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The Report on Carcinogens (RoC) is congressionally mandated

- Public Health Service Act, Section 301(b)(4) (1978, amended 1993)
  - Directs Secretary, Health and Human Services (HHS) to publish a list of carcinogens
  - Lists substances as “known” or “reasonably anticipated human carcinogens”
- Identifies substances that pose a cancer hazard for people in the United States
- NTP prepares the RoC for the Secretary, HHS
- Each edition of the report is cumulative

http://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/go/roc
Process for the Preparation of the RoC

Nomination and Selection of Candidate Substances

- Invite nominations to the RoC
- Interagency review
- Public comment
- Develop draft concept documents for substances proposed for evaluation
- Public comment
- Review of draft concept documents by NTP Board of Scientific Counselors*
  (public meeting, public comment)
- NTP Director
- Select candidate substances

Scientific Evaluation of Candidate Substances

- Prepare draft RoC Monograph for a candidate substance
  (initiate cancer evaluation component)
- External scientific input, as needed
  (e.g., consultants, ad hoc presentations, expert panels*)
- Public input
  (e.g., listening session, comment)
- Interagency input
  (complete cancer evaluation component and prepare draft substance profile)
- Interagency review
- Complete draft RoC Monograph

Public Release and Peer Review of Draft RoC Monographs

- Release draft RoC Monograph
- Public comment
  Peer review of draft RoC Monograph by NTP Peer-Review Panel*
  (public meeting, public comment, peer-review report)
- Present information regarding the peer review and revised draft RoC Monograph to NTP Board of Scientific Counselors
  (public meeting, public comment)
- NTP Director
- Finalize RoC Monograph
  (cancer evaluation component and substance profile)

HHS Approval and Release of Latest Edition of the RoC

- Submit recommended listing status for newly reviewed candidate substances
  NTP Executive Committee
  Approval of listing status by Secretary, HHS
  (transmit latest edition of RoC to Congress and release to the public)

Key
HHS = Health and Human Services
NTP = National Toxicology Program
RoC = Report on Carcinogens
* Federally chartered advisory groups
RoC related products

• Concept document
  – Contains rationale and proposed approach for the substance review

• Draft RoC monograph consists of two parts
  – Cancer hazard evaluation component
  – Substance profile

• Report on Carcinogens
  – Compilation of substance profiles for each listed substance
Completed Steps in the Process

Selection of “cobalt” as a candidate substance

**Invited nominations**
- Interagency review
- Public comment (N = 1)
  - Sept 20, 2013: FR

**Developed draft concept**
- Public comment (N = 0)
  - March 7, 2014: FR
- Draft concept reviewed by BSC
  - April 16-18, 2014 public mtg

**Selected candidate substance**

Cobalt metal nominated based on NTP bioassay

Expanded scope in concept document to “cobalt”

Based on widespread exposure and adequate database
Completed Steps in the Process

Candidate substance defined as the class – cobalt and certain cobalt compounds (cobalt*)

- Prepared draft RoC monograph
- Established website
- Selected monograph team
- Convened informational group: Oct. 7, 2014
- Prepared & posted protocol
- Internal review

- Proposed class based on mechanistic data
- Cobalt sulfate, which is currently listed in the RoC, is included in the evaluation
- Other metal compounds in the RoC are listed as a class rather than as individual compounds
Protocol for preparing the cancer hazard evaluation

1. **Identify relevant literature**
   - Appendix A
   - Search strategy document
   - Carcinogenicity information from peer-reviewed and publicly available sources

2. **Extract data/describe findings**
   - Databases
   - Appendix and monograph tables

3. **Evaluate study utility**
   - Appendix C, D (human & animal)
   - Potential for bias
   - Sensitivity

4. **Assess data**
   - Exposure conclusion
   - Synthesize across studies for each evidence stream
   - Evidence integration & evaluation of cobalt as a class
Identify the relevant literature

Literature search: databases

1st level review (7150)

Citations: (1485) Tagged

Excluded citations

Web-based software
Inclusion/exclusion criteria
Multiple reviewers

Exposure
ADME
Human cancer
Exp. animal cancer
Genotoxicity
Mechanisms

2nd level review (full text)

Excluded citations

Secondary Citations

Additional searches

Included citations (471)

Updated Searches
Reach RoC Conclusions

**Evaluate whether a significant number of U.S. residents are exposed to cobalt**

- **Congressional mandate**
  - Publish a report that lists substances which are known or reasonably anticipated to be human carcinogens and to which a significant number of persons residing in the United States are exposed.

- **Evaluate data**
  - Exposure usually inferred from data on use, production volume, occupational monitoring, environmental (occurrence), estimated intake, and biomonitoring.
  - Past exposure is relevant because cancer has a long latency period.

- **Reviewer instructions**
  - Use their judgment as to whether the exposure information in the draft monograph supports NTP conclusion that a significant number of U.S. residents are exposed to cobalt.
Evaluate evidence for carcinogenicity of cobalt*

**Preliminary listing recommendation**

- **Level of evidence:** Human studies
- **Level of evidence:** Experimental animal studies (as a class)
- **Conclusions from mechanistic data:** Cobalt* as a class

RoC listing criteria
RoC Listing Criteria

Reach level of evidence conclusion for carcinogenicity from studies in humans*

**Sufficient evidence**

- Causal relationship between exposure to the agent, substance, or mixture, and human cancer

**Limited evidence**

- Causal interpretation is credible, but that alternative explanations, such as chance, bias, or confounding factors, could not adequately be excluded

*This evidence can include traditional cancer epidemiology studies, data from clinical studies, and/or data derived from the study of tissues or cells from humans exposed to the substance in question that can be useful for evaluating whether a relevant cancer mechanism is operating in people.*
RoC Listing Criteria

Reach level of evidence conclusion for carcinogenicity from studies in experimental animals

Sufficient evidence

- Increased incidence of malignant and/or a combination of malignant and benign tumors
  - In multiple species or at multiple tissue sites
  - By multiple routes of exposure
  - To an unusual degree with regard to incidence, site, or type of tumor, or age at onset
Evaluate mechanistic and other relevant data

• Provides context for biological plausibility of findings reported in human and experimental animal cancer studies

• Mechanistic data are often sparse

• Can be used to list/not list a substance or support findings in humans and experimental animals
  – Agent belongs to a well-defined, structurally related class of substances whose members are listed in the RoC
  – Convincing data that a substance operates by a mechanism that would cause cancer in humans
  – Compelling data that a substance causes cancer by a mechanism that would not occur in humans

• Evaluate evidence for considering cobalt as a class
RoC Listing Criteria

Reach preliminary listing recommendation

**Known to be a human carcinogen**
- Sufficient evidence of carcinogenicity from studies in humans

**Reasonably anticipated to be a human carcinogen**
- Limited evidence from studies in humans  
  OR

- Sufficient evidence from studies in experimental animals  
  OR

- Less than sufficient evidence in humans or experimental animals
  - Agent, substance, or mixture belongs to a well-defined, structurally related class of substances whose members are listed in a previous RoC as either known to be a human carcinogen or reasonably anticipated to be a human carcinogen  
    OR

- Convincing relevant information that the agent acts through mechanisms indicating it would likely cause cancer in humans
Conclusions regarding carcinogenicity in humans or experimental animals are based on scientific judgment, with consideration given to all relevant information.

Relevant information includes, but is not limited to, dose response, route of exposure, chemical structure, metabolism, pharmacokinetics, sensitive sub-populations, genetic effects, or other data relating to mechanism of action or factors that may be unique to a given substance.

For example, there may be substances for which there is evidence of carcinogenicity in laboratory animals, but there are compelling data indicating that the agent acts through mechanisms which do not operate in humans and would therefore not reasonably be anticipated to cause cancer in humans.
Process for the Preparation of the RoC

Nomination and Selection of Candidate Substances

- Invite nominations to the RoC
  - Interagency review
    - Public comment
  - Develop draft concept documents for substances proposed for evaluation
    - Public comment
  - Review of draft concept documents by NTP Board of Scientific Counselors*
    (public meeting, public comment)
  - NTP Director
    - Select candidate substances

Scientific Evaluation of Candidate Substances

- Prepare draft RoC Monograph for a candidate substance
  - (initiate cancer evaluation component)
    - External scientific input, as needed
      (e.g., consultants, ad hoc presentations, expert panels*)
    - Public comment
      (e.g., listening session, comment)
    - Interagency input
      (complete cancer evaluation component and prepare draft substance profile)
    - Interagency review
      - Complete draft RoC Monograph

Public Release and Peer Review of Draft RoC Monographs

- Release draft RoC Monograph
- Public comment
- Peer review of draft RoC Monograph by NTP Peer-Review Panel*
  (public meeting, public comment, peer-review report)
- Present information regarding the peer review and revised draft RoC Monograph to NTP Board of Scientific Counselors
  (public meeting, public comment)
- NTP Director
- Finalize RoC Monograph
  (cancer evaluation component and substance profile)

HHS Approval and Release of Latest Edition of the RoC

- Submit recommended listing status for newly reviewed candidate substances
  - NTP Executive Committee
  - Approval of listing status by Secretary, HHS
    (transmit latest edition of RoC to Congress and release to the public)

Key:
HHS = Health and Human Services
NTP = National Toxicology Program
RoC = Report on Carcinogens
* Federally chartered advisory groups
| Charge | To comment on the draft cancer evaluation component, specifically, whether it is technically correct and clearly stated, whether the NTP has objectively presented and assessed the scientific evidence, and whether the scientific evidence is adequate for applying the listing criteria. |
| Actions (votes) | Whether the scientific evidence supports the NTP’s conclusions on the level of evidence for carcinogenicity from cancer studies in human and experimental animals of cobalt and certain cobalt compounds. | Whether the scientific evidence supports the NTP’s preliminary listing decision for cobalt and certain cobalt compounds in the RoC. |
Next Steps

Process for the preparation of the RoC

**Nomination and Selection of Candidate Substances**
- Invite nominations to the RoC
- Interagency review
- Public comment
- Develop draft concept documents for substances proposed for evaluation
- Public comment
- Review of draft concept documents by NTP Board of Scientific Counselors* (public meeting, public comment)
- NTP Director
- Select candidate substances

**Scientific Evaluation of Candidate Substances**
- Prepare draft RoC Monograph for a candidate substance (initiate cancer evaluation component)
- External scientific input, as needed (e.g., consultants, ad hoc presentations, expert panels*)
- Public input (e.g., listening session, comment)
- Interagency input (complete cancer evaluation component and prepare draft substance profile)
- Interagency review
- Complete draft RoC Monograph

**Public Release and Peer Review of Draft RoC Monographs**
- Release draft RoC Monograph
- Public comment
- Peer review of draft RoC Monograph by NTP Peer-Review Panel* (public meeting, public comment, peer-review report)
- Interagency input
- Present information regarding the peer review and revised draft RoC Monograph to NTP Board of Scientific Counselors (public meeting, public comment)
- NTP Director
- Finalize RoC Monograph (cancer evaluation component and substance profile)

**HHS Approval and Release of Latest Edition of the RoC**
- Submit recommended listing status for newly reviewed candidate substances
  - NTP Executive Committee
  - Approval of listing status by Secretary, HHS
    (transmit latest edition of RoC to Congress and release to the public)

* Federally chartered advisory groups

**Key**
- HHS = Health and Human Services
- NTP = National Toxicology Program
- RoC = Report on Carcinogens
Questions?