

red blood cells, hemoglobin levels and hematocrit levels) for female animals obtained from its mid-term and long-term toxicity tests on rats was adjusted for their durations to provide 186 ppm (560 mg/m³) for its intermittent to continuous exposure and divided by a factor of 10 due to their short test periods. 56 mg/m³ was identified to be the reliable lowest dose as its ‘non-toxic level*’.

As for its oral exposure, its maximum exposure concentration was predicted to be approximately 0.011 µg/kg/day, when its intakes through freshwater from public water bodies were assumed. The MOE (Margin of Exposure) would be 2,700,000 when calculated from the substance’s ‘non-toxic level*’ of 297 mg/kg/day and the maximum exposure concentration predicted from animal experiments and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human. As exposure to the substance in the environment through food intakes would be limited, the MOE would not change significantly even when this exposure was included. Therefore, no further action would be required at this moment to assess its health risk from oral exposure.

With regard to inhalation exposure to the substance, the maximum exposure concentration in the ambient air was predicted to be about 0.74 µg/m³. The MOE would be 7,600 when calculated from the substance’s ‘non-toxic level*’ of 56 mg/m³ and the maximum exposure concentration predicted from animal experiments and divided by a factor of 10 to convert animal data to human. As for concentrations in the indoor air, the MOE would be 470 when the maximum exposure concentration was predicted to be approximately 12 µg/m³. Therefore, no further action would be required at this moment to assess health risk from its inhalation both in the ambient air and in the indoor air.

Toxicity				Exposure assessment		Result of risk assessment			Judgment
Exposure Path	Criteria for risk assessment	Animal	Criteria for diagnoses (endpoint)	Exposure medium	Predicted maximum exposure dose and concentration				
Oral	‘Non-toxic level*’ 297 mg/kg/day	Rat	Increased kidney weight	Drinking water	- µg/kg/day	MOE	-	x	
				Freshwater	0.011 µg/kg/day	MOE	2,700,000		
Inhalation	‘Non-toxic level*’ 56 mg/m ³	Rat	Increased red blood cells, hemoglobin levels and hematocrit levels	Ambient air	0.74 µg/m ³	MOE	7,600		
				Indoor air	12 µg/m ³	MOE	470		

Non-toxic level *

- When a LOAEL is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a NOAEL-equivalent level.
- When an adverse effect level for the short-term exposure is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a level equivalent to an adverse effect level for the long-term exposure.

4. Initial assessment of ecological risk

With regard to acute toxicity, the following reliable data were obtained: a 48-h EC₅₀ of 2,300,000 µg/L for growth inhibition in the green alga *Desmodesmus subspicatus*, a 96-h LC₅₀ of 949,000 µg/L for the crustacean *Orconectes immunis* (North American freshwater crayfish), a 96-h LC₅₀ of 1,330,000 µg/L for the fish species *Oncorhynchus mykiss* (rainbow trout), and a 48-h LC₅₀ of 2,090,000 µg/L for the midge *Tanytarsus dissimilis*. Accordingly, based on these acute toxicity values and an assessment factor of 100, a predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) of 9,490 µg/L was obtained.

With regard to chronic toxicity, a 21-d NOEC of 4,000 µg/L for reproductive inhibition in the crustacean *Daphnia magna* was obtained as a reliable data. Accordingly, based on this chronic toxicity value and an assessment factor of 100, a PNEC of 40 µg/L was obtained.

The value of 40 µg/L obtained from the chronic toxicity to the crustacean was used as the PNEC for this substance.

The PEC/PNEC ratio was 0.007 for both freshwater bodies and seawater. Accordingly, further work is considered unnecessary at this time.

Hazard assessment (basis for PNEC)			Assessment factor	Predicted no effect concentration PNEC (µg/L)	Exposure assessment		PEC/PNEC ratio	Judgment based on PEC/PNEC ratio	Assessment result
Species	Acute/ chronic	Endpoint			Water body	Predicted environmental concentration PEC (µg/L)			
Crustacean <i>Daphnia magna</i>	Chronic	NOEC Reproductive inhibition	100	40	Freshwater	0.27	0.007		
					Seawater	0.29	0.007		

5. Conclusions

	Conclusions		Judgment
Health risk	Oral exposure	No need for further work.	
	Inhalation exposure	No need for further work.	
Ecological risk	No need of further work at present.		

[Risk judgments] : No need for further work ▲: Requiring information collection
 ■: Candidates for further work ×: Impossibility of risk characterization
 () : Though a risk characterization cannot be determined, there would be little necessity of collecting information.
 () : Further information collection would be required for risk characterization.