

Advancing the Next Generation of Risk Assessment



A Community of Practice Discussion

Ila Cote, PhD, DABT NexGen Program Director National Center for Environmental Assessment Office of Research and Development



The purpose of this talk is to:
– Review the NexGen Program
– Discuss and get feedback on potential implications for risk assessment



What is NexGen??

Program Goal:

To advance risk assessment science via incorporation of recent progress in molecular systems biology



Photos courtesy of MIT Koch Institute



NexGen Partners

- US Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development
- National Institutes of Environmental Health Sciences & National Toxicology Program
- Centers for Disease Control & Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
- NIH Chemical Genomics Center
- California's Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
- FDA National Center for Toxicological Research
- Department of Defense
- European Chemical Agency & Joint European Commission Joint Research Center















Drivers for Change

- Scientific revolution in biology most is not used in risk assessment
- In the European Union
 - REACH ~ 120,000 chemicals
 - Emphasis on "non-standard" data for risk assessment
 - 40,000 dossiers in near future
- In the United States
 - Several NRC reports and workshops
 - Tox21 10,000 chemicals tested in biotech assays the next few years



Objectives of NexGen

- Pilot a NexGen Framework that considers at how new types of data fits in with other types of data used in risk assessment
- Refine bioinformatics systems for knowledge mining and creation to serve risk assessment.
- Develop prototype health assessments
 - Elucidate proof of concept, value of information, & decision rules
 - Refine through discussions with scientists, risk managers, and stakeholders

Risk Assessment Questions

- Identify potential adverse health effects?
- Inform doseresponse?
- Link dose to exposures?
- Address issues:
 - -Low-dose response?
 - -Sensitive subpops?
 - -Relevance of nonhuman species?
 - –Mixtures/stressors exposures?
- Better characterize human risks?



General Prototype Approach Reverse Engineer Well-Studied **Environmental Public** Animal Human **Health Risks** Bioassay Disease **Knowledge** Knowledge **Molecular Systems Biology** Data

Validate Against Human Data

Risk Assessment

Methods/Models

Probabilities

Uncertainties

Validate Against Animal Bioassay Data

Overview of Projects



Methods and Models



Hazard Id: Can We Identify Specific Adverse Effects Using Omics?



Hazard Id: Can We Identify Specific Adverse Effects

- I think yes.
- It seems like we are beginning to identify causal mechanism or molecular patterns that make one chemical more likely to produce a specific effect than another.
- The "answer" will, for the foreseeable future, be a probability vs. yes/no answer about cause and effect.
- Knowledge of single events or linear MOAs, <u>in general</u>, is not insufficient – Think Networks
- Some illustrations follow....

From Chris Portier

Cancer Pathways

System egradation Receptor Signaling Pathway ositol Phosphate Metabolism nosphatidylinositol Signaling orsal-Ventral Axis Formation cid Metabolism Signaling Pathway rb-B Signaling Pathway Long-Term Potentiation GnRH Signaling Pathway nsulin Signaling Pathway Metabolism nene D Steroids gnaling Pathway gnaling Pathway Metabolism Junction late Biosynthes Guidance anogenesis Junction and Acid Glutathione etabolism achidonic yde monene svnthe dherens Ľ noleic Ľ ത õ 8 통 Shit Φ ε

Types of Cancer



DNA Damage Colorectal Cancer Bladder Cancer Esophageal Cancer Gastric Cancer Head and Neck Cancer Cancer (not otherwise specified) Lung Cancer Breast Cancer Prostate Cancer Ovarian Cancer Leukemia Lymphoma Brain Cancer Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Cervical Cancer Melanoma Ulcerative Colitis Pancreatic Cancer Hepatitus C Multiple Sclerosis Rheumatic Arthritis Endometrial Cancer Thyroid Cancer

Chemicals linked to breast cancer



from Chris Portier



Hazard Id: Issues

So we are beginning to identify hazards with omics, BUT its complicated....

- Omic patterns change with dose and time.
- Metabolism still matters.
- High throughput cell line assays can only tell us about molecular/cellular mechanisms.
- Specific phenotypic outcome depend on both tissues/organism level integration, and lifestage; examples follow



Hazard Identify: Issues Common Pathway/Different Disease



Hazard Identify: Issues Common Mechanism/Different Diseases Lifestage Dependency





Dose – Response: At what concentrations do effects occur?



Dose – Response Tier 1

- Lots of nice dose-response data, collected over a wide range
- Must integrate various pathway data
 - Use LOEL or slope estimate of molecular data
 - Number of pathways impacted
- Must incorporate variability as feasible
- Yields relative potencies of chemicals to induce molecular/cellular mechanisms
- Use experimental data, don't extrapolate





Dose – Response – Tier 2

- Similar to Tier 1 but using high & medium test systems that yield more direct insights into risks by including tissue/ organism level integration and metabolism.
- Examples include: virtual tissue modeling, tissue, culture, alternative species of Tier 2 include.





Dose – Response: Tier 3



Heat map of DNA methylation patterns in in vivo benzene exposed and control humans. Red is methylated. Green is unmethylated. Zhang et al. 2010

- Human biomarkers of effect and exposures
- Estimation of risks vs. relative potencies
- Interaction of background and chemically induced events leading to disease
- Think in terms of biasing the population toward or away from disease.
- Risk assessments will focus on shifts in population distribution





- Proof of concept, value of information and decision rules are being developed.
- New types of data (e.g. omics) can be used to identify the likelihood of adverse effect outcomes and estimate relative potencies and human risks.
- Weight of evidence varies depending on the type of data





- Think in terms of networks and pattern recognition:
 - -Phenotypically similar diseases can be induce by perturbation in different parts of the network.
 - A specific pattern of disruption can result in several different diseases depending on species, tissue and life stage.
- Risk will best be characterized as distributions that incorporate variability.



NexGen Health Assessment Timeline





Acknowledgements

Paul Anastas Becki Clark Peter Preuss James Avery Stan Barone Weihsueh Chiu Kathleen Deener Rob DeWoskin Lynn Flowers Kate Guyton Annie Jarabek Kathleen Raffaele Jason Lambert **David Miller** Debra Segal **Bob Sonowane David Bussard** Abdel Kadry

Robert Kavlock David Dix

Richard Judson Tom Knudsen David Reif Matt Martin Imran Shah John Wambaugh Lyle Burgoon **Robert Devlin** Stephen Edwards Mary Gilbert Julian Preston Woody Setzer Hal Zenick Linda Sheldon Annette Gatchett

John Vandenberg

Martyn Smith Ken Ramos Linda Birnbaum Ray Tice Mike Devito Kris Thayer Chris Austin James Inglese Chris Portier **Bruce Fowler Rusty Thomas** Peter McClure **Dale Hattis** Dan Krewski **Doug Crawford-**Brown **Greg Paoli** Lauren Zeiss Martha Sandy **Brenda Foos**

And ~ 50 other people



Please visit EPA's NexGen Web site for more information:

www.epa.gov/risk/nexgen





Assays & Assessments

Tier 1 10,000s of chemicals	Tier 2 1000s of chemicals	Tier 3 100s of chemicals
High Throughput Molecular Mechanisms of Action	+High Content/Med Throughput Adds Tissue/Organism Level Integration	+High Content, Med/Low Throughput Adds Most Realistic Scenarios
 In vitro only bioassay batteries (~73-500 assays) Network/disease pattern recognition Metabolism or surrogates QSAR Anchored to in vivo data Bioinformatic data integration 	 Short-term in vivo exposures with in vitro assays Mammalian species Alternative species Primary tissue culture In silico virtual tissues In vivo or anchored to in vivo data Bioinformatic data & knowledge integration 	 Mo/ecular epidemiology & clinical Studies Molecular biology + traditional animal bioassay Environmental exposures Upstream & phenotypic outcomes Mechanism of action for multiple stressors Knowledge integration
Screening/Ranking Limited decision-making Regulatory decision-making		
Increasing Weight of Evidence		