NEW APPROACH METHODS AND REDUCING THE USE OF LABORATORY ANIMALS FOR CHRONIC AND CARCINOGENICITY TESTING

June 5, 2020

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention in collaboration with the Office of Research and Development

Table of Contents

New Approach Methods and Reducing the Use of Laboratory Animals for Chronic and Carcinogenicity Testing

1.0 Introduction

The mission of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP) is to protect humans and the environment from potential risks associated from exposure to pesticides and toxic chemicals. In order to achieve this, two offices within OCSPP are responsible for evaluating these potential risks. The Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) regulates the use of all pesticide chemicals, while the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics (OPPT) evaluates new and existing chemical substances (excluding, among others, pesticides, tobacco and tobacco products, food, food additives, drugs, and cosmetics).

The EPA-OPP and EPA-OPPT regulate and evaluate chemicals under authority granted by regulatory statutes, which also allow the Agency to require or request a suite of data and relevant information from pesticide registrants and chemical manufacturers to support scientifically-based risk assessment. To assess the potential hazard of a chemical for human health risk assessment, toxicological studies in laboratory animals are used to provide information on a wide range of adverse health outcomes, routes of exposure, exposure durations, and lifestages. EPA-OPP routinely requests chronic and/or carcinogenicity testing to be conducted in laboratory animals. These laboratory animal studies have been used by regulatory agencies for decades to evaluate hazards and dose-response and for extrapolating risk through the development of points of departure and reference doses. However, the rodent bioassay has some well-recognized shortcomings, including imperfect translational relevance to human health, extensive time required to conduct studies and report results, high cost, low throughput, and the large number of animals required (typically > 1000 per substance).

New approach methodologies (NAMs) is a broadly descriptive reference to any technology, methodology, approach (including computational/*in silico* models (i.e., QSARs)), or combination thereof that can be used to provide information on chemical hazard and risk assessment that avoids the use of intact animals. In September, 2019, EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler directed staff and managers at the agency to prioritize the reduction of animal use and specifically noted that EPA will reduce its requests for, and our funding of, mammal studies by 30 percent by 2025 and will eliminate all mammal study requests and funding by 2035 (unless approved by the Administrator on a case-by-case basis). To achieve these goals, EPA must accelerate NAM and other related animal reduction activities.

EPA's OCSPP is committed to supporting NAM development and implementation and, to this end, is collaborating with the Office of Research and Development (ORD) and numerous government, industry and non-governmental stakeholders on a variety of projects such as retrospective analyses and NAM development for a range of human health and ecological effects. As summarized in this draft white paper and described in detail in attachments, OCSPP is working to improve chronic/carcinogenicity testing through collaborative projects with the Division of the National

Toxicology Program (DNTP), the Health and Environmental Sciences Institute (HESI), the PETA International Science Consortium Ltd. (PETA-ISC), and pesticide and chemical companies. All of these activities are currently on-going and are at a point where input from external experts and the public would be helpful. OCSPP will solicit comment from the Science Advisory Board (SAB) through a consultation on these activities.

1.1.   Regulatory Background

Under 40 CFR Part 158, the EPA-OPP requires toxicology data to support registration of food and non-food use pesticides. The regulations give EPA substantial discretion to make registration decisions based on what the Agency believes are the most relevant and important data for each action. The actual data and studies required may be modified on an individual basis to fully characterize the use and properties of specific pesticide products under review. Also, the data requirements may not always be considered appropriate. For instance, the properties of a chemical or an atypical use pattern could make it impossible to generate the required data or the data would not be considered useful in the Agency's evaluation. Therefore, the Agency may waive data requirements, but must ensure that sufficient data are available to make the determinations required by the applicable statutory standards. 40 CFR 158.75 also provides EPA with broad flexibility to request additional data beyond the Part 158 data requirements that may be important to the risk management decision. Alternative methods and approaches can be considered and accepted for these additional data, when appropriate.

EPA-OPP has developed a 2009 Strategic Vision for Adopting 21st Century Science Methodologies[1,2]. This strategic direction describes the need for a broader suite of computer-aided methods to better predict potential hazards and exposures, and to focus testing on likely risks of concern; improved approaches to more traditional toxicity tests to minimize the number of animals used while expanding the amount of information obtained; and improved understanding of toxicity pathways to allow development of non-animal tests that better predict how exposures relate to adverse effects. EPA-OPP's commitment to reducing the use of animals in pesticide testing and accelerating the use of alternative methods was reaffirmed in 2016 in an open letter to stakeholders from EPA-OPP's Office Director that describes the need to re-evaluate studies not routinely used in decision making, advancing the implementation of NAMs and to facilitate global harmonization of new approaches[3].

Under Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), the EPA-OPPT is authorized to require testing to develop data about health or environmental effects when there is insufficient data to determine whether a chemical presents an unreasonable risk to health or the environment. A new subsection under Section 4 also requires the EPA to develop a strategic plan to promote the use and development of alternative test methods and strategies to reduce, refine or replace vertebrate animal testing (Section 4(h), Reduction of Testing on Vertebrates). Under this new subsection, when testing is required, EPA "shall reduce and replace, to the extent practicable, scientifically

---

[1] https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-science-and-assessing-pesticide-risks/strategic-vision-adopting-21st-century-science
[2] https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0284-0006
[3] https://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0093-0003

justified, and consistent with the policies of this title, the use of vertebrate animals in the testing of chemical substances or mixtures...." (Section 4(h)(1)).

In 2018, EPA-OPPT published its Strategic Plan to Promote the Development and Implementation of Alternative Test Methods within the TSCA Program[4]. The TSCA Strategic Plan has three core components: (1) identifying, developing and integrating NAMs for TSCA decisions; (2) building confidence that the NAMs are scientifically reliable and relevant for TSCA decisions; and (3) implementing the reliable and relevant NAMs for TSCA decisions.

1.2   Scope & Purpose of the 2020 Science Advisory Board Meeting on NAMs for Chronic/Carcinogenicity Testing

This draft white paper provides a brief overview of activities focused on different aspects of improving the science used in risk assessment for chronic/carcinogenicity testing. These activities are organized by the 3Rs principles for laboratory animal testing-- *reduce, replace, refine* as originally proposed by Russell and Burch (1). Because of the complexities in biology and toxicology, there will not be a "one-size-fits-all" solution to improving chronic/carcinogenicity testing. As such, EPA and its collaborators are taking a multifaceted approach that advances several areas simultaneously.

Reduce: using fewer animals in experimentation

OPP has been collaborating with PETA-ISC along with Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA), Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA), and several pesticide registrants to develop a risk-based weight of evidence (WOE) analysis framework specifically for use in evaluating the need for chronic/carcinogenicity testing in rodents for pesticide active ingredients. This project is called Rethinking Carcinogenicity Assessment for Agrochemicals Project (ReCAAP) and is described in Section 2.0 below. The draft WOE approach is conceptually consistent with existing EPA-OPP waiver guidance for neurotoxicity, inhalation, dermal and immunotoxicity studies. Attachment 1 provides the current working draft of a risk-based WOE waiver framework. Some initial case studies have been done as part of WOE waiver framework development phase of the project; one example draft case study is provided in Attachment 2. Another set of case studies are just getting started and will be used to test the draft WOE waiver framework. Feedback from the SAB and public will be useful for revising the WOE waiver framework and case studies.

Replace: using non-vertebrate animal test systems

To achieve Administrator Wheeler's goals to eliminate all mammal study requests and funding by 2035, more NAM approaches need to be developed to replace the typical laboratory animal studies. Beyond the ethical issues associated with animal use, NAMs are expected to improve the scientific

---

foundation of risk assessments by providing more human-relevant information that is more efficient and less costly. To this end, EPA is collaborating with Division of the National Toxicology Program (DNTP) of National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and HESI to consider NAM-based approaches to replace chronic/carcinogenicity testing in mammals.   These efforts are in the early stages of development and would benefit from expert and public input on the direction and scope of these efforts.

- The DNTP is an intramural research division within the NIEHS. The DNTP is beginning a "Translational Toxicological Pipeline" approach that includes data mining, computational toxicology, and *in vitro* and *in vivo* testing. This involves an initiative called Health Effects Innovations (HEIs), which will concentrate research and translation efforts in three areas, one of which is carcinogenicity testing for the 21st century (the other two focusing on cardiovascular disease and developmental neurotoxicity). The carcinogenicity HEI is described below in Section 3.1.

- The nonprofit, Health and Environmental Sciences Institute's Emerging Systems in Toxicology (HESI eSTAR) program has convened a multi-sector and multi-disciplinary working group to build and implement a framework for the application of a transcriptomic evaluation of chemical exposure for use in risk assessment to result in a health protective point of departure (POD). Section 3.2 describes the foundation and goals for this work.

- EPA-OPP and EPA-ORD are in the initial stages of scoping a project to evaluate gene expression evaluation of pesticides with established liver tumor modes of action. Section 3.2 describes the context and plans for this work.

Refine: *the lessening or avoidance of pain and distress*

Despite efforts to develop alternatives to animal testing and providing waivers for those studies determined not to be needed, some laboratory animal studies will continue to be conducted in the near future. EPA is also engaged with stakeholders in activities to adopt kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD) approach in lieu of the traditional maximal tolerated dose (MTD) in designing mammalian toxicity studies. When using the KMD, toxicity studies are conducted at kinetically linear doses or slightly above the point of inflection from linearity of kinetics. The KMD approach can help prevent the use of toxicity data generated at excessively high doses at which the physiology of test species is greatly altered, and the levels are orders of magnitude higher than possible human exposures. Thus, the KMD approach not only lessens or avoids unnecessary pain and distress in animals, but also generates data that are relevant and more predictive of human health risks. EPA-OPP has already received multiple submissions of KMD proposals from pesticide registrants and interest in this approach is growing. There is an immediate need to standardize these approaches for broad regulatory use and facilitate global harmonization. EPA-OPP has been collaborating with Canada PMRA, APVMA, HESI, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) Interagency Center for the Evaluation of Alternative Toxicological Methods (NICEATM) and several pesticide registrants on KMD. Section 4 below describes these activities in more detail. An example of a KMD approach on 1,3-dichloropropene accepted by EPA-OPP in 2019 has been provided. Attachments 3 and 4 describe a new workgroup being formed by HESI and workshop being planned for October, 2020 both aimed at the development of best practices for KMD.

2.0 Reduce: Develop Weight of Evidence Approach for Waiving Chronic/Carcinogenicity studies

As described in the 40 CFR Part 158, EPA-OPP requires extensive toxicology testing for pesticides in a variety of species (e.g., rat, mouse, rabbit, dog, fish, bird, insects) to conduct human health and ecologic risk assessments. Carcinogenicity studies in two rodent species are required for the registration of food use pesticides or when the use of a pesticide is likely to result in repeated human exposure over a considerable portion of the human lifespan (40 CFR Part 158.500). Agency guideline carcinogenicity studies (OCSPP 870.4200, 870.4300) have been harmonized with OECD guidelines (Test Nos. 451 and 453) and are designed to test three or more doses in both sexes (with at least 50 animals/sex/dose) with adequate dose spacing to characterize tumor dose-response relationships. Test substances are typically administered in animal carcinogenicity studies by the oral route for food use pesticides but can also be conducted via dermal or inhalation route on a case-by-case basis. These studies are generally conducted in mice and rats with exposure durations of 18-24 months for mice and 24 months for rats, which represent exposures of the majority of the expected lifespan in these animals.

However, EPA-OPP has flexibility in implemented these data requirements. EPA-OPP's 2013 "Guiding Principles for Data Requirements" guidance[5] was developed to provide consistency in the identification of data needs, promote and optimize full use of existing knowledge, and focus on the critical data needed for risk assessment while avoiding unnecessary use of time and resources, data generation costs, and animal testing. The guiding principles document ensures that "there is sufficient information to reliably support registration decisions that are protective of public health and the environment while avoiding the generation and evaluation of data that does not materially influence the scientific certainty of a regulatory decision...."

In an effort to reduce the number of animals used for pesticide toxicity testing, EPA-OPP created the Hazard and Science Policy Council (HASPOC) to review requests for waiving animal study requirements for human health risk assessments and make recommendations based on a weight-of-the-evidence approach.   To date, HASPOC has primarily focused on study waivers for neurotoxicity studies, subchronic inhalation and dermal toxicity studies, and immunotoxicity studies but has also waived some developmental neurotoxicity, developmental toxicity, reproductive toxicity and chronic studies. The waiving of studies by HASPOC has resulted in over 200,000 animals saved (2). This has been accomplished through the implementation of the guidance document entitled "Part 158 Toxicology Data Requirements: Guidance for Neurotoxicity Battery, Subchronic Inhalation, Subchronic Dermal and Immunotoxicity Studies[6]." This guidance document describes a risk-based WOE approach that considers physical-chemical properties, exposure profile, toxicity profile, mode of action/adverse outcome pathway, read across along with other relevant information. EPA-OPP is now extending this effort to identify the types of data that

---

[5] http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/regulating/data-require-guide-principle.pdf

[6] http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/regulating/part158-tox-data-requirement.pdf

can be used in a WOE framework to inform chronic/carcinogenicity testing without conducting one or more of the rodent cancer bioassays.

The ReCAAP was established to help develop a draft WOE waiver framework and is led by PETA International Consortium Ltd. and includes experts from EPA-OPP and other US agencies, Canada PMRA, APVMA and industry. The problem statement and objectives of ReCAAP are excerpted below.

> *"There are no specific criteria to determine when not to require the Combined Chronic Toxicity/Carcinogenicity studies (OECD 453; 451), or how to determine appropriate POD for chronic risk assessments for pesticides based on available toxicological and exposure data in the absence of chronic toxicity studies…there is a movement to transition away from a routine 'check-box' approach towards a more scientifically sound weight of evidence (WOE) carcinogenicity assessment for non-genotoxic food-use pesticides."*

At this time, ReCAAP has developed a draft risk-based WOE framework, which is provided in Attachment 1. The major components are:

- Use pattern & exposure scenarios
- Physical-chemical properties
- Pharmacokinetics (PK) and absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion (ADME)
- Toxicity profile (mode of action; acute and subchronic toxicity; potential for hormone perturbation or immune suppression; genetic toxicology; mechanistic evidence from key event studies, biomarkers, NAM information, etc.)
- Read across
- Proposed Points of Departure and Prospective Risk Assessments
- Summary & recommendations for/against waiver

ReCAAP has also developed some initial case studies that were developed as part of framework development stage. One example is provided in Attachment 2. Another set of case studies are just being started and will be used to test the draft WOE waiver framework. Feedback from the SAB and public will be useful as the project continues to move forward.

3.0 Replace: Developing NAMs for Chronic/Carcinogenicity Testing

The effort to develop NAMs for chronic/carcinogenicity testing is one of many areas that EPA-OPP and EPA-OPPT are working with stakeholders. EPA-OPPT has a long history of using QSARs and read across approaches in its new chemicals program for hazard identification and fate characterization and modeling for exposure assessment. As part of the TSCA Strategic Plan, a list of NAMs accepted by EPA-OPPT for use in decision making is available[7]. EPA-OPP has been actively engaged in the development and implementation of NAMs for acute lethality, skin irritation, and eye irritation for the last several years. In addition, EPA-OPP and EPA-OPPT jointly developed the

---

[7] https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-12/documents/alternative_testing_nams_list_first_update_final.pdf

"Interim Science Policy: Use of Alternative Approaches for Skin Sensitization as a Replacement for Laboratory Animal Testing[8]." EPA-OPP and EPA-OPPT are also working together to implement NAMs for inhalation toxicity and solicited comment from the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel in 2018 on a case study using the fungicide, chlorothalonil[9].

3.1 DNTP Efforts to Improve Carcinogenic Assessment of Environmental Substances

The Division of the National Toxicology Program (DNTP) is an intramural research division within the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). The DNTP is committed to advancing public health and the discipline of toxicology through the use of innovative tools and strategies that are translatable, predictive, and timely. This commitment requires the continual evaluation and evolution of existing methodologies as well as the development and application of new technologies and approaches with the potential to protect and improve public health. This new "Translational Toxicological Pipeline" approach spans the continuum of data mining, computational toxicology, bioactivity screening, *in vitro* studies, short-term *in vivo* studies, chronic *in vivo* studies, and knowledge integration. Earlier access to information and less reliance on chronic *in vivo* studies is anticipated given the tiered structure of this approach. The major vehicle for this paradigm shift at DNTP is a new initiative called HEIs, which will concentrate research and translation efforts in three areas, one of which is carcinogenicity testing for the 21st century (the other two focusing on cardiovascular disease and developmental neurotoxicity).

Since the early 1980s, the US National Toxicology Program has served as a national and world resource for conducting the two-year rodent bioassay to assess the carcinogenic potential of industrial and agricultural chemicals, food additives, environmental pollutants, and other exposures of public health concern. The current National Toxicology Program rodent cancer bioassay evolved from that of the National Cancer Institute in the 1970s. Since its inception, DNTP has published technical reports on over 600 substances, providing valuable cancer hazard information for the protection of public health. In addition, these studies represent a unique and valuable source of reference data to support the development new assays that can potentially better inform cancer risk assessment. The Carcinogenicity HEI (Carci HEI) will work with federal agencies and other stakeholders to develop efficient, fit for purpose approaches to characterize the potential for environmental exposures to cause or contribute to the development of cancer in humans and communicate actionable information to stakeholders in a timely manner. The effort is divided into three focus areas, as described below.

1. Developing a translational toxicology pipeline (TTP) of capacities to characterize the potential for environmental substances to cause or contribute to the development of cancer. This approach will evaluate opportunities to assess carcinogenic potential using innovative methods and approaches while maintaining the 2-year rodent bioassay as an option in the TTP. The TTP will initially be populated using existing tools, technologies, and animal studies for which existing data are available for chemicals previously evaluated in the NTP rodent bioassay. An Adverse Outcome Pathway (AOP) framework will be employed in combination with Integrated Approaches to Testing and Assessment (IATAs), considering data from various components of the TPP in

---

[8] https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0093-0090
[9] https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/december-4-6-8-2018-fifra-sap-meeting

combination. IATAs will be iteratively developed and evaluated against results obtained from existing data from NTP bioassays, with each cycle informing potential modifications to improve their predictive performance.

2. Establishing fit-for-purpose TTPs to characterize the potential for environmental exposures to cause or contribute to cancer development of site-specific cancer in humans. Recognizing that "cancer" is a collection of over 100 related diseases that may evolve by different pathways, a disease-specific TPP framework will be developed using approaches that address mechanisms relevant to site-specific cancers and their link to environmental exposures. Initial focus would be on those cancers with a high or increasing burden of disease in the human population, such as early-onset colorectal cancer.

3. Developing a communication strategy that will engage stakeholders and maximize the impact of the Carci HEI. The identification of environmental causes of cancer is of great potential benefit to public health. However, such information is only of value if communicated in a manner that is relatable to the target stakeholder group, therefore requiring a unique communication effort for different audiences. The Carci HEI will work with communication experts and stakeholders to develop a strategy that will help ensure clear and actionable information is provided to all audiences in a timely manner.

The next steps planned by the Carci_HEI for 2020 include:
- engaging in further dialogue with stakeholders to better understand and publish their specific requirements, data needs, and contexts of use;
- providing easy access to historical NTP bioassay data in a computational-ready format;
- identify initial human cancer areas of focus and availability of relevant assays/models;
- evaluating the concordance between human and rodent cancer mutational signatures;
- evaluating the concordance between *in vivo* and *in vitro* (human and rodent) mutational signatures associated with environmental exposures;
- evaluating the association between the Key Characteristics of Cancer and outcomes in NTP rodent bioassays for chemicals in the Tox21 inventory.

Progress on each of these initiatives will be publicly communicated and made available on the NTP website.

3.2 Health and Environmental Sciences Institute (HESI) Point of Departure Program Overview

A cornerstone of traditional human health risk assessment is the evaluation of dose-response and temporality of toxic effects in experimental animal studies, resulting in the identification of points of departure (POD) and subsequent derivation of non-cancer or cancer values. A major limitation in this traditional approach to human health risk assessment is the necessity for resource-intensive

studies, using whole laboratory animal models, to identify PODs based upon apical adverse effects (e.g., histopathological manifestations; organ/tissue weights; etc.) (3.4). The justification for continued use of this low-throughput approach is born of historical context that the basis of a risk assessment be anchored to identification of a POD from *in vivo* apical effects. Development and application of alternative approaches that facilitate higher-throughput POD identification is important to advancing assessment of chemicals and pesticides.

Several alternative approaches to identify PODs based on non-apical endpoint bioactivity are under development. These approaches cover a diverse array of model systems (both *in vitro* and *in vivo*) and incorporate the use of *in silico* and molecular technologies (e.g., high throughput screening, structure activity, and an assortment of omic technologies) (5-11). Several independent investigators have explored the use of short-term (e.g., 5 days), repeat dose studies in rodents to derive molecular, or more specifically, transcriptomic (i.e., genomic or subgenomic level changes in mRNA levels) PODs (12-17). These studies have found that transcriptomic-based PODs closely align with PODs derived from traditional apical endpoints observed in guideline toxicological studies. Not only do short-term transcriptomic PODs align with traditional endpoint (e.g., histopathology)-based PODs in the same short-term exposure paradigm, these also closely align with PODs that are identified in subchronic or chronic duration guideline toxicological studies such as the 2-year rodent cancer bioassay. Notably, across two different rodent species, sexes, and routes of exposure, these 'omic studies, although using a variety of transcriptome measurement technologies, have arrived at the same conclusion of apical endpoint and molecular bioactivity POD concordance. These findings highlight the generalizability of the approach and the reliability/accuracy of the measurement technologies and analysis methods (18-22). Such observations are consistent with the logic flow illustrated in the Adverse Outcome Pathway concept that a molecular level change precedes a change at the organ/tissue level, such as histopathology. Therefore, molecular level changes (using a comprehensive analysis method such as transcriptomics) are a plausible means for identifying human health-protective bioactivity-based POD values.

One potential challenge associated with a transcriptomic based approach to deriving a POD is that it departs from the traditional toxicity testing and assessment paradigm, as it does not entail the direct identification of specific adverse effects. Instead, the short-term (e.g., 5-day) *in vivo* exposure transcriptomic approach leads to identification of a dose (e.g., POD) associated with minimal gene expression change. Due to our limited understanding of systems biology, often the genes underlying the transcriptomic POD do not have an immediately discernable mechanistic linkage to a specific toxicological pathway or process. Although the landscape of molecular perturbations induced by environmental chemicals are complex, the noted observations of concordance between transcriptomic and apical PODs opens the door to the idea that it is unnecessary to have a known mechanistic linkage between transcriptional changes and specific adverse effects to identify a POD that is sufficient for human health risk assessment. In practice, the comprehensive nature of a transcriptomic-based POD may be even more protective of human health than the current toxicity testing and risk assessment process which queries numerous but not all potential hazards. Importantly when this challenge of translation to apical toxicological effects is viewed through the lens of systems biology it is plausible to hypothesize that the genes that underlie an apical effect POD are closely coregulated (i.e., similar potency) with genes informative of molecular level toxicological processes (23). Bearing this in mind there is a definable route to linking transcriptomic changes to toxicological apical effect processes and to support mechanistic inquiry; however, from purely an empirical perspective, it is unnecessary to delineate these mechanistic

processes in order to identify a bioactivity-based transcriptional POD that can be used in risk assessment.

Despite the empirical support for the use of an *in vivo* transcriptional POD in risk assessment and the obvious efficiency in the approach compared to traditional guideline study-based animal testing, there are still some important questions/uncertainties that need to be addressed before a transcriptional POD could be considered for regulatory use of chemical toxicity assessment. Some of these issues relate to study design, data analysis, POD modeling/identification, appropriate uncertainty factor application for non-cancer value derivation, and context of use of such values.

The nonprofit, Health and Environmental Sciences Institute's Emerging Systems in Toxicology (HESI eSTAR) program has convened a multi-sector and multi-disciplinary working group to build and implement a strategy for progressing the science to identify and address the scientific uncertainties associated with the use of a transcriptomic POD in human health risk assessment and to develop a framework for application of the approach in human health risk assessment. A working group is currently comprised of approximately 30 scientists and stakeholders from the private, public and academic sectors, representing multiple countries. This includes several scientists from the US EPA. To date the working group has met several times and performed a problem formulation exercise that resulted in the following problem statement and goal:

> "*In order to reduce the need for resource intensive animal testing we propose the development of a framework for the application of a transcriptomic evaluation of chemical exposure for use in risk assessment to result in a health protective POD with confidence, without needing to correlate with a specific adverse effect, mechanism and/or mode of action*."

Based upon identification of this specific challenge, the HESI working group has proposed the following goal:

> "*To address uncertainties about the derivation and use of transcriptomics-based molecular PODs from a relevant in vivo study; and, to demonstrate application of these transcriptomic PODs to human health assessment of chemicals*."

To date there are two proposed work products that the working group will produce. The first will be a manuscript that reviews the state of the science and defines remaining uncertainties that may hinder the adoption of an *in vivo*, transcriptomics-based POD in chemical risk assessment. The intent of the group is to finish the first work product in early 2021. The second work product will be guided by the state of the science findings, specifically the intent is to perform targeted studies with the goal of generating data to reduce uncertainties associated with the derivation and use of an in vivo, transcriptomics-based POD in in non-pharmaceutical chemical risk assessment. Completion of the second work product will be dependent on resources, and number of uncertainties identified and associated complexity of the science that needs to be addressed.

3.3 Gene Expression Evaluation of Pesticides with Established Liver Tumor Modes of Action

EPA-OPP typically receives both the rat and mouse carcinogenicity studies for conventional, food-use pesticides. EPA-OPP's Cancer Assessment Review Committee (CARC) evaluates the results of

these studies in accordance with the EPA's 2005 Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment[10] and following the IPSC WHO mode of action and human relevance frameworks (24-29). EPA-OPP routinely uses mode of action data to support various aspects of human health risk assessment including cancer assessment, lifestage susceptibility, and cumulative risk assessment. The CARC has evaluated tumor mode of action data for > 60 pesticides and has accepted the proposed MOA and conducted non-linear dose-response assessment for > 50 pesticides. Of the cancer MOAs accepted by the CARC, close to ½ involve liver tumors.

A typical MOA submitted to EPA-OPP contains a combination of the long-term in vivo studies, short-term vivo studies and low-thru put in vitro studies specifically designed to evaluate the dose-response and temporal concordance of proposed key events in a MOA. As such, EPA-OPP possesses a unique set of guideline studies and mechanistic information for many pesticides. These studies can be used to provide a bridge between traditional toxicology studies and NAMs for purposes of methods development and confidence building.

EPA's ORD has been evaluating quantitative gene expression data from short-term *in vivo* rat studies using gene expression biomarkers consisting of 7-113 genes including those that predict the six major molecular initiating events in liver cancer (genotoxicity, cytotoxicity, and activation of AhR, CAR, ER, or PPARα) (30-33). Used together, the biomarkers were able to accurately identify chemical-dose combinations in short-term rat exposures that cause liver tumors at 2 years. Furthermore, biological thresholds that define tumorigenic responses were identified for the six biomarkers, individual genes in the biomarkers, and common measures in animal studies (liver weight to body weight, clinical chemistry) (30-33). Given that these methods were derived using Affymetrix microarray data and most of the chemicals used to expose rats were pharmaceutical compounds, EPA-ORD and OPP will use a different transcript profiling platform to determine how accurate these methods are at predicting the MOA and tumorigenic doses for a set of pesticides with accepted liver tumor cancer MOAs.

4.0 Refine: Kinetically-Derived Maximum Dose (KMD)

Pharmacokinetics (PK) refers to the study of chemical movement into, through, and out of a living organism determined by the rate and extent of a chemical's absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion (ADME). ADME determines the amount of chemical available for eliciting toxicological response in the tissues from a given external exposure. Thus, knowledge of PK, along with other information (e.g., mode of action), can improve the design of animal toxicity studies and interpretation of results from these studies. EPA routinely uses PK data and information to help interpret results from toxicity studies and provide a perspective on their relevance to human health risk assessment. In some cases, comparative metabolism data, *in vitro* absorption rate measurement, physiologically based pharmacokinetic [PBPK] model predictions, and other PK data are used in place of default uncertainty factors for more refined, data-driven risk assessment. Another use of PK data and information is adopting the KMD approach in lieu of the traditional MTD approach when selecting top doses in animal toxicity studies. KMD refers to the highest dose at, or slightly above the point of departure from dose proportionality, or PK linearity. This approach is endorsed in the OECD Guidance document 116 (34) on the *Conduct and Design of*

---

[10] https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2013-09/documents/cancer_guidelines_final_3-25-05.pdf

Chronic Toxicity and Carcinogenicity Studies, Supporting Test Guidelines 451, 452, and 453 (2nd Edition; p. 53):

> "Although top dose selection based on identification of inflection points in toxicokinetic nonlinearity may result in study designs that fail to identify traditional target organ or body weight effects, it must be appreciated that metabolic saturation in fact represents an equivalent indicator of biological stress. In this case, the stress is evidenced by appearance of non-linear toxicokinetics rather than appearance of histological damage, adverse changes in clinical chemistry, hematology parameters or decrease in body weight gain."

Toxicity findings at doses above a KMD (i.e., where PK is non-linear) may not be relevant to human health risks when potential exposure levels are orders of magnitude lower. Such high dose levels may greatly alter the physiology of animals and overwhelm adaptive or repair mechanism. Non-linear PK can be caused by saturation or limitation of various ADME factors, such as absorption in gut wall, plasma protein binding, metabolic capability, and active renal secretion.

While KMD is routinely considered in preclinical tests to provide perspective on the relevance of study results to human safety assessment for drugs, KMD is rarely used in chemical safety assessment. In the last few years, EPA-OPP has received multiple submitted studies using or proposing a KMD approach and the interest in this approach is growing rapidly. One of these was recently completed (35, 36). In this example, multiple lines of evidence were used to investigate whether lung tumors observed in male mice at high dose exposure to 1,3-Dichloropene are due to saturation of metabolic clearance. Blood concentrations (both total and isomer-specific) and glutathione depletion were measured at multiple inhalation doses to determine a KMD. Based on these data, EPA-OPP concluded that there were no treatment-related tumors in male mice via the inhalation route at concentrations below the KMD (36).

Given the broad interest in KMD and that the quality of KMD submissions to EPA-OPP has varied significantly, there is a need to develop more consistent, transparent approach that supports broader, accelerated application and global harmonization. EPA is engaging international stakeholders to develop best practices on KMD analysis. EPA, NICEATM, and HESI are co-organizing a 3-day workshop, on October 6-8, 2020, to address commonly raised technical and science issues related to the use of KMD as an approach to set top dose in toxicity studies, or to interpret dose-response results from toxicity studies. In addition, a working group has been formed to develop best practices (1) selecting the appropriate PK parameter to examine dose proportionality; (2) estimating the onset of non-linear PK based on PK data or predictions; (3) conducting statistical analyses to determine a KMD for interpreting dose-response data; and (4) determining and using a KMD to set the top dose in toxicity studies.

The following attachments are provided the SAB for consideration:

- Agenda and description of the upcoming workshop the on kinetically-derived maximum dose (Attachment 3)
- Workgroup charge for the HESI workgroup on KMD project (Attachment 4)

5.0 Summary & Next Steps

EPA is actively engaged with numerous stakeholders to reduce laboratory animals used in chronic/carcinogenicity testing and develop NAMs for use in risk assessment. EPA will solicit comments from the SAB on direction, scope and/or status of the on-going projects related to moving away from the traditional laboratory animal chronic/carcinogenicity bioassay. The feedback from the SAB will be used to inform the next steps on each activity as the agency moves towards adopting new scientific approaches.

6.0 References

1.   Russell, W.M.S. and R.L. Burch (1959). The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique, accessed and available online at the Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing (CAAT) website - http://altweb.jhsph.edu/pubs/books/humane_exp/foreword

2.   Craig E, Lowe K, Akerman G, et al. Reducing the need for animal testing while increasing efficiency in a pesticide regulatory setting: Lessons from the EPA Office of Pesticide Programs' Hazard and Science Policy Council. Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 2019;108:104481. doi:10.1016/j.yrtph.2019.104481

3.   EPA; U. Data Requirements for Pesticide Registration 2020 [Available from: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/data-requirements-pesticide-registration.

4.   FDA; U. M3(R2) Nonclinical Safety Studies for the Conduct of Human Clinical Trials and Marketing Authorization for Pharmaceuticals 2010 [Available from: https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/m3r2-nonclinical-safety-studies-conduct-human-clinical-trials-and-marketing-authorization.

5.   Ramaiahgari SC, Waidyanatha S, Dixon D, DeVito MJ, Paules RS, Ferguson SS. Three-Dimensional (3D) HepaRG Spheroid Model With Physiologically Relevant Xenobiotic Metabolism Competence and Hepatocyte Functionality for Liver Toxicity Screening. Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology. 2017;160(1):189-90.

6   Helman G, Patlewicz G, Shah I. Quantitative prediction of repeat dose toxicity values using GenRA. Regulatory toxicology and pharmacology : RTP. 2019;109:104480-.

7.   Paul Friedman K, Gagne M, Loo LH, Karamertzanis P, Netzeva T, Sobanski T, et al. Utility of In Vitro Bioactivity as a Lower Bound Estimate of In Vivo Adverse Effect Levels and in Risk-Based Prioritization. Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology. 2020;173(1):202-25.

8.   Bushel PR, Paules RS, Auerbach SS. A Comparison of the TempO-Seq S1500+ Platform to RNA-Seq and Microarray Using Rat Liver Mode of Action Samples. Frontiers in genetics. 2018;9:485.

9.   Ramaiahgari SC, Auerbach SS, Saddler TO, Rice JR, Dunlap PE, Sipes NS, et al. The Power of Resolution: Contextualized Understanding of Biological Responses to Liver Injury Chemicals Using High-throughput Transcriptomics and Benchmark Concentration Modeling. Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology. 2019;169(2):553-66.

10.   Zhang Q, Li J, Middleton A, Bhattacharya S, Conolly RB. Bridging the Data Gap From in vitro Toxicity Testing to Chemical Safety Assessment Through Computational Modeling. Front Public Health. 2018;6:261.

11.   Thomas RS, Bahadori T, Buckley TJ, Cowden J, Deisenroth C, Dionisio KL, et al. The Next Generation Blueprint of Computational Toxicology at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology. 2019;169(2):317-32.

12.   National Toxicology Program. National Toxicology Program Proposed Approach to Genomic Dose-Response Modeling. In press2017.

13.   Rager JE, Ring CL, Fry RC, Suh M, Proctor DM, Haws LC, et al. High-throughput screening data interpretation in the context of in vivo transcriptomic responses to oral Cr(VI) exposure. Toxicological Sciences. 2017;158(1):199-212.

14.   Thomas RS, Allen BC, Nong A, Yang L, Bermudez E, Clewell HJ, 3rd, et al. A method to integrate benchmark dose estimates with genomic data to assess the functional effects of chemical exposure. Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology. 2007;98(1):240-8.

15.   Thomas RS, Clewell HJ, Allen BC, Yang L, Healy E, Andersen ME. Integrating pathway-based transcriptomic data into quantitative chemical risk assessment: A five chemical case study. Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis. 2012;746(2):135-43.

16.   Thomas RS, Himmelstein MW, Clewell HJ, Yang Y, Healy E, Black MB, et al. Cross-species transcriptomic analysis of mouse and rat lung exposed to chloroprene. Toxicological Sciences. 2013;131(2):629-40.

17.   Thomas RS, Wesselkamper SC, Wang NCY, Zhao QJ, Petersen DD, Lambert JC, et al. Temporal Concordance Between Apical and Transcriptional Points of Departure for Chemical Risk Assessment. Toxicological Sciences. 2013;134(1):180-94.

18.   Webster AF, Chepelev N, Gagne R, Kuo B, Recio L, Williams A, et al. Impact of Genomics Platform and Statistical Filtering on Transcriptional Benchmark Doses (BMD) and Multiple Approaches for Selection of Chemical Point of Departure (PoD). PLoS One. 2015;10(8):e0136764.

19.   Farmahin R, Williams A, Kuo B, Chepelev NL, Thomas RS, Barton-Maclaren TS, et al. Recommended approaches in the application of toxicogenomics to derive points of departure for chemical risk assessment. Archives of Toxicology. 2017;91(5):2045-65.

20.   Black MB, Parks BB, Pluta L, Chu TM, Allen BC, Wolfinger RD, et al. Comparison of microarrays and RNA-Seq for gene expression analyses of dose-response experiments. Toxicological Sciences. 2014;137(2):385-403.

21.   Yang L, Allen BC, Thomas RS. BMDExpress: A software tool for the benchmark dose analyses of genomic data. BMC genomics. 2007;8.

22.   Phillips JR, Svoboda DL, Tandon A, Patel S, Sedykh A, Mav D, et al. BMDExpress 2: Enhanced transcriptomic dose-response analysis workflow. Bioinformatics. 2018.

23.   Sutherland JJ, Jolly RA, Goldstein KM, Stevens JL. Assessing Concordance of Drug-Induced Transcriptional Response in Rodent Liver and Cultured Hepatocytes. PLoS Comput Biol. 2016;12(3):e1004847.

24.   IPCS (International Programme on Chemical Safety). (1999) IPCS workshop on developing a conceptual framework for cancer risk assessment, February 16-18, 1999, Lyon, France. IPCS/99.6. World Health Organization, Geneva.

25.   Boobis AR, Cohen SM, Dellarco V, McGregor D, Meek ME, Vickers C, Willcocks D, Farland W. IPCS framework for analyzing the relevance of a cancer mode of action for humans. Crit Rev Toxicol. 2006;36:781–792.

26.   Boobis AR, Doe JE, Heinrich-Hirsch B, Meek ME, Munn S, Ruchirawat M, Schlatter J, Seed J, Vickers C. IPCS framework for analyzing the relevance of a noncancer mode of action for humans. Crit Rev Toxicol. 2008;38:87–96.

27.   Boobis AR, Daston GF, Preston RJ, Olin SS. Application of key events analysis to chemical carcinogens and noncarcinogens. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2009;49:690–707.

28.   Meek ME, Boobis A, Cote I, et al. New developments in the evolution and application of the WHO/IPCS framework on mode of action/species concordance analysis. J Appl Toxicol. 2014;34(1):1–18. doi:10.1002/jat.2949

29.   Sonich-Mullin C, Fielder R, Wiltse J, Baetcke K, Dempsey J, Fenner-Crisp P, Grant D, Hartley M, Knaap A, Kroese D, Mangelsdorf I, et al. IPCS conceptual framework for evaluating a mode of action for chemical carcinogenesis. Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 2001; 34:146–152. [PubMed: 11603957]

30.   Rooney, J., T. Hill, 3rd, C. Qin, F. D. Sistare and J. C. Corton (2018). "Adverse outcome pathway-driven identification of rat liver tumorigens in short-term assays." Toxicol Appl Pharmacol 356: 99-113.

31.   Corton, J. C., T. Hill, 3rd, J. Sutherland, J. Stevens and J. Rooney (2020). "A Set of Six Gene Expression Biomarkers Identify Rat Liver Tumorigens in Short-Term Assays." Submitted.

32.   Corton, J. (2020). "Thresholds Derived from Common Measures in Rat Studies are Predictive of Liver Tumorigenic Chemicals." Submitted.

33.   Hill, T., 3rd, J. Rooney, I. Abedini, H. El-Masri, F. D. Sistare, C. E. Wood and J. C. Corton (2020). "Gene Expression Thresholds Predictive of Rat Liver Tumorigens in Short-Term Assays." Submitted.

34.   OECD GD116 Guidance Document 116 on the Conduct and Design of Chronic Toxicity and Carcinogenicity Studies, Supporting Test Guidelines 451, 452 and 453. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/environment/guidance-document-116-on-the-conduct-and-design-of-chronic-toxicity-and-carcinogenicity-studies-supporting-test-guidelines-451-452-and-453_9789264221475-en

35.   Bartels, MJ, Hackett, MJ, Himmelstein, MW, Green, JW, Walker, C, Terry, C, Rasoulpour, R, Challender, M, Yan, Z (2020). Metabolic Basis for Nonlinearity in 1,3-Dichloropropene Toxicokinetics and Use in Setting a Kinetically-derived Maximum Inhalation Exposure Concentration in Mice, Toxicological Sciences, Volume 174, Issue 1, March 2020, Pages 16–24, https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfz241

36.   US EPA (2019). 1,3-Dichloropropene: Report of the Cancer Assessment Review Committee. US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0154-0104

Attachment 3: Draft Agenda and description of the upcoming workshop on Kinetically-Derived Maximum Dose (KMD)

NICEATM, HESI, USEPA

Kinetically-Derived Maximum Dose (KMD) Workshop

06-08 October 2020
NIH John Edward Porter Neuroscience Research Center, Bethesda, MD, USA

BACKGROUND:

The kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD) refers to the highest dose at, or slightly above, the departure from dose proportionality or linear pharmacokinetics (PK). Non-linear PK can be caused by saturation or limitation of various factors, including absorption (e.g., saturable transport in gut wall), distribution (e.g., plasma protein binding), metabolism (e.g., enzyme or co-factor limitation), and excretion (e.g., active renal secretion). In the pharmaceutical field, the KMD concept is often described as "the dose level that results in non-linear kinetics" or "the dose level above the inflection point of transition to non-linear kinetics", and it is routinely considered in animal toxicity studies to provide perspective on the relevance of these studies to human safety assessment. However, consideration of KMD in the design or interpretation of animal toxicity studies for environmental chemicals is rare. This may be because PK data are commonly available for drugs, but not for environmental chemicals. Additionally, the PK parameter most commonly used to examine dose proportionality is the area under the curve (AUC) of parent chemical in plasma for drugs, but it is more challenging to determine the appropriate PK parameter to determine a KMD for environmental chemicals.

One of the proposed uses of pharmacokinetic (PK) information is to select the top dose in a toxicity study based on kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD) to avoid excessively high doses at which the physiology of test species is greatly altered and that significantly higher than possible human exposures. In cases where PK data are generated after the initiation of a toxicity study, determining a KMD can help prevent inappropriate use of toxicity data in risk assessment, where actual human exposure levels are far below the KMD.

Since a KMD represents a dose above which the dose-response relationship differs from the one when PK is linear, a KMD should be based on dose proportionality of the dose metric. A dose metric should reflect the biologically active form of a chemical (e.g., parent chemical, metabolites, adducts), its level (e.g., concentration, amount), duration of internal exposure (e.g., acute vs. chronic; lifetime vs. a specific developmental period), intensity (e.g., peak, average, cumulative), and the biological matrix (e.g., plasma, target tissue, surrogate) (EPA, 2006). Furthermore, no guidance is currently available to address other technical and scientific issues related to KMD analysis. Examples of these issues include choosing the appropriate statistical tests to estimate the inflection point of transition to non-linear PK, interpreting dose-response results using KMD based on saturation or limitation of ADME, developing PK models to predict the transition from linear to non-linear PK, and using KMD to set doses in a toxicity study.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES: The purpose of this workshop is to provide an opportunity for impacted stakeholders to address commonly raised technical and scientific issues related to the use of KMD as an approach when designing toxicology testing studies or interpreting dose-response study results. Examples of these issues include the appropriate use of kinetic data to determine dose non-linearity, the possibility of human exposure levels close to KMD, the determination of KMD from sparse kinetic data, the use of in silico models to predict systemic dose, and the use of KMD to set top dose in a toxicity study.

- Discuss best practices and lessons learned on the following:
    - Selecting the appropriate PK parameter to examine dose proportionality
    - Defining a minimum dataset considered necessary to set a KMD
    - Estimating the onset of non-linear PK based on measurements or predictions
    - Conducting statistical analyses to determine a KMD for interpreting dose-response data
    - Determining and using a KMD to set the top dose in toxicity studies
- Discuss if and how KMD can be applied in the context of hazard classification as well as risk assessment
- Discuss and identify situations where the use of KMD might be limited or not possible (e.g., acute, high-exposure situations)

OUTPUT:
- Technical summary report of the workshop (highlighting case studies)
- Outline / draft of a best practices / guidance document
- Potentially a series of manuscripts in a special issue if enough case studies…

PARTICIPANTS:

Approximately 50 – 100 people, depending on interest / availability

DRAFT AGENDA (as of April 2020)

Oct 6, 2020

8:00   Registration

9:00   Welcome and logistics

9:15   Motivation and expected outcomes of the workshop (including background on OECD & other processes)

9:45   Concepts of non-linear pharmacokinetics and KMD

10:15   Implications of non-linear pharmacokinetics in toxicity testing studies (overview / highlight of guidance documents for pharmaceuticals?)

10:45   Break

11:00   Examples of KMD applications and challenges

11:30   Considering KMD in top dose selection or exposure levels vs. KMD

12:00   Lunch

1:00   Case study 1

1:30	Case study 2
2:00	Case study 3
2:30	Case study 4
3:00	Break
3:15	Case study 5
3:45	Case study 6
4:15	Case study 7: Statistical tests to determine KMD from sparse data points
4:45	Summary of day 1, preview of day 2
5:00	Adjourn

Oct 7, 2020

| 9:00 | Challenges in using pharmacokinetic information (or KMD) to select doses in toxicity studies |
| 9:15 | Presentations by workgroup leads – questions & outline desired paper(s) (15 min each) |

Group 1 topic: What type of data are needed when determining dose non-linearity?
Group 2 topic: How to determine a KMD?
Group 3 topic: When to use a KMD to set top dose, and when not to use a KMD?

10:00	Concurrent workgroup discussions
12:00	Lunch
1:00	Group feedback on breakout topics (10 min each)
1:30	Concurrent workgroup discussions
3:00	Break for participants
3:30	Report-out by workgroups, annotation of outline(s) (10 min for each group)
4:00	Discussion on workshop products (manuscripts, reports, etc.?)
5:00	Adjourn

Oct 8, 2020

| 9:00 | Write up (breakout topics, case studies) |
| 12:00 or 4:00 | Adjourn |

Attachment 4: Workgroup draft charge for the HESI workgroup on KMD project

HESI PBPK Committee

Kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD) project

DRAFT 05-04-2020

MISSION: Provide guidance on using the kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD) approach to set top doses in toxicity testing studies or to aid interpretation of dose-response study results for chemical risk assessment.

OBJECTIVES:

- Develop best practices and guidance on the following:
  - Selecting the appropriate PK parameter to examine dose proportionality
  - Defining a minimum dataset considered necessary to set a KMD
  - Estimating the onset of non-linear PK based on measurements or predictions
  - Conducting statistical analyses to determine a KMD for interpreting dose-response data
  - Determining and using a KMD to set the top dose in toxicity studies
- Discuss if and how KMD can be applied in the context of hazard classification as well as risk assessment
- Discuss and identify situations where the use of KMD might be limited or not possible (e.g., acute, high-exposure situations)

STRATEGY:

- Identify case studies to demonstrate the most suitable approaches for estimation and application of KMD
- Convene stakeholders who are interested in exploring the utility of KMD for regulatory submissions
- Discuss implications of using this approach

BACKGROUND:

Pharmacokinetics (PK) refers to the study of chemical movement into, through, and out of a living organism determined by the rate and extent of a chemical's absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME). PK determines the amount of chemical available for eliciting toxicological responses in the tissues from a given external exposure. Thus, knowledge on PK is likely to improve the design of dose-response studies and interpretation of results from these studies in chemical safety assessment.

Specifically, one of the proposed uses of PK information is to select the top dose in a toxicity study based on kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD) to avoid excessively high doses at which the physiology of test species is greatly altered and that significantly higher than possible human exposures. In cases where PK data are generated after the initiation of a toxicity study, determining a KMD can help prevent inappropriate use of toxicity data in risk assessment, where actual human exposure levels are far below the KMD.

KMD refers to the highest dose at, or slightly above, the departure from dose proportionality or linear PK. Non-linear PK can be caused by saturation or limitation of various factors, including absorption (e.g., saturable transport in gut wall), distribution (e.g., plasma protein binding), metabolism (e.g., enzyme or co-factor limitation), and excretion (e.g., active renal secretion). In the pharmaceutical field, the KMD concept is often described as "the dose level that results in non-linear kinetics" or "the dose level above the inflection point of transition to non-linear kinetics", and it is routinely considered in animal toxicity studies to provide perspective on the relevance of these studies to human safety assessment. However, consideration of KMD in the design or interpretation of animal toxicity studies for environmental chemicals is rare. This may be because PK data are commonly available for drugs, but not for environmental chemicals.

Additionally, the PK parameter most commonly used to examine dose proportionality is the area under the curve (AUC) of parent chemical in plasma for drugs, but it is more challenging to determine the appropriate PK parameter to determine a KMD for environmental chemicals.

Since a KMD represents a dose above which the dose-response relationship differs from the one when PK is linear, a KMD should be based on dose proportionality of the dose metric. A dose metric should reflect the biologically active form of a chemical (e.g., parent chemical, metabolites, adducts), its level (e.g., concentration, amount), duration of internal exposure (e.g., acute vs. chronic; lifetime vs. a specific developmental period), intensity (e.g., peak, average, cumulative), and biological matrix (e.g., plasma, target tissue, surrogate) (EPA, 2006).

Furthermore, no guidance is currently available to address other technical and scientific issues related to KMD analysis. Examples of these issues include choosing the appropriate statistical tests to estimate the inflection point of transition to non-linear PK, interpreting dose-response results using KMD based on saturation or limitation of ADME, developing PK models to predict the transition from linear to non-linear PK, and using KMD to set doses in a toxicity study.

NEXT STEPS:

- Discuss suitable case study examples that can be explored to illustrate key points
  - Use of kinetic data to determine dose non-linearity
  - Minimum dataset considered necessary to set a KMD
  - Comparison of potential human exposure levels to the KMD
  - Determination of a KMD from sparse kinetic data
  - Use of *in silico* models to predict systemic dose and possible KMD
  - Use of KMD to set a top dose in a toxicity study

- o Use of KMD to support hazard classification
- o KMD domain of applicability – when can you use KMD to set top dose, and when can it not be used?
- Hold a workshop to discuss case studies that will illustrate key aspects
- Develop a best practices / guidance document on the following aspects:
  - o Selecting the appropriate PK parameter to examine dose proportionality
  - o Estimating the onset of non-linear PK based on measurements or predictions
  - o Conducting statistical analyses to determine a KMD for interpreting dose-response data
  - o Determining and using a KMD to set the top dose in toxicity studies