



4/2007

24. Jahrgang, Nr. 4
ISSN 0946-7785
253-364 (2007)

ALTEX

ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

Annamaria A. Bottini, Patric Amcoff and Thomas Hartung:
**Food for thought ...
on globalisation**

Marie-Jeanne W. A. Schiffelers
et al.:
**Factors stimulating or
obstructing the
implementation of the 3Rs
in the regulatory process**

Petra Mayr et al.:
**Mensch und Mitgeschöpf
unter ethischem Aspekt.
Rezensionen zu den
Themen:
Allgemeines zum Tierschutz
Philosophische Ethik
Bioethik
Rechtsfragen und
Rechtentwicklung
Tierversuche**

Isabelle Häner, Gieri Bolliger
und Antoine F. Goetschel:
**Die Geheimhaltungspflicht
von Mitgliedern der
Tierversuchskommissionen**



Linz 2007

Andrew Knight:
**Animal experiments
scrutinised: systematic
reviews demonstrate
poor human clinical and
toxicological utility**

Roman Kolar and
Irmela Ruhdel:
**A survey concerning
the work of ethics
committees and
licensing authorities
for animal experiments
in Germany**

Martin Balluch and
Eberhart Theuer:
**Trial on personhood for
chimp "Hiasl"**

News / Nachrichten
Proceedings / Tagungsberichte
Calendar of events / Termine
Imprint / Impressum



Animal Experiments Scrutinised: Systematic Reviews Demonstrate Poor Human Clinical and Toxicological Utility

Andrew Knight

Animal Consultants International, London, UK

Summary

The assumption that animal models are reasonably predictive of human outcomes provides the basis for their widespread use in toxicity testing and in biomedical research aimed at developing cures for human diseases. To investigate the validity of this assumption, the comprehensive 'Scopus' biomedical bibliographic databases were searched for published systematic reviews of the human clinical or toxicological utility of animal experiments. Of 20 reviews examining clinical utility, authors concluded that the animal models were substantially consistent with or useful in advancing clinical outcomes in only two cases, and the conclusion in one case was contentious. Included were reviews of the clinical utility of experiments expected by ethics committees to lead to medical advances, of highly-cited experiments published in major journals, and of chimpanzee experiments – the species most likely to be predictive of human outcomes. Seven additional reviews failed to clearly demonstrate utility in predicting human toxicological outcomes such as carcinogenicity and teratogenicity. Consequently, animal data may not generally be assumed to be substantially useful for these purposes. Possible causes include interspecies differences, the distortion of experimental outcomes arising from experimental environments and protocols, and the poor methodological quality of many animal experiments evident in at least 11 reviews. No reviews existed in which a majority of animal experiments were of good quality. While the latter problems might be minimised with concerted effort, given their widespread nature, the interspecies limitations are likely to be technically and theoretically impossible to overcome. Yet, unlike non-animal models, animal models are not normally subjected to formal scientific validation. Instead of simply assuming they are predictive of human outcomes, the consistent application of formal validation studies to all test models is clearly warranted, regardless of their animal, non-animal, historical, contemporary or possible future status. Expected benefits would include greater selection of models truly predictive of human outcomes, increased safety of people exposed to chemicals that have passed toxicity tests, increased efficiency during the development of human pharmaceuticals, and decreased wastage of animal, personnel and financial resources. The poor human clinical

Zusammenfassung: Tierversuche auf dem Prüfstand: Systematische Untersuchungen belegen geringen klinischen und toxikologischen Nutzen

Die Annahme, dass Tiermodelle zu vernünftigen, auf Menschen übertragbare Voraussagen führen, bildet die Basis für ihre weitverbreitete Verwendung bei der Toxizitätstestung und in der biomedizinischen Forschung zur Entwicklung von Heilmitteln. Um die Gültigkeit dieser Annahme zu untersuchen, wurde die umfangreiche biomedizinische Datenbank „Scopus“ auf publizierte systematische Reviews zur humanmedizinischen oder toxikologischen Nützlichkeit von Tierexperimenten hin durchsucht. Nur in 2 von 20 gefundenen Reviews folgerten die Autoren, dass die Tiermodelle klinische Relevanz hatten. In einem Fall war die Folgerung umstritten. Einbezogen waren Reviews über den klinischen Nutzen von Experimenten, bei denen von Ethikkommissionen angenommen wurde, dass sie zu medizinischen Fortschritten führen würden, über vielzitierte, in wichtigen Zeitschriften publizierte Experimente, sowie über Experimente mit Schimpansen – jener Spezies, mit der sich am wahrscheinlichsten Voraussagen für den Menschen treffen lassen. In sieben Reviews gelang es nicht, den Nutzen für die Übertragbarkeit von toxikologischen Ergebnissen auf den Menschen, wie Karzinogenität und Teratogenität zu zeigen.

Folglich kann bei Tierdaten nicht generell angenommen werden, dass sie für diese Zwecke wirklich nützlich sind.

Mögliche Gründe beinhalten Unterschiede zwischen den Spezies, die Verzerrungen von Ergebnissen, die sich aus der experimentellen Umgebung und den Protokollen ergeben, sowie die schlechte methodische Qualität vieler Tierexperimente, die in mindestens 11 Reviews offenkundig war. Es gab keine Reviews bei denen mehrheitlich die Tierexperimente von guter Qualität waren. Während letztere Probleme mit gezielten Anstrengungen auf ein Minimum gebracht werden könnten, werden die „interspezies“-Einschränkungen aufgrund ihrer komplexen Natur vermutlich weder technisch noch theoretisch überwunden werden können. Tiermodelle werden, im Gegensatz zu Alternativmethoden, normalerweise keiner formalen wissenschaftlichen Validierung unterworfen. Anstatt einfach anzunehmen, dass Tierversuche eine Übertragbarkeit der Ergebnisse auf den Menschen zulassen, wäre eine einheitliche Anwendung forma-

cal and toxicological utility of most animal models for which data exists, in conjunction with their generally substantial animal welfare and economic costs, justify a ban on animal models lacking scientific data clearly establishing their human predictivity or utility.

ler Validierungsstudien auf alle Testmodelle sinnvoll, unabhängig ob es sich dabei um Tierversuche oder Alternativen handelt und unabhängig von ihrer historischen, heutigen oder möglichen zukünftigen Bedeutung. Die zu erwartenden Vorteile würden Folgendes beinhalten: eine größere Selektion von Modellen, die sichere Vorhersagen für den Menschen bringen; eine erhöhte Sicherheit für Personen, die toxizitätsgeprüften Chemikalien ausgesetzt sind; eine erhöhte Effizienz während der Entwicklung von Arzneimitteln für den Menschen; ein verminderter Verbrauch von Tieren sowie personellen und finanziellen Ressourcen.

Der schlechte klinische und toxikologische Nutzen der meisten Tiermodelle, zusammen mit ihren meist erheblichen Belastungen für die Tiere, rechtfertigen ein Verbot von Tiermodellen, bei denen sich auf Grund der Datenlage weder Relevanz noch Nutzen für den Menschen feststellen lassen.

Keywords: animal experiment, animal model, animal study, clinical trial, systematic review

1 Introduction

1.1 Trends in laboratory animal use

Annually, many millions of animals are used worldwide in toxicity testing and biomedical research aimed at developing cures for human diseases. Steady increases in the use of genetically modified animals and several large scale chemical testing programs within the US and Europe are increasing laboratory animal use.

1.2 Claims supporting laboratory animal use

Biomedical research using laboratory animals is highly controversial. Advocates frequently claim such research is vital for preventing, curing or alleviating human diseases (e.g. Brom, 2002; Festing, 2004), that the greatest achievements of medicine have been possible only due to the use of animals (e.g. Pawlik, 1998), and that the complexity of humans requires nothing less than the complexity of laboratory animals to effectively model during biomedical investigations (e.g. Kjellmer, 2002). They even claim that medical progress would be “severely maimed by prohibition or severe curtailing of animal experiments,” and that “catastrophic consequences would ensue” (Osswald, 1992).

1.3 The necessity of systematic reviews

The premise that laboratory animal models are generally predictive of human

outcomes is the basis for their widespread use in human toxicity testing, and in the safety and efficacy testing of putative chemotherapeutic agents and other clinical interventions. However, numerous cases of discordance between human and laboratory animal outcomes suggest that this premise may well be incorrect, and that the utility of animal experiments for these purposes may not be assured. On the other hand, only small numbers of experiments are normally reviewed in such case studies, and their selection may be subject to bias.

To provide more definitive conclusions, systematic reviews of the human clinical or toxicological utility of large numbers of animal experiments are necessary. Experiments included in such reviews are selected without bias, via randomisation or similarly methodical and impartial means. A growing number of such reviews and meta-analyses have been published, which collectively provide important insights into the human clinical and toxicological utility of animal models. Their identification and examination was the purpose of this review.

2 Methods

The ‘Scopus’ biomedical bibliographic databases – among the world’s most comprehensive – were searched for systematic reviews of the human clinical or toxicological utility of animal experiments published in the peer-reviewed

biomedical literature. To minimise bias, reviews were included only when systematically conducted using randomisation or similarly methodical and impartial means to select animal studies.

Only reviews examining the human toxicological predictivity or utility of animal experiments, their contributions towards the development of prophylactic, diagnostic or therapeutic interventions with clear potential for combating human diseases or injuries, or their consistency with human clinical outcomes, were examined. Reviews focusing only on the contributions of animal experiments towards increased understanding of the aetiological, pathogenesis or other aspects of human diseases, or on the clinical utility of animal experiments in non-human species, for example, were not included.

3 Results

As of 1st March 2007, 27 systematic reviews examining the contributions of animal experiments towards the development of human clinical interventions (20), or in deriving human toxicity classifications (seven) were located. Of the 20 clinical reviews, authors concluded that animal models were significantly useful in contributing to the development of clinical interventions or substantially consistent with clinical outcomes in only two cases, one of which was contentious. Of the seven toxicological reviews, none clearly demonstrated the utility of animal



models in predicting human toxicological outcomes such as carcinogenicity and teratogenicity.

4 Discussion

Space constraints preclude a detailed examination of these 27 reviews, which is provided elsewhere (Knight, 2007a). However, three different approaches that sought to determine the maximum human clinical utility that may be achieved by animal experiments were of particular interest.

4.1 Clinical utility of experiments expected to lead to medical advances

Lindl and colleagues (2005; 2006) examined animal experiments conducted at three German universities between 1991 and 1993 that had been approved by animal ethics committees at least partly on the basis of claims by researchers that the experiments might lead to concrete advances towards the cure of human diseases. Experiments were included only where previous studies had shown that the applications of related animal research had confirmed the hypotheses of the researchers, and where the experiments had achieved publication in biomedical journals.

For 17 experiments meeting these inclusion criteria, citations were analysed for at least 12 years. Citation frequencies and types of citing papers were recorded: whether reviews, or animal-based, *in vitro* or clinical studies. 1,183 citations were evident; however, only 8.2% of all citations (97) were in clinical publications, and of these, only 0.3% of all citations (four publications) demonstrated a direct correlation between the results of animal experiments and human outcomes. However, even in these four cases the hypotheses that had been verified successfully in the animal experiment failed in every respect when applied to humans. None of these 17 experiments led to any new therapies or had any beneficial clinical impact during the period examined.

Accordingly, Lindl and colleagues called for serious, rather than cursory, evaluations of the likely benefits of animal experiments by animal ethics committees and related authorities, and for a reversal of the current paradigm in which animal

experiments are routinely approved. Instead of approving experiments because of the possibility that benefits may accrue, Lindl and colleagues suggested that where significant doubt exists, laboratory animals should receive the benefit of that doubt, and that such experiments should not, in fact, be approved.

4.2 Clinical utility of highly cited animal experiments

Hackam and Redelmeier (2006) also utilised a citation analysis, although without geographical limitation. Based on the assumption that findings from highly cited animal experiments would be most likely to be subsequently tested in clinical trials, they searched for experiments with more than 500 citations published in the seven leading scientific journals when ranked by citation impact factor.

Of 76 animal studies located with a median citation count of 889 (range: 639-2,233), only 36.8% (28/76) were replicated in randomised human trials. 18.4% (14/76) were contradicted by randomised trials, and 44.7% (34/76) had not translated to clinical trials. Ultimately, only 10.5% (8/76) of these medical interventions were subsequently approved for use in patients. And even in these cases human benefit cannot be assumed, because adverse reactions to approved interventions are sufficiently common that they are the 4th - 6th reading cause of death (based on a 95% confidence interval) in US Hospitals (Lazarou and Pomeranz, 1998).

The low rate of translation to clinical trials of even these highly cited animal experiments occurred despite 1992 being the median publication year, allowing a median of 14 years for potential translation. For studies that did translate to clinical trials, the median time for translation was seven years (range 1-15). Frequency of translation was unaffected by laboratory animal species, type of disease or therapy under examination, journal, year of publication, methodological quality, and even, surprisingly, citation rate. However, animal studies incorporating dose-response gradients were more likely to be translated to clinical trials (OR 3.3; 95% CI 1.1-10.1).

Although the rate of translation of these animal studies to clinical trials was low, as Hackam and Redelmeier stated it is nevertheless higher than that of most published

animal experiments, which are considerably less likely to be translated than these highly cited animal studies published in leading journals. Furthermore, the selective focusing on positive animal data while ignoring negative results (optimism bias) is one of several cited factors that may increase the likelihood of translation beyond that scientifically merited. As Hackam (2007) stated, rigorous meta-analysis of all relevant animal experimental data would probably significantly decrease the translation rate to clinical trials.

Additionally, only 48.7% (37/76) of these highly cited animal studies were of good methodological quality. Despite the publication of these highly-cited animal studies in leading scientific journals, few included random allocation of animals, adjustment for multiple hypothesis testing, or blinded assessment of outcomes. Accordingly, Hackam and Redelmeier cautioned patients and physicians about extrapolating the findings of even highly cited animal research to the care of human disease.

4.3 Clinical utility of chimpanzee experiments

Chimpanzees are the species most closely related to humans, and consequently, most likely to be predictive of human outcomes when used in biomedical research. Hence, in 2005 I conducted a citation analysis examining the human clinical utility of chimpanzee experiments (Knight, 2007b).

I searched three major biomedical bibliographic databases, locating 749 papers published between 1995 and 2004 describing experiments on captive chimpanzees or their tissues. Although published in the international scientific literature, the vast majority of these experiments were conducted within the US (Conlee et al., 2004). To obtain 95% confidence intervals with an accuracy of at least plus or minus 10% when estimating the proportion of chimpanzee studies subsequently cited by other published papers, a subset of at least 86 chimpanzee studies was required (Morris, n.d.; Guenther, 1973; Green, 1982).

Of 95 published chimpanzee experiments randomly selected, 49.5% (47/95) were not cited by any subsequent papers, demonstrating minimal contributions towards the advancement of biomedical knowledge generally. This is of particular concern because research of lesser value is

not published; hence it appears that the majority of chimpanzee research generates data of questionable value, which makes little obvious contribution towards the advancement of biomedical knowledge.

35.8% (34/95) of 95 published chimpanzee experiments were cited by 116 papers that clearly did *not* describe well developed methods for combating human diseases. Only 14.7% (14/95) were cited by 27 papers that abstracts indicated described well developed methods for combating human diseases. However, detailed examination of these medical papers revealed that *in vitro* studies, human clinical and epidemiological studies, molecular assays and methods, and genomic studies, contributed most to their development. 63.0% (17/27) were wide-ranging reviews of 26-300 (median 104) references, to which the cited chimpanzee study made a very small contribution. Duplication of human outcomes, inconsistency with other human or primate data, and other causes resulted in the absence of any chimpanzee study able to demonstrate an essential contribution, or, in most cases, a significant contribution of any kind, towards the development of the medical method described.

Despite the low utility of chimpanzee experiments in advancing human health indicated by these results, it remains true that chimpanzees are the species most closely related to human beings. Hence it is highly likely that other laboratory species are even less efficacious when used as experimental models of humans in biomedical research and toxicity testing.

4.4 Causes for the poor human utility of animal models

Biomedical research

Chimpanzees are our closest living relatives, and consequently might be expected to have the greatest likelihood among laboratory species of accurately predicting human outcomes during biomedical research. However, despite great similarities between the structural regions of chimpanzee and human DNA, important differences between the regulatory regions exert an "avalanche" effect upon large numbers of structural genes (Bailey, 2005). Despite nucleotide difference between chimpanzees and humans of only 1-2%, the results are differences of around 80% in protein expression (Glazko et al., 2005),

resulting in marked phenotypic differences between the species. These differences manifest in altered susceptibility to, aetiology and progression of diseases; differing absorption, tissue distribution, metabolism, and excretion of chemotherapeutic agents; and differences in the toxicity and efficacy of pharmaceuticals (Bailey, 2005; Knight, 2007b). Such effects appear to be responsible for the demonstrated inability of most chimpanzee research to contribute substantially to the development of methods efficacious in combating human diseases (Knight, 2007b).

Other laboratory animal species are even less similar to humans, both genetically and phenotypically, and are therefore less likely to accurately model the progression of human diseases or the responses to putative chemotherapeutic agents or toxins.

Toxicity testing

Rodents are by far the most common laboratory animal species used in toxicity studies. Several factors contribute to the demonstrated inability of rodent bioassays to reliably predict human toxicity. The stresses incurred during handling, restraint, other routine laboratory procedures, and particularly, the stressful routes of dose administration common to toxicity tests, alter immune status and disease predisposition in ways which are difficult to accurately predict, distorting disease progression and responses to putative toxic and chemotherapeutic agents (Balcombe et al., 2004; Knight et al., 2006).

Additionally, animals have a broad range of physiological defences against general toxic insults, such as epithelial shedding and inducible enzymes, which commonly prove effective at environmentally relevant doses, but which may be overwhelmed at the high doses common to toxicity assays (Gold et al., 1998). Carcinogenicity assays also utilise chronic dosing. These may result in insufficient rest intervals between doses for the effective operation of DNA and tissue repair mechanisms, which, as with the unnatural elevation of cell division rates during *ad libitum* feeding studies, may predispose to mutagenesis and carcinogenesis. Lower doses, greater intervals between exposures, intermittent feeding, or shorter total periods of exposure, which may represent a more realistic model of environmental exposures for most potential

toxins, might not result in toxic changes at all (Knight et al., 2006).

Finally, differences in rates of absorption and transport mechanisms between test routes of administration and other important human routes of exposure, and the considerable variability of organ systems in response to toxic insults, between and within species, strains and genders, render attempts to accurately extrapolate human hazards from animal toxicity data difficult if not impossible (Knight et al., 2006).

Methodological quality

At least 11 systematic reviews (Horn et al., 2001; Lucas et al., 2002; Roberts et al., 2002 and Mapstone et al., 2003 (who described the same review); Lee et al., 2003; Macleod et al., 2005a; Macleod et al., 2005b; van der Worp et al., 2005; Wilmot et al., 2005a; Willmot et al., 2005b; Hackam and Redelmeier, 2006; Perel et al., 2007) demonstrated the poor methodological quality of many of the animal experiments examined, and no systematic reviews demonstrated good methodological quality of a majority of them.

Common deficiencies included lack of sample size calculations, sufficient sample sizes, appropriate animal models (particularly, aged animals or those with comorbidities likely with certain diseases), randomised treatment allocation, blinded drug administration, blinded induction of injury, blinded outcome assessment, and conflict of interest statements. Some studies also used anaesthetics that may have altered experimental outcomes, and substantial variation was evident in the parameters assessed.

4.5 Raising standards: evidence-based medicine

Evidence-based medicine (EBM) bases clinical decisions on methodologically-sound, prospective, randomised, blinded, controlled clinical trials, and the gold standard for EBM is large prospective epidemiological studies, or meta-analyses of randomised, blinded, controlled clinical trials (Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group, 1992). The implementation to animal experiments of EBM standards applied to human clinical trials would make results more robust and broadly applicable (Watters et al., 1999; Moher et al., 2001; Arlt and Heuwieser,



2005; Schulz, 2005; Perel et al., 2007).

Mechanisms would be needed to ensure compliance with such standards, however. Compliance could, for example, be made prerequisite for research funding, ethics committee approval and publication of results. These measures would require the education and cooperation of funding agencies, ethics committees and journals.

4.6 Fundamental constraints on the human utility of animal models

Strategies designed to increase full and impartial examination of existing data before conducting animal studies, to decrease variation in experimental environments and protocols and to improve their methodological quality, would minimise consumption of animal, financial and other resources within experiments of questionable merit and quality, and would increase the potential human utility of animal data. However, while these problems might be minimised with concerted effort, given their widespread nature, the poor human clinical or toxicological utility of many animal experiments is unlikely to result solely from such factors alone. As stated by Perel et al. (2007), the failure of animal models to adequately represent human disease may be another fundamental cause, which, in contrast, could be technically and theoretically impossible to overcome.

Genetic modification of animal models through the addition of foreign genes (transgenic animals) or inactivation or deletion of genes (knockout animals) is being attempted to make them more closely model humans. However, as well as being technically difficult very to achieve, such modification may not allow clear conclusions due to factors reflecting the intrinsic complexity of living organisms, e.g., the variable redundancy of some metabolic pathways between species (Houdebine, 2007). Furthermore, the animal welfare burdens incurred during the creation and utilisation of GM animals are particularly high (Sauer et al., 2006).

4.7 Implications for scientific validation of experimental models

Non-animal models are generally required to pass formal scientific validation prior to

regulatory acceptance. In contrast, animal models are simply assumed to be predictive of human outcomes. These 27 systematic reviews of the human utility of animal experiments demonstrate the invalidity of such assumptions, even for animal models in use for long periods.

The consistent application of formal validation studies to all test models is clearly warranted, regardless of their animal, non-animal, historical, contemporary or possible future status, with appropriate consideration also given to animal welfare, ethical, legal, economic and any other relevant factors. Likely benefits would include greater selection of models truly predictive for human outcomes, increased safety of people exposed to chemicals that have passed toxicity tests, increased efficiency during the development of human pharmaceuticals and other therapeutic interventions, and decreased wastage of animal, personnel and financial resources.

5 Conclusions

The historical and contemporary paradigm that animal models are generally reasonably predictive of human outcomes provides the basis for their continuing widespread use in toxicity testing and biomedical research aimed at developing cures for human diseases. However, their use persists for historical and cultural reasons, rather than because they have been demonstrated to be scientifically valid. For example, many regulatory officials "feel more comfortable" with animal data (O'Connor, 1997), and some even believe animal tests are inherently valid, simply because they are conducted in animals (Balls, 2004).

However, most existing systematic reviews have demonstrated that animal experiments are insufficiently predictive of human outcomes to provide substantial benefits during the development of human clinical interventions, or in deriving human toxicity assessments. Of 20 reviews examining clinical utility, authors concluded that animal models were significantly useful in contributing to the development of clinical interventions or substantially consistent with clinical outcomes in only two cases, one of which was contentious.

Seven additional reviews also failed to clearly demonstrate utility in predicting human toxicological outcomes such as carcinogenicity and teratogenicity. Consequently, animal data may not generally be assumed to be substantially useful for these purposes. The poor human clinical and toxicological utility of most animal models for which data exists, in conjunction with their generally substantial animal welfare and economic costs, justify a ban on animal models lacking scientific data clearly establishing their human predictivity or utility.

References

- Arlt, S. and Heuwieser, W. (2005). (Evidence based veterinary medicine) German. *Dtsch. Tierärztl. Wochenschr.* 112(4), 146-148.
- Bailey, J. (2005). Non-human primates in medical research and drug development: a critical review. *Biogenic Amines*, 19(4-6), 235-255.
- Balcombe, J., Barnard, N. and Sandusky, C. (2004). Laboratory routines cause animal stress. *Contemporary Topics in Laboratory Animal Science*, 43(6), 42-51.
- Balls, M. (2004). Are animal tests inherently valid? *ATLA* 32 (Suppl. 1B), 755-758.
- Brom, F. W. (2002). Science and society: different bioethical approaches towards animal experimentation. *ALTEX* 19(2), 78-82.
- Conlee, K. M., Hoffeld, E. H. and Stephens, M. L. (2004). A demographic analysis of primate research in the United States. *ATLA* 32 (Suppl. 1A), 315-322.
- Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. (1992). Evidence-based medicine. A new approach to teaching the practice of medicine. *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.* 286, 2420-2425.
- Festing, M. F. W. (2004). Is the use of animals in biomedical research still necessary in 2002? Unfortunately, "yes". *ATLA* 32 (Suppl. 1B), 733-739.
- Glazko, G., Veeramachaneni, V., Nei, M. and Makalowski, W. (2005). Eighty percent of proteins are different between humans and chimpanzees. *Gene* 346, 215-219.
- Gold, L. S., Slone, T. H. and Ames, B. N. (1998). What do animal cancer tests tell us about human cancer risk? Overview of analyses of the carcinogenic potency database. *Drug Metabolism Reviews* 30, 359-404.

- Green, J. (1982). Asymptotic sample size for given confidence interval length. *Applied Statistics* 31(3), 298-300.
- Guenther, W. C. (1973). A sample size formula for the hypergeometric. *Journal of Quality Technology* 5(4), 167-170.
- Hackam, D. G. and Redelmeier, D. A. (2006). Translation of research evidence from animals to humans. *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.* 296(14), 1731-1732.
- Hackam, D. G. (2007). Translating animal research into clinical benefit: poor methodological standards in animal studies mean that positive results may not translate to the clinical domain. *Brit. Med. J.* 334, 163-164.
- Horn, J., de Haan, R. J., Vermeulen, M. et al. (2001). Nimodipine in animal model experiments of focal cerebral ischemia: a systematic review. *Stroke* 32(10), 2433-2438.
- Houdebine, L. M. (2007). Transgenic animal models in biomedical research. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 360, 163-202.
- Kjellmer, I. (2002). Animal experiments are necessary. Coordinated control functions are difficult to study without the use of nature's most complex systems: mammals and human beings. (Djurförsök är nödvändiga. Samordnade kontrollfunktioner låter sig svårligen studeras utan tillgång till naturens mest komplexa system: däggdjur och människa.). *Lakartidningen* 99(11), 1172-1173.
- Knight, A. (2007a). Systematic reviews of animal experiments demonstrate poor human clinical and toxicological utility. *ATLA* (in press).
- Knight, A. (2007b). The poor contribution of chimpanzee experiments to biomedical progress. *J. Appl. Anim. Welf. Sci.* 10(4) 281-308.
- Knight, A., Bailey, J. and Balcombe, J. (2006). Animal carcinogenicity studies: 2. obstacles to extrapolation of data to humans. *ATLA* 34(1), 29-38.
- Lazarou, J. and Pomeranz, B. (1998). Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *J. Amer. Med. Assoc.* 279, 1200-1205.
- Lee, D. S., Nguyen, Q. T., Lapointe, N. et al. (2003). Meta-analysis of the effects of endothelin receptor blockade on survival in experimental heart failure. *J. Cardiac Fail* 9, 368-374.
- Lindl, T., Voelkel, M. and Kolar, R. (2005). Animal experiments in biomedical research. An evaluation of the clinical relevance of approved animal experimental projects. (German) *ALTEX* 22(3), 143-151.
- Lindl, T., Völkel, M. and Kolar, R. (2006). Animal experiments in biomedical research. An evaluation of the clinical relevance of approved animal experimental projects: No evident implementation in human medicine within more than 10 years. (Lecture abstract). *ALTEX* 23(2), 111.
- Lucas, C., Criens-Poublon, L. J., Cockrell, C. T. and De Haan, R. J. (2002). Wound healing in cell studies and animal model experiments by Low Level Laser Therapy; were clinical studies justified? A systematic review. *Lasers in Medical Science* 17(2), 110-134.
- Macleod, M. R., O'Collins, T, Horky, L. L. et al. (2005a). Systematic review and meta-analysis of the efficacy of melatonin in experimental stroke. *J. Pineal Res.* 38, 35-41.
- Macleod, M. R., O'Collins, T., Horky, L. L. et al. (2005b). Systematic review and metaanalysis of the efficacy of FK506 in experimental stroke. *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism* 25(6), 1-9.
- Mapstone, J., Roberts, I. and Evans, P. (2003). Fluid resuscitation strategies: a systematic review of animal trials. *J. Trauma Injury Infect. Crit. Care* 55, 571-589.
- Moher, D., Schulz, K. F. and Altman, D. G. (2001). The CONSORT statement: revised recommendations for improving the quality of reports of parallel-group randomised trials. *Lancet* 357, 1191-1194.
- Morris, E. (Undated). Sampling from small populations. <http://uregina.ca/~morrisev/Sociology/Sampling%20from%20small%20populations.htm>. (Accessed 20 Sep. 2006).
- O'Connor, A. M. (1997). Barriers to regulatory acceptance. In L. F. M. van Zutphen and M. Balls (eds.), *Animal Alternatives, Welfare and Ethics* (1173-1176). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Science B.V.
- Osswald, W. (1992). Ethics of animal research and application to humans (Ética da investigação no animal e aplicação ao homem). *Acta medica portuguesa* 5(4), 222-225.
- Pawlik, W.W. (1998). The significance of animals in biomedical research. (Znaczenie zwierząt w badaniach biomedycznych.). *Folia Medica Cracoviensia* 39(3-4), 175-182.
- Perel, P., Roberts, I., Sena, E. et al. (2007). Comparison of treatment effects between animal experiments and clinical trials: systematic review. *Brit. Med. J.* 334, 197-200.
- Roberts, I., Kwan, I., Evans, P. and Haig, S. (2002). Does animal experimentation inform human healthcare? Observations from a systematic review of international animal experiments on fluid resuscitation. *Brit. Med. J.* 324, 474-476.
- Sauer, U. G., Kolar, R. and Rusche, B. (2006). The use of transgenic animals in biomedical research in Germany. Part 2: Ethical evaluation of the use of transgenic animals in biomedical research and perspectives for the changeover in research to research animal-free methods. (German). *ALTEX* 23(1), 3-16.
- Schulz, K. F. (2005). Assessing allocation concealment and blinding in randomised controlled trials: why bother? *Equine Veterinary Journal* 37(5), 394-395.
- van der Worp, H. B., de Haan, P., Morrema, E. and Kalkman, C. J. (2005). Methodological quality of animal studies on neuroprotection in focal cerebral ischaemia. *J. Neurol.* 252, 1108-1114.
- Watters, M. P. R. and Goodman, N. W. (1999). Comparison of basic methods in clinical studies and in vitro tissue and cell culture studies in three anaesthesia journals. *Br. J. Anaes.* 82, 295-298.
- Willmot, M., Gray, L., Gibson, C. et al. (2005a). A systematic review of nitric oxide donors and L-arginine in experimental stroke: effects on infarct size and cerebral blood flow. *Nitric Oxide* 12, 141-149.
- Willmot, M., Gibson, C., Gray, L. et al. (2005b). Nitric oxide synthase inhibitors in experimental ischemic stroke and their effects on infarct size and cerebral blood flow: a systematic review. *Free Radical Biology & Medicine* 39, 412-425.

Correspondence to

Andrew Knight BSc., BVMS, CertAW, MRCVS
Director
Animal Consultants International
91 Vanbrugh Ct.
Wincott St.
London SE11 4NR
UK
www.AnimalConsultants.org



ALTEX

www.altex.ch

A quarterly journal for new paths in biomedical science

Official organ of the Middle European
Society for Alternative Methods to Animal
Testing (MEGAT)

Bd. 24 (4/2007)

Editor:

Society ALTEX Edition, Zurich, Switzerland.
President: Nina Schweigert (CH-Zürich),
Vizepräsident: Helmut Appl (A-Wien),
Society Board: Thomas Hartung (D-Konstanz),
Claudia Mertens (CH-Winterthur),
Daniel Favre (CH-Thônex).
Secretary and Editor in Chief:
Franz P. Gruber (Küsnacht ZH).

Editorial Office:

Franz P. Gruber (CH-Küsnacht, ZH),
Petra Mayr (D-Wuppertal), Carolin Rauter
(D-Konstanz) and Horst Spielmann (D-Berlin).

ALTEX Edition, Postfach 2011,
CH-8032 Zürich

Tel. +41 (0) 44 380 08 30

Fax +41 (0) 44 422 80 10

e-mail: editor@altex.ch

Lektorat: Irène Hagmann (CH-Zürich) and
Sonja von Aulock (D-Konstanz)

Advisory Board:

Peter Bossard (Horw, Switzerland)
Miroslav Cervinka (Hradec Cralove,
Czech Republic)
Nicole Clemann (Basel, Switzerland)
Klaus Cüßler (Langen, Germany)
Andrzej Elzanowski (Wroclaw, Poland)
Friedrich Harrer (Salzburg, Austria)
Thomas Hartung (Konstanz, Germany)
Jan G. Hengstler (Leipzig, Germany)
Jane Huggins (Plainsboro, USA)
Marcel Leist (Konstanz, Germany)
Coenraad F. M. Hendriksen (Bilthoven,
The Netherlands)
Claudia Mertens (Winterthur, Switzerland)
Brigitte Rusche (Neubiberg, Germany)
Walter Pfaller (Innsbruck, Austria)
Harald Schöffl (Linz, Austria)
Horst Spielmann (Berlin, Germany)
Gotthard M. Teutsch (Bayreuth, Germany)
Jan van der Valk (Utrecht, The Netherlands)
Angelo Vedani (Basel, Switzerland)

ALTEX Online:

www.altex.ch

English summaries: <http://altweb.jhsph.edu>
ALTEX is indexed in MEDLINE, Current
Contents®, SciSearch® and ISI Document
Solution® and EMBASE.

Cover picture:

In 1982, the chimp "Hiasl" was abducted from
the Western African jungle to be used in
scientific experiments in Austria. He was freed
at the airport and grew up in a human family.
Now he lives in a shelter in Vienna. His friends
try get the status of personhood for him.
See article of Balluch and Theuer in this issue.

ALTEX is published with the support of the society members and additional sponsors:

Members:

Aerztinnen und Aerzte für Tierschutz in der
Medizin, www.aerztefuertierschutz.ch*
Animalfree Research (former FFVFF),
www.animalfree-research.org*
Deutscher Tierschutzbund,
www.tierschutzbund.de*
Doerenkamp-Zbinden Stiftung,
www.doerenkamp-zbinden.org*
Erna-Graff-Stiftung f. Tierschutz,
www.erna-graff-stiftung.de
Fondation Egon Naef,
www.fondation-naef.com*
I-CARE, www.icare-worldwide.org
Institut für Ethik und Wissenschaft im Dialog
der Universität Wien, www.univie.ac.at/ethik/
Ligue Suisse contre la vivisection, www.lscv.ch*
Ligue Vaudoise pour la défense des animaux et
contre la vivisection, www.miaou.ch*
MEGAT – Mitteleurop. Gesellschaft für
Alternativen zu Tierversuchen,
www.zet.or.at/MEGAT/*
Menschen für Tierrechte - Tierversuchsgegner
Baden Württemberg e.V., www.tierrechte-bw.org
Stiftung Biografik Labor 3R, www.biografik.ch*
Stiftung für das Tier im Recht,
www.tierimrecht.org
Tierschutzbund Zürich,
www.tierschutzbund-zuerich.ch*
Vier Pfoten Osterreich, www.vier-pfoten.at
zet, Zentrum für Ersatz- und
Ergänzungsmethoden zu Tierversuchen,
www.zet.or.at*
Zürcher Tierschutz, www.zuerchertierschutz.ch*

* These members also are sponsors

Additional Sponsors:

set, Stiftung zur Foerderung der Erforschung
von Ersatz- und Ergaenzungsmethoden zur
Einschraenkung von Tierversuchen,
www.stiftung-set.de

Layout: H. P. Hoesli, Zurich, Switzerland

Print: Stuertz GmbH, Wuerzburg, Germany

Distribution:

ALTEX, Schuetzenstr. 14, 78462 Konstanz,
Postbox 100125, 78401 Konstanz, Germany,
Phone: +49-7531-16614,
Mobile: +49-1726272224, Fax +49-7531-25833,
e-mail: abo@altex.ch

Publisher:

Spektrum Akademischer Verlag GmbH.
Spektrum Akademischer Verlag ist ein Unter-
nehmen von Springer Science+Business Media.

Edition: 1000

Circulation: 4 times per annum plus
supplements

Subscription rates:

Europe

Private subscribers 75 Euro

Libraries, commercial institutions 150 Euro

No 4 subscription 20 Euro

Outside Europe

Private subscribers 91 Euro

Libraries, commercial institutions 166 Euro

No 4 subscription 24 Euro

Subscription rates include costs of shipment
(four issues/year) and taxes. Animal
welfare organisations, students and subscribers
from threshold countries may ask for
special subscription rates. Scientific journalists
(press card) can apply for a free subscription.

Aims and scope

ALTEX, edited by the Swiss Society ALTEX Edition is the official journal of MEGAT, the Middle European Society for Alternatives to Testing in Animals. ALTEX is devoted to the publication of research on the development and promotion of alternatives to animal experiments according to the 3R concept of Russell and Burch: Replace, Reduce, and Refine. ALTEX is publishing original articles, short communications, reviews as well as news and comments, meeting reports and book reviews in English and German. Animal experiments are defined by the editors as all experimental procedures using animals which may cause pain, suffering, and emotional harm to animals and which are conducted in testing, research and education or to obtain tissues, organs, and other animal derived products.

Besides covering the biomedical aspects of animal experimentation, ALTEX is also devoted to the bioethics of the complex relationship between man and animals. Articles published in ALTEX should express a basic concern about the dignity of living creatures. ALTEX is not only aimed at developing a new approach to recognise animals as partners but it also intends to introduce a scientific sight in the discussions on animal experiments. Articles devoted to the social and ethical aspects of this topic will, therefore, be judged according to stringent scientific standards. Manuscripts submitted to ALTEX are evaluated by two reviewers. The evaluation takes into account the scientific merit of a manuscript and the contribution to animal welfare and the 3R-principle.

© Copyright: Society ALTEX Edition, Zurich, Switzerland