

Public Comment Received on the Draft OHAT Approach – February 2013

Received on the On-line Submission Form

- The NTP invites you to comment on the Draft OHAT Approach for Systematic Review and Evidence Integration for Literature-Based Health Assessments – February 2013 in the form below

Respondent Information

- **Name:** Dr. Mari Golub
- **Affiliation:** Univ CA Davis and Cal/EPA

Date Received: April 29, 2013

Responses

1. The unstructured risk assessment process gathers all the scientific information on the agent and integrates it into evaluation of hazard. The structured process proposed by OHAT provides greater consistency, transparency and efficiency in use of resources. However, it does involve a selection of scientific reports that is based not only on the relevance of the material but also on the format in which it is presented. Here are some thoughts on promoting formats that ensure selection of relevant information by OHAT. NIEHS researchers: NIEHS as a component of NTP could provide funded investigators with a set of guidelines for publishing data so that it would pass OHAT risk assessment screens. Alternatively NIEHS could compile databases of protocols and data from funded studies that could be accessed directly for risk assessment purposes. RA friendly journals: Publishers could be given an option of allowing RA friendly formatting of their articles outside the journal restrictions on length and detail, and the reviewers suggestions for formatting. This option could be implemented as supplementary material. For instance, presentation of data in figures sometimes makes it difficult to identify group values but a corresponding table could always be provided in supplementary materials. Non-English, non-NIH scientific data: journals could alert contributors to the possibility that US RA agencies may be interested in their work and ask if they would be willing to respond to requests for more detailed information. This might reduce the time and uncertainty involved in these contacts. Motivation: There does not seem to be any motivation for researchers to produce scientific reports that are suitable for passing the OHAT screens. Money, recognition and involvement in the risk assessment are three possibilities. Few investigators inside or outside toxicology know when their studies are critical to risk assessment decisions. Good science and science useful for risk assessment should overlap as much as possible.