# Breakout Group 1

Is there a gold standard ?

# Gold standard for the validation of *in vitro* methods

- Against which assays ? LLNA ? MKGPMT ?
- Those substances for which the LLNA and MKGPMT fit and have relevance for humans; and that cover a wide range of chemical classes
- Miss conflicting results ? Those compounds are equally important
- For validation, you need reliable results, thus develop method for compounds with sufficient WoE; subsequently test the ‘special cases’

# Gold standard for the classification and labelling

- Many LLNA fail when confirmed in humans (US FDA)
- WoE is important, but what for new substances under REACH ?
- Depends on ‘how new’ the substance is (QSAR)
- See *in vitro* methods as mechanistic additional information (e.g. with positive LLNA)

# Gold standard for the classification and labelling

- In first instance, have an international workshop on experiences with LLNA and MKGPMT in **different** sectors (*epaa*)
- Publish results
- Make up a peer-reviewed scientifically based decision tree for method selection
- Make a distinction between new and existing substances

# Gold standard for the classification and labelling

- Decision tree based upon
  - purity
  - physico-chemistry
  - existing knowledge on the substance
  - chemical structure (QSAR alerts)
  - existing knowledge on applicability domain
- Safety as primary goal
- Scientific argumentation
- Include peer-review as much as possible

# Gold standard for the classification and labelling

- **A single ‘gold standard’ does not exist ! It is a set of data providing sufficient WoE**
- Main problem is new substances
- Additional problem is regulatory acceptance of argumentation
- Bring it to the attention of the *epaa* and have them involved