

File No: LTD/2036 and LTD/2037

August 2018

**NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS NOTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT SCHEME  
(NICNAS)**

**PUBLIC REPORT**

**1-Cyclohexene-1-propanoic acid, ethyl ester (LTD/2036)  
2-Cyclohexene-1-propanoic acid, ethyl ester (LTD/2037)**

This Assessment has been compiled in accordance with the provisions of the *Industrial Chemicals (Notification and Assessment) Act 1989* (the Act) and Regulations. This legislation is an Act of the Commonwealth of Australia. The National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS) is administered by the Department of Health, and conducts the risk assessment for public health and occupational health and safety. The assessment of environmental risk is conducted by the Department of the Environment and Energy.

This Public Report is available for viewing and downloading from the NICNAS website or available on request, free of charge, by contacting NICNAS. For requests and enquiries please contact the NICNAS Administration Coordinator at:

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Street Address: | Level 7, 260 Elizabeth Street, SURRY HILLS NSW 2010, AUSTRALIA. |
| Postal Address: | GPO Box 58, SYDNEY NSW 2001, AUSTRALIA.                         |
| TEL:            | + 61 2 8577 8800  |
| FAX:            | + 61 2 8577 8888  |
| Website:        | <a href="http://www.nicnas.gov.au">www.nicnas.gov.au</a>        |

**Director  
NICNAS**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| SUMMARY .....   | 3         |
| CONCLUSIONS AND REGULATORY OBLIGATIONS .....  | 3         |
| ASSESSMENT DETAILS .....  | 6         |
| 1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS .....   | 6         |
| 2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL.....  | 6         |
| 3. COMPOSITION.....   | 7         |
| 4. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES .....   | 7         |
| 5. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION .....   | 8         |
| 6. HUMAN HEALTH IMPLICATIONS .....  | 9         |
| 6.1. Exposure Assessment.....   | 9         |
| 6.1.1. Occupational Exposure.....   | 9         |
| 6.1.2. Public Exposure.....   | 10        |
| 6.2. Human Health Effects Assessment .....  | 11        |
| 6.3. Human Health Risk Characterisation .....   | 14        |
| 6.3.1. Occupational Health and Safety .....   | 14        |
| 6.3.2. Public Health .....  | 14        |
| 7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS.....  | 15        |
| 7.1. Environmental Exposure & Fate Assessment .....   | 15        |
| 7.1.1. Environmental Exposure .....   | 15        |
| 7.1.2. Environmental Fate .....   | 15        |
| 7.1.3. Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC).....                                     | 16        |
| 7.2. Environmental Effects Assessment.....  | 16        |
| 7.2.1. Predicted No-Effect Concentration .....  | 16        |
| 7.3. Environmental Risk Assessment .....  | 17        |
| <u>APPENDIX A: PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES .....</u>                                   | <u>18</u> |
| <u>APPENDIX B: TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS .....</u>                                       | <u>21</u> |
| B.1. Acute toxicity – oral.....   | 21        |
| B.2. Acute toxicity – dermal.....   | 21        |
| B.3. Acute toxicity – inhalation .....  | 22        |
| B.4. Corrosion – skin ( <i>in vitro</i> EPIDERM™ Skin Corrosion Test).....                  | 23        |
| B.5. Irritation– skin ( <i>in vitro</i> EPIDERM™ Skin Irritation Test) .....                | 23        |
| B.6. Irritation – eye ( <i>in vitro</i> Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability Test) ..... | 24        |
| B.7. <i>In Chemico</i> Skin Sensitisation (DPRA Test).....                                  | 25        |
| B.8. <i>In Vitro</i> Skin Sensitisation (ARE-Nrf2 Luciferase Test).....                     | 26        |
| B.9. <i>In Vitro</i> Skin Sensitisation (h-CLAT test).....                                  | 26        |
| B.10. Skin sensitisation – mouse local lymph node assay (LLNA) .....                        | 27        |
| B.11. Skin sensitisation – human volunteers .....   | 28        |
| B.12. Repeat dose toxicity – 14 Day Preliminary Toxicity Study .....                        | 29        |
| B.13. Repeat dose toxicity (first study).....   | 30        |
| B.14. Repeat dose toxicity (second study; repeat of first study).....                       | 31        |
| B.15. Repeat dose toxicity (third study) .....  | 33        |
| B.16. Genotoxicity – bacteria .....   | 35        |
| B.17. Genotoxicity – <i>in vitro</i> chromosome aberration test .....                       | 36        |
| <u>APPENDIX C: ENVIRONMENTAL FATE AND ECOTOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS .....</u>             | <u>38</u> |
| C.1. Environmental Fate .....   | 38        |
| C.1.1. Ready biodegradability.....  | 38        |
| C.1.2. Ready biodegradability.....  | 38        |
| C.2. Ecotoxicological Investigations .....  | 39        |
| C.2.1. Acute toxicity to fish .....   | 39        |
| C.2.2. Acute toxicity to aquatic invertebrates .....  | 40        |
| C.2.3. Algal growth inhibition test.....  | 41        |
| C.2.4. Inhibition of microbial activity.....  | 42        |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY .....  | 43        |

## SUMMARY

The following details will be published in the NICNAS *Chemical Gazette*:

| ASSESSMENT REFERENCE | APPLICANT   | CHEMICAL OR TRADE NAME   | HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL | INTRODUCTION VOLUME                          | USE                  |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------|--|----------------------|
| LTD/2036<br>LTD/2037 | International Flavours and Fragrances (Australia) Pty Ltd | 1-Cyclohexene-1-propanoic acid, ethyl ester (LTD/2036)<br><br>2-Cyclohexene-1-propanoic acid, ethyl ester (LTD/2037) | Yes                | ≤ 1 tonne per annum (each notified chemical) | Fragrance ingredient |

## CONCLUSIONS AND REGULATORY OBLIGATIONS

### Hazard classification

Based on the available information, the notified chemicals are recommended for hazard classification according to the *Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)*, as adopted for industrial chemicals in Australia. The recommended hazard classification is presented in the following table.

| <i>Hazard classification</i>     | <i>Hazard statement</i>                    |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Skin Sensitisation (Category 1B) | H317 – May cause an allergic skin reaction |

The environmental hazard classification according to the *Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)* is presented below. Environmental classification under the GHS is not mandated in Australia and carries no legal status but is presented for information purposes.

| <i>Hazard classification</i> | <i>Hazard statement</i>      |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Acute Category 2             | H401 – Toxic to aquatic life |

### Human health risk assessment

Under the conditions of the occupational settings described, the notified chemicals are not considered to pose an unreasonable risk to the health of workers.

When used in the proposed manner, the notified chemicals are not considered to pose an unreasonable risk to public health.

### Environmental risk assessment

On the basis of the PEC/PNEC ratio the notified chemicals are not considered to pose an unreasonable risk to the environment.

### Recommendations

#### REGULATORY CONTROLS

#### Hazard Classification and Labelling

- The notified chemicals should be classified as follows:
  - Skin Sensitisation (Category 1B): H317 – May cause an allergic skin reaction

The above should be used for products/mixtures containing the notified chemicals, if applicable, based on the concentration of the notified chemicals present.

### Health Surveillance

- As the notified chemicals are skin sensitisers, employers should carry out health surveillance for any worker who has been identified in the workplace risk assessment as having a significant risk of skin sensitisation.

### CONTROL MEASURES

#### Occupational Health and Safety

- A person conducting a business or undertaking at a workplace should implement the following engineering controls to minimise occupational exposure to the notified chemicals during reformulation processes:
  - Enclosed, automated processes, where possible
  - Local exhaust ventilation
- A person conducting a business or undertaking at a workplace should implement the following safe work practices to minimise occupational exposure to the notified chemicals during reformulation processes:
  - Avoid skin contact
- A person conducting a business or undertaking at a workplace should ensure that the following personal protective equipment is used by workers to minimise occupational exposure to the notified chemicals during reformulation processes:
  - Impervious gloves
  - Coveralls

Guidance in selection of personal protective equipment can be obtained from Australian, Australian/New Zealand or other approved standards.

- A copy of the SDS should be easily accessible to employees.
- If products and mixtures containing the notified chemicals are classified as hazardous to health in accordance with the *Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)* as adopted for industrial chemicals in Australia, workplace practices and control procedures consistent with provisions of State and Territory hazardous substances legislation should be in operation.

#### Disposal

- Where reuse or recycling are not appropriate, dispose of the notified chemicals in an environmentally sound manner in accordance with relevant Commonwealth, state, territory and local government legislation.

#### Storage

- The handling and storage of the notified chemicals should be in accordance with the Safe Work Australia Code of Practice for *Managing Risks of Hazardous Chemicals in the Workplace* (SWA, 2012) or relevant State or Territory Code of Practice.

#### Emergency procedures

- Spills or accidental release of the notified chemicals should be handled by containment, physical collection and subsequent safe disposal.

## Regulatory Obligations

### *Secondary Notification*

This risk assessment is based on the information available at the time of notification. The Director may call for the reassessment of the chemical under secondary notification provisions based on changes in certain circumstances. Under Section 64 of the *Industrial Chemicals (Notification and Assessment) Act (1989)* the notifier, as well as any other importer or manufacturer of the notified chemical, have post-assessment regulatory obligations to notify NICNAS when any of these circumstances change. These obligations apply even when the notified chemical is listed on the Australian Inventory of Chemical Substances (AICS).

Therefore, the Director of NICNAS must be notified in writing within 28 days by the notifier, other importer or manufacturer:

- (1) Under Section 64(1) of the Act; if
  - the importation volume exceeds one tonne per annum for each notified chemical;
  - the combined concentration of the notified chemicals exceeds or is intended to exceed  $\leq 1.1\%$  concentration in air freshener products, rinse-off cosmetic products and other household products,  $\leq 0.73\%$  in fine fragrances,  $\leq 0.5\%$  concentration in body lotion, hand and face creams and  $\leq 0.3\%$  concentration in deodorants;

or

- (2) Under Section 64(2) of the Act; if
  - the function or use of the chemicals has changed from a fragrance ingredient, or is likely to change significantly;
  - the amount of chemicals being introduced has increased, or is likely to increase, significantly;
  - the chemicals have begun to be manufactured in Australia;
  - additional information has become available to the person as to an adverse effect of the chemicals on occupational health and safety, public health, or the environment.

The Director will then decide whether a reassessment (i.e. a secondary notification and assessment) is required.

### *Safety Data Sheet*

The SDS of the isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals and products containing the isomer mixture provided by the notifier were reviewed by NICNAS. The accuracy of the information on the SDS remains the responsibility of the applicant.

## ASSESSMENT DETAILS

### 1. APPLICANT AND NOTIFICATION DETAILS

#### APPLICANT

International Flavours and Fragrances (Australia) Pty Ltd (ABN: 77 004 269 658)  
310 Frankston-Dandenong Road  
DANDENONG VIC 3175

#### NOTIFICATION CATEGORY

LTD/2036: Limited-small volume: Chemical other than polymer (1 tonne or less per year)  
LTD/2037: Limited-small volume (reduced fee notification): Chemical other than polymer (1 tonne or less per year) - Chemical notified at the same time as a similar chemical.

#### EXEMPT INFORMATION (SECTION 75 OF THE ACT)

No details are claimed exempt from publication.

#### VARIATION OF DATA REQUIREMENTS (SECTION 24 OF THE ACT)

Variation to the schedule of data requirements is claimed for dissociation constant.

#### PREVIOUS NOTIFICATION IN AUSTRALIA BY APPLICANT

None

#### NOTIFICATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES

China – Simplified Notification (2015)

### 2. IDENTITY OF CHEMICAL

#### MARKETING NAMES

FRET 11-0078 (mixture of the notified chemicals; > 97% combined concentration)

#### CAS NUMBER

LTD/2036: 65173-43-5  
LTD/2037: 109976-49-0

#### CHEMICAL NAME

LTD/2036: 1-Cyclohexene-1-propanoic acid, ethyl ester  
LTD/2037: 2-Cyclohexene-1-propanoic acid, ethyl ester

#### OTHER NAMES


LTD/2036: Ethyl 3-(cyclohex-1-en-1-yl) propanoate  
LTD/2037: Ethyl 3-(cyclohex-2-en-1-yl) propanoate

#### MOLECULAR FORMULA


C<sub>11</sub>H<sub>18</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (LTD/2036 and LTD/2037)

#### STRUCTURAL FORMULA

LTD/2036:



LTD/2037:



## MOLECULAR WEIGHT

182.26 g/mol (LTD/2036 and LTD/2037)

## ANALYTICAL DATA

Reference NMR, FT-IR, HPLC, GC, GC-MS, UV spectra were provided and optical activity was determined. (Analysed as FRET 11-0078: mixture of the notified chemicals)

## 3. COMPOSITION

## DEGREE OF PURITY

The notified chemicals are manufactured as an inseparable isomer mixture with a combined purity of > 96%. The ratio of the two isomers has been determined on two separate batches by GC-MS (IFF, 2013) and GC (IFF, 2017) as follows:

GC-MS

67.9% (LTD/2036)

29.5% (LTD/2037)

GC

81.0% (LTD/2036)

15.0% (LTD/2037)

## NON HAZARDOUS IMPURITIES (&gt; 1% BY WEIGHT)

|                      |   |                 |                       |
|----------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Chemical Name</i> | Propanoic acid, 3-cyclohexylidene-, ethyl ester |                 |                       |
| <i>CAS No.</i>       | 18559-89-2                                      | <i>Weight %</i> | 2.8 (GC); 0.4 (GC-MS) |

## ADDITIVES/ADJUVANTS

|                             |  |                 |     |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----|
| <i>Chemical Name</i>        | 2-Propenoic acid, 3-phenyl-, 2-propen-1-yl ester   |                 |     |
| <i>CAS No.</i>              | 1866-31-5  | <i>Weight %</i> | 0.1 |
| <i>Hazardous Properties</i> | H302 – Harmful if swallowed<br>H315 – Causes skin irritation<br>H319 – Causes serious eye irritation |                 |     |

## 4. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

The following measured physicochemical properties were obtained on the isomer mixture of the notified chemicals.

APPEARANCE AT 20 °C AND 101.3 kPa: colourless liquid

| Property                       | Value  | Data Source/Justification |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Freezing Point                 | < -20 °C   | Measured                  |
| Boiling Point                  | Boiling with decomposition from ~237 °C at 102.9 kPa                                     | Measured                  |
| Density                        | 966 kg/m <sup>3</sup> at 20 °C   | Measured                  |
| Vapour Pressure                | 7 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> kPa at 25 °C  | Measured                  |
| Water Solubility               | 8.17 × 10 <sup>-2</sup> g/L at 20 °C   | Measured                  |
| Hydrolysis as a Function of pH | t <sub>1/2</sub> at 25 °C: 64.4 days at pH 4;<br>54.8 days at pH 7;<br>14.2 days at pH 9 | Measured                  |

|  |                                     |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| Partition Coefficient<br>(n-octanol/water) | log Pow = 4.08 – 4.19 at 35 °C      | Measured                                      |
| Adsorption/Desorption                      | log K <sub>oc</sub> = 2.96 at 30 °C | Measured                                      |
| Dissociation Constant                      | Not determined                      | No dissociable functionality                  |
| Surface Tension                            | 66.5 mN/m at 20 °C                  | Measured                                      |
| Flash Point                                | 104 ± 2 °C at 101.3kPa              | Measured                                      |
| Pyrophoric Properties                      | Non-pyrophoric                      | Measured                                      |
| Flammability                               | Combustible liquid <sup>#</sup>     | Based on measured flash point                 |
|  | Non-flammable in contact with water | Measured                                      |
| Autoignition Temperature                   | 252 ± 5 °C                          | Measured                                      |
| Explosive Properties                       | Not explosive                       | Expert prediction based on chemical structure |
| Oxidising Properties                       | Not oxidising                       | Expert prediction based on chemical structure |

<sup>#</sup>Based on *Australian Standard AS1940 definitions*

#### DISCUSSION OF PROPERTIES

For full details of tests on physical and chemical properties, refer to Appendix A.

#### Reactivity

The notified chemicals are expected to be stable under normal conditions of use.

#### Physical hazard classification

Based on the submitted physico-chemical data depicted in the above table, the isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals is not recommended for hazard classification according to the *Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)*, as adopted for industrial chemicals in Australia.

The isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals has a flash point of 104 °C. Based on *Australian Standard AS1940* definitions for combustible liquids, a liquid that has a flash point which is both greater than 93 °C and is less than its boiling point is a Class C2 combustible liquid.

## 5. INTRODUCTION AND USE INFORMATION

#### MODE OF INTRODUCTION OF NOTIFIED CHEMICAL (100%) OVER NEXT 5 YEARS

The notified chemicals will be introduced into Australia as components of fragrance oils at a combined concentration of ≤ 11%.

#### MAXIMUM INTRODUCTION VOLUME OF NOTIFIED CHEMICAL (100%) OVER NEXT 5 YEARS

##### LTD/2036

| Year   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Tonnes | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 |

##### LTD/2037

| Year   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Tonnes | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 | ≤ 1 |

#### PORT OF ENTRY

Melbourne

#### IDENTITY OF RECIPIENTS

International Flavours & Fragrances (Australia) Pty Ltd

#### TRANSPORTATION AND PACKAGING

The notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of ≤ 11%) will be imported as components of fragrance oils in 205 L polypropylene-lined steel drums. The imported fragrance oils containing the notified chemicals will be transported to reformulation sites within Australia by road. The end-use products containing the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of ≤ 1.1%) will be packaged in containers suitable for retail sale.



**USE**

The notified chemicals will be used as fragrance ingredients for use in cosmetic and household products. The proposed use concentration for both chemicals (combined) is  $\leq 1.1\%$  concentration in (spray) air freshener products, rinse-off cosmetic products and other household products,  $\leq 0.73\%$  in fine fragrances,  $\leq 0.5\%$  concentration in body lotion, hand and face creams and  $\leq 0.3\%$  concentration in deodorants.

**OPERATION DESCRIPTION**

The notified chemicals will not be manufactured in Australia. The notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 11\%$ ) will be introduced into Australia as components of fragrance oils for reformulation into cosmetic and household products.

*Reformulation*

The procedures for incorporating the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 11\%$ ) into end-use products will likely vary depending on the nature of the formulated products and may involve both automated and manual transfer steps. However, in general, it is expected that for the reformulation process, the notified chemicals will be weighed and added to the mixing tank where it will be blended with additional additives to form the finished cosmetic and household products. This will be followed by automated filling of the reformulated products into containers of various sizes. The blending operations are expected to be highly automated and use closed systems and/or adequate ventilation. During the reformation process, samples of the notified chemicals and the finished end-use products will be taken for quality control testing.

*Cosmetic products*

The finished cosmetic products containing the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$ ) will be used by consumers and professionals (such as beauticians and hair dressers). Depending on the nature of the products, application could be by hand, sprayed or through the use of an applicator.

*Household products*

Household products containing the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$ ) may be used by consumers and professional workers (i.e., cleaners). The products may be used in either closed systems with episodes of controlled exposures, for example automatic washing machines, or open processes and manually by rolling, brushing, spraying and dipping.

**6. HUMAN HEALTH IMPLICATIONS****6.1. Exposure Assessment****6.1.1. Occupational Exposure**

## CATEGORY OF WORKERS

| <i>Category of Worker</i>               | <i>Exposure Duration (hours/day)</i> | <i>Exposure Frequency (days/year)</i> |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Transport and warehouse workers         | Incidental                           | Incidental                            |
| Plant operators - mixing/blending       | 4                                    | 250                                   |
| Plant operators - drum handling         | 1                                    | 250                                   |
| Plant operators - drum cleaning/washing | 2                                    | 200                                   |
| Plant operators - equipment maintenance | 2                                    | 250                                   |
| Quality control workers                 | 1                                    | 250                                   |
| End users (professionals)               | 1                                    | 250                                   |

## EXPOSURE DETAILS

*Transport and storage*

Transport, storage and warehouse workers may come into contact with the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 11\%$  in fragrance oils or  $\leq 1.1\%$  concentration in final formulated products), only in the unlikely event of an accidental rupture of containers.

*Reformulation*

During reformulation, dermal, ocular and perhaps inhalation exposure of workers to the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 11\%$ ) may occur during handling of drums, during weighing and transfer stages, blending, quality control analysis and cleaning and maintenance of equipment. The notifier states that exposure

is expected to be minimised through the use of local ventilation and/or enclosed systems, and through the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) such as protective clothing, eye protection and impervious gloves.

#### *End use professionals*

Workers involved in professions which involve professional cleaning or the application of cosmetic products containing the notified chemical to clients (e.g. beauty salon workers) may be exposed to the notified chemicals at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$ . The principal route of exposure will be dermal, while ocular and inhalation exposure are also possible. Such professionals may use some PPE to minimise repeated exposure and good hygiene practices are expected to be in place. If PPE is used, exposure of such workers is expected to be of a similar or lesser extent than that experienced by consumers using products containing the notified chemicals.

#### **6.1.2. Public Exposure**

There will be widespread and repeated exposure of the public to the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$ ) through the use of a wide range of cosmetic and household products. The principal route of exposure will be dermal, while ocular and inhalation exposure (e.g. through the use of spray products) are also possible.

Data on typical use patterns of product categories (SCCS, 2012; Cadby *et al.*, 2002; ACI, 2010; Loretz *et al.*, 2006) in which the notified chemicals may be used are shown in the following tables. For the purposes of the exposure assessment, Australian use patterns for the various product categories are assumed to be similar to those in Europe. A dermal absorption (DA) rate of 100% was assumed for the notified chemicals for calculation purposes. For the inhalation exposure assessment, a 2-zone approach was used (Steiling *et al.*, 2014; Rothe *et al.*, 2011; Earnest, Jr, 2009) with an adult inhalation rate of 20 m<sup>3</sup>/day (enHealth, 2012). It was conservatively assumed that the fraction of the notified chemicals inhaled is 50%. A lifetime average female body weight (BW) of 64 kg (enHealth, 2012) was used for calculation purposes.

#### *Cosmetic products (dermal exposure)*

| Product Type          | Amount<br>(mg/day) | C<br>(%) | RF<br>(unitless) | Daily Systemic Exposure<br>(mg/kg bw/day) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------|------------------|---|
| Body lotion           | 7820               | 0.500    | 1.000            | 0.6109                                    |
| Face cream            | 1540               | 0.500    | 1.000            | 0.1203                                    |
| Hand cream            | 2160               | 0.500    | 1.000            | 0.1688                                    |
| Fine fragrances       | 750                | 0.730    | 1.000            | 0.0855                                    |
| Deodorant (non-spray) | 1500               | 0.300    | 1.000            | 0.0703                                    |
| Shampoo               | 10460              | 1.100    | 0.010            | 0.0180                                    |
| Conditioner           | 3920               | 1.100    | 0.010            | 0.0067                                    |
| Shower gel            | 18670              | 1.100    | 0.010            | 0.0321                                    |
| Hand wash soap        | 20000              | 1.100    | 0.010            | 0.0344                                    |
| Hair styling products | 4000               | 1.100    | 0.100            | 0.0688                                    |
| <b>Total</b>          |                    |          |                  | <b>1.2158</b>                             |

C = maximum intended combined concentration of the notified chemicals; RF = retention factor

Daily systemic exposure = (Amount  $\times$  C  $\times$  RF  $\times$  Dermal Absorption) / Body Weight

#### *Household products (indirect dermal exposure – from wearing clothes)*

| Product type    | Amount<br>(g/use) | C<br>(%) | Product<br>Retained (%) | Transfer<br>(%) | Daily systemic exposure<br>(mg/kg bw/day) |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Laundry liquid  | 230               | 1.1      | 0.95                    | 10              | 0.0376                                    |
| Fabric softener | 90                | 1.1      | 0.95                    | 10              | 0.0147                                    |
| <b>Total</b>    |                   |          |                         |                 | <b>0.0523</b>                             |

C = maximum intended combined concentration of the notified chemicals

Daily systemic exposure = (Amount  $\times$  C  $\times$  Product Retained  $\times$  Transfer  $\times$  Dermal Absorption) / Body Weight

#### *Household products (direct dermal exposure)*

| Product type   | Frequency<br>(use/day) | C<br>(%) | Contact<br>Area<br>(cm <sup>2</sup> ) | Product<br>Use C<br>(g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) | Film<br>Thickness<br>(cm) | Time<br>Scale<br>Factor | Daily systemic<br>exposure<br>(mg/kg bw/day) |
|----------------|------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Laundry liquid | 1.43                   | 1.1      | 1980                                  | 0.01                                     | 0.01                      | 0.007                   | 0.0003                                       |

|                     |   |     |      |       |      |       |               |
|---------------------|---|-----|------|-------|------|-------|---------------|
| Dishwashing liquid  | 3 | 1.1 | 1980 | 0.009 | 0.01 | 0.03  | 0.0028        |
| All-purpose cleaner | 1 | 1.1 | 1980 | 1     | 0.01 | 0.007 | 0.0238        |
| <b>Total</b>        |   |     |      |       |      |       | <b>0.0269</b> |

C = maximum intended combined concentration of the notified chemicals

Daily systemic exposure = (Frequency × C × Contact area × Product Use Concentration × Film Thickness on skin × Time Scale Factor × Dermal Absorption)/Body Weight

*Hairspray (Inhalation exposure):*

| Product type | Amount (g/use) | C (%) | Inhalation rate (m <sup>3</sup> /day) | Exposure duration zone 1 (min) | Exposure duration zone 2 (min) | Fraction inhaled (%) | Volume zone 1 (m <sup>3</sup> ) | Volume zone 2 (m <sup>3</sup> ) | Daily systemic exposure (mg/kg bw/day) |
|--------------|----------------|-------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Hairspray    | 9.89           | 1.1   | 20                                    | 1                              | 20                             | 50                   | 1                               | 10                              | 0.0354                                 |
| <b>Total</b> |                |       |                                       |                                |                                |                      |                                 |                                 | <b>0.0354</b>                          |

C = maximum intended combined concentration of the notified chemicals

Total daily systemic exposure = Daily systemic exposure in Zone 1 [(amount × C × inhalation rate × exposure duration (zone 1) × fraction inhaled)/(volume (zone 1) × body weight)] + Daily systemic exposure in Zone 2 [(amount × C × inhalation rate × exposure duration (zone 2) × fraction inhaled)/(volume (zone 2) × body weight)]

The worst case scenario estimation using these assumptions is for a person who is a simultaneous user of all products listed in the above tables that contain the notified chemicals at the maximum intended combined concentration as specified by the notifier in various product types. This would result in a combined internal dose of 1.3304 mg/kg bw/day.

It is acknowledged that inhalation exposure to the notified chemicals from use of other cosmetic and household cleaning products (in addition to hair spray) may occur. However, it is considered that the combination of the conservative hair spray inhalation exposure assessment parameters, and the aggregate exposure from use of the dermally applied products, which assumes a conservative 100% absorption rate, is sufficiently protective to cover additional inhalation exposure to the notified chemicals from use of other spray cosmetic and household products with low exposures (e.g. air fresheners and deodorants).

## 6.2. Human Health Effects Assessment

The results from toxicological investigations conducted on the isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals are summarised in the following table. For full details of the studies, refer to Appendix B.

| Endpoint   | Result and Assessment Conclusion   |
|--|--|
| Rat, acute oral toxicity   | LD50 > 2000 mg/kg bw; low toxicity   |
| Rat, acute dermal toxicity   | LD50 > 2000 mg/kg bw; low toxicity   |
| Rat, acute inhalation toxicity   | LC50 > 4.78 mg/L/4 hour; low toxicity  |
| Skin corrosion – <i>in vitro</i> (EpiDerm™ model)  | non-corrosive  |
| Skin irritation – <i>in vitro</i> (EpiDerm™ model)   | non-irritating   |
| Eye irritation – <i>in vitro</i> Bovine Corneal Opacity Test (BCOP)  | non-irritating   |
| Skin sensitisation – <i>in chemico</i> Direct Peptide Reactivity Assay (DPRA)  | positive (moderate to high reactivity)   |
| Skin sensitisation – <i>in vitro</i> ARE-Nrf2 luciferase test  | negative   |
| Skin sensitisation – <i>in vitro</i> human Cell Line Activation Test (h-CLAT)  | positive   |
| Mouse, skin sensitisation – Local lymph node assay   | evidence of sensitisation (EC3 = 34%)  |
| Human, skin sensitisation – RIPT (1.5%)  | no evidence of sensitisation   |
| Rat, combined repeated dose oral toxicity with reproduction/developmental screening (first study)                                  | Reproductive effects in females treated at 10,000 ppm (low number of pregnant dams that gave birth and litters that survived until study termination). |
| Rat, combined repeated dose oral toxicity with reproduction/developmental screening test (second study; repeat of the first study) | The study was terminated due to abnormally low number of pregnant dams that gave birth and had litters that survived until study termination.          |
| Rat, combined oral repeated dose oral toxicity with reproduction/developmental screening test (third                               | NOAEL parental toxicity: 2,500 ppm (equivalent to 148 mg/kg bw/day in males and 175 mg/kg bw/day in  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| study)  | females)<br>NOAEL reproductive toxicity: 10,000 ppm (equivalent to 553 mg/kg bw/day in males and 687 mg/kg bw/day in females)<br>NOAEL developmental (offspring) toxicity: 2,500 ppm |
| Mutagenicity – bacterial reverse mutation                 | non mutagenic  |
| Genotoxicity – <i>in vitro</i> chromosome aberration test | non clastogenic  |

#### *Toxicokinetics*

Given the low molecular weight of the notified chemicals (182.26 g/mol) absorption across the gastrointestinal and respiratory tracts may occur. However, dermal absorption is expected to be limited given the low water solubility (0.0817 g/L) and high lipophilicity (log Pow = 4.08 – 4.19) of the notified chemicals, limiting penetration through the hydrophilic epidermis.

#### *Acute toxicity*

The isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals is of low acute oral, dermal, and inhalation toxicity based on studies conducted in rats.

#### *Irritation and sensitisation*

The isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals was found to be non-corrosive and non-irritating to the skin based on *in vitro* studies conducted using the reconstructed human epidermis model.

In an *in vitro* bovine corneal opacity and permeability (BCOP) eye irritation test the isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals was determined to be non-irritating.

One *in chemico* and two *in vitro* cell based assays were conducted to evaluate the skin sensitisation potential of the isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals. The tests are part of Integrated Approach to Testing and Assessment (IATA) which address specific events of the Adverse Outcome Pathway (AOP) leading to development of skin sensitisation (OECD, 2016). The tests are thus considered relevant for assessment of the skin sensitisation potential of a test substance, along with other supporting information.

The first key event in the AOP, commonly referred to as the molecular initiating event, for sensitisation is the covalent binding to nucleophilic centres in skin proteins. The *in chemico* Direct Peptide Reactivity Assay (DPRA) aims to address this key event by measuring the interaction of a test substance with cysteine and lysine-containing small synthetic peptides (representing the nucleophilic centres in skin protein).

The second key event in the AOP for sensitisation is the activation of keratinocytes which leads to upregulation of stress related proteins (cytokines) via transcriptional upregulation of the genes. The ARE-Nrf2 Luciferase Assay aims to address this key event by measuring the change in expression of luciferase gene under the transcriptional control of a constitutive promoter fused with an Antioxidant Response Element (ARE). The ARE is from a gene that is known to be upregulated by contact sensitisers.

The third key event in the AOP for sensitisation is the activation of dendritic cells resulting in change in cell surface expression of markers such as CD54 and CD86. The *in vitro* h-CLAT assay measures the change in expression of cell surface markers CD54 and CD86 upon activation of human monocyte leukaemia cell line (THP-1) with proper stimuli. The assay addresses the third key event in the AOP for skin sensitisation.

The isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals showed positive responses in two of the three tests (DPRA assay and h-CLAT test), suggesting the notified chemicals could be skin sensitisers. According to the OECD test guidelines (TG 442c, 442d and 442e), the suite of tests based on the AOP may not detect pre-haptens (chemicals that can become sensitisers following auto-oxidation) and pro-haptens (chemicals requiring enzymatic activation to become sensitisers). As such, (i) the notified chemical may be a stronger sensitiser than predicted in the DPRA assay and h-CLAT test (ii) the negative result in the ARE-Nrf2 Luciferase assay could potentially be a false negative.

The isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals was found to be a weak skin sensitiser in a mouse local lymph node assay (EC3 = 34%). However, the notified chemicals tested negative in a human repeat insult patch test when tested at 1.5% concentration.

Based on the results of the LLNA study, the notified chemicals are considered Category 1B skin sensitisers.

### *Repeated dose toxicity*

Three combined repeated dose toxicity studies with reproduction/developmental screening tests were conducted in rats. For information on the first two studies, refer to the table in this section and 'B.13. Repeat dose toxicity (first study)' and 'B.14. Repeat dose toxicity (second study; repeat of first study)'.

In the third repeated dose toxicity study, the test substance was administered at 2,500, 5,000 and 10,000 ppm (148, 289 and 584 mg/kg bw/day) in males for 6 weeks (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating and until approx. 80% of the females had given birth). Females were dosed with the test substance at 2,500, 5,000 and 10,000 ppm (175, 351 and 679 mg/kg bw/day) for approx. 8 weeks (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating and gestation and at least up to post-partum day 14). Recovery group males and females were given the test substance at 10,000 ppm (522 and 694 mg/kg bw/day, respectively) for 6 weeks, followed by a recovery period of 2 weeks. The recovery animals were not mated during the study. The average high dose intake in males and females (main study and recovery groups combined) was 553 and 687 mg/kg bw/day, respectively.

One female animal treated at 2,500 ppm was found dead on day 24 of gestation. No clinical signs of toxicity were noted from any of the main group and recovery animals.

High dose males had decreased mean body weight gain (statistically significant at Weeks 2 and 7) due to decreased food consumption. High dose females had a statistically significantly lower body weight than controls during day 14 of lactation. The mean body weight gain for these females was also 69% lower than controls over the whole lactation period; this was not accompanied by differences in mean food consumption.

Males treated at 10,000 ppm showed notable increases in white blood cell, neutrophil, lymphocyte, monocyte and basophil counts, compared to controls. Females in the 10,000 ppm group showed notable increases in neutrophil and reticulocyte counts. High dose males had notable reductions in lactate dehydrogenase and creatinine kinase activity compared to controls; this trend continued after recovery. Lactate dehydrogenase and creatinine kinase activity was noticeably lower in all female treatment groups (statistically significant decrease only at 10,000 ppm); these trends were partially reversed after recovery. Large decreases in thyroid stimulating hormone were reported in all treated males (statistically significant only at 10,000 ppm). High and low dose female showed notable increases in thyroid stimulating hormone concentrations compared to controls.

No consistent organ abnormalities were detected during necropsy. The mean absolute weight of the Cowper's gland in low and high dose males was statistically significantly decreased; the relative weight of this gland was statistically significantly and notably decreased in low and high dose males, respectively. After recovery, high dose males continued to have notably lower Cowper's gland weight. High dose females had apparent decreases in absolute and relative thymus weight in comparison with controls; but reversed after recovery.

The No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) for the test substance was established by the study authors as 148 mg/kg bw/day in males and 175 mg/kg bw/day in females (lowest dose tested).

### *Toxicity for reproduction*

Fertility index, parturition index, percentage of pregnant animals, litter size, pup ano-genital distance, mating index and pup mortality were not affected. No consistent signs of toxicity were noted in the pups belonging to the control or treatment groups. The live birth index however, was statistically significantly lower in the 10,000 ppm group compared to the control group.

The combined mean body weight of pups of both sexes on lactation day 14 was statistically significantly lower in the 5,000 and 10,000 ppm groups compared to the control group. The mean body weight gain over the entire lactation period for pups in these groups was statistically significantly lower than the control group. These body weight and body weight gain changes were seen as test substance-related and adverse.

The NOAEL for reproductive toxicity was established as 10,000 ppm and the NOAEL for developmental (offspring) toxicity was established as 2,500 ppm.

### *Mutagenicity/Genotoxicity*

The isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals tested negative in a bacterial reverse mutation assay and in an *in vitro* mammalian cell chromosome aberration test with human lymphocytes.

**Health hazard classification**

Based on the available information, the notified chemicals are recommended for hazard classification according to the *Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)*, as adopted for industrial chemicals in Australia. The recommended hazard classification is presented in the following table.

| <i>Hazard classification</i>     | <i>Hazard statement</i>                    |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Skin Sensitisation (Category 1B) | H317 – May cause an allergic skin reaction |

**6.3. Human Health Risk Characterisation****6.3.1. Occupational Health and Safety**

Based on the available information, the notified chemicals are weak skin sensitisers.

*Reformulation*

During reformulation, workers may be at risk of skin sensitisation when handling the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 11\%$ ) as introduced. The notifier anticipates that worker exposure will be limited through the use of engineering controls such as enclosed systems, automated processes and local exhaust ventilation. The use of appropriate PPE (coveralls, imperious gloves and eye protection) will also be used to limit worker exposure.

*End-Use*

Workers involved in professions which involve cleaning or the application of cosmetic products containing the notified chemicals to clients (*e.g.* beauty salon workers) may be exposed to the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$ ). The principal route of exposure will be dermal, while ocular and inhalation exposure are also possible. PPE may be employed by workers to minimise repeated exposure, and good hygiene practices are expected to be in place. If PPE is used, the risk to such workers is expected to be of a similar or lesser extent than that for consumers using the various products containing the notified chemicals.

Therefore, under the occupational settings described, the risk to the health of workers from use of the notified chemicals is not considered to be unreasonable.

**6.3.2. Public Health**

Members of the public will experience widespread and frequent exposure to the notified chemicals (at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$ ) through daily use of cosmetic and household cleaning products. The main route of exposure is expected to be dermal, while ocular and inhalation exposure are also possible, particularly if products are applied by spray.

*Sensitisation*

Based on the results of an LLNA study, the notified chemicals are weak skin sensitisers (EC3 = 34%).

Proposed methods for the quantitative risk assessment of dermal sensitisation have been the subject of significant discussion (see for example, Api *et al.*, 2008 and RIVM, 2010). As is shown in the table below, the Consumer Exposure Level (CEL) from use of the notified chemicals in leave-on and rinse-off cosmetic products may be estimated (SCCS, 2012 and Cadby *et al.*, 2002). Consideration of available information and application of appropriate safety factors allowed the derivation of an Acceptable Exposure Level (AEL) of  $27.37 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ . In this instance, the factors employed included an interspecies factor (3), intraspecies factor (10), a matrix factor (3.16), a use and time factor (3.16) and a database factor (1), giving an overall safety factor of 300.

| <b>Product type</b>                            | <b>Proposed usage concentration (%)</b> | <b>CEL (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2</math>)</b> | <b>AEL (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2</math>)</b> |
|--|---|---|---|
| Fine fragrances                                | 0.73                                    | 27.37   | 27.37   |
| Other leave-on cosmetics (assumed: face cream) | 0.5                                     | 13.63   | 27.37   |
| Rinse-off cosmetics (assumed: hand wash soap)  | 1.1                                     | 2.56  | 27.37   |

As the  $AEL \geq CEL$ , the risk to the public of the induction of sensitisation that is associated with the use of the notified chemicals at a combined concentration of  $\leq 0.73\%$  concentration in fine fragrances, at  $\leq 0.3\%$  concentration in deodorants and  $\leq 0.5\%$  in other leave-on cosmetics (using face cream as a worst case example), and at  $\leq 1.1\%$  concentration in rinse-off cosmetic products and household cleaning products (using hand wash soap as a worst case example) is not considered to be unreasonable. It is acknowledged that consumers may be exposed to multiple products containing the notified chemicals, and a quantitative assessment based on the aggregate exposure has not been conducted.

#### *Repeated dose toxicity*

The repeat dose toxicity potential was estimated by calculation of the margin of exposure (MoE) of the notified chemicals using the worst case exposure scenario from use of multiple products by an individual with total exposure of 1.3304 mg/kg bw/day (see Section 6.1.2). Using a NOAEL for the notified chemicals of 148 mg/kg bw/day in males and 175 mg/kg bw/day in females derived from combined oral repeated dose oral toxicity with reproduction/developmental screening test, the margin of exposure (MoE) was estimated to be 111 for males and 132 for females. A MoE value  $\geq 100$  is generally considered to be acceptable for taking into account intra- and inter-species differences.

Overall, based on the information available, the risk to the public associated with use of the notified chemicals at a combined concentration of  $\leq 1.1\%$  in (spray) air freshener products, rinse-off cosmetic products and other household products,  $\leq 0.73\%$  in fine fragrances,  $\leq 0.5\%$  concentration in body lotion, hand and face creams and  $\leq 0.3\%$  in deodorants is not considered to be unreasonable.

## **7. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

### **7.1. Environmental Exposure & Fate Assessment**

#### **7.1.1. Environmental Exposure**

##### RELEASE OF CHEMICAL AT SITE

The notified chemicals will be imported as a component of fragrance oil formulations for local reformulation into finished cosmetic and household products. Environmental release during importation, transport and distribution may occur as a result of accidental spills. In the event of a spill, the notified chemicals are expected to be contained and collected with an inert absorbent material and disposed of to landfill.

The fragrance formulations containing the notified chemicals will be blended with other ingredients in the manufacture of cosmetic and household products within a fully enclosed environment. The process is expected to be followed by automated filling of the formulated products into containers of various sizes suitable for retail sale and end-use. Wastes containing the notified chemicals generated during reformulation include equipment wash water, empty import containers and spilt materials. These will be collected, recycled or released to on-site wastewater treatment facilities or sewers in accordance with local government regulations. Empty containers will be either recycled or disposed of to landfill.

##### RELEASE OF CHEMICAL FROM USE

The notified chemicals are expected to be released to the aquatic compartment through sewers during its use in various cosmetic and household products.

##### RELEASE OF CHEMICAL FROM DISPOSAL

Approximately 1% of the import volume of the notified chemicals is expected to remain as residues in end-use containers (or up to 10 kg/year for each notified chemical). Wastes and residue of the notified chemicals in empty containers are likely to either share the fate of the container and be disposed of to landfill, or be released to the sewer system when containers are rinsed before recycling through an approved waste management facility.

#### **7.1.2. Environmental Fate**

Following their use in cosmetic and household products in Australia, the majority of the notified chemicals are expected to enter the sewer system, before potential release to surface waters nationwide. Based on the result of a biodegradability study, the notified chemicals are considered readily biodegradable (79% in 28 days). For details of the environmental fate studies, please refer to Appendix C. The submitted study by the notifier has also indicated that the notified chemicals are not hydrolytically stable.

The half-life of the notified chemicals in air is calculated to be 1.19 hours based on reactions with hydroxyl radicals (AOPWIN v1.92, US EPA 2011). Therefore, the notified chemicals are not expected to persist in the atmospheric compartment.

### 7.1.3. Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)

The predicted environmental concentration (PEC) has been calculated to assume a worst case scenario, with 100% release of the notified chemicals into sewer systems nationwide and no removal within sewage treatment plants (STPs).

| Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) for the Aquatic Compartment |        |              |
|---|--------|--------------|
| Total Annual Import Volume  | 1,000  | kg/year      |
| Proportion expected to be released to sewer                             | 100    | %            |
| Annual quantity of chemical released to sewer                           | 1,000  | kg/year      |
| Days per year where release occurs                                      | 365    | days/year    |
| Daily chemical release:   | 2.74   | kg/day       |
| Water use   | 200.0  | L/person/day |
| Population of Australia (Millions)                                      | 24.386 | million      |
| Removal within STP  | 0      | %            |
| Daily effluent production:  | 4,877  | ML           |
| Dilution Factor - River   | 1.0    |              |
| Dilution Factor - Ocean   | 10.0   |              |
| PEC - River:  | 0.56   | µg/L         |
| PEC - Ocean:  | 0.06   | µg/L         |

STP effluent re-use for irrigation occurs throughout Australia. The agricultural irrigation application rate is assumed to be 1000 L/m<sup>2</sup>/year (10 ML/ha/year). The notified chemicals in this volume are assumed to infiltrate and accumulate in the top 10 cm of soil (density 1500 kg/m<sup>3</sup>). Using these assumptions, irrigation with a concentration of 0.562 µg/L may potentially result in a soil concentration of approximately 0.0037 mg/kg. Assuming accumulation of the notified chemicals in soil for 5 and 10 years under repeated irrigation, the concentration of notified chemicals in the applied soil in 5 and 10 years may be approximately 0.018-0.002 mg/kg and 0.037 mg/kg, respectively.

## 7.2. Environmental Effects Assessment

The results from ecotoxicological investigations conducted on the isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals are summarised in the table below. Details of these studies can be found in Appendix C.

| Endpoint                            | Result                            | Assessment Conclusion                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Fish Toxicity                       | 96h LC50 = 1.65 mg/L              | Toxic to fish                           |
| <i>Daphnia</i> Toxicity             | 48h EC50 = 1.3 mg/L               | Harmful to <i>Daphnia</i>               |
| Algal Toxicity                      | 72h E <sub>r</sub> C50 = 4.6 mg/L | Harmful to algae                        |
| Inhibition of Bacterial Respiration | 3h EC50 = 410 mg/L                | Not inhibitory to bacterial respiration |

Based on the above ecotoxicological data for the isomer mixture, the notified chemicals are expected to be acutely toxic to fish, daphnia and algae. Therefore, under the Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) (United Nations, 2009), the notified chemicals are formally classified as “Acute Category 2; Toxic to aquatic life”. Based on the ready biodegradability and low bioaccumulation potential, the notified chemicals are not expected to be harmful to aquatic life in the long term, and are therefore not formally classified under the GHS.

### 7.2.1. Predicted No-Effect Concentration

The predicted no-effects concentration (PNEC) was calculated from the most sensitive endpoint, which in this case is *Daphnia* toxicity. A safety factor of 100 was used as acute endpoints for three trophic levels are available.

| Predicted No-Effect Concentration (PNEC) for the Aquatic Compartment |     |      |
|--|-----|------|
| LC50 ( <i>Daphnia</i> , 48h)   | 1.3 | mg/L |
| Assessment Factor  | 100 |      |
| PNEC:  | 13  | µg/L |



### 7.3. Environmental Risk Assessment

The Risk Quotient ( $Q = \text{PEC}/\text{PNEC}$ ) has been calculated based on the predicted PEC and PNEC.

| Risk Assessment | PEC $\mu\text{g/L}$ | PNEC $\mu\text{g/L}$ | Q      |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Q - River       | 0.56                | 13                   | 0.043  |
| Q - Ocean       | 0.056               | 13                   | < 0.01 |

The risk quotient for discharge of treated effluents containing the notified chemicals to the aquatic environment indicates that the notified chemicals are unlikely to reach ecotoxicologically significant concentrations in surface waters based on its maximum annual importation quantity. The notified chemicals are readily biodegradable, and expected to have a low potential for bioaccumulation. On the basis of the PEC/PNEC ratio and maximum annual importation volume the notified chemicals are not expected to pose an unreasonable risk to the environment.

**APPENDIX A: PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES****Freezing Point** < -20 °C

Method OECD TG 102 Melting Point/Melting Range (1995)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.1 Melting/Freezing Temperature (2008)

Remarks The test substance did not freeze under the conditions of the study.

Test Facility Harlan (2014a)

**Boiling Point** Boils with decomposition from ~237 °C at 102.9 kPa

Method OECD TG 103 Boiling Point (1995)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.2 Boiling Temperature (2008)

Remarks Determined using differential scanning calorimetry. After heating to the maximum experimental temperature (450 °C), the test substance had lost approx. 95% of its original weight. A black, solid residue had also formed around the periphery of the crucibles that had initially contained the test item. Based on these observations, the study authors concluded that the test item had decomposed upon boiling.

Test Facility Envigo (2017a)

**Density** 966 kg/m<sup>3</sup> at 20 °C

Method OECD TG 109 Density of Liquids and Solids (2012)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.3 Relative Density (2008)

Remarks Pycnometer method

Test Facility Envigo (2017a)

**Vapour Pressure** 7 × 10<sup>-3</sup> kPa at 25 °C

Method OECD TG 104 Vapour Pressure (2006)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.4 Vapour Pressure (2008)

Remarks Vapour pressure balance method

Test Facility Harlan (2014b)

**Water Solubility** 8.17 × 10<sup>-2</sup> g/L at 20 °C

Method OECD TG 105 Water Solubility (1995)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.6 Water Solubility (2008)

Remarks On the basis of the preliminary test, which estimated the water solubility to be greater than 10<sup>-2</sup> g/L, the flask shake method was performed.

Test Facility Harlan (2014a)

**Hydrolysis as a Function of pH**

Method OECD TG 111 Hydrolysis as a Function of pH (2004)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 C.7 Abiotic Degradation: Hydrolysis as a Function of pH (2008)

| <i>pH</i> | <i>T</i> (°C) | <i>t</i> <sub>1/2</sub> <i>days</i> |
|-----------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4         | 25            | 64.4                                |
| 7         | 25            | 54.8                                |
| 9         | 25            | 14.2                                |

Remarks The linearity of the detector response with respect to concentration was assessed over the nominal concentration range of 2.0 to 25 mg/L for each of the three analysis solution matrices used. The results were satisfactory with first order correlation coefficients (r) of ≥ 0.99 being obtained.

Test Facility Envigo (2017b)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Partition Coefficient (n-octanol/water)</b> | log Pow = 4.08 – 4.19 at 35 °C  |
| Method   | OECD TG 117 Partition Coefficient (n-octanol/water) (2004).<br>EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.8 Partition Coefficient (2008).  |
| Remarks  | The HPLC method was considered to be suitable for the purpose of the study since it showed two main peaks with well-defined and reproducible retention times.   |
| Test Facility                                  | Harlan (2014a)  |
| <b>Adsorption/Desorption</b>                   | log K <sub>oc</sub> = 2.96 at 30 °C   |
| Method   | OECD TG 121 Estimation of the Adsorption Coefficient (K <sub>oc</sub> ) on Soil and on Sewage Sludge using High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) (2001)<br>EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 C.19 Estimation of the Adsorption Coefficient (K <sub>oc</sub> ) on Soil and on Sewage Sludge using High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) (2008) |
| Remarks  | The test substance is not ionisable and therefore the study was conducted, at an approximately neutral pH.  |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017b)  |
| <b>Surface Tension</b>                         | 66.5 mN/m at 20 °C  |
| Method   | OECD TG 115 Surface Tension of Aqueous Solutions (1995)<br>EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.5 Surface Tension (2008)   |
| Remarks  | Concentration: 90% saturated solution. Based on the result of this study, the test item is regarded not to be surface active.   |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017a)  |
| <b>Flash Point</b>                             | 104 ± 2 °C at 101.3 kPa   |
| Method   | EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.9 Flash Point (2008)  |
| Remarks  | Closed cup method   |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017b)  |
| <b>Pyrophoric Properties</b>                   | Non-pyrophoric  |
| Method   | EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.13 Pyrophoric Properties of Solids and Liquids (2008)   |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017b)  |
| <b>Flammability</b>                            | Not flammable in contact with water   |
| Method   | EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.12 Flammability (Contact with Water) (2008)   |
| Remarks  | No gases were evolved from the test substance during the course of the experiment.  |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017b)  |
| <b>Autoignition Temperature</b>                | 252 ± 5 °C  |
| Method   | EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.15 Auto-Ignition Temperature (Liquids and Gases)  |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017b)  |
| <b>Explosive Properties</b>                    | No explosive properties   |
| Method   | EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.14 Explosive Properties (2008).   |
| Remarks  | Based on chemical structure   |
| Test Facility                                  | Envigo (2017b)  |
| <b>Oxidizing Properties</b>                    | No oxidising properties   |
| Method   | EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 A.21 Oxidizing Properties (Liquids) (2008)  |

|               |                             |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Remarks       | Based on chemical structure |
| Test Facility | Envigo (2017b)              |

**APPENDIX B: TOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS****B.1. Acute toxicity – oral**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE   | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals  |
| METHOD           | OECD TG 420 Acute Oral Toxicity - Fixed Dose Method (2001)<br>EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 B.1 bis Acute Toxicity (Oral) Fixed Dose Method |
| Species/Strain   | Rat/ Wistar (Rcc:Han)   |
| Vehicle          | None for 2000 mg/kg bw<br>Arachis oil BP – 300 mg/kg bw   |
| Remarks - Method | No significant protocol deviations. Animals were dosed by gavage.   |

## RESULTS

## Sighting Study

| <i>Dose mg/kg bw</i> | <i>Administered</i> | <i>Evident Toxicity</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 300                  | 1F                  | None                    | 0/1              |
| 2000                 | 1F                  | None                    | 0/1              |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Signs of Toxicity | No mortalities occurred or clinical signs of toxicity were noted. |
| Effects in Organs | No abnormalities detected at necroscopy.                          |
| Remarks - Results | All animals made expected body weight gains during the study.     |

## Main Study

| <i>Group</i> | <i>Number and Sex of Animals</i> | <i>Dose (mg/kg bw)</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 1            | 4F                               | 2000                   | 1/4              |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| LD50              | > 2000 mg/kg bw  |
| Signs of Toxicity | One animal was found dead on day 1 after dosing. No signs of toxicity were recorded for this animal during its previous observation time points.<br><br>Hunched posture was observed in the remaining rats on day 1 after dosing. No signs of toxicity appeared from day 2 after dosing till the end of the study.                               |
| Effects in Organs | The animal that had died during the study presented with haemorrhagic lungs, dark liver and dark kidneys. No abnormalities were detected at necroscopy in the remaining animals.   |
| Remarks - Results | The animal that had died during the study weighed 8 grams less than at the start of the study. All remaining animals had made expected body weight gains during the study. Body weights were not recorded on Day 14 after dosing due to technical error.<br><br>Based on the results of this study, the LD50 was estimated to be > 2000 mg/kg bw |

CONCLUSION The test substance has low acute oral toxicity

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017d)

**B.2. Acute toxicity – dermal**

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals  |
| METHOD         | OECD TG 402 Acute Dermal Toxicity – Limit Test (1987)<br>EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 B.3 Acute Toxicity (Dermal) – Limit Test |
| Species/Strain | Rat/Wistar (Rcc:Han)  |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Vehicle          | None  |
| Type of dressing | Semi-occlusive.                                   |
| Remarks - Method | No deviations from the study protocol were noted. |

## RESULTS

| Group | Number and Sex of Animals | Dose (mg/kg bw) | Mortality |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| 1     | 1M                        | 2000            | 0/1       |
| 2     | 1F                        | 2000            | 0/1       |
| 3     | 4M                        | 2000            | 0/4       |
| 4     | 4F                        | 2000            | 0/4       |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| LD50                         | > 2000 mg/kg bw   |
| Signs of Toxicity - Local    | None observed during the study  |
| Signs of Toxicity - Systemic | None observed during the study  |
| Effects in Organs            | None observed   |
| Remarks - Results            | All male animals showed expected body weight gains during the study, except the male in Group 1 (weight loss on the second week). All Group 4 females presented with weight loss on the first week of the study, but made expected weight gains during the second week. |

CONCLUSION The test substance is of low acute toxicity via the dermal route.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017e)

**B.3. Acute toxicity – inhalation**

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| METHOD             | OECD TG 403 Acute Inhalation Toxicity (2009)<br>EC Council Regulation No 440/2008, 93/21/EEC B.2 Acute Toxicity (Inhalation) (2014) |
| Species/Strain     | Rat/Wistar (Rcc:Han)  |
| Vehicle            | Acetonitrile  |
| Method of Exposure | Oro-nasal exposure  |
| Exposure Period    | 4 hours   |
| Physical Form      | Liquid aerosol  |
| Particle Size      | 3.11 µm (mean mass aerodynamic diameter)  |
| Remarks - Method   | No significant protocol deviations were noted.  |

## RESULTS

|   | Number and Sex of Animals | Concentration (mg/L) |        | Mortality |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------|-----------|
|   |                           | Nominal              | Actual |           |
| 1 | 5F/5M                     | 17.28                | 4.78   | 0/10      |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| LC50              | > 4.78 mg/L/4 hours   |
| Signs of Toxicity | During exposure to the test substance, all animals presented with wet fur and decreased respiratory rate. Immediately upon removal from the test chamber, all animals additionally displayed hunched posture and pilo-erection. All effects continued in all animals at one hour post exposure and had regressed from one day post exposure until the end of the study. |
| Effects in Organs | One male animal presented with dark patches on the lungs and one female animal presented with pale lungs.   |
| Remarks - Results | The authors of this study note that hunched posture pilo-erection and wet fur are commonly seen in animals for short period after removal from the exposure chamber following 4 hour inhalation studies. As such, these observations were considered to be due to the restraint procedure and not related to the test substance.  |

Nearly all animals (9/10) showed slight weight loss during the first day of the study, after exposure to the test substance. During the remainder of the recovery period all animals showed expected body weight gains, with the exception of one female animal, which exhibited body weight loss from days 1 to 3 after exposure.

CONCLUSION The test substance is of low acute toxicity via inhalation.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017f)

#### B.4. Corrosion – skin (*in vitro* EPIDERM™ Skin Corrosion Test)

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 431 *In vitro* Skin Corrosion - Reconstructed Human Epidermis (RHE) Test Method (2015)

EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 B.40 BIS. *In vitro* Skin Corrosion - Human Skin Model Test (2008)

Vehicle None

Remarks - Method No deviations to the study protocol were noted.

Test system: EpiDerm Skin Model.

The test substance (50 µL) was applied to the tissues in duplicate. Following exposure periods of 3 minutes (room temperature; test 1) and 1 hour (37 °C; test 2), the tissues were rinsed, treated with MTT and incubated (37 °C, 3 hours, dark conditions) to test cell viability. After extraction, optical densities were determined at 562 nm.

A preliminary test had been conducted, which found that the test substance was not able to directly reduce MTT.

Positive and negative controls were run in parallel with the test substance:

- Negative control: Sterile distilled water
- Positive control : Potassium hydroxide (8M)

#### RESULTS

| <i>Test material</i>    | <i>Test 1 (3 minute exposure period)</i>          |                                    | <i>Test 2 (1 hour exposure period)</i>            |                                    |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
|                         | <i>Mean OD<sub>562</sub> of duplicate tissues</i> | <i>Relative mean viability (%)</i> | <i>Mean OD<sub>562</sub> of duplicate tissues</i> | <i>Relative mean viability (%)</i> |
| <i>Negative control</i> | 1.794   | 100                                | 1.618   | 100                                |
| <i>Test substance</i>   | 1.676   | 93.4                               | 1.787   | 110.4                              |
| <i>Positive control</i> | 0.053   | 3.0                                | 0.039   | 2.4                                |

OD = optical density

Remarks - Results The positive and negative controls performed as expected and variation between tissue replicates was within acceptable range, confirming the validity of the test system.

CONCLUSION The test substance was non-corrosive to the skin under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017g)

#### B.5. Irritation– skin (*in vitro* EPIDERM™ Skin Irritation Test)

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 439 *In vitro* Skin Irritation: Reconstructed Human *Epidermis* Test Method (2015)

EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 B.46 *In vitro* Skin Irritation - Reconstructed Human *Epidermis* Test Method (2009)

Vehicle None  
Remarks - Method No deviations to the study protocol were noted.

The test substance (10 µL) was applied to the tissues in triplicate. Following a 15 minutes exposure at room temperature, the tissues were washed in Dulbecco's PBS (with Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup>), and then incubated in fresh medium at 37 °C for 42 hours. Each plate (which contained tissues and maintenance medium) was shaken for 15 min and then 1.6mL of maintenance medium from beneath each tissue was transferred to separate tubes and stored in a freezer for potential inflammatory mediator determination. The tissues were transferred to fresh medium containing MTT and incubated at 37 °C for 3 hours to test cell viability. After extraction, optical densities were determined at 562 nm.

Preliminary tests had been conducted, which indicated that the test substance does not directly interfere with MTT.

Positive and negative controls were run in parallel with the test substance:  
 - Negative control: Dulbecco's PBS with (with Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup>)  
 - Positive control: sodium dodecyl sulphate (5% w/v - aqueous)

#### RESULTS

| <i>Test material</i>    | <i>Mean OD<sub>562</sub> of triplicate tissues</i> | <i>Relative mean Viability (%)</i> | <i>SD of relative mean viability</i> |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Negative control</i> | 0.731  | 100                                | 5.7                                  |
| <i>Test substance</i>   | 0.842  | 115.2                              | 9.3                                  |
| <i>Positive control</i> | 0.083  | 11.4                               | 6.1                                  |

OD = optical density; SD = standard deviation

Remarks - Results The positive and negative controls performed as expected and the standard deviation of the relative mean viability of the test substance-treated tissues was within acceptable range, confirming the validity of the test system.

CONCLUSION The test substance was non-irritating to the skin under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017h)

#### B.6. Irritation – eye (*in vitro* Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability Test)

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 437 Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability Test Method for Identifying i) Chemicals Inducing Serious Eye Damage and ii) Chemicals Not Requiring Classification for Eye Irritation or Serious Eye Damage (2013)  
 EC Council Regulation No 440/2008 B.47 Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability Test Method for Identifying Ocular Corrosives and Severe Irritants

Vehicle None  
Remarks - Method No significant protocol deviations were noted.

Positive and negative controls were run in parallel with the test substance:  
 - Negative control: sodium chloride (0.9% w/v)  
 - Positive control: ethanol



## RESULTS

| <i>Test material</i>     | <i>Mean opacities of triplicate tissues</i> | <i>Mean permeabilities of triplicate tissues</i> | <i>IVIS</i> |
|--------------------------|---|--|-------------|
| <i>Negative control</i>  | 1.7   | 0.033  | 2.2         |
| <i>Test substance*</i>   | 2.0   | 0.020  | 2.3         |
| <i>Positive control*</i> | 32.7  | 0.845  | 45.3        |

IVIS = *in vitro* irritancy score

\*Corrected for background values

Remarks - Results The positive and negative controls performed as expected, confirming the validity of the test system.

The IVIS for the test substance was < 3, indicating that the test substance did not require classification for eye irritation.

CONCLUSION The test substance was not an eye irritant under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017i)

### B.7. *In Chemico* Skin Sensitisation (DPRA Test)

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD Derived from Gerberick *et al*, 2004, 2007.

Vehicle DMSO:acetonitrile (1:1) made to a final concentration of 100 mM

Remarks - Method The test substance was prepared in the vehicle solution. p-benzoquinone was used as a positive control and benzoic acid was used as a negative control. Both controls were set up in the vehicle solution. Vehicle reference controls were setup and run in parallel to the test substance. 0.5 mM solutions of cysteine and lysine peptides were prepared in dimethylformamide and lysine peptide reaction storage buffer, respectively. The test substance was incubated with the peptide solutions for 24 hours at room temperature in the dark. The ratios of test substance to peptides were 1:10 and 1:50 for cysteine and lysine peptides, respectively. Peptide depletion was then monitored by LC/MS/MS.

## RESULTS

| <i>Sample</i>    | <i>Cysteine Peptide Depletion (% ± CV)</i> | <i>Lysine Peptide Depletion (% ± CV)</i> |
|------------------|--|--|
| Vehicle          | 0.0 ± 10.0                                 | 0.0 ± 13.6                               |
| Negative Control | -6.7 ± 5.4                                 | -1.1 ± 9.9                               |
| Test Substance   | 77.1 ± 10.9                                | 6.9 ± 6.3                                |
| Positive Control | 98.3 ± 10.3                                | 97.9 ± 31.9                              |

CV = Coefficient of Variance

Remarks - Results The average reactivity of the test substance was calculated as 42%. This result ranked the test substance as moderately reactive overall. However, it should be noted that this average reactivity was just below the cut-off for high reactivity (42.47%).

The positive, negative and reference controls performed as expected, confirming the validity of the test.

CONCLUSION The test substance was considered to have moderate to high reactivity (positive for skin sensitisation) under the conditions of the test for peptide depletion, in the first key event of the adverse outcome pathway (AOP) for skin sensitisation.

TEST FACILITY Cyprotex (2014)

**B.8. In Vitro Skin Sensitisation (ARE-Nrf2 Luciferase Test)**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE   | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals  |
| METHOD           | Natsch and Emter 2008; Natsch, Emter and Ellis 2009; Natsch <i>et al.</i> , 2011  |
| Vehicle          | DMSO  |
| Remarks - Method | A 200mM stock solution of test substance was prepared in DMSO. A set of twelve solutions were prepared in DMSO from the stock solution (conc. range 0.98 – 2000 µM). The KeratinoSens cell line was treated with the test substance for 48 hours. DMSO and cinnamic aldehyde were used in parallel with the test substance as vehicle and positive controls respectively. Three independent experiments were conducted with samples tested in triplicate in each experiment. Cell viability was determined for each replicate using the MTT and Neutral Red assays. Skin sensitisation was measured as luciferase induction, calculated from three independent experiments. |

**RESULTS**

| <i>Sample</i>    | <i>Cell viability – IC50 (µM)<br/>(mean*)</i> | <i>Luciferase I<sub>MAX</sub> (maximum average fold<br/>induction of luciferase activity)<br/>(mean*)</i> |
|------------------|---|---|
| Negative control | -   | -   |
| Vehicle control  | -   | -   |
| Test substance   | 299.20  | 1.28  |
| Positive control | > 64  | -   |

\*: from three independent experiments conducted in triplicate

-: not provided

IC50 = Concentration for 50% reduction in cell viability

I<sub>MAX</sub> = Maximal fold-gene induction of the reporter gene up to 1000 µM concentration

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Remarks - Results | The EC1.5 value (concentration for an induction of 50% above solvent controls) was < 1000 µg/mL in at least 2 out of the 3 independent replicates. As such, the test substance was not considered a potential sensitiser. |
|                   | The positive control performed as expected. No information was given on the performance of the negative and vehicle controls.   |
| CONCLUSION        | The test substance was negative under the conditions of the test for the second key event in the AOP for skin sensitisation.  |

TEST FACILITY Institute for In Vitro Sciences (2014)

**B.9. In Vitro Skin Sensitisation (h-CLAT test)**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| TEST SUBSTANCE   | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals  |
| METHOD           | OECD TG 442E <i>In Vitro</i> Skin Sensitisation: human Cell Line Activation Test (h-CLAT; 2016)   |
| Vehicle          | Culture medium was the vehicle for the test substance. DMSO was the vehicle for the positive control. Culture medium: RPMI-1640 supplemented with 10% foetal bovine serum (v/v).  |
| Remarks - Method | No deviations from the study protocol that affected study integrity were noted.   |
|                  | Human monocytic leukaemia cell line (THP-1) was used for the assay. Positive control was 1-chloro-2, 4-dinitrobenzene (DNCB) at 2 and 3 µg/mL, solvent control for the test substance was the vehicle and medium control for the test substance was culture medium. Stimuli mediated increase in expression of cell surface markers CD86 and CD54 was measured with fluorescence tagged antibodies. |

Two dose finding assays (XTT Test) were conducted to find the test substance concentration at which cell viability is reduced to 75% (CV75) to decide test substance concentrations for CD54 and CD86 expression test. The following test substance concentrations were used: 19.6, 9.1, 78.1, 156.3, 312.5, 625, 1250 and 2500 µg/mL.

Two main tests were conducted to evaluate the ability of the test substance to induce expression of CD54 and CD86. The highest dose of the test substance to be used in the main test was derived from the following formula: CV75 (mean of both assays) × 1.2. The following concentrations of the test substance were used: 193, 231, 278, 333, 400, 480, 576 and 691 µg/mL.

The test substance is considered a sensitiser:

- If the relative fluorescence intensity (RFI) of CD86 is  $\geq 150\%$  or;
- If the RFI of CD54 is  $\geq 200\%$  in both tests

The two main tests produced opposing results. As such, a third main test had to be performed. In this instance, the test substance is considered a sensitiser:

- If the RFI of CD86 is  $\geq 150\%$  at any dose in at least 2 of 3 tests or;
- If the RFI of CD54 is  $\geq 200\%$  in at least 2 of 3 tests

## RESULTS

| Sample           | Concentration<br>(µg/mL) | RFI Sensitisation Evaluation |      |        |      |        |      |
|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
|                  |                          | Test 1                       |      | Test 2 |      | Test 3 |      |
|                  |                          | CD54                         | CD86 | CD54   | CD86 | CD54   | CD86 |
| Medium Control   | -                        | -                            | -    | -      | -    | -      | -    |
| DMSO Control     | -                        | -                            | -    | -      | -    | -      | -    |
| Positive Control | 2.0                      | +                            | +    | +      | +    | +      | +    |
|                  | 3.0                      | +                            | +    | +      | +    | +      | +    |
| Test Substance   | 193                      | -                            | -    | -      | -    | -      | -    |
|                  | 231                      | -                            | -    | -      | -    | -      | -    |
|                  | 278                      | -                            | -    | -      | +    | -      | +    |
|                  | 333                      | -                            | -    | +      | +    | -      | +    |
|                  | 400                      | -                            | -    | -      | +    | -      | +    |
|                  | 480                      | -                            | -    | +      | +    | -      | +    |
|                  | 576                      | -                            | -    | -      | +    | -      | +    |
|                  | 691                      | -                            | -    | +      | +    | -      | +    |

RFI: relative fluorescence intensity

+: RFI exceeds sensitisation-positive criteria

-: RFI below sensitisation-positive criteria

### Remarks - Results

The dose finding assay and main tests fulfilled the acceptance criteria, confirming the validity of the test systems used in the dose finding assay and main tests.

The RFI of CD86 exceeded the sensitisation-positive criteria (i.e. was  $\geq 150\%$ ) in 2 out of 3 tests, and at 6 separate doses in each test. The RFI of CD54 exceeded the sensitisation-positive criteria (i.e. was  $\geq 200\%$ ) in 1 out of 3 tests, at 3 separate doses.

### CONCLUSION

The test substance was considered a skin sensitiser in the AOP KE3 assay.

### TEST FACILITY

Envigo CRS GmbH (2017)

### B.10. Skin sensitisation – mouse local lymph node assay (LLNA)

#### TEST SUBSTANCE

Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| METHOD            | OECD TG 429 Skin Sensitisation: Local Lymph Node Assay (2010)<br>EC Directive 2004/73/EC B.42 Skin Sensitisation (Local Lymph Node Assay)  |
| Species/Strain    | Mouse/CBA (Ca Ola Hsd)   |
| Vehicle           | Acetone:olive oil (4:1)  |
| Preliminary study | Yes  |
| Positive control  | 25% v/v dilution of $\alpha$ -Hexylcinnamaldehyde (85% purity) in acetone:olive oil mixture (4:1).   |
| Remarks - Method  | No deviations from the study protocol or test guideline were noted. A preliminary screening test using the undiluted test substance was conducted to determine dose concentrations for the main study. Based on these results, 100% was chosen as the high dose for the main study as it was not expected to induce any systemic toxicity, a 25% or more increase in ear thickness or moderate to severe erythema. |

## RESULTS

| <i>Concentration<br/>(% w/w)</i> | <i>Number and sex of<br/>animals</i> | <i>Proliferative response<br/>(DPM/animal)</i> | <i>Stimulation Index<br/>(Test/Control Ratio)</i> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <i>Test Substance</i>            |                                      |  |   |
| 0 (vehicle control)              | 5F                                   | 1859.41  | 1.00  |
| 25                               | 5F                                   | 4358.04  | 2.34  |
| 50                               | 5F                                   | 7754.98  | 4.17  |
| 100                              | 5F                                   | 6009.18  | 3.23  |
| <i>Positive Control</i>          |                                      |  |   |
| 25                               | 5F                                   | 16628.25                                       | 8.94  |

EC3 34%

Remarks - Results No mortalities and no signs of systemic toxicity were noted in the test or control animals during the study. No signs of irritation were observed in any treatment group.

The positive control performed as expected confirming the validity of the study.

CONCLUSION There was evidence of induction of a lymphocyte proliferative response indicative of skin sensitisation to the test substance.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017j)

**B.11. Skin sensitisation – human volunteers**

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals (1.5% w/w)

METHOD Repeated insult patch test with challenge

Study Design Induction Procedure: Patches containing 0.2 mL test substance were applied 3 times per week (Monday, Wednesday and Friday) for a total of 9 applications. Patches were removed by the applicants after 24 hours and graded after an additional 24 h (or 48 h for patches applied on Friday).

Rest Period: 14 days

Challenge Procedure: Patches were applied to previously untreated test sites. Patches were removed by a laboratory technician after 24 h. Sites were graded immediately following, and 48 h and 72 h post-patch removal.

Study Group 93 F, 20 M; age range 18 - 66 years

Vehicle Ethanol (24.5% w/w) and diethyl phthalate (74% w/w) were combined with the notified chemical to produce a formulation of the notified chemical at a 1.5% w/w concentration.

Remarks - Method Occluded. The test substance was spread on a 3.63 cm × 3.63 cm patch.

The vehicle control was a formulation consisting of distilled water (1.5% w/w), alcohol SD39C (24.5% w/w) and diethyl phthalate (70.5% w/w). The test substance or vehicle control was spread on a 3.63 cm × 3.63 cm patch. The test substance or vehicle control was allowed to evaporate on the patch for at least 30 mins, but no longer than 90 mins, prior to patch application.

**RESULTS****Remarks - Results**

106/113 subjects completed the study. The remaining subjects discontinued their participation for reasons unrelated to the application of the test material.

No visible skin reaction was observed on any of the subjects during the induction or challenge phases.

**CONCLUSION**

The test substance at 1.5% concentration was non-sensitising under the conditions of the test.

**TEST FACILITY**

CRL (2014)

**B.12. Repeat dose toxicity – 14 Day Preliminary Toxicity Study****TEST SUBSTANCE**

Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

**METHOD**

There are no specific testing guidelines for this study. General regulatory guidelines for toxicity studies were incorporated into the study design.

**Species/Strain**

Rat/Sprague Dawley

**Route of Administration**

Oral – diet

**Exposure Information**

Total exposure days: 14 days

Dose regimen: 7 days per week

Post-exposure observation period: Nil

**Vehicle**

None

**Remarks - Method**

No protocol deviations were noted. No statistical analysis was conducted on the data obtained during the study.

**RESULTS**

| <i>Group</i> | <i>Number and Sex of Animals</i> | <i>Dose ppm (mg/kg bw/day)</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| 1            | 3M/3F                            | 2,500 (173/175)                | 0/6              |
| 2            | 3M/3F                            | 5,000 (289/341)                | 0/6              |
| 3            | 3M/3F                            | 10,000 (567/573)               | 0/6              |
| 4            | 3M/3F                            | 20,000 (899/962)               | 0/6              |

*Mortality and Time to Death*

No unscheduled deaths occurred.

*Clinical Observations*

The total mean body weight change and total mean food consumption from Day 1 to Day 15 of treatment for males and females treated at 20,000 ppm was noticeably reduced in comparison to animals treated at the lower doses.

*Effects in Organs*

Males treated at 20,000 ppm had noticeably higher epididymes and kidney weights compared to males treated at 2,500 ppm (increases of 24% and 20%, respectively). These males also showed lower spleen weight compared to males treated at 2,500 ppm (a decrease of 10%). Females treated at 10,000 and 20,000 ppm showed decreased ovaries, spleen and uterus weight compared to females treated at 2,500 ppm (decreases of 28% and 30%, 18% and 8%, and 14% and 19%, respectively).

**Remarks – Results**

No NOEL or NOAEL was established. Based on this study, the dietary dose levels recommended for



Males treated at 5,000 ppm showed a noticeable decrease in mean body weight compared to controls (a decrease of 30%) during the first week of treatment (pre-mating period). Males treated at 10,000 ppm showed statistically significant decreases in mean body weights during the first two weeks of treatment (pre-mating period; decreases of 29% and 26%, respectively compared to controls and noticeable decreases in mean body weight during the last two weeks of treatment (post-mating period; decreases of 10% and 16%, respectively in comparison with controls). Over the gestation period (gestation days 0-20), females treated at 10,000 ppm displayed a 15% decrease in mean body weight compared to controls.

Females treated at 2,500, 5,000, and 10,000 ppm presented statistically significant decreases in food consumption during days 4-6 of lactation compared to controls (decreases of 36%, 32% and 30%, respectively). These reductions in food consumption were not considered as reliable results due to cannibalism displayed by several of the dams. Furthermore, these reductions in food consumption were not accompanied by any statistically significant or noticeable changes in body weight.

#### *Laboratory Findings – Clinical Chemistry, Haematology*

Red blood cell count was statistically significantly increased and reticulocyte count was noticeably decreased in males treated at 5,000 and 10,000 ppm in comparison to controls (increases of 6% and 9%, and decreases of 19% and 23%, respectively). Males treated at 10,000 ppm also had statistically significantly higher haematocrit concentration (increase of 6%) and a noticeably lower platelet count (reduction of 17%) than controls.

Aspartate aminotransferase activity was statistically significantly reduced in males treated at 5,000 and 10,000 ppm, respectively (decreases of 20% and 31%, respectively). Statistically significant decreases in potassium ion concentrations were observed in males treated at 2,500, 5,000 and 10,000 ppm (decreases of 9%, 12% and 7%, respectively compared with controls). Females treated at 10,000 ppm had a notably lower cholesterol concentration and statistically significant lower triglyceride, total protein, albumin and globulin concentrations in comparison with controls (reductions of 24%, 30%, 11%, 11% and 10%, respectively). Statistically significant decreases in calcium ion concentrations were observed in females treated at 2,500, 5,000 and 10,000 ppm (decreases of 3%, 5% and 7% respectively, compared with controls).

#### *Reproductive/developmental findings*

Five female animals failed to litter, including three control females, one female treated at 5,000 ppm and one female treated at 10,000 ppm. It was also reported that two females in the 10,000 ppm group showed total litter loss on postnatal days 2 and 3. The total number of pups found dead or missing by postnatal day 4 was nearly 2.5 times higher in the 10,000 ppm group compared to the control group (an increase of 238%), leading to viability index in the 10,000 ppm group that was 41% lower than the control group. Furthermore, 10,000 ppm group produced heavy decreases in the average number of live pups per litter on postnatal days 4 and 7, compared to the control group (10.8 vs. 5.5 pups, and 10.8 vs. 5.4 pups, respectively). Average pup weight in the 10,000 ppm group was also noticeably decreased on postnatal days 1 and 4, and statistically significantly lower on postnatal day 7 in comparison with the control group (decreases of 11%, 19% and 17%, respectively). These changes were considered as test substance-related as they were greater than historical control values. The higher pup mortality in the 10,000 ppm group was thought to be primarily due to the observed decreases in pup weight at birth, which is often linked with failure to thrive and the subsequent presumed cannibalism by the dams. This reduced failure to thrive was also considered as related to the test substance.

#### *Effects in Organs*

No notable effects on absolute or relative organ weights, macroscopic findings or histopathological changes were observed in adult animals and their pups.

#### CONCLUSION

The findings in this study suggest that there may have been test substance-related reproductive issues occurring in female animals treated at 10,000 ppm. However, the authors of this study note that it was difficult to accurately interpret the findings from the study as there was an abnormally reduced number of pregnant dams that gave birth and had litters that survived until study termination. Hence, the authors of this study recommended the study to be repeated.

TEST FACILITY Envigo CRS Inc. (2017)

#### **B.14. Repeat dose toxicity (second study; repeat of first study)**

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| METHOD                  | OECD TG 422 Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (1996)  |
| Species/Strain          | Rat/Sprague-Dawley (CrI:CD BR)  |
| Route of Administration | Oral – diet   |
| Exposure Information    | Total exposure days: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 35 days for males (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating (up to 2 weeks) and until scheduled necropsy)</li> <li>- Approx. 56 days for females (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating (up to 2 weeks) and until lactation day 6).</li> <li>- Females were given untreated feed on lactation day 6 through scheduled necropsy.</li> </ul> Dose regimen: 7 days per week<br>Post-exposure observation period: None |
| Necropsy                | All surviving male animals were euthanised on study day 36. Female animals that produced litters were euthanised on lactation day 7. Female animals which failed to deliver a litter were euthanised on gestation day 25. Female animals with total litter loss (all pups found dead prior to scheduled sacrifice) were euthanised on the day of total litter loss.   |
| Vehicle                 | None  |
| Remarks - Method        | Notable protocol deviations include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On lactation day 6, female animals were given treated food instead of untreated food.</li> </ul> All protocol deviations were not considered to have affected the integrity of the study.   |

## RESULTS

| <i>Group</i> | <i>Number and Sex of Animals</i> | <i>Dose ppm (mg/kg bw/day)</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| control      | 10M/10F                          | 0                              | 0/20             |
| low dose     | 10M/10F                          | 2,500 (163/198)                | 0/20             |
| mid dose     | 10M/10F                          | 5,000 (335/380)                | 0/20             |
| high dose    | 10M/10F                          | 10,000 (624/731)               | 1/20             |

*Mortality and Time to Death*

One female treated at 10,000 ppm was found dead on gestational day 22, just after parturition. Based on the macroscopic findings during necropsy, this death was considered associated with parturition and not test substance-related.

*Clinical Observations*

The mean body weight change for female animals in the 10,000 ppm group during gestation was 15% lower than in the control group. This decrease was not accompanied by any changes in mean food consumption during the gestation period. On lactation day 7, the mean body weight for female animals treated at 5,000 ppm and 10,000 ppm were lower than the control group (decreases of 11 % and 12%, respectively). Average food consumption during day 6-7 of lactation in females treated at 5,000 ppm and 10,000 ppm was also lower than the control group (decreases of 13% and 30%, respectively).

*Laboratory Findings – Clinical Chemistry, Haematology, Urinalysis*

Female animals treated at 5,000, and 10,000 ppm showed dose-dependent decreases in reticulocyte count compared to controls (decreases of 25% and 34%, respectively). Female animals in the 10,000 ppm group also displayed increased platelet counts and decreased eosinophil counts in comparison with control animals (changes of 23% and 58%, respectively).

All clinical chemistry parameters were comparable between all groups in this study.

*Reproductive/developmental findings*

One female animal in the 2,500 ppm group failed to litter; this was much lower than in the previous repeat dose toxicity study. However, the number of female animals that had total litter loss was much higher than in the previous repeat dose toxicity study (see 'B.13. Repeat dose toxicity (first study)'). Total litter loss was 5/10,



2/10, 3/10 and 4/9 in the control, 2,500 ppm, 5,000 ppm and 10,000 ppm female groups, respectively. Due to these losses, the study was terminated as this had confounded the evaluation of parameters including post implantation index, live birth index, and viability index.

#### *Effects in Organs*

Small spleen was noted in two female animals in the 10,000 ppm group that had total litter loss. However, no other organ weight changes or macroscopic findings were reported.

#### CONCLUSION

Based on the abnormally high number of animals that experienced total litter loss, it is difficult to interpret the study data.

TEST FACILITY Envigo CRS Inc. (2018)

#### **B.15. Repeat dose toxicity (third study)**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| TEST SUBSTANCE          | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals   |
| METHOD                  | OECD TG 422 Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (2016)   |
| Species/Strain          | Rat/Sprague-Dawley (CrI:CD)  |
| Route of Administration | Oral –diet   |
| Exposure Information    | Total exposure days: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6 weeks for main group male animals (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating and until approx. 80% of the females had given birth)</li> <li>- Approx. 8 weeks for main group female animals (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating and gestation and at least up to post-partum day 14).</li> <li>- 6 weeks for high dose recovery animals. These animals were not mated during the study; they were exposed to the test substance for an equivalent duration to the main group male animals.</li> </ul> |
| Necropsy                | Dose regimen: 7 days per week<br>Post-exposure observation period: 14 days<br>All surviving male animals were sacrificed after approx. 80% of female had delivered. Female animals that produced litters were sacrificed on post-partum day 15. Female animals which failed to deliver a litter were sacrificed on the 25 <sup>th</sup> day after the last mating day. Recovery group animals were sacrificed 14 days after the first scheduled dam sacrifice.   |
| Vehicle                 | None   |
| Remarks - Method        | No deviations from the study protocol were noted. The dose levels were selected based on the recommendation of the study sponsor (the notifier of the test substance).   |

#### RESULTS

| <i>Group</i>       | <i>Number and Sex of Animals</i> | <i>Dose ppm (mg/kg bw/day)</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| control            | 15M/15F                          | 0                              | 0/30             |
| low dose           | 15M/15F                          | 2,500 (148/175)                | 0/30             |
| mid dose           | 15M/15F                          | 5,000 (289/351)                | 1/30             |
| high dose          | 15M/15F                          | 10,000 (584/679)               | 0/30             |
| control recovery   | 5M/5F                            | 0                              | 0/10             |
| high dose recovery | 5M/5F                            | 10,000 (522/694)               | 0/10             |

#### *Mortality and Time to Death*

One female animal treated at 2,500 ppm was found dead on day 24 of gestation.

#### *Clinical Observations*

No clinical signs of toxicity were observed in any of the main group and recovery animals throughout the study.

There were no differences in mean body weights in main test and recovery groups during the study. High dose males had decreased mean body weight gain (statistically significant on Weeks 2 and 7) due to decreased food consumption.

High dose females had statistically significantly lower body weights than control females during day 14 of lactation (a decrease of 8%). The mean body weight gain for females in the 10,000 ppm group was also noticeably lower than controls on days 0-4, 4-7, 7-14 and 0-14 time points during the lactation period (decreases of 39%, 46%, 190% and 69%, respectively), although there were no differences in mean food consumption.

#### *Laboratory Findings –Haematology, Clinical Chemistry, Urinalysis*

Main group males and females treated at 10,000 ppm showed increased blood parameters compared to controls (white blood cell, neutrophil, lymphocyte, monocyte, eosinophil and basophil count increases of 32%, 30%, 53%, 39%, 80% and 17%, respectively in males and neutrophil and reticulocyte count increases of 23% and 30%, respectively in females).

Male animals treated at 10,000 ppm showed notable reductions in lactate dehydrogenase and creatinine kinase activity compared to controls (16% reduction in the activity of both enzymes); this trend continued in treated males after recovery (activity reductions of 14% and 13%, respectively). Male animals in the 10,000 ppm group also showed apparent increases in urea, blood urea nitrogen, total bilirubin and bile acid concentration (increases of 13%, 15%, 14% and 37%, respectively); these parameters were more comparable with controls following recovery. Glucose concentration was statistically significantly decreased, and triglyceride concentration was notably decreased in treated recovery male rats compared to controls (decreases of 9% and 37%, respectively). Decreased thyroid stimulating hormone levels were reported in treated males but were only statistically significant at 10,000 ppm (decreases of 28%, 26% and 38%, at 2,500, 5,000, and 10,000 ppm, respectively).

Lactate dehydrogenase and creatinine kinase activity were noticeably decreased in treated females but statistically significant only at 10,000 ppm (decreases of 16% and 17%, 36% and 33%, and 58% and 55%, respectively). These trends were partially reversed after recovery. Alkaline phosphatase activity was decreased in all treated females compared to controls (increases of 78%, 34% and 42% at 2,500, 5,000, and 10,000 ppm, respectively); this trend was partially reversed after recovery. High dose females showed statistically significant increases in urea and blood nitrogen urea concentrations (46% increase for both) and notable increases in total bilirubin and bile acid concentrations (increases of 30% and 18%, respectively); all trends were reversed after. Females treated at 2,500 and 10,000 ppm showed notable increases in thyroid stimulating hormone concentrations compared to controls (increases of 23% and 47%, respectively).

Decreases in urine volume were observed in all treated males compared to controls (decreases of 18%, 46%, and 30% at 2,500, 5,000, and 10,000 ppm, respectively), while females treated at 2,500 ppm and 10,000 ppm showed notable increases in urine volume compared to controls (increases of 27% and 23%, respectively). After recovery, the trend in males was reversed and the trend in females continued. Small amounts of bilirubin were detected in the urine of some males treated at 5,000 ppm and 10,000 ppm. After recovery, no urine bilirubin was detected in any of the animals.

#### *Reproductive/developmental findings*

Fertility index, parturition index, percentage of pregnant animals, litter size, pup ano-genital distance, mating index and pup mortality were not affected. No consistent signs of toxicity were noted in the pups belonging to the control or treatment groups. The live birth index however, was statistically significantly lower in the 10,000 ppm group compared to the control group (7% decrease).

The combined mean body weight of pups of both sexes on lactation day 14 was statistically significantly lower at 5,000 and 10,000 ppm compared to the control group (reductions of 14% and 26%, respectively). The mean body weight gain over the entire lactation period for pups (both sexes) in these two groups was statistically significantly lower than the control group pups (decreases of 17%, and 32%, respectively).

#### *Effects in Organs*

The absolute and relative mean spleen weight for high dose males was elevated compared to controls during the main study (increases of 12% and 15%) and following recovery (16% and 19%). The mean absolute weight of the Cowper's gland in males treated at 2,500 and 10,000 ppm was statistically significantly decreased compared to control animals (decreases of 19% and 17%, respectively) and not reversed during the recovery period.

High dose females showed decreased absolute and relative thymus weight compared to controls (32% and 28%, respectively), but reversed during recovery.

No consistent organ abnormalities were detected during necropsy.

#### CONCLUSION

The following were established by the study authors:

- The No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) for parental toxicity as 2,500 ppm (equivalent to 148 mg/kg bw/day in males and 175 mg/kg bw/day in males);
- The NOAEL for reproductive toxicity as 10,000 ppm (equivalent to 553 mg/kg bw/day in males and 687 mg/kg bw/day in females)
- The NOAEL for developmental (offspring) toxicity as 2,500 ppm.

TEST FACILITY JRF (2018)

#### B.16. Genotoxicity – bacteria

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 471 Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test (1997)  
EC Directive 2000/32/EC B.13/14 Mutagenicity – Reverse Mutation Test using Bacteria (2008)  
Test 1: Plate incorporation procedure  
Test 2: Pre incubation procedure

Species/Strain *Salmonella typhimurium*: TA1535, TA1537, TA98, TA100  
*Escherichia coli*: WP2uvrA

Metabolic Activation System S9 fraction from phenobarbitone/β-naphthoflavone induced rat liver.

Concentration Range in Main Test Test 1  
a) With metabolic activation: 1.5 – 5000 µg/plate  
b) Without metabolic activation: 1.5 – 5000 µg/plate

Test 2  
a) All *Salmonella* strains (+/- metabolic activation): 0.5 – 500 µg/plate  
b) *Escherichia coli* (+/- metabolic activation): 5 - 5000 µg/plate

Vehicle DMSO

Remarks - Method No noted deviations from the study plan. The dose range for Test 1 had been determined prior to the study. The dose range used for Test 2 was determined by the results of Test 1.

#### RESULTS

| Metabolic Activation | Test Substance Concentration (µg/plate) Resulting in: |                           |               |                  |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|
|                      | Cytotoxicity in Preliminary Test                      | Cytotoxicity in Main Test | Precipitation | Genotoxic Effect |
| <i>Absent</i>        |   |                           |               |                  |
| Test 1               | ≥ 500   | -                         | ≥ 5000        | Negative         |
| Test 2               | -   | ≥ 150                     | > 5000        | Negative         |
| <i>Present</i>       |   |                           |               |                  |
| Test 1               | ≥ 500   | -                         | ≥ 5000        | Negative         |
| Test 2               | -   | ≥ 150                     | ≥ 5000        | Negative         |

Remarks - Results No substantial increase in revertant colony numbers of any of the five tester strains was observed following treatment with the test substance at any dose level, in the presence or absence of metabolic activation. Vehicle and positive controls performed as expected, confirming the validity of the test system.

CONCLUSION The test substance was not mutagenic to bacteria under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY Harlan (2014c)

### B.17. Genotoxicity – *in vitro* chromosome aberration test

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 473 *In vitro* Mammalian Chromosome Aberration Test  
EC Directive 2000/32/EC B.10 Mutagenicity - *In vitro* Mammalian Chromosome Aberration Test (2008)

Species/Strain Human  
Cell Type/Cell Line Lymphocytes  
Metabolic Activation System S9 fraction from phenobarbitone/ $\beta$ -naphthoflavone induced rat liver (S9-mix)  
Vehicle DMSO  
Remarks - Method No noted deviations from the study plan. A preliminary experiment was conducted to determine the dose range for the main test. The doses used in this experiment were: 7.1, 14.2, 28.5, 56.9, 113.8, 227.6, 455.3, 910.5 and 1821  $\mu\text{g/mL}$ . Test 1 and 2 samples designated for metabolic activation were exposed to S9-mix at 2% and 1% concentration, respectively.

| Metabolic Activation | Test Substance Concentration ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) | Exposure Period | Harvest Time |
|----------------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| <i>Absent</i>        |   |                 |              |
| Test 1               | 30, 60*, 90*, 120*, 180, 240                      | 4h              | 24h          |
| Test 2               | 3.75, 7.5, 15, 30*, 60*, 90*, 180*                | 24h             | 24h          |
| <i>Present</i>       |   |                 |              |
| Test 1               | 30, 60*, 120*, 240*, 360, 480                     | 4h              | 24h          |
| Test 2               | 30, 60, 120*, 240*, 300*, 360*                    | 4h              | 24h          |

\*Cultures selected for metaphase analysis.

### RESULTS

| Metabolic Activation | Test Substance Concentration ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ ) Resulting in: |                           |               |                  |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|
|                      | Cytotoxicity in Preliminary Test*                               | Cytotoxicity in Main Test | Precipitation | Genotoxic Effect |
| <i>Absent</i>        |   |                           |               |                  |
| Test 1               | $\geq 56.1$   | $\geq 120$                | $> 240$       | Negative         |
| Test 2               | $\geq 14.2$   | $> 180$                   | $> 180$       | Negative         |
| <i>Present</i>       |   |                           |               |                  |
| Test 1               | $\geq 113.8$  | $\geq 120$                | $> 480$       | Negative         |
| Test 2               | -   | $\geq 360$                | $> 360$       | Negative         |

\*Preliminary toxicity test performed using the exposure conditions for Test 1 and Test 2

Remarks - Results In Tests 1 and 2, haemolysis was observed in the presence and absence of metabolic activation at dose concentrations  $\geq 60 \mu\text{g/mL}$  and  $\geq 30 \mu\text{g/mL}$ , respectively.

In the presence and absence of metabolic activation, there were no biologically relevant increases in structural chromosomal aberrations after treatment with the test substance.

In the presence and absence of metabolic activation, there were no biologically relevant increases in polyploid cells after treatment with the test substance.

The solvent and positive controls performed as expected, confirming the validity of the test system.

CONCLUSION The test substance was not clastogenic to human lymphocytes treated *in*

*vitro* under the conditions of the test.

TEST FACILITY

Harlan (2014d)

## APPENDIX C: ENVIRONMENTAL FATE AND ECOTOXICOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

### C.1. Environmental Fate

#### C.1.1. Ready biodegradability

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| TEST SUBSTANCE        | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals   |
| METHOD                | OECD TG 301 D Ready Biodegradability: Closed Bottle Test   |
| Inoculum              | Activated sludge   |
| Exposure Period       | 28 days  |
| Auxiliary Solvent     | None   |
| Analytical Monitoring | Theoretical Oxygen Demand (ThOD)   |
| Remarks - Method      | Conducted in accordance with the test guidelines above, and in compliance with GLP standards and principles. |

#### RESULTS

| <i>Test substance</i> |                      | <i>Sodium benzoate</i> |                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Day</i>            | <i>% Degradation</i> | <i>Day</i>             | <i>% Degradation</i> |
| 7                     | 61.7                 | 7                      | 72.8                 |
| 14                    | 68.8                 | 14                     | 70.2                 |
| 25                    | 76.5                 | 25                     | -                    |
| 28                    | 78.8                 | 28                     | -                    |

Remarks - Results

All validity criteria of the test guideline were satisfied. The percentage degradation of the reference compound (sodium benzoate) surpassed the threshold level of 60% after 14 days (70%). Therefore, the tests indicate the suitability of the inoculums. Oxygen depletion in the inoculum blank was 0.73 mg/L on day 14. The residual concentrations of oxygen in the test bottles were greater than 0.5 mg/L during the test period. The percentage biodegradation in toxicity control at day 14 was 65.8%. The degree of degradation of the test substance after 28 days was 78% and reached the pass level at the end of 10-d window.

CONCLUSION

The test substance is readily biodegradable.

TEST FACILITY

Suzhou Research (2014)

#### C.1.2. Ready biodegradability

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| TEST SUBSTANCE        | Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals   |
| METHOD                | OECD TG 301 F Ready Biodegradability: Manometric Respirometry Test (1992)                                    |
| Inoculum              | Treated effluent   |
| Exposure Period       | 28 days  |
| Auxiliary Solvent     | None   |
| Analytical Monitoring | Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)  |
| Remarks – Method      | Conducted in accordance with the test guidelines above, and in compliance with GLP standards and principles. |

A nominal amount of test substance (50 mg) was dispersed in mineral medium (350 mL) and subjected to high shear mixing for 15 minutes prior to the addition of inoculum (5 mL) and adjusted to a final volume of 500 mL with mineral media to give the test concentration of 100 mg/L.

## RESULTS

| <i>Test substance</i> |                      | <i>Aniline</i> |                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| <i>Day</i>            | <i>% Degradation</i> | <i>Day</i>     | <i>% Degradation</i> |
| 7                     | 0                    | 7              | 43                   |
| 14                    | 10                   | 14             | 69                   |
| 21                    | 17                   | 21             | 68                   |
| 28                    | 21                   | 28             | 67                   |

## Remarks – Results

The mean BOD of the inoculated mineral medium (control) was 46.35 mg O<sub>2</sub>/L after 28 days. The pH of the inoculated test substance vessels on Day 28 ranged from 7.5 to 7.6. The difference between extremes of replicate BOD values at the end of the test was less than 20%.

The study was conducted at 19 to 21 °C. On Day 26 of the test the temperature in the water bath was 19.4 °C. This was a deviation from the study plan which states the test will be conducted at a temperature of between 20 to 24 °C with a maximum deviation of ± 1 °C. However, this deviation was not considered to have affected the integrity or validity of the study given that all validation criteria were met.

The percentage degradation of the reference compound (Aniline) surpassed the threshold level. Therefore, the tests indicate the suitability of the inoculums. The toxicity control attained 26% biodegradation after 14 days and 43% biodegradation after 28 days thereby confirming that the test item was not toxic to the sewage micro-organisms used in the test. The test substance attained 21% biodegradation after 28 days and therefore cannot be considered to be readily biodegradable under the strict terms and conditions of OECD Guideline 301F.

## CONCLUSION

The test substance is not readily biodegradable.

## TEST FACILITY

Envigo (2017k)

**C.2. Ecotoxicological Investigations****C.2.1. Acute toxicity to fish**

## TEST SUBSTANCE

Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

## METHOD

OECD TG 203 Fish, Acute Toxicity Test – Semi Static (1992)

## Species

Zebra fish (*Brachydanio rerio*)

## Exposure Period

96 hours

## Auxiliary Solvent

None

## Water Hardness

50 mg CaCO<sub>3</sub>/L

## Analytical Monitoring

Gas Chromatography (GC)

## Remarks – Method

Desired amounts of the test substance were weighed and mixed with the test water to produce test solutions with nominal concentration (loading rates) of 1.0 mg/L, 1.5 mg/L, 2.3 mg/L, 3.4 mg/L, and 5.1 mg/L. The mixed solutions were stirred for about 5 hours. The test solutions were prepared every 24 hours just before use.

## RESULTS

| <i>Concentration mg/L</i> |               | <i>Number of Fish</i> | <i>Mortality</i> |             |             |             |
|---------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>Nominal</i>            | <i>Actual</i> |                       | <i>24 h</i>      | <i>48 h</i> | <i>72 h</i> | <i>96 h</i> |
| Control                   | 0             | 10                    | 0                | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 1.0                       | 0.84          | 10                    | 0                | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| 1.5                       | 0.82          | 10                    | 0                | 0           | 0           | 1           |

|     |      |    |    |    |    |    |
|-----|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| 2.3 | 1.27 | 10 | 0  | 0  | 1  | 2  |
| 3.4 | 2.1  | 10 | 0  | 1  | 2  | 5  |
| 5.1 | -*   | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |

\*As all fish died in the first 24 hours, the test concentration was not renewed or measured.

LC50 1.68 mg/L at 96 hours (95% confidence limits 1.39-1.65)

Remarks – Results

All validity criteria for the test were met. The dissolved oxygen concentration was within the range of 60.6% - 98.3% air saturation value throughout the test.

The measured concentrations of the test solutions ranged from 9.3 % to 84.3 % of the nominal before renewing the test solution, which could not be maintained within 80%-120%. Therefore, the geometric means of the measured concentrations were used for the LC50 calculation.

The 96 h LC50 for fish was determined to be 1.68 mg/L, based on geometrical mean measured concentrations.

CONCLUSION

The test substance is toxic to fish

TEST FACILITY

Suzhou Research (2015)

**C.2.2. Acute toxicity to aquatic invertebrates**

TEST SUBSTANCE

Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD

OECD TG 202 *Daphnia sp.* Acute Immobilisation Test – Semi Static

Species

*Daphnia magna*

Exposure Period

48 hours

Auxiliary Solvent

None

Water Hardness

220 mg CaCO<sub>3</sub>/L

Analytical Monitoring

GC-MS

Remarks - Method

No significant protocol deviations.

A nominal amount of test substance (1100 mg) was dispersed in 11 litres of test water for 24 hours. Any undissolved test substance was removed by filtration to give a 100% w/v saturated solution. A series of dilutions was made from this saturated solution to give the required test concentrations of 10, 5.6, 3.2, 1.8 and 1.0% v/v saturated solutions.

RESULTS

| Concentration (v/v) |         | Number of <i>D. magna</i> | Number Immobilised |      |
|---------------------|---------|---------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Nominal             | Actual  |                           | 24 h               | 48 h |
| Control             | Control | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 1.0                 | 0.08    | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 1.8                 | 0.13    | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 3.2                 | 0.29    | 20                        | 0                  | 0    |
| 5.6                 | 1.2     | 20                        | 0                  | 7    |
| 10                  | 4.4     | 20                        | 3                  | 20   |

EC50

1.3 mg/L at 48 hours

The EC50 value at 48 hours and the slope of the response curve and its standard error were calculated by Probit analysis using Linear Maximum-Likelihood regression. However, this method is not regarded as the most appropriate where there is only one partial toxic response (5.6 mg/L).

Remarks - Results

All validity criteria for the test were satisfied.



The dissolved oxygen concentration at the end of the test was equal to or greater than 3 mg/L in the control and test vessels.

Analysis of the freshly prepared test solutions at 0 and 24 h showed measured test concentrations to range from 0.078 to 7.0 mg/L. A decline in measured test concentrations was also observed in the old or expired test solutions at 24 and 48 hours. Given this decline in measured test concentrations it was considered appropriate to calculate the results based on the geometric mean measured test concentration.

CONCLUSION Under the study conditions, the test substance is considered to be toxic to *Daphnia* on an acute basis.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2018)

### C.2.3. Algal growth inhibition test

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 201 Freshwater Alga, Growth Inhibition Test (2006)  
EC Council Regulation No 761/2009 C.3 Algal Inhibition Test  
*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata* (green alga)  
Species  
Exposure Period 72 hours  
Concentration Range Nominal: 0.1 - 100 mg/L  
Actual: 0.089 - 71 mg/L  
Auxiliary Solvent None  
Water Hardness Not reported  
Analytical Monitoring GC-MS  
Remarks - Method No significant protocol deviations.

A nominal amount of test substance (1100 mg) was dispersed in 11 litres of test water for 24 hours. Any undissolved test substance was removed by filtration to give a 100% w/v saturated solution. A series of dilutions was made from this saturated solution to give the required test concentrations of 0.1, 1.0, 10 and 100% w/v saturated solutions.

The definitive test was conducted at 20.8-24.0 °C, outside the 21-24 °C range stated in the protocol. The coefficient of variation for the average specific growth rates in the control cultures between 48 and 72 hours was 37%, just exceeding the 35% criteria stated in the protocol. Neither deviation from protocol was deemed to have had a significant impact on the validity or integrity of the study.

### RESULTS

| <i>Biomass</i>                                     |                                 | <i>Growth</i>                                      |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| <i>E<sub>b</sub>C<sub>50</sub></i><br>mg/L at 72 h | <i>NOE<sub>b</sub>C</i><br>mg/L | <i>E<sub>r</sub>C<sub>50</sub></i><br>mg/L at 72 h | <i>NOE<sub>r</sub>C</i><br>mg/L |
| 1.9*   | 0.86                            | 4.6 (95% CL 3.5-6.1)                               | 0.86                            |

\* It was not possible to calculate 95% confidence limits for the *E<sub>y</sub>C<sub>50</sub>* value as the data generated did not fit the models available for the calculation of confidence limits.

CL: Confidence Limits

Remarks - Results Most of the validity criteria for the test were satisfied. The cell concentration of the control cultures increased by a factor of 92 over the test period. The mean of the coefficients of variation of growth rates in the control cultures during the course of the test (days 0-1, 1-2 and 2-3) was 20%. The coefficient of variation of the average specific growth rate in replicate control cultures was 3%. The 72 h *E<sub>b</sub>C<sub>50</sub>* and *E<sub>r</sub>C<sub>50</sub>* were

determined to be 1.9 and 4.6 mg/L respectively, based on geometric mean measured concentrations. The 72 h NOEC was determined to be 0.86 mg/L. All statistical analyses were performed using the SAS computer software package (SAS, 1999 - 2001).

Analysis of the freshly prepared test solutions at 0 h showed measured test concentrations to range from 0.62 to 77 mg/L. A decline in measured test concentrations was also observed in the old or expired test solutions at 24, 48 and 72 hours. Given this decline in measured test concentrations it was considered appropriate to calculate the results based on the geometric mean measured test concentration

CONCLUSION Under the study conditions, the test substance is considered to be harmful to algae.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017l)

#### C.2.4. Inhibition of microbial activity

TEST SUBSTANCE Isomer mixture containing the notified chemicals

METHOD OECD TG 209 Activated Sludge, Respiration Inhibition Test (2010)

Inoculum Aerated activated sludge

Exposure Period 3 hours

Concentration Range Nominal: 100 - 1000 mg/L

Actual: Not determined

Remarks – Method No deviations from the study plan. Following a preliminary range-finding test, activated sewage sludge was exposed to an aqueous dispersion of the test substance at concentrations of 100, 180, 320, 560 and 1000 mg/L for a period of 3 hours at measured temperatures of approximately 21 °C with the addition of a synthetic sewage as a respiratory substrate. 3,5-dichlorophenol was used as the reference control. The respiration rate was determined by measurement of BOD during the test after 3 hours of exposure.

#### RESULTS

EC50 410 mg/L (95% confidence limits: 380 - 440 mg/L) at 3 hours.

Remarks – Results All validity criteria for the test were satisfied. The coefficient of variation of oxygen uptake in the control vessels was 4.2% and the specific respiration rate of the controls was 30.03 mg oxygen per gram dry weight of sludge per hour. The 3-hour EC50 was determined to be 410 mg/L, based on nominal concentrations. The reference substance gave a 3-hour EC50 value of 7.5 mg/L.

CONCLUSION The test substance is not inhibitory to microbial activity.

TEST FACILITY Envigo (2017m)

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- ACI (2010) Consumer Product Ingredient Safety, Exposure and Risk Screening Methods for Consumer Product Ingredients, 2nd Edition, American Institute, Washington DC.
- Api AM, Basketter DA, Cadby PA, Cano MF, Ellis G, Gerberick GF, Griem P, McNamee PM, Ryan CA and Safford R (2008) Dermal Sensitisation Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) for Fragrance Ingredients, Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 52:3-23.
- Argus (2018) Evaluation of Three OECD 422 Studies on FRET 11-0078: Combined Repeat Dose Toxicity Study via Dietary Administration with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (Reference No. not provided, February, 2018). Pennsylvania, UK, Argus International Inc. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Cadby, P.A., Troy, W.R., Vey, M.G.; Consumer Exposure to Fragrance Ingredients: Providing Estimates for Safety Evaluation, Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 36 (2002) 246-252.
- CRL (2014) Repeated Insult Patch Test (RIPT) – Shelanski Method (Study No. CRL87814-1, December, 2014). New Jersey, USA, Clinical Research Laboratories, Inc (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Cyprotex (2014) Sensitization Screen using the Direct Peptide Reactivity Assay (DPRA) (Study No. 9320-101114, June, 2014). Michigan, USA, Cyprotex, LLC. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Earnest, C.W., Jr. (2009) A Two-Zone Model to Predict Inhalation Exposure to Toxic Chemicals in Cleaning Products, MSCEng thesis, The University of Texas at Austin
- enHealth (2012) Australian Exposure Factor Guide, companion document to: Environmental Health Risk Assessment: Guidelines for assessing human health risks from environmental hazards, EnHealth, Commonwealth of Australia.
- Envigo (2017a) FRET 11-0078: Determination of Boiling Point, Density and Surface Tension (Study No. PX69JS, February, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017b) FRET 11-0078: Determination of Hydrolysis as a Function of pH and Adsorption Coefficient (Study No. LH18CF, September, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017c) FRET 11-0078: Determination of Hazardous Physico-Chemical Properties (Study No. LL01QS, October, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017d) FRET 11-0078: Acute Oral Toxicity in the Rat – Fixed Dose Method (Study No. FC53SL, March, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017e) FRET 11-0078: Acute Dermal Toxicity (Limit Test) Study in the Rat (Study No. WV40CB, October, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017f) FRET 11-0078: Acute Inhalation Toxicity (Nose Only) in the Rat (Study No. DN41WJ, March, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017g) FRET 11-0078: *In vitro* EPIDERM™ Skin Corrosion Test (Study No. RD54LV, February, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017h) FRET 11-0078: Determination of Skin Irritation Potential using the EPISKIN™ Reconstructed Human Epidermis Model (Study No. CC94MF, March, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017i) FRET 11-0078: The Bovine Corneal Opacity and Permeability (BCOP) Assay (Study No. BX13CQ, May, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017j) FRET 11-0078: Local Lymph Node Assay in the Mouse – Individual Method (Study No. KM57MN), June, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017k) FRET 11-0078: Assessment of Ready Biodegradability; Manometric Respirometry Test (Study No. XJ56TQ, March, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).

- Envigo (2017l) FRET 11-0078: Algal Growth Inhibition Test (Study No. GW05BJ, September, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2017m) FRET 11-0078: Toxicity to Activated Sludge in a Respiration Inhibition Test (Study No. CC57RM, February, 2017). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo (2018) FRET 11-0078: *Daphnia sp.*, 48-Hour Acute Immobilization Test (Study No. DX76FB, February, 2018). Derbyshire, UK, Envigo Research Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo CRS GmbH (2017) FRET 11-0078: *In vitro* Skin Sensitisation Test – human Cell Line Activation Test (h-CLAT) (Study No. VX31ND, March, 2017). Rossdorf, Germany, Envigo CRS GmbH (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo CRS Inc. (2017) FRET 11-0078: Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study via Dietary Administration with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (Study No. 14-4432), April, 2017). New Jersey, USA, Envigo CRS Inc. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Envigo CRS Inc. (2018) FRET 11-0078: Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study via Dietary Administration with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (Study No. GJ37KT), March, 2018). New Jersey, USA, Envigo CRS Inc. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Gerberick, G.F., Vassallo, J.D., Bailey, R.E., Chaney, J.G., Morall, S.W., Lepoittevin, J.P. (2004). Development of a Peptide Reactivity Assay for Screening Contact Allergens. *Toxicological Sciences* 81, 332-343.
- Gerberick G.F., Vassallo J.D., Foertsch L.M., Price B.B., Lepoittevin J.P. (2007). Quantification of Chemical Peptide Reactivity for Screening Contact Allergens: A Classification Tree Model Approach. *Toxicological Sciences* 97 (2), 417-427.
- Harlan (2014a) IFF TM 11-0078: Determination of General Physico-Chemical Properties (Study No. 41304195, February, 2014). Derbyshire, UK, Harlan Laboratories Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Harlan (2014b) IFF TM 11-0078: Determination of Vapour Pressure (Study No. 41304196, August, 2014). Derbyshire, UK, Harlan Laboratories Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Harlan (2014c) IFF TM 11-0078: Reverse Mutation Assay ‘Ames Test’ Using *Salmonella typhimurium* and *Escherichia coli* (Study No. 41304197, August, 2014). Derbyshire, UK, Harlan Laboratories Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Harlan (2014d) IFF TM 11-0078: Chromosome Aberration Test in Human Lymphocytes *in vitro* (Study No. 41304198, September, 2014). Derbyshire, UK, Harlan Laboratories Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Huntingdon (2015) FRET 11-0078: A 14-Day Preliminary Toxicity Study via Dietary Administration in Rats (Study No. 14-4431, June, 2015). New Jersey, USA, Huntingdon Life Sciences (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Institute for In Vitro Sciences (2014) Induction of Antioxidant-Response-Element Dependent Gene Activity and Cytotoxicity (using MTT) in the Keratinocyte ARE-Reporter Cell Line Keratino-Sens (Study No. 13AL98-AM03, AN30-AN31.170001, June, 2014). Maryland, USA, Institute for In Vitro Sciences, Inc. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- JRF (2018) Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study with the Reproduction/Developmental Toxicity Screening Test of FRET 11-0078 Through Diet in Sprague Dawley Rats (Study No. 615-1-04-19684), February, 2018). Gujarat, India, Jai Research Foundation. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Loretz, L., Api, A.M., Barraji, L., Burdick, J. Davis, D.A., Dressler, W., Gilberti, E., Jarrett, G., Mann, S., Pan, Y.H.L., Re, T., Renskers, K., Scrafford, C., Vater, S. (2006) Exposure data for personal care products : Hairspray, spray perfume, liquid foundation, shampoo, body wash, and solid antiperspirant, *Food and Chemical Toxicology* 44 (2006) 2008-2018.
- Natsch, A. and Emter, R. (2008) Skin sensitizers induce antioxidant response element dependent genes: Application to the *in vitro* testing of the sensitization potential of chemicals. *Toxicological Sciences*. 102(1): 110-119.
- Natsch, A., Emter, R., and Ellis, G. (2009) Filling the concept with data: Integrating data from different *in vitro* and *in silico* assays on skin sensitizers to explore the battery approach for animal-free skin sensitization testing. *Toxicological Sciences*. 107(1): 106-121.

- Natsch, A., Bauch C., Foertsch, L., Gerberick, F., Norman, K., Hilberer, A., Inglis, H., Landsiedel, R., Onken, S., Reuter, H., Schepky, A., and Emter, R. (2011) The intra- and inter-laboratory reproducibility and predictivity of the KeratinoSens<sup>®</sup> assay to predict skin sensitizers in vitro: Results of a ring-study in five laboratories. *Toxicology in Vitro*. 25(3): 733-774
- RIVM (2010) Observations on the Methodology for Quantitative Risk Assessment of Dermal Allergens, Report 320015003/2010, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment.
- Rothe, H., Fautz, R., Gerber, E., Neumann, L., Rettinger, K., Schuh, W., Gronewold, C (2006) Special aspects of cosmetic spray evaluations: Principles on inhalation risk assessment, *Toxicology Letters* 205 (2011) 97-104.
- SCCS (2012) Notes of Guidance for testing of Cosmetic Ingredients and Their Safety Evaluation (8th revision). European Commission - Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety.
- Steiling, W., Bascompta, M., Carthew, P., Catalano, G., Corea, N., D'Haese, A., Jackson, P., Kromidas, L., Meurice, P., Rothe, H., Singal, M. Principle considerations for the risk assessment of sprayed consumer products, *Toxicology Letters* 227 (2014) 41-49.
- Suzhou Research (2014) Ready Biodegradability Test of FRET 11-0078 (Study No. 2014-252-01-02, November, 2014). Jiangsu Province, China, Suzhou Xishan Zhongke Drug R&D Co., Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- Suzhou Research (2015) Fish, Acute Toxicity Test for FRET 11-0078 (Study No. 2014-252-01-01, March, 2015). Jiangsu Province, China, Suzhou Xishan Zhongke Drug R&D Co., Ltd. (Unpublished report submitted by the notifier).
- SWA (2012) Code of Practice: Managing Risks of Hazardous Chemicals in the Workplace, Safe Work Australia, <https://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au/doc/model-code-practice-managing-risks-hazardous-chemicals-workplace>
- United Nations (2009) Globally Harmonised System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS), 3rd revised edition. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE), <[http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/ghs\\_rev03/03files\\_e.html](http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/ghs_rev03/03files_e.html) >