

Open letter to the European commission: scientifically unfounded precaution drives European commission's recommendations on EDC regulation, while defying common sense, well-established science, and risk assessment principles

Daniel Dietrich · Sonja von Aulock · H. W. J. Marquardt · Bas J. Blaauboer · Wolfgang Dekant · James Kehrer · Jan G. Hengstler · Abby C. Collier · Gio Batta Gori · Olavi Pelkonen · Florian Lang · Frans P. Nijkamp · Kerstin Stemmer · Albert Li · Kai Savolainen · A. Wallace Hayes · Nigel Gooderham · Alan Harvey

Received: 6 August 2013 / Accepted: 6 August 2013 / Published online: 27 August 2013
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

We, the undersigned editors of journals of pharmacology and toxicology, are drawing your attention to the imminent decisions by the European Commission to enforce a regulatory framework for so-called endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs).¹ The currently drafted framework is based on virtually complete ignorance of all well-established and taught principles of pharmacology and toxicology, of opinions raised by the European Commission's own competent expert authority (European Food Safety Authority (EFSA 2013)), and of critical statements made by member countries, while avoiding asking for support

from the European Commission's own scientific expert committees.

As a statement, and as emphasized by others before, "endocrine disruption" is not a toxicologically defined end point but a mode of action that may or may not result in adverse effects. In itself, the mode-of-action concept implies the necessary existence of a threshold as experimentally proven for numerous other non-genotoxic agents including EDCs. Moreover, endocrine systems play a fundamental role in the physiological response to changes in the environment with the aim of keeping an organism's

The opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors of this letter, and do not necessarily reflect the positions or views of Springer Science + Business Media.

D. Dietrich (✉)
EDTA-VMG Non-Animal of the OECD, Faculty of Biology,
University of Konstanz, Constance, Germany
e-mail: hengstler@ifado.de

S. von Aulock
ALTEX, Kuesnacht, Switzerland

H. W. J. Marquardt
Toxicology, Department of Toxicology, Hamburg University
Medical School, Kortenredder 3, 22397 Hamburg, Germany

B. J. Blaauboer
Division of Toxicology, Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences,
Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

W. Dekant
Department of Toxicology, University of Würzburg, Würzburg,
Germany

J. Kehrer
Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Katz Centre
for Pharmacy and Health Research, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, AB, Canada

¹ This letter was provided by Prof. Daniel R. Dietrich. A similar text has been published in ALTEX. 30, 3/13, 381–385 and in Chemico Biological Interactions.

J. G. Hengstler
Leibniz Research Centre for Working Environment and Human
Factors, IFADo, Dortmund, Germany

A. C. Collier
John A. Burns School of Medicine, University of Hawaii at
Mānoa, BioSciences 320-3, 651 Ilalo Street, Honolulu,
HI 96813, USA

G. B. Gori
Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, The Health Policy
Center, 6704 Barr Road, Bethesda, MD 20816, USA

O. Pelkonen
Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, University
of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

F. Lang
Toxins, Universität Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

F. P. Nijkamp
European Journal of Pharmacology, Utrecht,
The Netherlands

biology within the homeostatic space. It is the task of toxicologists to make the distinction between those effects that are within this adaptive range and effects that go beyond the boundaries of this space and thus can be called adverse. Such adverse effects can be observed in adequately designed and performed toxicity studies.

While we agree that a concern for possible EDCs is sensible and important, we also think that the identification and regulation of such substances should depend on (a) the definition of adverse effects that are relevant to whole human or animal organisms and not to isolated test systems of unknown homeostatic significance, and (b) on a characterization of real-life potency and therefore of thresholds of concern.

In contrast, the currently drafted EU framework for EDCs foresees a priori regulation of agents that may show presumably endocrine-mediated effects in some experimental system (in vitro, in silico, and in vivo...) and under the a priori default assumption of no thresholds. This approach is based on a very small number of publications (Sheehan 2006; Vandenberg et al. 2012; Zoeller et al. 2012; Birnbaum 2013) that lack the required scientific robustness needed for such an important piece of legislation that is sweeping in nature, will set an unforeseen precedence, and finally will have profound ramifications for everyone's livelihood. Furthermore, the regulatory draft specifically states that the identification of an endocrine disruptor relies "on the *demonstration of an adverse effect for which there is convincing evidence of a biologically plausible causal link to an endocrine-disrupting mode of action and for which disruption of the endocrine system is not a secondary consequence of other non-endocrine-mediated*

systemic toxicity. Relevance of the data to humans should be assumed in the absence of appropriate data demonstrating non-relevance".

As all scientists should know, it is biologically and statistically impossible to demonstrate "absence of effect" and thus "absence of relevance". The mere statement demonstrates the lack of attention paid by the European Commission to the weight of scientific evidence that clearly demonstrates the presence of a threshold for non-genotoxic compounds including EDCs (Rhomberg et al. 2011; Rhomberg and Goodman 2012; Borgert et al. 2012; Piersma et al. 2011; Boobis et al. 2009), as well as to the scientific detail with regard to the physiological and statistical implausibility of the approach taken. In fact, any scientist familiar with the overwhelming biochemical complexity of life understands that the healthy homeostasis of an organism results from an orchestrated network of myriad thresholds for every component substance.

On this account, a nucleus of scientists sent an open letter on June 18, 2013 (see footnote 1) to Prof. Anne Glover, Chief Scientific Advisor to the President of the European Commission Manuel Barroso, pointing out the major deficiencies of the drafted EU framework and the worrisome ramifications this draft could have for science, the economy, and human welfare the world over.

Although some readers may shrug and think this is not important and not their problem, it soon could be. Regulations that profoundly affect human activities that legally impose significant fines and even detention should not be based on irrelevant tests forced to be regarded as relevant by administrative dictates and on arbitrary default assumptions of no thresholds. Such standards would be contrary not only to science, but to the very principles of an enlightened governance and social contract. Not only scientists but society itself would pay dearly if unscientific approaches were to undermine our everyday practice of science, and the stringency of data analysis and evaluation developed by scientific thinking over the past centuries. In the present instance, the very credibility of thorough and robust teaching, research, and scientific analysis is questioned. This calls for action, and as beneficiaries of public support, it is the utmost responsibility of our scientists to resist and counteract any efforts that undermine the core of science and its continuing promise for the betterment of the human condition and of the planet.

K. Stemmer

Toxicology in Vitro, Helmholtz Zentrum, Munich, Germany

A. Li

Chemico Biological Interactions, In Vitro ADMET Laboratories LLC, Advanced Pharmaceutical Sciences, Inc., 15235 Shady Grove Road, Suite 303, Rockville, MD 20850, USA

K. Savolainen

Human and Experimental Toxicology, Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland

A. W. Hayes

Human and Experimental Toxicology, Food and Chemical Toxicology, Vision and Strategy, Spherix Consulting and Harvard University, 298 South Main Street, Andover, MA 01810, USA

N. Gooderham

Toxicology Research, Imperial College London, London, UK

A. Harvey

Toxicon, Strathclyde Institute for Drug Research (SIDR), Strathclyde Institute of Pharmacy and Biomedical Sciences (SIPBS), University of Strathclyde, The John Arbuthnot Building, 27 Taylor Street, Glasgow G4 0NR, UK

References

- Birnbaum L (2013) When environmental chemicals act like uncontrolled medicine. *Trends Endocrinol Metab* doi:10.1016/j.tem.2012.12.005. [Epub ahead of print]
- Boobis AR, Daston GP, Preston RJ, Olin SS (2009) Application of key events analysis to chemical carcinogens and noncarcinogens. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr* 49(8):690–707

- Borgert CJ, Sargent EV, Casella G, Dietrich DR, McCarty LS, Golden RJ (2012) The human relevant potency threshold: reducing uncertainty by human calibration of cumulative risk assessments. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* 62(2):313–328
- European Food Safety Authority Scientific Committee (2013) Scientific opinion on the hazard assessment of endocrine disruptors: scientific criteria for identification of endocrine disruptors and appropriateness of existing test methods for assessing effects mediated by these substances on human health and the environment. *EFSA J* 11(3):3132–3216
- Piersma AH, Hernandez LG, van Benthem J, Muller JJA, van Leuween FXR, Vermiere TG, van Raaij MTM (2011) Reproductive toxicants have a threshold of adversity. *Crit Rev Toxicol* 41(6):545–554
- Rhomberg LR, Goodman JE (2012) Low-dose effects and nonmonotonic dose–responses of endocrine disrupting chemicals: has the case been made? *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* 64:130–133
- Rhomberg LR, Goodman JE, Haber LH, Dourson M, Andersen ME, Klaunig JE, Meek B, Price PS, McClellan RO, Cohen SM (2011) Linear low-dose extrapolation for noncancer health effects is the exception, not the rule. *Crit Rev Toxicol* 41(1):1–19
- Sheehan DM (2006) No-threshold dose-response curves for nongenotoxic chemicals: findings and applications for risk assessment. *Environ Res* 100:93–99
- Vandenberg LN, Colborn T, Hayes TB, Heindel JJ, Jacobs DR Jr, Lee DH, Shioda T, Soto AM, Vom Saal FS, Welshons WV, Zoeller RT, Myers JP (2012) Hormones and endocrine-disrupting chemicals: low-dose effects and nonmonotonic dose responses. *Endocr Rev* 33(3):378–455
- Zoeller RT, Brown TR, Doan LL, Gore AC, Skakkebaek NE, Soto AM, Woodruff TJ, Vom Saal FS (2012) Minireview: endocrine-disrupting chemicals and public health protection: a statement of principles from the endocrine society. *Endocrinology* 153(9):1–14