DRSG telemeeting minutes: January 05, 2016

**Present:** Allen Davis (Chair), Julie Fitzpatrick, Rick Hertzberg, Ingrid Druwe (Vice-Chair), Kan Shao (Trustee/Past Chair), Peg Coleman, Ken Bogen (Chair-elect), Mike Musso (Trustee-at-Large), Sara Henry, Lynne Haber, Weihsueh Chiu (Trustee-at-Large), Jeff Gift, Julia Pletz (Secretary/Treasurer)

1. **Approve minutes from Nov 3rd 2015 meeting, and the Business Meeting at the SRA Annual Meeting (All)**
   Allen Davis added to the Business Meeting minutes that he had announced a contribution to the DRSG budget from the CatReg workshop he held with Jeff Gift at the SRA Annual Meeting. He stressed that this information does not have to be added to the minutes. Both minutes were approved without any objections.

2. **2016 Officers/Trustees (All)**
   Allen once again welcomed Ken Bogen, Ingrid Druwe and Mike Musso to the DRSG officers’ team.

3. **Discuss possible themes/topics for 2016 DRSG teleseminar series (Ken Bogen and all)**
   a. Coordination of at least one DRSG teleseminar/webinar with SRA webinar series
   Allen put up for discussion whether an overarching topic should be defined for the teleseminar series this year. He mentioned that SRA plans on having 12 monthly teleseminars in 2016, and specialty group chairs have been contacted to provide ideas. As DRSG have been doing teleseminars for years, DRSG may contribute one or two seminars to the SRA teleseminar series in 2016. At the DRSG meeting during the SRA Annual Meeting 2015, Jeff had proposed a webinar on addressing model uncertainties incl. model averaging. Other suggestions were related to low-dose non-monotonic dose response modeling, PCB assessment within IRIS and mixture dose-response assessment. Michelle Deveau sent a suggestion to Allen on incorporating next gen (omic) data in a dose-response assessment.
   Lynne Haber commented that the endocrine society came out with a statement on the low-dose non-monotonicity topic. A US EPA draft report about the issue went to NAS review. Jeff expressed his interest in the topic. Weihsueh Chiu added that he could provide further contacts of people involved in the low-dose toxicity discussion. However, NAS panelists may not be able to contribute at this stage. The thyroid part of the report was least criticized. Lynne and Julie Fitzpatrick suggested to contact Rita Schoeny. Rita was involved in the 2013 report, is now retired and travelling but she may be available for a webinar or provide a contact.
   Allen re-addressed Michelle’s suggestion to organize a teleseminar on gene expression dose response/toxicogenomics which would be relevant to the IRIS assessment and other similar assessments. Michelle contacted the first author, an early career scientist, of a paper on toxicogenomic dose-response assessment to see if she would feel comfortable speaking at a teleseminar. As DRSG had invited early career scientists for the teleseminar series in the past, Allen suggested approaching the junior researcher whom Michelle contacted for a toxicogenomics teleseminar. The idea was supported by Weihsueh and Lynne.
Mike Musso proposed other topics, such as dose-response on non-ionizing radiation and (non-)dose-response on cell phone use, including an appraisal of whether different countries agree on the science. He would be interested in taking the lead in organizing respective webinars if there is interest in these topics.

Sara Henry suggested a comparison of risks and benefits of e-cigarettes, and the issue of potential toxicity of dietary supplements. As dietary supplements are not regulated by the FDA, it might be interesting to discuss what is known about the potential toxicity to date. Sara would provide a contact if this is of interest. Julie recommended Mike DeVito (NIEHS) for that topic.

Ken Bogen mentioned a fascinating paper by Bill Roebuck’s group (Johnson et al., Cancer Prevention Research) which shows that liver tumors induced by aflatoxin were ablated by an anti-inflammatory agent. Mutagenic adducts were predominantly suppressed and the carcinogenic response was zero.

The presence of a threshold for DNA damage for cancer development constitutes a paradigm shifting observation for dose-response assessment. If this is of interest he will get in touch with the authors.

Allen recommended a project Ingrid Druwe and Lyle Burgoon are working on, using Bayesian methods to analyze two different cancer datasets related to arsenic exposure. It is a novel application of Bayesian statistics. The project is based on a paper published several years ago. The way control was done was controversial which is why it was decided to re-analyze the data and see if the control was appropriate.

Peg Coleman received a number of very positive comments from participants of the microbial dose-response relationship roundtable. Participants would welcome a follow-up on the role of microbiota on microbial pathogens and chemical exposures, and implications for a dose-response assessment.

Allen concluded the discussion of topics for the teleseminar series. He encouraged Ken to start following up on the two key topics, low-dose non-monotonic dose-response assessment and dose response based on toxicogenomic data. Allen thinks that a risk-benefit analysis of e-cigarette smoking would be very interesting, as well as microbial dose-response assessment. He encouraged everyone to get in touch with Ken if more topics come up at a later stage. He put up for discussion whether DRSG should aim for four or rather five to six teleseminars in 2016.

Weihsueh expressed interest for microbial dose-response as well and thought that limiting the series to four teleseminars would not be necessary.

Ken asked about the dates for the teleseminars. Allen responded that they would have to be organized on the first Tuesday of the month, starting at noon, Eastern time, and lasting for an hour. Any month except for December would be fine. Ken inquired whether there was a formal process to follow for lining up speakers. Allen replied that he did not follow a formal process last year. He counted six topics in addition to the two key topics defined, so it would have to be decided which of the six to pursue. Kan Shao commented that from his point of view there is no problem with organizing more than four teleseminars but the scheduling would have to be carefully planned as the meetings in May and June will be needed for discussions on defining topics and submitting abstracts for the SRA Annual Meeting. According to Julie, the meeting in June would be good for a teleseminar as topics for the Annual Meeting will have been submitted by that time. During last year’s submissions there were a couple of problems which could be discussed during the telemeeting in June.
With regard to the excess topic ideas, Julia Pletz proposed to pass these on to SRA for their webinar series. Allen replied that the idea was that DRSG line up their teleseminar series and the whole SRA group may be invited. He concurred with Kan regarding the telemeetings needed to discuss topics for the Annual Meeting. Therefore, it may be good to limit the teleseminar series to five in 2016.

4. **Student award submission elicitation (Ingrid and all)**

Allen asked for advice from people who worked on student awards before to give Ingrid some guidance on how to approach the task. Julie mentioned that it would be important to identify suitable places to advertise at for abstract submissions. In past year, we received three suitable candidates, whereas in a previous year DRSG did not give out any award because no suitable abstract was received. Therefore, Julie suggested extending last year’s list with contacts of West Coast universities. Ingrid asked whether people who submit abstracts have to be SRA/DRSG members. Kan and Julie responded that membership was not a prerequisite, but giving out an award was rather a tool to recruit new members.

5. **DRSG finances (Julia and all)**

Julia received a financial report which included records entered up until Nov-30-2015 with a beginning balance of approx. $7,500, an income of approx. $800 from dues and expenses of $500 for the student awards. This leaves an ending balance of approx. $7800 from which $700 for Kan’s travel to the SRA World Congress and the expenses for the mixer and speaker support at the SRA Annual Meeting will be deducted. Allen noted that he was not sure at this point how much money will be donated from the CatReg workshop but in previous years their contribution was around $1000. Regarding expected speakers’ expenses during the Annual Meeting, Peg added that the expenses of two of her speakers would amount to $600. Peg, Allen and Kan clarified that DRSG agreed on donating $300 for the mixer as opposed to $500 as stated in previous minutes. $300 were communicated to Jennifer Rosenberg, and if more than that is charged we will have to contact Jennifer.

6. **Other items**

None.