Each of you is playing the role of a member of the **Advocacy Group:**

An **advocacy group** is typically concerned with the humane treatment of animals and limiting their use in regulatory decision-making. For this scenario, you are part of the IN VITRO NOW an advocacy group whose main interest is to urge the use of tests that can replace animal testing. You have the following data from In Vitro Inc, who developed an alternative model and propose it as the new testing strategy for classification of compounds as skin irritants instead. You will be speaking with government regulators to pitch your view of these new results.

The Data:

In the study below, 4 chemicals were tested using the Human Cell Culture Skin Tox Test and compared to the established rabbit skin model and the human patch test (HPT). Each chemical was evaluated in 12 different trials. If more than ¾ of the trials showed toxicity, the chemical was classified as an IRRITANT and if ¾ of the trials did not show toxicity, the chemical was classified as a NON-IRRITANT. *For simplicity, the positive and negative controls are not included in the data, but showed the appropriate responses to validate each trial.*

	TOXICOLOGY TEST		
	Rabbit Skin Test	**Human Skin Test (HP4)**	**In VITRO INC Human Cell Culture Test**
	TEST RESULTS *(based on 12 different trials)*		
Chemical A	IRRITANT	IRRITANT	NON-IRRITANT
Chemical B	IRRITANT	NON-IRRITANT	NON-IRRITANT
Chemical C	NON-IRRITANT	IRRITANT	IRRITANT
Chemical D	NON-IRRITANT	NON-IRRITANT	NON-IRRITANT

Your Questions *(discuss as a group and be prepared to report out your key ideas)*

Question 1:
Discuss your interpretation of the variability within the data from the perspective of an advocacy group member. What general conclusions can you draw from the data?

Question 2:
As an advocate do you think confirmatory testing in a living animal is ever justified? Why or why not? If so, when would an animal model be appropriate to use?