1. BPA produced minimal effects at varying doses that were distinguishable only statistically from background in this study, particularly below 25,000 µg BPA/kg bw/day.

2. Many of the statistically significant BPA effects were not dose-responsive or occurred in only one dose group, typically not the highest dose group, and there was not a clear pattern of consistent responses in the stop-dose and continuous-dose study arms.

3. Background BPA exposure, from the diet or other unintended sources, did not affect the interpretation of the study.

4. Although animals in the stop-dose and continuous-dose arms were handled differently and were not statistically compared, in several cases statistically significant increases in lesion incidences in BPA treatment groups relative to the vehicle control in one study arm were similar to the vehicle control group in the other study arm.

5. Some of the effects observed at 25,000 µg BPA/kg bw/day (e.g., pituitary and epididymis in males, uterus and vagina in females) may be treatment-related.

6. The high EE2 dose (0.5 µg EE2/kg bw/day) elicited effects in females and males.

7. The points above suggest that the observed variations in endpoints (e.g., body weights, lesion incidences), at least those below the highest BPA dose, within a given study arm were within the range of normal biological variation.
Voting Process

- Panel votes on NTP’s draft scientific interpretations of the data as written.

- First, the Panel considers all 7 interpretations at once:
  - Chair calls for a motion and a second to accept all 7 interpretations as written.
  - If a motion and second are put forward, the Panel votes by a show of hands to accept the interpretations. Panelists may vote “yes”, “no”, or abstain.
  - If the majority vote is “yes”, panelists who vote “no” or abstain state why for the record.
  - The chair votes only in case of a tie.

- If there is no motion or second to accept all 7 interpretations as written, or if the Panel votes “no” to the interpretations in total, the Panel votes on each interpretation separately.
  - Chair calls for a motion and a second for each interpretation.
  - If no one motions to accept, or if there is only one person to motion to accept, panelists who did not motion state why for the record.
  - Panel votes by a show of hands only if there is a motion and a second to accept the interpretation as-is. Panelists may vote “yes”, “no”, or abstain.
  - Panelists who vote “no” or abstain state why for the record.
  - The chair votes only in case of a tie.
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