

**Statement from Amy Kyle, PhD
Associate Research Professor, School of Public Health
University of California Berkeley**

Many agencies and others are working hard to develop alternative methods to assess chemicals (and other agents). These are part of an overall effort toward being better able to understand what poses a health or safety hazard and what does not. Many people including those in communities and civil society are interested in and supportive of this aim.

Existing methods primarily using animal models have well defined limitations. However, one significant benefit of existing methods primarily using animal models is that the gist of what they do is relatively understandable and intuitive to an engaged lay audience. Most people know what an animal is and what a disease is and can grasp concepts expressed as "dose" and "response" with some explanation. These are things that people experience in their lives.

Some or many of the alternative methods rely on tracking perturbations to some portions of a biological response resulting from a stimulus. In some or many cases, the significance of the biological response is not fully understood. In some or many cases, the significance of the perturbation of the biological response may not be fully understood. In the case of high dimensional methods, even the stimulus may not be well characterized. Such results often have obscure names that do not have correlates in human experiences. They do not include anything as complete as a "animal," and they do not result in anything as defined as a disease.

While substantial scientific energy and innovation has gone into developing new methods, investment in development of ways to communicate their meaning to communities and civil society are equally needed.