Predicting LLNA Potency (Strong, Weak, Non-sensitizers) Defined Approach: Kao STS Kao ITS Shiseido ANN (D hC) Shiseido ANN (D hC KS) P&G BN ITS-3

Table 6. Defined Approach (DA) performance in predicting LLNA sensitizing potency.

Bayesian network; DKH and D hC KS: DPRA/h-CLAT/KeratinoSensTM; D hC: DPRA/h-CLAT.

N	126	120	126	126	115
Accuracy (%)*	67.5	66.7	65.1	69.8	67.8
Over-predicted (%)	21.4	14.2	21.4	23.0	12.2

*Performance was assessed	for prediction of the	ree potency classes as de	escribed in the main text, and is s	hown against the maximum subse	et (N) out of 128 s
Under-predicted (%)	11.1	19.2	13.5	7.1	20.0
Over-predicted (%)	21.4	14.2	21.4	23.0	12.2

stances with all necessary DA features. With the exception of the P&G BN ITS-3, all DA human potency predictions were off by one class only (i.e. no non-sensi-

tizers predicted as strong or vice versa).

LLNA: local lymph node assay; STS: sequential testing strategy; ITS: integrated testing strategy; SVM: support vector machine; ANN: artificial neural network; BN: