

assessment (RA), which involves examining the intrinsic toxicity of an agent (hazard assessment) and comparing it with the anticipated human exposure to characterize the likelihood of adverse effects (risk characterization). Although this process is meant to integrate all data sources (human, environmental, in vivo, in vitro, in silico), in practice existing regulations of pharmaceutical and chemical substances continue to ask for sector-specific RAs, each of which has its own specific information requirements and uses different methods for the ultimate risk quantification. Although regulators often stress the primacy of human data, in practice their use is constrained by availability and lack of defined quality criteria. There have been some efforts in the past to develop frameworks for the use of human data (eg, from poison centers) for risk assessment purposes. However, these have had only limited success. More recently, integrated approaches have been developed using information from animal studies and human data based on mode of action and weight of evidence concepts. These approaches need to be tested and validated. Harmonized data collection based on defined quality criteria is a precondition for better use of human data in risk assessment. It will only become a reality if existing networks of institutions such as poison control and clinical toxicology centers are being strengthened and, importantly, if they interact with regulatory decision makers on a regular basis. This will result in enhanced sharing of knowledge, build consensus, and facilitate clear, easily understood, transparent, and unambiguous integrated RA procedures. Network initiatives such as the EU FP7 project HEROIC aim to contribute to the development of such harmonized approaches that meet the challenges of RA.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT STATE OF CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY IN RUSSIA

K. Zagorodnikova*

Therapeutics and Clinical Pharmacology, North-western state medical university named after I.I.Mechnikov, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation

Summary: K. Zagorodnikova, A. Burbello, M. Frolov, D. Sychev, V. Petrov

Clinical pharmacology in Russia was established 13 years after the first World Health Organization (WHO) manifesto describing its duties was released. In 1983, it was defined as a separate educational discipline in medical universities. Starting from 1997, the medical specialty “clinical pharmacologist” was established, and its functions were defined. It was built on the union of pharmacology and internal medicine, and that is why clinical pharmacology in Russia is characterized by close proximity to routine patient care. A clinical pharmacologist in Russia should first receive training in internal medicine and then 2-year specialization in clinical pharmacology. The current main duties of clinical pharmacologists in Russia are defined by the ministerial laws released in 2003 and 2010, updated in 2012. According to these documents, clinical pharmacologists should see patients and be able to adjust treatment by taking into account various possible factors of individual response to medications. They should advise when necessary and interpret results of pharmacogenetic analyses; perform therapeutic drug monitoring and drug interaction analyses; and diagnose, register, and manage adverse drug reactions. Furthermore, clinical pharmacologists should manage quality control of medications used in their hospitals, participate in drug and therapeutics committees, develop and maintain a system of formulary lists of medications, perform drug utilization surveillance, participate in microbiology monitoring in relation to antibiotic utilization, define economic feasibility of different medications use, and approve purchase of drugs according to the general hospital needs.

They should also provide informational services to physicians and patients on various issues of rational drug use.

According to the current law, every medical institution should have a position of clinical pharmacologist; hospitals with >500 beds are advised to have a corresponding division. This provides grounds for active development of the specialty and improvement of educational programs. Some universities have courses of clinical pharmacology included in the curriculum of other specialists. Since 2009, clinical pharmacologists in Russia are cooperating within the all-Russian “Association of Clinical Pharmacologists” comprising the vast majority of regions. The association is performing important organizational, informational and expert functions.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared.

References

- Clinical pharmacology. Scope, Organization, Training. Report of a WHO study group. *World Health Organ Tech Rep Ser.* 1970;446:5-21.
- “On establishment of the specialty “clinical pharmacology”” – law of the Ministry of Health of Russia No.131. 1997.
- “On upgrading activities of physicians - clinical pharmacologists” law of the Ministry of Health of Russia No. 494. 2003.
- “On approval of the Order of medical assistance to the population in the field of clinical pharmacology” law of the Ministry of Health of Russia No. 575H. 2012.

DIABETES, DIABETES RISK FACTORS AND TREATMENTS, AND BREAST CANCER

P. Boyle*

International Prevention Research Institute, Lyon, France

Summary: To clarify the potential association between diabetes, related factors, treatments, and breast cancer risk, a series of meta-analyses was carried out following PRISMA guidelines. For breast cancer at all ages, the risks obtained from prospective studies were: diabetes (SRR = 1.27 [95% CI, 1.16 to 1.39]); physical activity (SRR = 0.88 [0.85 to 0.92]); glycemic load (SRR = 1.05 [1.00 to 1.10]); glycemic index (SRR = 1.05 [1.00 to 1.09]); fasting glucose (SRR = 1.14 [0.94 to 1.37]); serum insulin (SRR = 1.11 [0.75 to 1.85]); c-peptide (SRR = 1.00 [0.69 to 1.46]), and adiponectin (SRR = 1.16 [0.93 to 1.46]). An increase of 5 units in BMI was associated with postmenopausal breast cancer (SRR = 1.12 [95% CI, 1.08 to 1.16]) but not at premenopausal ages (SRR = 0.83 [95% CI, 0.72 to 0.95]). Serum insulin and c-peptide were associated with breast cancer at postmenopausal ages but not at premenopausal. For IGF-1, Hodge's standardized mean difference (HSMD) was calculated, and there was no significant association with breast cancer (HSMD = 0.026 [95% CI, -0.031 to 0.084]).

The SRR for breast cancer among users of insulin glargine was 1.08 (0.98 to 1.20) and was 0.92 (0.32 to 2.65) when restricted to randomized trials. Among new users, the SRR for breast cancer was 1.09 (0.98, 1.21), and there was no trend of increasing breast cancer risk with increasing duration of use of glargine ($\beta = 0.04$) ($P = 0.52$). Risk of breast cancer in a prospective cohort declined with increasing follow-up, from 1.99 (1.31, 2.03) with 2 years of follow-up, to 1.60 (1.10 to 2.32) with 3 years, 1.50 (1.10 to 2.10) with 4 years and 1.18 (0.84 to 1.66) with 5 years of follow-up. There is no reduction in risk of breast cancer associated with metformin use (SRR = 0.96 [95% CI, 0.85 to 1.08]) even for the longest duration of use (SRR = 0.94 [95% CI, 0.81 to 1.09]).

An association between these 2 common diseases could have important implications for public health, with common risk factors