



long-term toxicity tests for mice was divided by 10, due to their short test periods, to provide 5.3 mg/kg/day as its 'non-toxic level\*'.

As for its inhalation exposure, LOAEL of 10 ppm (for degeneration of nasal mucosa) was obtained from its mid-term and long-term toxicity tests for rats, and this LOAEL of 10 ppm (for degeneration of nasal mucosa) was obtained also from its mid-term and long-term toxicity tests for mice. LOAEL of 10 ppm was then adjusted against exposure conditions to provide 1.8 ppm (9.4 mg/m<sup>3</sup>). This was divided by 10, as is always the case with LOAEL, to provide 0.18 ppm (0.94 mg/m<sup>3</sup>) as its 'non-toxic level\*'.

As for its oral exposure, its maximum exposure was estimated to be around 0.0076 µg/kg/day, when intakes of freshwater from public water supply were assumed. Its margin of exposure (MOE) would be 14,000 when calculated from its 'non-toxic level\*' of 5.3 mg/kg/day and its estimated maximum exposure, then divided by 10 due to the fact that 'non-toxic level\*' was obtained from animal experiments, and divided again by 5 when its carcinogenicity was considered. Its intakes through food up to 0.026 µg/kg/day have been reported for some location. For information, if this is combined with its estimated maximum exposure through water to produce 0.034 µg/kg/day for calculation of MOE, it will be 3,100. Even when its intakes through drinking water at this location are considered, MOE will be no less than 3,100. No further action will be required at the moment to assess health risk from oral exposure to this substance.

As for its inhalation exposure, its maximum exposure concentration was estimated to be around 0.27 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, when its concentrations in the ambient air were considered. Its MOE would be 70, when calculated from its 'non-toxic level\*' of 0.94 mg/m<sup>3</sup> and its estimated maximum exposure concentration, then divided by 10 due to the fact that 'non-toxic level\*' was obtained from animal experiments, and divided again by 5 when its carcinogenicity was considered. For information, its exposure concentrations up to around 120 µg/m<sup>3</sup> have been reported for some location, and this will provide MOE of 0.16. Collection of information would be required to assess health risk from inhalation exposure to this substance in the ambient air, and its exposure in the indoor air would be among those which may require detailed assessment.

Information of toxicity				Exposure assessment		Result of risk assessment			Judgment	
Exposure Path	Criteria for risk assessment		Animal	Criteria for diagnoses (endpoint)	Exposure medium					Predicted maximum exposure quantity and concentration
Oral	'Non-toxic level'	5.3 mg/kg/day	Mice	reduced spleen weight	Drinking water	— µg/kg/day	MOE	—	×	○
					Freshwater	0.0076 µg/kg/day	MOE	14,000	○	
Inhalation	'Non-toxic level'	0.94 mg/m <sup>3</sup>	Rats, Mice	degeneration of nasal mucosa	Ambient air	0.27 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	MOE	70	▲	▲
					Indoor air	— µg/m <sup>3</sup>	MOE	—	×	■

Non-toxic level \*

- When a LOAEL is available, it is divided by 10 to obtain a level equivalent to NOAEL.
- 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

An initial assessment of ecological risk posed to aquatic organisms was not carried out for this substance because a water quality target value related to the preservation of aquatic organisms has been derived.

#### 5. Conclusions

		Conclusions	Judgment
Health risk	Oral exposure	No further action required.	○
	Inhalation	For the ambient air, collection of information required on health risk	■

	exposure	associated with inhalation exposure in it. For the indoor air, risk can not be assessed, but this substance is considered to be a candidate of assessment in detail.	
Ecological risk	An initial assessment of ecological risk posed to aquatic organisms was not carried out for this substance because a water quality target value related to the preservation of aquatic organisms has been derived.		(-)

[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.