability values as detailed in the draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards⁵⁰.

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. Woolhiser, on behalf of his Evaluation Group, presented the Evaluation Group's responses to the ICCVAM questions asked about the draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards for the entire Panel to consider. The overall question for the Panel was whether these performance standards were considered adequate for assessing the accuracy and reliability of test method protocols that were based on similar scientific principles and that measured the same biological effect as the traditional LLNA. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to the draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards are reflected in the Panel report published in May 2008⁵¹.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m., to reconvene at 8:30 a.m., Thursday, March 6, 2008.

Thursday, March 6, 2008

Reconvening of the Panel Meeting

Dr. Luster reconvened the Panel Meeting at 8:30 a.m. He introduced himself and then asked that all Panel members and all others in attendance introduce themselves as well.

Overview of the Draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards

Panel Evaluation:

Dr. Woolhiser reviewed some of the important points highlighted during the previous day's discussion on this topic, and then continued to summarize the remaining comments of his Evaluation Group on the questions asked by ICCVAM on the draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards for consideration by the entire Panel. As mentioned above, the Panel

⁵⁰ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/PerfStds/LLNAPerfStd07Jan08FD.pdf>

⁵¹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRpt2008.pdf

discussion and their recommended revisions to the draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards are reflected in the Panel report published in May 2008⁵².

Dr. Woolhiser noted that there were general comments on the topic order for the Panel's review. He asked if Dr. Stokes would comment on the rationale for the topic order. Dr. Stokes indicated that as the IWG deliberated the order of topics for this review, consideration was given to the fact that the three non-radioactive methods had undergone validation studies prior to the creation of LLNA performance standards. Thus, the non-radioactive test methods were reviewed before the performance standards, so as to not bias the Panel's assessment of each test method's performance. The performance standards could then be considered for their application to future test methods.

Public Comments:

Dr. Amy Rispin, EPA

Dr. Rispin stated that her intent was to provide some additional regulatory perspective on some of the points that have been discussed. When Federal agencies evaluate the validation status of a test method under ICCVAM, they conduct a comprehensive analysis of overall performance (i.e., accuracy and reliability) in the context of making regulatory decisions with data from the test method. Thus, in a regulatory situation, equal or greater accuracy compared to the reference test method is the expectation. If the number of animals can be decreased only at the expense of accuracy, the acceptability of such a test method for the particular regulatory purpose would need to be carefully considered. Certain methods, instead of being complete replacements, might have to be relegated to the role of screens, where positives would be accepted, but negatives would require further testing - a less than ideal situation.

Dr. Rispin commented that performance standards are the regulating agencies basis for the acceptability of variations of accepted test methods. If an agency receives data from a modified LLNA method that has not been reviewed and validated in the ICCVAM process, there is unlikely to be a comprehensive peer review of it within the agency, given resource limitations. Therefore, the question of major versus minor departures from the functional criteria is important to ICCVAM and its member agencies. One cannot anticipate that there will be anything other than these performance standards to adequately evaluate the usefulness and limitations of a new method.

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter first commented on a point that Dr. Thomas Gebel alluded to during the Panel's discussion of the draft ICCVAM LLNA Performance Standards, which was that if a new laboratory performed the traditional LLNA to assess 18 or 22 chemicals, they probably wouldn't get a complete match. Dr. Basketter disagreed with Dr. Gebel's statement and viewed that a competent laboratory performing the LLNA would get it 100% correct.

Dr. Basketter then provided some comments that he stated were "from the ECVAM perspective." He stated that the ECVAM performance standards tried to address adhering to a standard

⁵² http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRRept2008.pdf

protocol and that any change to the protocol other than the method for evaluating lymph node proliferation (e.g., strain, species, number of applications, time) was considered not to be minor, and therefore such a protocol would not be applied to these performance standards. By restricting the performance standards to minor changes, ECVAM was trying to minimize the number of chemicals required to evaluate sensitivity. Furthermore, the EC3 value could be used to see if the test method could classify substances in the appropriate range of sensitization potency.

ECVAM initially chose their reference substances in order to determine whether a modified method (differing only in the method for measuring cell proliferation) would give the same answer as the traditional LLNA. Thus, there was no intent to compare to the guinea pig or human data.

Dr. Basketter speculated that it is doubtful that data from multiple LLNA studies on the same substance are available and therefore it is unlikely that much larger sample sizes from which to calculate mean EC3 values and associated ranges will be obtained.

Dr. Basketter concluded by stating that ECVAM will not include more false positives and false negatives in its list. It has included one false positive and false negative in order to harmonize with ICCVAM but they don't see an added statistical value of just having one more false positive and false negative.

Karen Hamernik, EPA

Dr. Hamernik concurred with the comments that Dr. Rispin made previously, that performance standards, if developed such that they are too generalized with respect to minor versus major changes, would be problematic for regulatory agencies when they are reviewing submissions that include data from a modified LLNA protocol. Dr. Hamernik also asked for clarification from the Panel on a statement made during their discussions that a test for concordance for measuring the accuracy of classification (i.e., yes/no answer) should be done and that a chemical-for-chemical match is not necessary. Dr. Flournoy responded that concordance is not absolute but a continuum. Dr. Luster further clarified that the Panel discussion was based on the fact that the traditional LLNA is not a perfect match when compared to the guinea pig tests. Because there are false negatives and false positives compared to the guinea pig, there should be some flexibility so that an absolute chemical-by-chemical match is not required. In addition, a scientifically valid explanation can be provided for any discordance. Dr. Stokes emphasized that this was an important point and that additional clarity on the differences between a chemical-by-chemical match and overall accuracy need to be carefully considered before the final test method accuracy requirements are defined.

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to review the conclusions and recommendations for the ICCVAM LLNA performance standards they had discussed earlier and to make any revisions, if necessary. The Panel indicated that modified LLNA protocols that are undergoing validation should contain essential test method components that follow the ICCVAM-recommended

protocol⁵³, unless adequate scientific rationale for deviating from this protocol was provided. The Panel also identified aspects of the LLNA that should be required as part of the test method validation process, if more extensive changes to the protocol are being considered: (1) application of the test substance to the skin with sampling of the lymph nodes draining that site, (2) measurement of cell proliferation in the draining lymph node, (3) absence of a skin reaction that could be indicative of the onset of the elicitation phase of skin sensitization, (4) data collected at the level of the individual animal to allow for an estimate of the variance within control and treatment groups,⁵⁴ and (5) if dose response information is needed, there are an adequate number of dose groups ($n \geq 3$) with which to accurately characterize the dose response for a given test substance.

The Panel also recommended that statistical tests to analyze the data might allow for a more accurate interpretation. They recommended that a suitable variance-stabilizing transformation (e.g., log transformation, square root transformation) be applied in all statistical analyses and in reporting summary standard deviations. The Panel also recommended that a more rigorous evaluation be conducted of what would be considered an appropriate range of EC_t values (i.e., estimated concentration needed to produce a stimulation index that is indicative of a positive response) to include as a requirement. This would be a statistical evaluation that considers the variability of EC_t values generated among the sensitizers included on the performance standards reference substances list and the statistical multiple comparisons problem.

Dr. Luster asked the Panel if they agreed with the changes and revisions made at this point and with the Panel conclusions and recommendations as presented and revised. The members of the Panel agreed with one abstention; Dr. McDougal abstained from voting stating that he still had a concern about what constitutes a “major/minor” change. The Panel’s detailed recommendations and conclusions on the ICCVAM LLNA performance standards are included in their final Panel report.⁵⁵

Overview of the Draft LLNA Potency Determinations BRD and Draft ICCVAM Test Method Recommendations

Dr. Strickland presented an overview of the draft ICCVAM BRD for the use of the LLNA to determine skin-sensitization potency. She mentioned that the draft ICCVAM BRD provided a comprehensive review of the available data and information regarding the usefulness and limitations of the LLNA as a stand-alone assay for hazard categorization of skin-sensitization potency. In the BRD, the LLNA was evaluated for its ability to categorize substances for skin-sensitization potency using EC₃ values.

Dr. Strickland noted that the analyses conducted in the BRD were based on LLNA studies obtained from ICCVAM (1999), the published literature, and data received in response to an *FR* notice (72 FR 27815, May 17, 2007) requesting original data from the LLNA. As a result, the analyzed data included 170 substances with LLNA, human, and/or guinea pig data. Dr.

⁵³ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/llna/LLNAProt.pdf

⁵⁴ Individual animal data will allow the application of a formal statistical test, if deemed necessary, and will also allow power calculations associated with the modified LLNA test.

⁵⁵ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPrept2008.pdf

Strickland noted that three sets of data were analyzed and briefly summarized the results which are detailed in the draft ICCVAM BRD.⁵⁶ Dr. Strickland also briefly summarized the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations for potency determinations.⁵⁷

Panel Evaluation:

Ms. Headrick presented her Evaluation Group's draft responses to ICCVAM's questions to the Panel for consideration by the entire Panel. This included their review of the draft BRD for errors and omissions, their overall assessment of the validation status of the test method, and their comments on the draft ICCVAM test method recommendations. The Panel discussion and their recommended revisions to each section of the draft ICCVAM BRD and recommendations are reflected in the Panel report published in May 2008.⁵⁸

During the course of the discussion on the potency applicability of the LLNA, Dr. Woolhiser asked what the basis for the human threshold concentration cutoff values of 250 and 500 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ were. Dr. Wind replied that a number of experts and clinicians from throughout the world went back and looked at what, in their countries, they demarcated as strong sensitizers. The proposed Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) subcategory guidance values for the LLNA, guinea pig tests (GPMT, BT) and human data (HMT and HRIPT) were made on the basis of an impact analysis of 175 chemicals. In addition, the two proposed cut-offs were evaluated by the GHS Expert Group on Sensitization based upon chemicals already regulated as strong sensitizers to ensure their inclusion within the GHS categorization scheme. Clinical members of the Expert Group also confirmed relevance of the cut-off values such that clinically important skin sensitizers fell into the appropriate subcategory. The proposed guidance values were also in line with the European Commission's Expert Working Group recommendations.

Public Comments:

Dr. David Basketter, ECVAM Observer

Dr. Basketter commented that reviewing the potency data by splitting it into pooled and unpooled groups could be interesting but might be difficult since the majority of available data likely comes from pooled groups. Furthermore, much of the deliberation concluding that individual animal data must be used, was derived from analyses based only or largely on pooled data from four animals.

Dr. Basketter further stated that he viewed the analyses, which make the assumption that the human threshold data is the gold standard, as fundamentally flawed. Human data comes from studies conducted at different times, with different protocols, according to varying quality standards, and by different people. Therefore, there is no definitive knowledge of the reproducibility of the data. However, he considers the analyses adequate for recommending the LLNA as a part of a weight-of-evidence decision on human sensitization potency categorizations.

⁵⁶ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/LLNA-pot/LLNAPotency18Jan08FD.pdf>

⁵⁷ <http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/methods/immunotox/LLNA-pot/LLNAPotencyRecs18Jan08FD.pdf>

⁵⁸ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPrept2008.pdf

Dr. Amy Rispin, EPA

Dr. Rispin noted that there has been much discussion about various ways of handling the potency data. The OECD expert task force on skin sensitization needs to see an analytical comparison of what is considered to be the most appropriate approach for evaluating the data. The question for categorization purposes is, *What is the ideal testing modality for separating strong versus weak sensitizers for potency categorization?* A regulator who must assign a categorization is going to be confronted with all available test data and must know which data should be given the greatest weight in their evaluation.

Dr. Rispin noted that the OECD task force also reviewed the draft BRD on potency determinations and sent a list of several questions to the Panel, some of which have been answered, many of which have not been. One of the questions is, can the LLNA protocols be refined (e.g., by selection of solvents or choice of other test parameters) to improve correlation? She concluded by noting that she hopes that the additional analyses that the Panel has suggested will bring some clarity to the matter.

Panel Conclusions and Recommendations:

Dr. Luster asked the Panel to review the conclusions and recommendations for the LLNA potency determinations they had discussed earlier and to make any revisions, if necessary. The Panel agreed with the draft ICCVAM recommendation that the LLNA should not be used as a stand-alone assay for categorizing skin sensitizers as strong versus weak, but that it could be used as part of a weight-of-evidence evaluation (e.g., along with quantitative structure-activity relationships, peptide reactivity, human evidence, historical data from other experimental animal studies) for this purpose. The Panel also agreed with ICCVAM's recommendation that any LLNA studies conducted for the purpose of evaluating skin-sensitization potency should use the ICCVAM-recommended LLNA protocol. In addition, the Panel stated that the relevant testing guidelines for the traditional LLNA should be revised to include the procedure for calculating an EC3 value. Dr. Luster asked the Panel if they agreed with the changes and revisions made at this point and with the Panel conclusions and recommendations as presented and revised; the Panel unanimously agreed. The Panel's detailed recommendations and conclusions on the LLNA potency determinations are included in their final Panel report.⁵⁹

Concluding Remarks

Dr. Luster, on behalf of the Panel, thanked the NICEATM-ICCVAM staff for their continued assistance during the review process and the Panel meeting. He also thanked Drs. Joanna Matheson and Abby Jacobs, the IWG co-chairs, and Dr. Marilyn Wind, ICCVAM Chair and IWG member, for the hard work they put into the project. Dr. Luster also thanked the Panel and the Panel Chairs for their involvement in the huge task of reviewing seven topics. He commented that, for future reference for ICCVAM, the Panel in their individual groups were able to do a good job in reviewing the materials, but because they were so focused on their particular topics due to serious time constraints, there may not have been the full benefit of their expertise for other topics in all cases.

⁵⁹ http://iccvam.niehs.nih.gov/docs/immunotox_docs/LLNAPRPRRept2008.pdf

Drs. Wind and Stokes thanked the Panel again for their hard work, thoughtful and objective deliberations, and advice. Dr. Stokes further thanked the invited test method developers for their excellent summaries of their method for the benefit of the Panel, and CPSC for hosting the Panel meeting. He mentioned that there has been discussion about obtaining additional existing data (i.e., on mixtures, on one or more of the non-radiolabeled test methods), and that should these data become available in a timely manner and if NICEATM is able to assimilate and analyze the data, the Panel might be reconvened by teleconference to review the data. Dr. Stokes concluded by saying he looked forward to further working with the Panel members to complete their Panel report.

Adjournment


The meeting was adjourned and concluded at 3:20 p.m.


William S. Stokes, D.V.M.
NIEHS
P.O. Box 12233
MD-EC17
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709


Dear Dr. Stokes,

The Meeting Summary Minutes, Independent Scientific Peer Review Panel Meeting, Validation Status of New Versions and Applications of the Murine Local Lymph Node Assay (LLNA): A Test Method for Assessing the Allergic Contact Dermatitis Potential of Chemicals and Products, accurately summarizes the Peer Review Panel meeting of March 4-6, 2008, in Bethesda, MD.

Sincerely,


Signature


Printed Name


Date