Table 1. Shepard's Criteria for Proof of Teratogenicity in Humans as Applied to the Relationship between Zika Virus Infection and Microcephaly and Other Brain Anomalies.*

Criterion No.	Criterion	Evidence	Criterion Met?
1	Proven exposure to the agent at one or more critical times during prenatal development	On the basis of case reports, case series, and epidemiologic studies of microcephaly that are associated with laboratory-confirmed or presumed Zika virus infection, the timing of Zika virus infection associated with severe microcephaly and intracranial calcifications appears to be in the late first or early second trimester.[14-20]	Yes
2	Consistent findings by ≥2 high-quality epidemiologic studies, with control of confounding factors, sufficient numbers, exclusion of positive and negative bias factors, prospective studies if possible, and relative risk ≥6	On the basis of data from Brazil, the temporal and geographic association between Zika virus illness and cases of microcephaly is strong.[1] Two epidemiologic studies have been published. In a study in Brazil[14] that used a prospective cohort design, 29% of women with Zika virus infection at any time during pregnancy had abnormalities on prenatal ultrasonography, some of which have not been confirmed postnatally, In a study in French Polynesia,[2] retrospective identification of eight cases of microcephaly and the use of serologic and statistical data and mathematical modeling suggested that 1% of fetuses and infants born to women with Zika virus infection during the first trimester had microcephaly; the risk ratio in this analysis was approximately 50, as compared with the baseline prevalence of microcephaly. No other epidemiologic studies have examined this association to date.	Partially
3	Careful delineation of clinical cases; a specific defect or syndrome, if present, is very helpful	The phenotype has been well characterized in fetuses and infants with presumed congenital Zika virus infection, including microcephaly and other serious brain anomalies, redundant scalp skin, eye findings, arthrogryposis, and clubfoot.[15,20-23] The phenotype in some infants appears to be consistent with the fetal brain disruption sequence,[20,22] which has been observed after infection with other viral teratogens.[24]	Yes
4	Rare environmental exposure that is associated with rare defect	Reports of fetuses and infants with microcephaly who are born to women with brief periods of travel to countries with active Zika virus transmission are consistent with Zika virus being a rare exposure.[16,18,19] The defect, congenital microcephaly, is rare, with a birth prevalence of approximately 6 cases per 10,000 liveborn infants, according to data from birth-defects surveillance systems in the United States.[25]	Yes
5	Teratogenicity in experimental animals important but not essential	No results of an animal model with Zika virus infection during pregnancy and fetal effects have yet been published.	No
6	Association should make biologic sense	Findings are similar to those seen after prenatal infection with some other viral teratogens (e.g., cytomegalovirus, rubella virus).[26] Animal models have shown that Zika virus is neurotropic,[27,28] which supports biologic plausibility. Evidence that Zika virus infects neural progenitor cells and produces cell death and abnormal growth,[29] along with evidence of Zika virus in brains of fetuses and infants with microcephaly, on the basis of immunohistochemical staining and identification of Zika virus RNA and live virus,[16,17,19] provides strong biologic plausibility.	Yes
7	Proof in an experimental system that the agent acts in an unaltered state	This criterion applies to a medication or chemical exposure, not to infectious agents.	NA

* The criteria listed here were proposed by Shepard.[9] Criteria 1, 2, and 3 or criteria 1, 3, and 4 are considered to be essential, whereas criteria 5, 6, and 7 are helpful but not essential. Partial evidence is insufficient to meet a criterion. NA denotes not applicable.