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Review of new data on *Hamamelis virginiana* L., folium et cortex aut ramunculus destillatum

Periodic review (from 2009 to 2018)

Scientific data (e.g. non-clinical and clinical safety data, clinical efficacy data)

- Pharmacovigilance data (e.g. data from EudraVigilance, VigiBase, national databases)
- Scientific/Medical/Toxicological databases (PubMed, TOXLINE). Search period was set from January 2006 to January, 2019. The following key words were used Hamamelis*, witch hazel. 44 references were found and 17 of them were included in the list of references as relevant.
- Other

Regulatory practice
Old market overview in AR (i.e. products fulfilling 30/15 years on the market)

☐ New market overview (including pharmacovigilance actions taken in member states)
☐ Referral
☐ Ph.Eur. monograph
☐ Other

Consistency (e.g. scientific decisions taken by HMPC)
☐ Public statements or other decisions taken by HMPC
☐ Consistency with other monographs within the therapeutic area
☐ Other

**Availability of new information (i.e. likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific data</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New non-clinical safety data likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New clinical safety data likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New data introducing a possibility of a new list entry</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New clinical data regarding the paediatric population or the use during pregnancy and lactation likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New clinical studies introducing a possibility for new WEU indication/preparation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other scientific data likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory practice</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New herbal substances/preparations with 30/15 years of TU</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New herbal substances/preparations with 10 years of WEU</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regulatory practices likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ph. Eur. monograph likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New or revised public statements or other HMPC decisions likely to lead to a relevant change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant inconsistencies with other monographs within the therapeutic area that require a change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant inconsistencies that require a change of the monograph</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and conclusions on the review**

During the review 44 new references not yet available during the first/previous assessment were identified.

16 references were provided by Interested Parties during the Call for data.

Among them, 10 were considered to be relevant for the assessment; most of the references reviewed and summarised the already known properties of Hamamelis. Results of clinical studies describing
the efficacy in dermatitis disease, sensitive scalp, venous insufficiency (in combination) and use in children above 11 years of age have been found. Other references describe new chemical methods for qualitative and quantitative analysis of raw material, primary biological properties such as antioxidant ability and new research on other activities (i.e. antitumoral, antimicrobial effects).

An NTP study with Hamamelis water has been developed and all the results published up to the moment about genetic toxicology yielded negative outcomes, so no toxic effects can be foreseen for Hamamelis folium under the conditions of use reflected in the monograph.

Another NTP study was published in 2013 on pyrogallol about its dermal toxicity. The conclusions of these 3 months to 2 years dermal studies showed that there was no evidence of carcinogenic activity of pyrogallol in male or female rats administered 5, 20 or 75mg/kg. There was equivocal evidence of carcinogenic activity in male mice and some evidence of carcinogenic activity in female mice.

Even the lowest tested dose is much higher than the recommended posology for the different Hamamelis preparations and also the duration of use is much shorter (no more than two weeks).

No new relevant data have been found which could affect the existing monograph and no changes in the regulatory practice have been introduced which could justify a revision of *Hamamelis virginiana* L., cortex et folium monograph.
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b) References that justify the need for the revision of the monograph:

None

**Rapporteur’s proposal on revision**

☐ Revision needed, i.e. new data/findings of relevance for the content of the monograph

☒ No revision needed, i.e. no new data/findings of relevance for the content of the monograph

**HMPC decision on revision**

☐ Revision needed, i.e. new data/findings of relevance for the content of the monograph

☒ No revision needed, i.e. no new data/findings of relevance for the content of the monograph

HMPC agreed with Rapporteurs position that no monograph and list entry revision is needed because no new data of relevance were detected that would change the content of the monograph and list entry.

The HMPC decided by majority not to revise the monograph, list entry, assessment report and list of references on *Hamamelis virginiana* L., folium et cortex aut ramunculus destillatum.