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RISK ASSESSMENT & RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE EU

Scientific assessment

Policy, legislation, authorisation...

European Commission
European Parliament
European Council
EU Member States
**EFSA Founding Regulation (EC) 178/2002**

**EFSA does not**

- Develop or propose policies, legislation, norms and standards
- Enforce legislation
- Classification of products as food/food category
- Authorise products & nutrition/health claims made on foods
- Take charge of food safety/quality controls
- Setting labelling requirements
- Make recommendations to consumers
- Monitor or assess consumers’ behaviour, societal/economical aspects

**These are for Risk Managers**
Health claims should only be authorised in the EU after a scientific assessment of the highest possible standard. Claims substantiated by:

- Generally accepted scientific evidence
- Totality of the available scientific data
- Weighing the evidence

EFSA NDA Panel adopts scientific opinions

Authorisation: by Commission/Member States, European Parliament scrutiny.
HEALTH CLAIMS ON FOODS: REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS


- Food category, a food or a food constituent (e.g. a nutrient or other substance, or a fixed combination of nutrients/other substances)
- Function claims **cannot** refer to a disease
- Disease risk reduction claims **cannot** refer to reduction of the risk of a disease, but to reduction of a risk factor for disease
- Subjects with a disease **cannot** be the target population for claims made on food
  - Target population for claims = **general (healthy) population or subgroups thereof**
- **Efficacy assessment.** No safety assessment
PRINCIPLES FOR SCIENTIFIC SUBSTANTIATION

General scientific guidance for stakeholders on health claim applications

A food/constituent   ➔   A claimed effect

1. Is the food/constituent characterised?
2. Is the claimed effect based on the essentiality of a nutrient? OR
   Is the claimed effect defined and is it a beneficial physiological effect, and can be measured \textit{in vivo} in humans?
3. Is a cause and effect relationship established between the consumption of the food/constituent and the claimed effect?
   ✓ for the target population and under the proposed conditions of use (CoU)

Scientific substantiation (positive outcome) requires a favourable outcome to ALL three questions
**Characterisation of the food/constituent**

**i. Composition/characteristics**
- Plant sterols/stanols
- LDL-cholesterol
- Resistant starch
- Post-prandial blood glucose
- Sugar-free gum
- Tooth mineralisation

**ii. Manufacturing process**
- Water-soluble tomato concentrate
  - Standardised by the total of 37 constituents
  - Inhibiting platelet aggregation *in vitro*

**iii. Known mechanism of action**
- Non-digestible carbohydrates
- Post-prandial blood glucose

**For a food category:** Whether the information provided sufficiently addresses the variability between individual foods regarding those characteristics which may influence the specific claimed effect?
PRINCIPLES FOR SCIENTIFIC SUBSTANTIATION (cont.)

General scientific guidance for stakeholders on health claim applications

Characterisation of microorganisms

- **Species identification + strain characterisation/typing** needed, since effects are strain specific unless the contrary is demonstrated.
- New **molecular tools** (multilocus sequence typing, optical mapping, whole-genome sequencing, etc.). Open list to others.
- **Several methods** often needed in combination.
General scientific guidance for stakeholders on health claim applications

Characterisation of the claimed effect

- the human studies submitted
- Identify the health/disease outcome(s) in relation to the food/constituent and for which the available evidence may be strong
- Do outcome(s) describe a beneficial physiological effect?
- Are outcome variable(s) direct measures of the claimed effect?
- Are the assessment methods appropriate?
General scientific guidance for stakeholders on health claim applications

- Pertinent human efficacy studies (central for substantiation) – hierarchy of evidence
  - carried out with the food/constituent for the claim?
  - appropriate outcome measure(s) for the claimed effect?
  - study group is representative of the target population?
  - the design and quality of the study in relation to the risk of bias?
  - conditions for human studies vs. conditions of use for the claim?

- Supportive studies: Efficacy studies in animals, non-efficacy studies in humans, animals/in vitro (e.g. mechanisms that explain the effect of the food)

- Weighing the evidence: combining human efficacy studies + supportive studies + biological plausibility of the effect to conclude on substantiation
Insufficient characterisation of the food/constituent

a major reason for unfavourable opinions related to microorganisms in 2009/2010

- Non-characterised microorganisms (87%)
- Characterised microorganisms (13%)
Insufficient characterisation of the claimed effect
other major reason for unfavourable opinions

- **Non defined claims:**

- **Non beneficial claims:**
  ‘reduction of gastric acid levels’, ‘reduction of inflammation’

- **Specific and measurable**

- **Is a beneficial physiological effect for the target population**
Insufficient characterisation of the claimed effect

Not all outcomes, which can be measured *in vivo* in humans by generally accepted methods, reflect a direct benefit on human physiology

E.g. Changes in the composition of the gut microbiota / immune markers *per se* / SCFA

Adapted from NaturalMed Apothecary, Inc. 2006
Lack of pertinent human studies

Clinical utility of probiotics in inflammatory bowel disease.
Cain AM, Karpa KD.
York Hospital, Pennsylvania, USA.

Probiotics and prebiotics: findings in allergic disease.
Tang ML, Lahn H, Blaser MJ, Grigoriadis A, Karpati BM, Effectove Immunology, Royal Children’s Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia. mimi.tang@rch.org.au

Grandy G, Medina M, Soria R, Terán CG, Araya M.
Paediatric Centre Albina Patiño, Department of Gastroenterology and Nutrition, Cochabamba, Bolivia. ggrandy@inta.cl
Peer-reviewed publications may not provide the evidence needed for scientific substantiation of health claims

- **Aim of the publication** (human intervention/observational studies, meta-analysis of RCTs) **may not fit the purpose and conditions of the claim** (e.g. insufficient characterisation of the food/constituent, study group not representative of the target population, inappropriate outcome measures of the claimed effect)

- **Statistical analyses** may be inappropriate in relation to the outcome measure of interest for the claim (e.g. PP and/or ITT analyses based on a different outcome)

- **Relevance of findings may depend on the context** (e.g. hypothesis-generating, exploratory studies vs. confirmatory studies)

The use and value of peer-reviewed publications depend on their purpose.
# Examples of authorised/non-authorised health claims (Art. 13.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food/constituent</th>
<th>Health relationship</th>
<th>Reasons/outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dietary fibre                     | • Maintain a healthy immune system;  
• Maintain normal blood lipid levels/a healthy cardiovascular system  
• Maintain healthy cholesterol levels  
• Maintain normal blood sugar levels  
• Low glycaemic response  
• Reduce fat absorption  
• Maintain your body weight  
• Maintain normal bowel/colonic function | Unfavourable evaluation:  
Not sufficiently characterised  
Non-authorised |
| Arabinoxylan from wheat endosperm | Reduction of post-prandial glycaemic responses                                        | Favourable evaluation  
Authorised |
| Rye fibre                         | Changes in bowel function                                                             | Favourable evaluation  
Authorised |
| Wheat bran fibre                  | ↑ intestinal transit                                                                  | Favourable evaluation  
Authorised |
Health claim assessments in different jurisdictions are often driven by different legislative frameworks governing the authorisation of health claims made on food!
ALTERNATIVES to HEALTH CLAIMS?

- “Probiotics” as generic descriptor
- Nutrition claim “contains probiotics”
- “Probiotics” as recognised food category (comparable to “dietary fibre”)
- “Probiotics” in “positive list” (as Canada)

For consideration by EU Risk Managers

(i.e. Member States and the European Commission)
EFSA GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

- General scientific guidance for stakeholders on health claim applications
- Preparation and presentation of health claim application
- 6 guidance on specific health claims areas

- Scientific Committee Guidance on the assessment of the biological relevance of data in scientific assessments
  - generic issues/criteria to consider biological relevance, particularly when deciding on whether an observed effect is of biological relevance
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