PRHE DEVELOPS NEW RESEARCH METHOD

With collaborators, UCSF's Program on Reproductive Health and the Environment (PRHE) developed the Navigation Guide systematic review methodology in 2009 to better evaluate the quality and strength of the evidence on how hazardous chemicals affect

reproductive health.

The Navigation Guide is changing how environmental health evidence is evaluated.



TESTING AND PROOF OF CONCEPT

The Navigation Guide systematic review method has been demonstrated through 8 scientific peer reviewed studies evaluating developmental exposures to pollutants and subsequent health effects.

ENDORSEMENT AND DISSEMINATION

The National Academies of SCIENCES · ENGINEERING · MEDICINE



"...systematic-review standards provide an approach that would substantially strengthen the IRIS process..."

- NASEM 2014

The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) cited the Navigation Guide systematic review method as exemplary of the type of methods EPA should use.

> "Judging that this existing review fulfilled the requirements of a systematic review and that there was no evidence of risk of bias in the assessment, the committee used the Lam et al. review as a basis for its own assessment."

"If DOD's intent is to perform a credible systematic review, the committee suggests following one of the established methods (e.g., Woodruff and Sutton 2014; NTP 2019)"

- NASEM 2019

- NASEM 2017

The Navigation Systematic reviews Use of systematic reviews 2000 Guide is cited are now required by in environmental health 1800 N law by EPA under 1600 has grown dramatically SYSTEMATIC REVI the Toxic Substances 1400 **Control Act (TSCA)** 1200 times in the 1000 scientific 800 literature. 600 400 Ь 200 # 0 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2009 2010 2011 YEAR

GLOBAL IMPACT





The World Health Organization / International Labour Organization Joint Estimates of the Global Burden of Work-Related Disease and Injury, is currently implementing the Navigation Guide method across 15 systematic reviews, with the input of over 200 of the world's leading environmental scientists from over 35 countries marking global recognition of our work on better methods for evaluating environmental health evidence.

