

Weight of the Evidence – Aggregated Sources

(non-sequenced – may be redundant non-sorted entries)

Ågerstrand M and Beronius A, 2016. Weight of evidence evaluation and systematic review in EU chemical risk assessment: Foundation is laid but guidance is needed. *Environment International*, 92–93, 590–596. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.10.008>

ANSES, 2016. Evaluation du poids des preuves à l'Anses: revue critique de la littérature et recommandations à l'étape d'identification des dangers. Rapport d'expertise collective. Saisine 2015-SA-0089, 116 pp.

Becker RA, Ankley GT, Edwards SW, Kennedy SW, Linkov L, Meek B, Sachana M, Segner H, Van Der Burg B, Villeneuve DL, Watanabe H and Barton-Maclaren TS, 2015. Increasing Scientific Confidence in adverse outcome pathways: application of tailored bradford-hill considerations for evaluating weight of evidence. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 72, 514–537.

Beronius A, Molander L, Rudén C and Hanberg A, 2014. Facilitating the use of non-standard in vivo studies in health risk assessment of chemicals: a proposal to improve evaluation criteria and reporting. *Journal of Applied Toxicology*, 34, 607–617. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jat.2991>

Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT and Rothstein HR, 2009. *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Wiley, Chichester, UK.

CEE (Collaboration for Environmental Evidence), 2016. Systematic mapping. Available online: http://environmentalevidence.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/EE_InstructionsforAuthors_SYSTMAPS.pdf

Chapman PM, McDonald BG and Lawrence GS, 2002. Weight-of-evidence issues and frameworks for sediment quality (and other) assessments. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal*, 8, 1489–1515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20028091057457>

Collier ZA, Gust KA, Gonzalez-Morales B, Gong P, Wilbanks MS, Linkov I and Perkins EJ, 2016. A weight of evidence assessment approach for adverse outcome pathways. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 75, 46–57.

Doi SAR, 2014. Evidence synthesis for medical decision making and the appropriate use of quality scores. *Clinical Medical Research*, 12, 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.3121/cm.2013.1188>

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency), 2010. Practical guide 2: how to report weight of evidence. ECHA, Helsinki, pp. 1–26.

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency), 2015a. Guidance on the Application of the CLP Criteria Guidance to Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 on classification, labelling and packaging (CLP) of substances and mixtures Version 5.0 July 2017

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency), 2015b. ECHA Guidance on biocides legislation. Available from: <https://echa.europa.eu/guidance-documents/guidance-on-biocides-legislation>

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency), 2016. Practical guide. How to use and report (Q)SARs. Version. 3.1. Available online: https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13655/pg_report_qsars_en.pdf

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2006. Transparency in risk assessment carried out by EFSA: guidance document on procedural aspects. *EFSA Journal* 2006;4(5):353, 16 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2006.353>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2009. Guidance of the Scientific Committee on transparency in the scientific aspects of risk assessments carried out by EFSA. Part 2: general principles. *EFSA Journal* 2009;7(5): 1051, 22 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2009.1051>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2010a. Application of systematic review methodology to food and feed safety assessments to support decision making. *EFSA Journal* 2010;8(6):1637, 90 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1637>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2010b. Guidance on a harmonised framework for pest risk assessment and the identification and evaluation of pest risk management options. *EFSA Journal* 2010;8(2):1495, 66 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1495>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2011. EFSA Scientific Committee; Statistical Significance and Biological Relevance. *EFSA Journal* 2011;9(9):2372, 17 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2011.2372>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2012. Guidance on selected default values to be used by the EFSA Scientific Committee, Scientific Panels and Units in the absence of actual measured data. *EFSA Journal* 2012;10(3):2579 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2579>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014a. Discussion Paper - Transformation to an “Open EFSA”. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014b. Guidance on expert knowledge elicitation in food and feed safety risk assessment. *EFSA Journal* 2014;12(6):3734, 35 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3734>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014c. Guidance on statistical reporting. *EFSA Journal* 2014;12(12):3908, 18 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3908>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014d. Systematic review guidance.

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015a. Editorial: increasing robustness, transparency and openness of scientific assessments. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(3):e13031, 3 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.e13031>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015b. Scientific report on principles and process for dealing with data and evidence in scientific assessments. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(5):4121, 35 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4121>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2016a. Guidance on Uncertainty in EFSA Scientific Assessment - Draft version for internal testing. Available online: <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/unvertainty>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2016b. Scientific opinion on the evaluation of the safety and efficacy of Listex™ P100 for reduction of pathogens on different ready-to-eat (RTE) food products. *EFSA Journal* 2016;14(8):4565, 94 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4565>

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2016c. Guidance to develop specific protection goals options for environmental risk assessment at EFSA, in relation to biodiversity and ecosystem services. *EFSA Journal* 2016;14(6):4499, 50 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2016.4499>

EFSA ANS Panel (EFSA Panel on Food Additives and Nutrient Sources added to Food (ANS)), 2012. Guidance for submission for food additive evaluations. *EFSA Journal* 2012;10(7):2760, 60 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2760>. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal

EFSA Scientific Committee, 2013. Scientific Opinion on Priority topics for the development of risk assessment guidance by EFSA's Scientific Committee. *EFSA Journal* 2013;11(8):3345, 20 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3345>

EFSA Scientific Committee, Hardy A, Benford D, Halldorsson T, Jeger MJ, Knutsen HK, More S, Younes M, Naegeli H, Noteborn H, Ockleford C, Ricci A, Rychen G, Schlatter JR, Silano V, Solecki R, Turck D, Bresson J-L, Griffin J, Hougaard Benekou S, van Loveren H, Luttik R, Messean A, Penninks A, Ru G, Stegeman JA, dervan Werf W, Westendorf J, Woutersen RA, Barizzone F, Bottex B, Lanzoni A, Georgiadis N and Alexander J, 2017. Guidance on biological relevance. *EFSA Journal* 2017;15(8):4970, 73 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4970>

EPA, 2003. EPA 100/B-03/001 June 2003 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency A Summary of General Assessment Factors for Evaluating the Quality of Scientific and Technical Information Prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by members of the Assessment Factors Workgroup, a group of the EPA's Science Policy Council.

Gosling JP, Andy Hart H, Owen David M, Li J and MacKay C, 2013. A Bayes linear approach to 25 weight-of-evidence risk assessment for skin allergy. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8, 169–186.

Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, Norris S, Falck-Ytter Y, Glasziou P, DeBeer H, Jaeschke R, Rind D, Meerpohl J, Dahm P, Schunemann HJ, 2011. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction- GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 64, 383–394.

Higgins J and Green S, 2011. *Cochrane 5 Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Available online: <http://handbook.cochrane.org>

Higgins JP, Thompson SG and Spiegelhalter DJ, 2015. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 172, 137–159.

Hill AB, 1965. The environment and the disease: association or causation?. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine Royal Society of Medicine*, 58, 295–300.

Hull RN and Swanson S, 2006. Sequential analysis of lines of evidence--an advanced weight-of-evidence approach for ecological risk assessment. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 2, 302–311.

IARC, 2006. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans - Preamble. World Health Organization International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France.

IPCS (International Programme on Chemical Safety), 2004. IPCS Risk Assessment Terminology. International Programme on Chemical Safety, WHO, Geneva.

James KL, Randall NP and Haddaway NR, 2016. A methodology for systematic mapping in environmental sciences. *Environmental Evidence*, 5, 1.

Li Y and Ngom A, 2015. "Data integration in machine learning," *Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*. 2015 IEEE International Conference on, Washington, DC, 2015, pp. 1665–1671. <https://doi.org/10.1109/bibm.2015.7359925>. Available online: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=7359925&isnumber=7359638>

Linkov I, Loney D, Cormier S, Satterstrom FK and Bridges T, 2009. Weight-of-evidence evaluation in environmental assessment: review of qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Science of the Total Environment*, 407, 5199–5205.

Linkov I, Welle P, Loney D, Tkachuk A, Canis L, Kim JB and Bridges T, 2011. Use of multicriteria decision analysis to support weight of evidence evaluation. *Risk Analysis*, 31, 1211–1225.

Linkov I, Massey O, Keisler J, Rusyn I and Hartung T, 2015. From "weight of evidence" to quantitative data integration using multicriteria decision analysis and Bayesian methods. *Altex*, 32, 3–8.

Lorenz RR, Goodman JE, Bailey LA, Prueitt RL, Beck NB, Bevan C, Honeycutt M, Kaminski NE, Paoli G, Pottenger LH, Scherer RH, Wise KC and Becker RA, 2013. A survey of frameworks for best practices in weight-of-evidence analyses. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 43, 753–784.

Meek ME (Bette), Palermo CM, Bachman AN, North CM and Lewis RJ, 2014. Mode of action human relevance (species concordance) framework: evolution of the Bradford Hill considerations and comparative analysis of weight of evidence. *Journal of Applied Toxicology*, 34, 595–606. Published online 2014 Feb 10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jat.2984>

Moermond C, Beasley A, Breton R, Junghans M, Laskowski R, Solomon K and Zahner H, 2017. Assessing the reliability of ecotoxicological studies: An overview of current needs and approaches. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, 13, 640–651. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.1870>

Morgan RL, Thayer KA, Bero L, Bruce N, Falck-Ytter Y, Ghersi D, Guyatt G, Hooijmans C, Langendam M, Mandrioli D, Mustafa RA, Rehfuss EA, Rooney AA, Shea B, Silbergeld EK, Sutton P, Wolfe MS, Woodruff TJ, Verbeek JH, Holloway AC, Santesso N and Schünemann HJ, 2016. GRADE: Assessing the quality of evidence in environmental and occupational health. *Environment International*, 92-93, 611–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.01.004>. Epub 2016 Jan 27.

National Research Council (U.S.) Committee on Improving Risk Analysis Approaches Used by the U.S. EPA, 2009. Science and decisions: Advancing risk assessment/ Committee on Improving Risk Analysis Approaches Used by the U.S. EPA, Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, Division on Earth and Life studies.

NTP (National Toxicology Program), 2015. Handbook for Preparing Report on Carcinogens Monographs July 20, 2015. Available online: https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/roc/handbook/roc_handbook_508.pdf

OECD, 2016. Users' Handbook supplement to the Guidance Document for developing and assessing Adverse Outcome Pathways, OECD Series on Adverse Outcome Pathways, No. 1, OECD Publishing, Paris. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.1787/5jlv1m9d1g32-en>

OHAT, 2015. Handbook for Conducting a Literature-Based Health Assessment Using OHAT Approach for Systematic Review and Evidence Integration. Research Triangle Park, NC: 30 OHAT.

OSHA, 2016. Guidance on data evaluation for weight of evidence determination: application to the 2012 Hazard Communication Standard.

Oxford Dictionaries, 2017. Available from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/>

Perkins EJ, Antczak P, Burgoon L, Falciani F, Garcia-Reyero N, Gutsell S, Hodges G, Kienzler A, Knapen D, McBride M and Willett C, 2015. Adverse outcome pathways for regulatory applications: examination of four case studies with different degrees of completeness and scientific confidence. *Toxicological Sciences*, 148, 14–25.

SCENIHR (Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks), 2012. Memorandum on the use of the scientific literature for human health risk assessment purposes – weighing of evidence and expression of uncertainty, 19 March, 2012.

SCHER, SCENIHR, SCCS, 2013. Making risk assessment more relevant for risk management. Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks, Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks, and Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety. March 2013.

Small MJ, 2008. Methods for assessing uncertainty in fundamental assumptions and associated models for cancer risk assessment. *Risk Analysis*, 28, 1289–1308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2008.01134.x>

Staples C, Mihaich E, Carbone J, Woodburn K and Klecka G, 2004. A weight of evidence analysis of the chronic ecotoxicity of nonylphenol ethoxylates, nonylphenol ether carboxylates, and nonylphenol. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment*, 10, 999–1017.

Suter II GW, 2016. Weight of evidence in ecological assessment. Document EPA/100/R16/001. Risk Assessment Forum, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Washington, DC 20460.

Suter GW 2nd and Cormier SM, 2011. Why and how to combine evidence in environmental assessments: weighing evidence and building cases. *Science of the Total Environment*, 409, 1406–1417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.12.029>. Epub 2011 Jan 31.

Sutton AJ and Abrams KR, 2001. Bayesian methods in meta-analysis and evidence synthesis. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 10, 277–303.

Thayer KA and Schünemann HJ, 2016. Using GRADE to respond to health questions with different levels of urgency. *Environment International*, 92–93, 585–589.

Turner RM, Spiegelhalter DJ, Gordon C, Smith S and Thompson SG, 2009. Bias modelling in evidence synthesis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A*, 172, 21–47.

US EPA (US Environmental Protection Agency), 1998. Guidelines for Ecological Risk Assessment. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC.

US EPA (US Environmental Protection Agency), 2000. Risk Characterization Handbook. Science Policy Council, US EPA, Washington DC.

Vermeire T, Aldenberg T, Buist H, Escher S, Mangelsdorf I, Pauné E, Rorije E and Kroese D, 2013. OSIRIS, a quest for proof of principle for integrated testing strategies of chemicals for four human health endpoints. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* 67, 136–145.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2013.01.007>

WCRF/AICR, 2007. Second expert report - food, nutrition, physical activity and the prevention of cancer: a global perspective systematic literature review - specification manual.

Weed D, 2005. Weight of evidence: a review of concept and methods. *Risk Analysis*, 25, 1545–1557.

WHO (World Health Organization), 2009. Food Safety. Project to update the principles and methods for the assessment of chemicals in food. Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food. EHC 240. ISBN 978 92 4 157240 8.

Wittwehr C, Aladjov H, Ankley H, Byrne HJ and de Knecht HJ, 2016. How adverse outcome pathways can aid the development and use of computational prediction models for regulatory toxicology. *Toxicological Sciences*, 155, 326–336.

EFSA Scientific Committee, Hardy A, Benford D, Halldorsson T, Jeger MJ, Knutsen HK, More S, Naegeli H, Noteborn H, Ockleford C, Ricci A, Rychen G, Schlatter JR, Silano V, Solecki R, Turck D, Benfenati E, Chaudhry QM, Craig P, Frampton G, Greiner M, Hart A, Hogstrand C, Lambre C, Luttik R, Makowski D, Siani A, Wahlstroem H, Aguilera J, Dorne J-L, Fernandez Dumont A, Hempen M, Valtueña Martínez S, Martino L, Smeraldi C, Terron A, Georgiadis N and Younes M, 2017. Scientific Opinion on the guidance on the use of the weight of evidence approach in scientific assessments. *EFSA Journal* 2017;15(8):4971, 69 pp. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4971>

Dorne JLCM, Bottex B, Merten C, Germini A, Georgiadis N, Aiassa E, Martino L, Rhomberg L, Clewell HJ, Greiner M, Suter GW, Whelan M, Hart ADM, Knight D, Agarwal P, Younes M, Alexander J and Hardy AR, 2016. Special issue: weighing evidence and assessing uncertainties. *EFSA Journal* 2016;14(S1):s0511, 13 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2016.s0511 (“*Methodologies for integrating (weighing) evidence and assessing uncertainties are of utmost importance to ensure that scientific assessments are transparent, robust and fit for purpose to support decision-makers.*”)

NRC (National Research Council). Review of the Environmental Protection Agency's Draft IRIS Assessment of Formaldehyde. Committee to Review EPA's Draft IRIS Assessment of Formaldehyde. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2011.

Rhomberg LR, Goodman JE, Bailey LA, Prueitt RL, Beck NB, Bevan C, Honeycutt M, Kaminski NE, Paoli G, Pottenger LH, Scherer RW, Wise KC, Becker RA. A survey of frameworks for best practices in weight-of-evidence analyses. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2013; 43(9):753–784.

Weed DL. Weight of evidence: A review of concepts and methods. *Risk Analysis*, 2005; 25:1545–1557.

Boobis AR, Cohen SM, Dellarco V, McGregor D, Meek ME, Vickers C, Willcocks D, Farland W. IPCS framework for analyzing the relevance of a cancer mode of action for humans. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2006; 36:781–792.

Boobis AR, Doe JE, Heinrich-Hirsch B, Meek ME, Munn S, Ruchirawat M, Schlatter J, Seed J, Vickers C. IPCS framework for analyzing the relevance of a noncancer mode of action for humans. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2008; 38:87–96.

Meek ME, Bucher JR, Cohen SM, Dellarco V, Hill RN, Lehman-McKeeman LD, Longfellow DG, Pastoor T, Seed J, Patton DE. A framework for human relevance analysis of information on carcinogenic modes of action. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2003; 33:591–653.

Hill AB. The environment and disease: Association or causation? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1965; 58:295–300.

Rhomberg LR. Hypothesis-Based Weight of Evidence: An Approach to Assessing Causation and its Application to Regulatory Toxicology, *Risk Analysis*, 2015, 35: 1114–1124. doi:10.1111/risa.12206.

Rhomberg LR, Bailey LA, Goodman JE. Hypothesis-based weight of evidence: A tool for evaluating and communicating uncertainties and inconsistencies in the large body of evidence in proposing a carcinogenic mode of action—Naphthalene as an example. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2010; 40(8):671–696.

Rhomberg LR, Bailey LA, Goodman JE, Hamade AK, Mayfield DB. Is exposure to formaldehyde in air causally associated with leukemia?—A hypothesis-based weight-of-evidence analysis. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2011; 41(7):555–621.

Prueitt RL, Goodman JE, Bailey LA, Rhomberg LR. Hypothesis-based weight of evidence evaluation of the neurodevelopmental effects of chlorpyrifos. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 2011; 42(10):822–903.

Bailey LA, Prueitt RL, Rhomberg LR. Hypothesis-based weight-of-evidence evaluation of methanol as a human carcinogen. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 2012; 62:278–291.

Lutter, R., Abbott, L., Becker, R., Borgert, C., Bradley, A., Charnley, G., Dudley, S., Felsot, A., Golden, N., Gray, G., Juberg, D., Mitchell, M., Rachman, N., Rhomberg, L., Solomon, K., Sundlof, S. and Willett, K. (2015), Improving Weight of Evidence Approaches to Chemical Evaluations. *Risk Analysis*, 35: 186–192. doi:10.1111/risa.12277

Aiassa E, Higgins JP, Frampton GK, Greiner M, Afonso A, Amzal B, Deeks J, Dorne JL, Glanville J, Lövei GL and Nienstedt K, 2015. Applicability and feasibility of systematic review for performing evidence-based risk assessment in food and feed safety. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 55, 1026–1034. doi: 10.1080/10408398.2013.769933

Bailey LA, Nascarella MA, Kerper LE and Rhomberg LR, 2016. Hypothesis-based weight-of-evidence evaluation and risk assessment for naphthalene carcinogenesis. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 46, 1–42. doi: 10.3109/10408444.2015.1061477

Benfenati E, Berggren E, Fritsche E, Hartung T, William Slikker W Jr, Spielmann H, Testai E, Tice RR, Tiramani M and Villenave R, 2016. Novel chemical hazard characterisation approaches. In: EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015. *Shaping the Future of Food Safety, Together: Proceedings of the 2nd EFSA Scientific Conference*. Milan, Italy, 14–16 October 2015. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(10):s1310. 38–41 pp. doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2015.s1310

Boobis AR, Cohen SM, Dellarco V, McGregor D, Meek ME, Vickers C, Willcocks D and Farland W, 2006. IPCS framework for analyzing the relevance of a cancer mode of action for humans. *Critical*

Reviews in Toxicology, 36, 781–792. doi: 10.1080/10408440600977677

Boobis AR, Doe JE, Heinrich-Hirsch B, Meek ME, Munn S, Ruchirawat M, Schlatter J, Seed J and Vickers C, 2008. IPCS framework for analyzing the relevance of a noncancer mode of action for humans. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 38, 87–96. doi: 10.1080/10408440701749421

Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT and Rothstein HR, 2009. *Introduction to meta-analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey. 452 pp.

Burden N, Sewell F, Andersen ME, Boobis A, Chipman JK, Cronin MT, Hutchinson TH, Kimber I and Whelan M, 2015. Adverse outcome pathways can drive non-animal approaches for safety assessment. *Journal of Applied Toxicology*, 35, 971–975. doi: 10.1002/jat.3165

Cassini A, Hathaway S, Havelaar A, Koopmans M, Koutsoumanis K, Messens W, Müller-Seitz G, Nørrung B, Rizzi V and Scheutz F, 2015. Microbiological risk assessment. In: EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015. *Shaping the Future of Food Safety, Together: Proceedings of the 2nd EFSA Scientific Conference*. Milan, Italy, 14–16 October 2015. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(10):s1310. 38–41 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2015.s1310

Devos Y, Gaugitsch H, Gray AJ, Maltby L, Martin J, Pettis JS, Romeis J, Rortais A, Schoonjans R, Smith J, Streissl F and Suter GW II, 2016. Special issue: advancing environmental risk assessment of regulated products under EFSA's remit. *EFSA Journal* 2016;14(S1):s0508, 13 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2016.s0508

ECHA (European Chemicals Agency), 2012. *Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment*. Chapter R.19: Uncertainty analysis. ECHA, Helsinki. 36 pp. Available online: http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13632/information_requirements_r19_en.pdf

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2006. *Guidance of the Scientific Committee on a request from EFSA related to Uncertainties in Dietary Exposure Assessment*. *EFSA Journal* 2006;4(1):438, 1–54. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2007.438

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2010. *Application of systematic review methodology to food and feed safety assessments to support decision making*. *EFSA Journal* 2010;8(6):1637, 90 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2010.1637

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2014. *Modern methodologies and tools for human hazard assessment of chemicals*. *EFSA Journal* 2014;12(4):3638, 87 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3638

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015a. *Editorial: increasing robustness, transparency and openness of scientific assessments*. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(3):e13031, 3 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2015.e13031

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015b. *Scientific report on Principles and process for dealing with data and evidence in scientific assessments*. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13(5):4121, 35 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4121

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015c. *Outcome of the targeted consultation of the EFSA Journal editorial on increasing openness, robustness and transparency of scientific assessments*. EFSA supporting publication 2015:EN-785, 26 pp.

EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2016. Draft Guidance document on Uncertainty in Scientific Assessment. Public consultation version. Available online: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/?files/consultation/150618.pdf>

EFSA BIOHAZ Panel, 2015. Scientific Opinion on the development of a risk ranking toolbox for the EFSA BIOHAZ Panel. *EFSA Journal* 2015;13:3939, 131 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2015.3939

European Commission, 2014. EURL ECVAM Status Report on the Development, Validation and Regulatory Acceptance of Alternative Methods and Approaches. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 84 pp. doi: 10.2788/86047

Fazil A, Rajic A, Sanchez J and McEwen S, 2008. Choices, choices: the application of multi-criteria decision analysis to a food safety decision-making problem. *Journal of Food Protection*, 71, 2323–2333.

Goodman JE, Boyce CP, Pizzurro DM and Rhomberg LR, 2014. Strengthening the foundation of next generation risk assessment. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 68, 160–170. doi: 10.1016/j.yrtph.2013.12.002

Hartung T, Hoffmann S and Stephens M, 2013. Mechanistic validation. *ALTEX*, 30, 119–130. doi: 10.14573/altex.2013.2.119

Health Canada, 2011, online. Weight of evidence: factors to consider for appropriate and timely action in a foodborne illness outbreak investigation. Available online: <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/fn-an/pubs/securit/2011-food-illness-outbreak-eclosion-malad-ailments/index-eng.php> [Accessed: 10 October 2015]

Higgins JP, Thompson SG and Spiegelhalter DJ, 2009. A re-evaluation of random-effects meta-analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A, (Statistics in Society)*, 172, 137–159. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-985X.2008.00552.x

IPCS (International Programme on Chemical Safety), 2008. Guidance Document on Characterizing and Communicating Uncertainty in Exposure Assessment. IPCS Harmonization Project Document No. 6, Part 1. World Health Organization, Geneva, 138 pp. Available online: <http://www.who.int/ipcs/methods/harmonization/areas/uncertainty%20.pdf>

IPCS (International Programme on Chemical Safety), 2014. Guidance Document on Evaluating and Expressing Uncertainty in Hazard Assessment. IPCS Harmonization Project Document No. 11. World Health Organization, Geneva, 158 pp. Available online: http://www.who.int/?ipcs/methods/harmonization/uncertainty_in_hazard_characterization.pdf

Linkov I, Long EB, Cormier SM, Satterstrom FK and Bridges T, 2009. Weight-of-evidence evaluation in environmental assessment: review of qualitative and quantitative approaches. *Science of The Total Environment*, 497, 5199–5205. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.05.004

CrossRef |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 76

Meek ME, Boobis A, Cote I, Dellarco V, Fotakis G, Munn S, Seed J and Vickers C, 2014. New developments in the evolution and application of the WHO/IPCS framework on mode of action/species concordance analysis. *Journal of Applied Toxicology*, 34, 1–18. doi: 10.1002/jat.2949

Wiley Online Library |

PubMed |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 38

Moon H, Kim HJ, Chen JJ and Kodell RL, 2005. Model averaging using the Kullback information criterion in estimating effective doses for microbial infection and illness. *Risk Analysis*, 25, 1147–1159. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2005.00676.x

Wiley Online Library |

PubMed |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 22

NRC (National Research Council), 2007. *Toxicity testing in the 21st Century: a vision and a strategy*. The National Academies Press, Washington, 216 pp. doi: 10.17226/11970

Olivieri AW, Seto E, Cooper RC, Cahn MD, Colford J, Crook J, Debroux JF, Mandrell R, Suslow T, Tchobanoglous G and Hultquist RA, 2014. Risk-based review of California's water-recycling criteria for agricultural irrigation. *Journal of Environmental Engineering*, 140, 04014015. doi:

10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0000833

CrossRef |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 1

Prueitt RL, Goodman JE, Bailey LA and Rhomberg LR, 2011. Hypothesis-based weight-of-evidence evaluation of the neurodevelopmental effects of chlorpyrifos. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 41, 822–903. doi: 10.3109/10408444.2011.616877

CrossRef |

PubMed |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 12

Rhomberg L, 2015. *Hypothesis-Based Weight of Evidence: an Approach to Assessing Causation and its Application to Regulatory Toxicology*. *Risk Analysis*, 35, 1114–1124. doi: 10.1111/risa.12206

Wiley Online Library |

PubMed |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 1

Rhomberg LR, Goodman JE, Bailey LA, Prueitt RL, Beck NB, Bevan C, Honeycutt M, Kaminski NE, Paoli G, Pottenger LH, Scherer RW, Wise KC and Becker RA, 2013. A survey of frameworks for best practices in weight-of-evidence analyses. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*, 43, 753–784. doi:

10.3109/10408444.2013.832727

CrossRef |

PubMed |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 20

SCHER, SCENIHR, and SCCS (Scientific Committee on Health and Environmental Risks), (Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks) (Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety), 2013. Addressing the New Challenges for Risk Assessment, March 2013.

Sonich-Mullin C, Fielder R, Wiltse J, Baetcke K, Dempsey J, Fenner-Crisp P, Grant D, Hartley M, Knaap A, Kroese D, Mangelsdorf I, Meek E, Rice J and Younes M, 2001. IPCS conceptual framework for evaluating a mode of action for chemical carcinogenesis. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 34, 146–152.

CrossRef |

PubMed |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 177

Suter GW II and Cormier SM, 2011. Why and how to combine evidence in environmental assessments: weighing evidence and building cases. *Science of the Total Environment*, 409, 1406–1417. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.12.029

CrossRef |

PubMed |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 27

Thomas RS, Philbert MA, Auerbach SS, Wetmore BA, Devito MJ, Cote I, Rowlands JC, Whelan MP, Hays SM, Andersen ME, Meek ME, Reiter LW, Lambert JC, Clewell HJ, Stephens ML, Zhao QJ, Wesselkamper SC, Flowers L, Carney EW, Pastoor TP, Petersen DD, Yauk CL and Nong A, 2013. Incorporating new technologies into toxicity testing and risk assessment: moving from 21st century vision to a data-driven framework. *Toxicological Sciences*, 136, 4–18. doi: 10.1093/toxsci/kft178

CrossRef |

PubMed |

CAS |

Web of Science® Times Cited: 58

US-EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), 2013. Next Generation Risk Assessment: Incorporation of Recent Advances in Molecular, Computational, and Systems Biology. Available online: <http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/risk/recordisplay.cfm?deid=259936#Download>

Vik J, Hexemer A and Farber J, 2014. Summary: weight of evidence-factors to consider when investigating a food-borne illness outbreak. *Canada Communicable Disease Report*, 40, 303 pp.

Weed DL, 2005. Weight of evidence: a review of concepts and methods. *Risk Analysis*, 25, 1545–1557. doi: 10.1111/j.1539-6924.2005.00699.x

Wiley Online Library |
PubMed |
Web of Science® Times Cited: 130

WHO (World Health Organization), 2014. Guidance document on evaluating and expressing uncertainty in hazard characterization. Harmonization Project Document 11. WHO, Geneva, 158 pp. available online: <http://www.inchem.org/documents/harmproj/harmproj/harmproj11.pdf>

WHO/FAO (World Health Organization) (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2003. Hazard characterization for pathogens in food and water: guidelines. Microbiological Risk Assessment Series, No. 3. WHO, Geneva, 76 pp. Available online: <http://www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/pathogen/en/>

WHO/FAO (World Health Organization) (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2008. Exposure assessment of microbiological hazards in food. Microbiological Risk Assessment Series, No. 7. WHO, Geneva, 102 pp. Available online: <http://www.who.int/foodsafety/publications/micro/MRA7.pdf>

WHO/FAO (World Health Organization) (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2009a. Risk Characterization of microbiological hazards in food. Microbiological Risk Assessment Series, No. 17 WHO, Geneva, 135 pp.

WHO/FAO (World Health Organization) (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2009b. Annex 1: Glossary of terms. In: Environmental Health Criteria 240: Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food. WHO, Geneva, 45 pp. Available online: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/44065/13/WHO_EHC_240_13_eng_Annex1.pdf

Weed, D. L. (2005). Weight of evidence: a review of concept and method. *Risk Analysis*, 25(6), 1545-1557.

Hill, A. B. (1965). The environment and disease: Association or causation? *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 58, 295-300.

Pothos, E. M., and Ward, R. (2000). Symmetry, repetition, and figural goodness: An investigation of the weight of evidence theory. *Cognition*, 75(3), B65-78.

Krimsky, S. (2005). The weight of scientific evidence in policy and law. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95 (S1), S129-S136 (*"In the policy sectors of government, regulatory agencies or risk analysis panels use WOE to assess the total value of the scientific evidence that a substance may be dangerous to human health."*)

Linkov, I. (2006). Weight of Evidence: What is the State of the Science? *Risk Analysis*, 26(3), 573-575.

Weed, D. L. (1997). On the use of causal criteria. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 26, 1137-1141.

Weed, D. L., and Hursting, S. D. (1998). Biologic plausibility in causal inference: Current method and practice. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 147, 415-425.

J. M. Culp, R. B. Lowell, and K. J. Cash. "Integrating Mesocosm Experiments with Field and Laboratory Studies to Generate Weight-of-Evidence Risk Assessments for Large Rivers." *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 19 (2000): 1167-1173.

L.W. Hall and J. M. Giddings. "The Need for Multiple Lines of Evidence for Predicting Site-Specific Ecological Effects." *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment* 6 (2000): 679-710.

C. Menzie, M. H. Henning, J. Cura, et al. "A Weight-of-Evidence Approach for Evaluating Ecological Risks: Report of the Massachusetts Weight of-Evidence Work Group." *Human Ecological Risk Assessment* 2 (1996): 277-304.

G.W. Suter II, ed. *Ecological Risk Assessment*. (Chelsea, MI: Lewis Pub. Co, 1993), 86.

V.R. Walker, "Risk Characterization and the Weight of Evidence: Adapting Gatekeeping Concepts from the Courts." *Risk Analysis* 14 (1996): 793-799.

G. E. Dallal, Chief, Biostatistics Unit, The Little Handbook of Statistical Practice (The Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging, Tufts University), available at <http://www.tufts.edu/~gdallal/LHSP.HTM>.

R. A. Chechile "Probability, utility, and decision trees in environmental decision analysis," in *Environmental Decision Making: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. (New York: Van Nostrand, 1991), 64-91.

Menzie, M. A. Ibrahim, G. G. Bond, T. A. Burke et al. "Weight of the Evidence on the Human Carcinogenicity of 2,4-D." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 96 (1991): 213-222.

R. L. Cooper and R. J. Kavlock. "Endocrine Disruptors and Reproductive Development: A Weight of Evidence Overview." *Journal of Endocrinology* 152 (1997): 159-166.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), "The Assessment Process: An Interactive Learning Program," available at <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/training/public-health-assessment-overview/html/module2/sv18.html>.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), "The Assessment Process: An Interactive Learning Program," available at <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/training/public-health-assessment-overview/html/module2/sv18.html>.

Edwards, G. Elwyn, K. Hood, and S. Rollnick "Judging the Weight of Evidence in Systematic Reviews: Introducing Rigour into the Qualitative Overview Stage by Assessing Signal and Noise." *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 6 (2000): 177-184.

R. L. Cooper and R. J. Kavlock "Endocrine Disruptors and Reproductive Development: A Weight-of-Evidence Review." *Journal of Endocrinology* 152 (1997):159-166.

C. G. Graves, G. M. Matanoski, and R. G. Tardiff “Weight of Evidence for an Association between Adverse Reproductive and Developmental Effects and Exposure to Disinfection By-Products: A Critical Review.” *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* 34 (2001): 103-124.

World Health Organization, IPCS Global Assessment of the State of the Science of Endocrine Disruptors: Chapter 7. “Causal Criteria for Assessing Endocrine Disruptors—a Proposed Framework,” 123-128 http://www.who.int/ipcs/publications/new_issues/endocrine_disruptors/en/.

E. J. Calabrese, L. A. Baldwin, P.T. Kostecky, et al. “A Toxicologically Based Weight-of-Evidence Methodology for the Relative Ranking of Chemicals of Endocrine Disruption Potential.” *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology* 26 (1997): 36-40.

E.P. Smith, I. Lipkovich, and K. Ye. Weight of Evidence (WOE): Quantitative Estimate of Probability of Impact. Working Paper. February 10, 2002.

D. J. Balding “When Can a DNA Profile Be Regarded as Unique?” *Science and Justice* 39 (1999): 257-260.

I.W. Evett, L. A. Forman, G. Jackson, et al. “DNA Profiling: a Discussion of Issues Relating to the Reporting of Very Small Match Probabilities.” *Criminal Law Review* (May 2000): 341-355.

International Joint Commission (IJC). Sixth Biennial Report on Great Lakes Water Quality. Washington, DC: International Joint Commission, 1992.

H.R. Pohl, N. Roney, M. Fay, et al. “Site-Specific Consultation for a Chemical Mixture.” *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 15 (1999): 470-479.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). Public Health Assessment Guidance Manual, Ch. 8, Health effects evaluation: weight-of-evidence analysis, available at <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HAC/PHAManual/ch8p1.html>.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), Chapter 8, <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/HAC/PHAManual/ch8p1.html>, pp. 2-3.

29CFR Par. 1910. Air Contaminants, Sec. VI. Health Effects Discussion and Determination of Final PEL, January 1989.

Environmental Protection Agency. Proposed Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment. Federal Register 61(79):17960-18011 (April 23, 1996).

A. Bradford-Hill, “The Environment and Disease: Association or Causation?” *Proc. Royal Soc. Med.* 58 (1965): 295-300.

M. E. Anderson, M. E. Meek, G. A. Boorman, et al. “Lessons Learned in Applying the U.S. EPA Proposed Cancer Guidelines to Specific Compounds.” *Toxicological Sciences* 53 (2000): 159-172.

M. M. Muntaz, P. Furkin, G. I. Diamond, et al. “Exercises in the Use of Weight-of-Evidence Approach for Chemical-Mixture Interactions.” *Journal of Clean Technology, Environmental Toxicology, and Occupational Medicine* 5 (1996): 339-345.

V.R. Walker “Risk Characterization and the Weight of Evidence: Adapting Gatekeeping Concepts

from the Courts.” *Risk Analysis* 16 (1996): 793-799.

T. O. McGarity “Proposal for Linking Culpability and Causation to Ensure Corporate Accountability for Toxic Risks.” *William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review*, Fall 2001.

T. S. Kuhn. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 36.

S. Haack “An Epistemologist in the Bramble-Bush: at the Supreme Court with Mr. Joiner.” *Journal of Health, Politics, Policy & Law*, 26 (2001): 217-248.