



1 12 July 2012  
2 EMA/CHMP/CVMP/JEG-3Rs/169839/2011-Rev.1  
3 Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)  
4 Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use (CVMP)

5 Revised Concept paper on the need for revision of the  
6 position on the replacement of animal studies by *in vitro*  
7 models (CPMP/SWP/728/95)  
8

Agreed by Joint CVMP/CHMP ad hoc expert group on the application of 3Rs in the regulatory testing of medicinal products	6 July 2012
Adopted by CVMP for release for consultation	12 July 2012
Start of public consultation	25 July 2012
End of consultation (deadline for comments)	28 September 2012

9  
10

Comments should be provided using this [template](#). The completed comments form should be sent to [vet-guidelines@ema.europa.eu](mailto:vet-guidelines@ema.europa.eu)

11

12 The concept paper below was developed by the CHMP Safety Working Party and published for  
13 consultation in March 2011. Following receipt of stakeholder comments and during the ongoing work to  
14 develop a paper describing a process for the regulatory acceptance of 3Rs alternatives (replacement,  
15 reduction and refinement), it has become clear that the approaches under discussion are relevant for  
16 regulatory testing of medicinal products for veterinary use as well as medicinal products for human  
17 use. It is therefore proposed that, while the original concept paper was written particularly with  
18 medicinal products for humans use in mind, as the underlying issues and principles are largely  
19 applicable to both human and veterinary medicinal products, the scope of the final guidance document  
20 to be developed will include both medicinal products for human and veterinary use.

21 This revision to the concept paper provides stakeholders with an opportunity to comment on the  
22 proposed widening of the scope of the work. It is noted that a number of veterinary stakeholders  
23 submitted comments following publication of the original concept paper. There is no need for these  
24 stakeholders to resubmit their comments.

25 It is also noteworthy that since publication of the original concept paper the EMA formed the Joint  
26 CHMP/CVMP ad hoc expert group on the application of the 3Rs in regulatory testing of medicinal



27 products (JEG 3Rs). As this group includes experts on both human and veterinary medicinal products it  
28 has been agreed that the work to develop a process for the regulatory acceptance of 3R alternatives  
29 will be undertaken by the JEG 3Rs in consultation with other relevant CHMP and CVMP working parties.

30 17 March 2011  
31 EMA/CHMP/SWP/169839/2011  
32 Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)

33 **Concept paper on the need for revision of the position on**  
34 **the replacement of animal studies by *in vitro* models**  
35 **(CPMP/SWP/728/95)**  
36

<b>Agreed by Safety Working Party</b>	<b>February 2011</b>
Adoption by CHMP for release for consultation	17 March 2011
End of consultation (deadline for comments)	30 June 2011

37  
38 The proposed Guideline will replace the Position on Replacement of Animal Studies by *in vitro* Methods  
39 (CPMP/SWP/728/95).

40

<b>Keywords</b>	<b><i>reduction, replacement, refinement, in vivo, in vitro, validation, regulatory acceptance</i></b>
-----------------	--

41

## 42 **1. Introduction**

43 A Position on the Replacement of Animal Studies by *in vitro* Models was adopted by the Committee for  
44 Medicinal Product for Human Use (CHMP) in February 1997 [1]. This paper addresses the feasibility of  
45 replacing *in vivo* animal studies by *in vitro* investigations in the non-clinical development of medicinal  
46 products. Furthermore, considerations regarding validation procedures for *in vitro* methods and their  
47 incorporation into CHMP guidelines are presented.

48 Over the past years a shift has been observed towards the regulatory acceptance of scientifically valid  
49 *in vitro* methods as well as formally validated *in vitro* methods as part of an integrated testing  
50 strategy. Moreover focus has broadened to the application of all 3 R's, replacement, reduction and  
51 refinement, whilst historically much emphasis has been placed only on replacement of animal studies  
52 by one or more *in vitro* or *in silico* approaches. Large EU initiatives such as the European Centre for the  
53 Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM) and the European Partnership for Alternative Approaches to  
54 Animal Testing (EPAA) facilitate progress in this field. Finally, the application of all 3 R's is currently  
55 embedded the drafting process of non-clinical regulatory guidance both at EMA and ICH level.

## 56 **2. Problem statement**

57 *In vitro* methods are already an integral part of the non-clinical testing programme of human medicinal  
58 products, either as pivotal, supportive or as exploratory studies. Moreover, approaches aiming at  
59 reducing or refining animal studies are routinely implemented in regulatory guidelines, where  
60 applicable. As such, although regulatory acceptance of 3R alternatives is currently possible via multiple  
61 and flexible approaches, at present there is no clearly defined process for regulatory acceptance of all  
62 3R alternatives (refinement, reduction and replacement).

63 Taking into account the progress in the field of the 3R's as described above, a thorough revision of the  
64 Position on the Replacement of Animal Studies by *in vitro* Models [1] is needed in order to ensure that:

- 65 • the focus is extended to include replacement, reduction and refinement alternatives;
- 66 • a process for regulatory acceptance of all 3R alternatives (replacement, reduction and refinement)  
67 is described;
- 68 • different possible approaches for regulatory acceptance of 3R alternatives are clearly described,  
69 and therefore the need for formal validation studies *versus* proof of scientific validity should be  
70 discussed;
- 71 • if applicable, formal validation requirements are updated according to the current state-of-the-art;
- 72 • and the legal requirements related to the application of the 3Rs as per Directive 2010/63/EC are  
73 adequately reflected.

74 This revision includes a change in title of the guideline to be developed as compared to the current  
75 position paper in order to take into account the above considerations.

## 76 **3. Discussion (on the problem statement)**

77 The field of the 3 Rs has significantly evolved since the Position on the Replacement of Animal Studies  
78 by *in vitro* models was adopted in 1997 [1].

79 Although non-clinical studies still heavily rely on animal data, adherence to the 3Rs principles is clearly  
80 evident both at the EU and ICH level.

81 Various *in vitro* test systems are currently used for different purposes and at different time-points  
82 within the non-clinical development programme. These include both formally validated tests (e.g. 3T3  
83 NRU phototoxicity test [2], *in vitro* micronucleus test [3]) and *in vitro* methods that have been  
84 'historically' introduced or models for which there is sufficient scientific validity based on accumulated  
85 experiences (e.g. *in vitro* genotoxicity tests [3], hERG assay [4]). Additionally, supportive mechanistic  
86 data are predominantly obtained in *in vitro* models of proven scientific validity (e.g. mitochondrial  
87 toxicity of HIV drugs) [5]. And finally, the use of *in vitro* methods for the purpose of compound  
88 screening by pharmaceutical companies is subject only to in-house validation.

89 In addition, the introduction of tailor-made non-clinical testing strategies, involving both *in vivo* and *in*  
90 *vitro* testing, in the recently adopted ICH guidelines M3 (R2) [6] and S9 [7] is expected to entail a  
91 significant reduction of animal use. At the EU level, the recognition that data obtained in traditional  
92 single dose toxicity studies are of limited value and that information on acute toxicity can be obtained  
93 in other types of toxicity studies, led to the removal of the 3BS1a Single Dose Toxicity guideline [8].  
94 This will reduce the number of animals used for testing and will contribute to animal welfare.

95 Finally the introduction of *in silico* approaches (e.g. DEREK [9]) as part of a tiered non-clinical testing  
96 strategy also contributes to a reduction of animal use.

97 The full revision of Directive 86/609/EC was recently completed and resulted in the adoption of  
98 Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes on 3 June 2010 [10].  
99 This Directive will take effect on 1 January 2013. Different articles relate to the application of the 3R's.  
100 As such, article 4 clearly states that:

101 Member States shall ensure that, wherever possible, a scientifically satisfactory method or testing  
102 strategy, not entailing the use of live animals, shall be used instead of a procedure<sup>1</sup>.

103 Member States shall ensure that the number of animals used in projects is reduced to a minimum  
104 without compromising the objectives of the project.

105 Member States shall ensure refinement of breeding, accommodation and care, and of methods used in  
106 procedures, eliminating or reducing to the minimum any possible pain, suffering, distress or lasting  
107 harm to the animals.

108 Also article 13 states that:

109 1. Without prejudice to national legislation prohibiting certain types of methods, Member States shall  
110 ensure that a procedure is not carried out if another method or testing strategy for obtaining the result  
111 sought, not entailing the use of a live animal, is recognised under the legislation of the Union.

112 2. In choosing between procedures, those which to the greatest extent meet the following  
113 requirements shall be selected:

114 (a) use the minimum number of animals;

115 (b) involve animals with the lowest capacity to experience pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm;

116 (c) cause the least pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm;

117 (d) and are most likely to provide satisfactory results.

118 Therefore, the Position on the Replacement of Animal Studies by *in vitro* Models [1] should be  
119 thoroughly revised (including a change in title) in order to take into account scientific and legislative

---

<sup>1</sup> A 'procedure' means any use, invasive or non-invasive, of an animal for experimental or other scientific purposes, with known or unknown outcome, or educational purposes, which may cause the animal a level of pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm equivalent to, or higher than, that caused by the introduction of a needle in accordance with the good veterinary practice [10].

120 progress and to formulate guidance on when and how 3R alternatives (replacement, reduction and  
121 refinement) can be considered for regulatory acceptance.

## 122 **4. Recommendation**

123 The CHMP recommends revising the Position on the Replacement of Animal Studies by *in vitro* Models  
124 [1] (including a change in title) in order to propose a clear process for regulatory acceptance of 3R  
125 alternatives (replacement, reduction and refinement) in regulatory non-clinical testing of medicinal  
126 products in line with current scientific progress and legislative requirements.

## 127 **5. Proposed timetable**

128 It is anticipated that a draft of the revised guideline may be released for consultation in 2011.

## 129 **6. Resource requirements for preparation**

130 The preparation of this guideline will involve the Safety Working Party of the CHMP and if appropriate  
131 an *ad hoc* working group on this area.

## 132 **7. Impact assessment (anticipated)**

133 The revised guideline is expected to provide clear information on the conditions and strategy for  
134 regulatory acceptance of 3R (replacement, reduction and refinement) alternative methods. This is  
135 anticipated to facilitate regulatory acceptance of 3R alternatives and thus to reduce animal use in non-  
136 clinical testing conducted to support the conduct of clinical trials and marketing authorisation.

## 137 **8. Interested parties**

138 Animal welfare organisations and relevant research organisations on alternative approaches to animal  
139 testing.

## 140 **9. References to literature, guidelines, etc.**

- 141 1. Position adopted by the CPMP on 19 February 1997 on Replacement of Animal Studies by *in vitro*  
142 Methods (CPMP/SWP/728/95).
- 143 2. Note for Guidance on Photosafety Testing (CPMP/SWP/398/01).
- 144 3. Note for Guidance on Genotoxicity Testing and Data Interpretation for Pharmaceuticals intended  
145 for Human Use (EMA/CHMP/ICH/126642/2008).
- 146 4. Note for Guidance on the Nonclinical Evaluation of the Potential for Delayed Ventricular  
147 Repolarization (QT Interval Prolongation) by Human Pharmaceuticals (CPMP/ICH/423/02).
- 148 5. Reflection Paper on *in vitro* Investigation of Mitochondrial Toxicity of Anti-HIV Nucleoside Reverse  
149 Transcriptase Inhibitors (EMA/CHMP/SWP/8212/2007).
- 150 6. Note for Guidance on Non-Clinical Safety Studies for the Conduct of Human Clinical Trials and  
151 Marketing Authorization for Pharmaceuticals (CPMP/ICH/286/95).
- 152 7. Note for Guidance on Nonclinical Evaluation for Anticancer Pharmaceuticals  
153 (EMA/CHMP/ICH/646107/2008).

- 154 8. Questions and answers on the withdrawal of the 'Note for guidance on single dose toxicity'  
155 (EMA/CHMP/SWP/81714/2010).
- 156 9. Questions and answers on the 'Guideline on the limits of genotoxic impurities'  
157 (EMA/CHMP/SWP/431994/2007 Rev. 3)
- 158 10. Directive 2010/63/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010 on the  
159 protection of animals used for scientific purposes (OJ L 276/33).