

Committee for Risk Assessment

RAC

Annex 1 Background document to the Opinion proposing harmonised classification and labelling at Community level of

Bromadiolone (ISO); 3-[3-(4'-Bromo[1,1'-biphenyl]-4yl)-3-hydroxy-1-phenylpropyl]-4-hydroxy-2H-1benzopyran-2-one

EC number: 249-205-9 CAS Number: 28772-56-7

CLH-O-000005446-71-01/F

The background document is a compilation of information considered relevant by the dossier submitter or by RAC for the proposed classification. It includes the proposal of the dossier submitter and the conclusion of RAC. It is based on the official CLH report submitted to public consultation. RAC has not changed the text of this CLH report but inserted text which is specifically marked as 'RAC evaluation'. Only the RAC text reflects the view of RAC.

Adopted 14 March 2014

Annankatu 18, P.O. Box 400, FI-00121 Helsinki, Finland | Tel. +358 9 686180 | Fax +358 9 68618210 | echa.europa.eu

CLH report

Proposal for Harmonised Classification and Labelling

Based on Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 (CLP Regulation), Annex VI, Part 2

Substance Name: Bromadiolone

EC Number: 249-205-9

CAS Number: 28772-56-7

Index Number:

Contact details for dossier submitter:

Swedish Chemicals Agency P.O. Box 2 SE-172 13 Sundbyberg Sweden telephone: +46 8519 41100

Version number: 2

Date: 2012-10-26

CONTENTS

1 PROPOSAL FOR HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 6 1.1 SUBSTANCE. 6 1.2 HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING BASED ON CLP REGULATION AND/OR DSD CRITERIA 7 2 BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 10 2.2 SHORT SUMMARY OF THE SCHENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI. Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.4 CURRENT SELF-CLASSIFICATION THA LABELLING 11	P	PART A	6
1.1 SUBSTANCE 6 1.2 HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING PROPOSAL 6 1.3 PROPOSED HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING BASED ON CLP REGULATION AND/OR DSD CRITERIA 7 7 2 BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 10 2.2 SINGRY SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFUC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.3.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B	1	PROPOSAL FOR HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING	6
1.2 HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING PROPOSAL 6 1.3 PROPOSED HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING BASED ON CLP REGULATION AND/OR DSD CRITERIA 7 BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 10 2.2 SHORT SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC UNSTRECATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.3.1 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.3.2 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 12 9ART B 13 10STIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B 13 11 11 12.1 1.1 NAME AND OTHER USTSTANCE 13 14 1.1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15		1.1 SUBSTANCE	6
1.3 PROPOSED HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING BASED ON CLP RECULATION AND/OR DSD CRITERIA 7 7 2 BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 10 2.3 CURRENT SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARNONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B 13 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 DENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 1.4 NANUFACTURE AND USES 17 <td></td> <td>1.2 HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING PROPOSAL</td> <td>6</td>		1.2 HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING PROPOSAL	6
2 BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 10 2.2 SHORT SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARMONED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria. 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria. 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL. 12 PART B. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 14 1.2.1 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18		1.3 PROPOSED HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING BASED ON CLP REGULATION AND/OR D 7	SD CRITERIA
2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING 10 2.2 SHORT SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARMONISE CLASSIFICATION NO THE CLH PROPOSAL 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.3.2 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 14 DENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 14 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 18 3.1.1 Summary and discusion of physico-chemical hazards 18 <td>2</td> <td>BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL</td> <td></td>	2	BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL	
2.2 SHORT SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL 10 2.3 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING. 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.3.2 Current classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria. 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria. 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria. 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B. 13 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 11 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE. 13 12 Composition of test material 15 13.1 NAME AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.1 DENTIFIED SUBSTANCE 17 2.1 DENTIFIES USSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.2 MANUFACTURE 17 2.1 MANUFAC		2.1 HISTORY OF THE PREVIOUS CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING	10
2.3 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING. 11 2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.3.2 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B 13 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.2 IDENTITIED USES 17 2.4 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.5 Comparison with criteria 19		2.2 SHORT SUMMARY OF THE SCIENTIFIC JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CLH PROPOSAL	
2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4. CURRENT SELF-CLASSIFICATION AND LABELING 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B 13 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE 17 2.1 Composition of test material 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.1 DENTIFIED USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3.1.1 NUACHER 17 2.2		2.3 CURRENT HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING.	
2.3.2 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3.4.1 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B. 13 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER DENTIFIES OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 DENTIFIED USES 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18		2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation	
2.4 CURRENT SELF-CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING. 11 2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria. 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE. 13 1.2 Composition of the substance 14 1.2.1 Composition of the substance 14 1.2.1 Composition of the substance 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 20		2.3.2 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation	
2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on he CLP Regulation criteria 11 2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFICE (ABSORFICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20		2.4 CURRENT SELF-CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING	
2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria. 11 3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA. 13 I DENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE. 13 1.2 Composition of the substance 14 1.2.1 Composition of the substance 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.1 DENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 20 4.1 TOXICONNETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information		2.4.1 <i>Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria</i>	
3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL 12 PART B. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on tassification and labelling 20 4.1 Non-human information. 20 4.1.1 Non-human information. 23 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics. 23 4.2.4 Acture toxicity: oral 24 4.2		2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria	11
PART B. 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE. 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 20 4.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.1 Accute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 20 4.1 Toxicokinetrics 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 2	3	JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL	
SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE ADATA 13 I DENTIFY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.4 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.12 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.13 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.14 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.15 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.14 Acute toxicity: otherinoles 25	P	PART B	13
SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA 13 1 DENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.3 1.4 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information <td< td=""><td>-</td><td></td><td>10</td></td<>	-		10
1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1	S	CIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA	
1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE. 13 1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 Identified USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 Toxicokinetics (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Non-human information	1	IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE	
1.2 COMPOSITION OF THE SUBSTANCE 14 1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes		1.1 NAME AND OTHER IDENTIFIERS OF THE SUBSTANCE	13
1.2.1 Composition of test material 15 1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Acute toxicity: enhalation 25 4.2.1 Non-human information 25		1.2 Composition of the substance	
1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 15 2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 23 4.1.2 Human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Non-human information 25 4.2.1 Non-human information 25		1.2.1 Composition of test material	
2 MANUFACTURE AND USES 17 2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 23 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: other notes 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other notes 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: other notes		1.3 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES	
2.1 MANUFACTURE 17 2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.3 Acut	2	MANUFACTURE AND USES	
2.2 IDENTIFIED USES 17 3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.1.2 Human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.3 Acute to		2.1 Manufacture	
3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES 18 3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 3.1.4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human informat		2.2 Identified uses	
3.1 PHYSICO-CHEMICAL HAZARDS 18 3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2	3	CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES	
3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards 18 3.1.2 Comparison with criteria 19 3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling 19 4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT 20 4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 20 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 25 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: dermal 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.5 Comparison on classification and labelling 26 4.2.4 </td <td></td> <td>3.1 Physico-chemical hazards</td> <td></td>		3.1 Physico-chemical hazards	
3.1.2 Comparison with criteria		3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards	
3.1.3Conclusions on classification and labelling194HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT204.1TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION)204.1.1Non-human information204.1.2Human information204.1.3Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics234.1.3Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics234.2ACUTE TOXICITY234.2.1Non-human information244.2.1.1Acute toxicity: oral244.2.1.2Acute toxicity: oral254.2.1.3Acute toxicity: dermal254.2.1.4Acute toxicity: other routes254.2.2Human information254.2.3Summary and discussion of acute toxicity264.2.4Comparison with criteria264.2.5Comparison with criteria264.2.4Comparison with criteria26		3.1.2 Comparison with criteria	
4HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT204.1TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION)204.1.1Non-human information204.1.2Human information234.1.3Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics234.2ACUTE TOXICITY234.2.1Non-human information244.2.1.1Acute toxicity: oral244.2.1.2Acute toxicity: inhalation254.2.1.3Acute toxicity: dermal254.2.1.4Acute toxicity: other routes254.2.2Human information254.2.3Summary and discussion of acute toxicity264.2.4Comparison with criteria264.2.5Complexions on discussion of acute toxicity264.2.4Comparison with criteria264.2.5Complexions on discussion of acute toxicity26		3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling	
4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION) 20 4.1.1 Non-human information 20 4.1.2 Human information 23 4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.1.4 Acute toxicity 23 4.1.5 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics 23 4.2 Acute toxicity 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26	4	HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT	
4.1.1Non-human information.204.1.2Human information.234.1.3Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics.234.2ACUTE TOXICITY.234.2.1Non-human information.244.2.1.1Acute toxicity: oral244.2.1.2Acute toxicity: inhalation.254.2.1.3Acute toxicity: dermal.254.2.1.4Acute toxicity: other routes.254.2.2Human information.254.2.3Summary and discussion of acute toxicity264.2.4Comparison with criteria.264.2.5Comparison of algorification and labelling.26		4.1 TOXICOKINETICS (ABSORPTION, METABOLISM, DISTRIBUTION AND ELIMINATION)	
4.1.2Human information.234.1.3Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics.234.2ACUTE TOXICITY.234.2.1Non-human information.244.2.1.1Acute toxicity: oral244.2.1.2Acute toxicity: inhalation.254.2.1.3Acute toxicity: dermal.254.2.1.4Acute toxicity: other routes.254.2.2Human information.254.2.3Summary and discussion of acute toxicity.264.2.4Comparison with criteria.264.2.5Comparison of algorification and labelling.26		4.1.1 Non-human information	
4.1.3Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics234.2ACUTE TOXICITY234.2.1Non-human information244.2.1.1Acute toxicity: oral244.2.1.2Acute toxicity: inhalation254.2.1.3Acute toxicity: dermal254.2.1.4Acute toxicity: other routes254.2.2Human information254.2.3Summary and discussion of acute toxicity264.2.4Comparison with criteria264.2.5Conclusions on classification and labelling26		4.1.2 Human information	
4.2 ACUTE TOXICITY 23 4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.5 Comparison on classification and labelling 26		4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics	
4.2.1 Non-human information 24 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral 24 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.5 Comparison of algorithmetical and labelling 26		4.2 ACUTE TOXICITY	
4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: orai 24 4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation 25 4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal 25 4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes 25 4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.5 Complusions on classification and labelling 26		4.2.1 Non-human information	
4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal		4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral	
4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes.254.2.2 Human information.254.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity264.2.4 Comparison with criteria.264.2.5 Complusions on classification and labelling26		4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal	
4.2.2 Human information 25 4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.5 Comparison of acute toxicity 26		4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes	25
4.2.5 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity 26 4.2.4 Comparison with criteria 26 4.2.5 Complusions on algorification and labelling 26		4.2.2 Human information	
4.2.4 Comparison with criteria		4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity	
//		4.2.4 Comparison with criteria	
4.3 SPECIFIC TARGET ORGAN TOXICITY – SINGLE EXPOSURE (STOT SE))		4.3 SPECIFIC TARGET ORGAN TOXICITY – SINGLE EXPOSURE (STOT SE))	

		•
4.3.1	Summary and discussion of Specific target organ toxicity – single exposure	28
4.3.2	Comparison with criteria	28
4.3.3	Conclusions on classification and labelling	28
4.4 Irri	TATION	28
4.4.1	Skin irritation	29
4.4.1	1 Non-human information	29
4.4.1	2 Human information	29
4.4.1	3 Summary and discussion of skin irritation	29
4.4.1	4 Comparison with criteria	29
4.4.1	5 Conclusions on classification and labelling	29
4.4.2	Eye irritation	31
4.4.2	1 Non-human information	31
4.4.2	2 Human information	31
4.4.2	3 Summary and discussion of eye irritation	31
4.4.2	4 Comparison with criteria	31
4.4.2	5 Conclusions on classification and labelling	32
4.4.3	Respiratory tract irritation	33
4.4.3	1 Non-human information	33
4.4.3	2 Human information	33
4.4.3	3 Summary and discussion of respiratory tract irritation	33
4.4.3	4 Comparison with criteria	33
4.4.3	5 Conclusions on classification and labelling	33
4.5 COR	ROSIVITY	33
4.5.1	Non-human information	33
452	Human information	33
4.5.2	Summary and discussion of correctivity	33
4.5.5	Summary and assession of corrosivity.	55
4.5.4	Comparison with criteria.	33
4.5.5	Conclusions on classification and labelling	34
4.6 SENS	ITISATION	34
4.6.1	Skin sensititsation	34
4.6.1	1 Non-human information	34
4.6.1	2 Human information	35
4.6.1	3 Summary and discussion of skin sensitisation	35
4.6.1	4 Comparison with criteria	35
4.6.1	5 Conclusions on classification and labelling	35
4.6.2	Respiratory sensitisation	36
4.6.2	1 Non-human information	36
4.6.2	2 Human information	36
4.6.2	3 Summary and discussion of respiratory sensitisation	36
4.6.2	4 Comparison with criteria	36
4.6.2	5 Conclusions on classification and labelling	36
4.7 Repe	ATED DOSE TOXICITY	37
4.7.1	Non-human information	38
4.7.1	1 Repeated dose toxicity: oral	38
4.7.1	2 Repeated dose toxicity: inhalation	40
4.7.1	3 Repeated dose toxicity: dermal	40
4.7.1	4 Repeated dose toxicity: other routes	41
4.7.1	5 Human information	41
4.7.1	6 Other relevant information	41
4.7.1	7 Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity	41
4.7.1	8 Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification according to DSD	41
4.7.1	9 Comparison with criteria of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification according to DSD	41
4.7.1	10 Conclusions on classification and labelling of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification	
accor	ding to DSD	41
4.8 SPEC	IFIC TARGET ORGAN TOXICITY (CLP REGULATION) – REPEATED EXPOSURE (STOT RE)	42
4.8.1	Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification as STOT RE	
accordi	ng to CLP Regulation	42
4.8.2	Comparison with criteria of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification as STOT RE	42
483	Conclusions on classification and labelling of repeated dose toricity findings relevant for classificati	on -
7.0.5	Conclusions on classification and taoching of repeated absolutiony findings retevant for classificant F RF	1
40 CEE	A CELL MUTA CENICITY (MUTA CENICITY)	42 16
4.9 GER	VI CELL MUTAGENICITY (MUTAGENICITY)	40
4.9.1	Ivon-numan information	48
4.9.1	1 III VIUO Uälä	48
4.9.1		48

	4.9.2	Human information	
	4.9.3	Other relevant information	
	4.9.4	Summary and discussion of mutagenicity	
	4.9.5	Comparison with criteria	
	4.9.6	Conclusions on classification and labelling	
4	4.10 CA	RCINOGENICITY	
	4.10.1	Non-human information	
	4.10.1	.1 Carcinogenicity: oral	49
	4.10.1	.2 Carcinogenicity: inhalation	50
	4.10.1	.3 Carcinogenicity: dermal	50
	4.10.2	Human information	
	4.10.3	Other relevant information	
	4.10.4	Summary and discussion of carcinogenicity	
	4.10.5	Comparison with criteria	
	4.10.6	Conclusions on classification and labelling	
4	4.11 To	XICITY FOR REPRODUCTION	
	4.11.1	Effects on fertility	
	4.11.1	.1 Non-human information	52
	4.11.1	.2 Human information	52
	4.11.2	Developmental toxicity	
	4.11.2	.1 Non-human information	52
	4.11.2	.2 Human information	55
	4.11.3	Other relevant information	
	4.11.4	Summary and discussion of reproductive toxicity	
	4.11.5	Comparison with criteria	
	4.11.6	Conclusions on classification and labelling	
2	4.12 O1	HER EFFECTS	65
	4.12.1	Non-human information	
	4.12.1	.1 Neurotoxicity	65
	4.12.1	.2 Immunotoxicity	65
	4.12.1	.3 Specific investigations: other studies	65
	4.12.1	.4 Human information	65
	4.12.2	Summary and discussion	
	4.12.3	Comparison with criteria	
	4.12.4	Conclusions on classification and labelling	
5	ENVIR	ONMENTAL HAZARD ASSESSMENT	67
4	5.1 Degr	ADATION	67
	5.1.1	Stability	
	5.1.2	Biodegradation	
	5.1.2.1	Biodegradation estimation	68
	5.1.2.2	2 Screening tests	68
	5.1.3	Summary and discussion of degradation	
4	5.2 Envii	RONMENTAL DISTRIBUTION	
	5.2.1	Adsorption/Desorption	69
	5.2.2	Volatilisation	
	5.2.3	Distribution modelling	
4	5.3 Aoua	TIC BIOACCUMULATION	
	5.3.1	Aquatic bioaccumulation	
	5.3.1.1	Bioaccumulation estimation.	
	5.3.1.2	2 Measured bioaccumulation data	
	5.3.2	Summary and discussion of aquatic bioaccumulation	
4	5.4 Aqua	TIC TOXICITY	
	5.4.1	Fish	
	5.4.1	Short-term toxicity to fish	
	5.4.1.2	2 Long-term toxicity to fish	
	5.4.2	Aquatic invertebrates	
	5.4.2.	Short-term toxicity to aquatic invertebrates	
	5.4.2.2	2 Long-term toxicity to aquatic invertebrates	
	5.4.3	Algae and aquatic plants	
	5.4.4	Other aquatic organisms (including sediment)	
4	5.5 Come	PARISON WITH CRITERIA FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS (SECTIONS 5.1 – 5.4)	

	5.6	Conclusions on classification and labelling for environmental hazards (sections $5.1 - 5.4$) 75
6	C	OTHER INFORMATION
7	A	NNEXES

Part A.

1 PROPOSAL FOR HARMONISED CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING

1.1 Substance

Table 1:Substance identity

Substance name:	Bromadiolone (ISO)
EC number:	249-205-9
CAS number:	28772-56-7
Annex VI Index number:	-
Degree of purity:	\geq 96.9% (w/w)
Impurities:	No impurities present at $\geq 1\%$ and none of the impurities present at lower levels are considered relevant for the classification of the substance

1.2 Harmonised classification and labelling proposal

Table 2: The current Annex VI entry and the proposed harmonised classification

	CLP Regulation	Directive 67/548/EEC (Dangerous Substances Directive; DSD)
Current entry in Annex VI, CLP Regulation	Not included	Not included
Current proposal for consideration by RAC	See Table 3	See Table 4
Resulting harmonised classification (future entry in Annex VI, CLP Regulation)		

1.3 Proposed harmonised classification and labelling based on CLP Regulation and/or DSD criteria

CLP Annex I	Hazard class	Proposed classification	Proposed SCLs and/or M-factors	Current classification	Reason for no classification ²⁾
ref				1)	
2.1.	Explosives				Data lacking
2.2.	Flammable gases				Data lacking
2.3.	Flammable aerosols				Data lacking
2.4.	Oxidising gases				Data lacking
2.5.	Gases under pressure				Data lacking
2.6.	Flammable liquids				Data lacking
2.7.	Flammable solids				Conclusive but not sufficient for classification
2.8.	Self-reactive substances and mixtures				Data lacking
2.9.	Pyrophoric liquids				Data lacking
2.10.	Pyrophoric solids				Data lacking
2.11.	Self-heating substances and mixtures				Data lacking
2.12.	Substances and mixtures which in contact with water emit flammable gases				Data lacking
2.13.	Oxidising liquids				Data lacking
2.14.	Oxidising solids				Data lacking
2.15.	Organic peroxides				Data lacking
2.16.	Substance and mixtures corrosive to metals				Data lacking
3.1.	Acute toxicity - oral	Acute Tox. 1; H300	Specific concentration limits are not applicable for acute toxicity classification according to regulation EC 1272/2008. Rather, the relative potency of substances is implicitly taken into account in the additivity formula.		
	Acute toxicity - dermal	Acute Tox. 1; H310	Specific concentration limits are not applicable for acute toxicity classification according to regulation EC 1272/2008. Rather, the relative potency of substances is implicitly taken into account in the		

 Table 3:
 Proposed classification according to the CLP Regulation

			additivity formula.	
	Acute toxicity - inhalation	Acute Tox. 1; H330	Specific concentration limits are not applicable for acute toxicity classification according to regulation EC 1272/2008. Rather, the relative potency of substances is implicitly taken into account in the additivity formula.	
3.2.	Skin corrosion / irritation			conclusive but not sufficient for classification
3.3.	Serious eye damage / eye irritation			conclusive but not sufficient for classification
3.4.	Respiratory sensitisation			data lacking
3.4.	Skin sensitisation			conclusive but not sufficient for classification
3.5.	Germ cell mutagenicity			data lacking
3.6.	Carcinogenicity			data lacking
3.7.	Reproductive toxicity	Repr. 1A; H360D	Specific concentration limit is needed; to be added when discussions on method for deriving SCLs are finalized	
3.8.	Specific target organ toxicity -single exposure			data lacking
3.9.	Specific target organ toxicity – repeated exposure	STOT RE. 1; H372	C≥ 0.01% STOT RE 1; H372 0.001 ≤C < 0.01%, STOT RE 2; H373	
3.10.	Aspiration hazard			data lacking
4.1.	Hazardous to the aquatic environment	Acute Cat. 1 H400 Chronic Cat. 1 H410	M-factor 1	
5.1.	Hazardous to the ozone layer			conclusive but not sufficient for classification

¹⁾ Including specific concentration limits (SCLs) and M-factors ²⁾ Data lacking, inconclusive, or conclusive but not sufficient for classification

Labelling: Signal word: Danger Hazard statements: H360D, H330, H310, H300, H372, H400, H410

Proposed notes assigned to an entry:

Hazardous property	Proposed classification	Proposed SCLs	Current classification ¹⁾	Reason for no classification ²⁾
Explosiveness				Data lacking
Oxidising properties				Data lacking
Flammability				Conclusive but not sufficient for classification
Acute toxicity	T+: R26/27/28	0.25%≤C<0.5%: T+; R26/27/28 0.025%≤C<0.25%: T; R23/24/25 0.0025%≤C<0.025: Xn; R20/21/22		
Acute toxicity – irreversible damage after single exposure				Data lacking
Repeated dose toxicity	T; R48/23/24/25	0.025%≤C<0.25% T; R48/23/24/25 0.0025%≤C<0.025% Xn; R48/20/21/22		
Irritation / Corrosion				conclusive but not sufficient for classification
Sensitisation				conclusive but not sufficient for classification
Carcinogenicity				data lacking
Mutagenicity – Genetic toxicity				conclusive but not sufficient for classification
Toxicity to reproduction – fertility				data lacking
Toxicity to reproduction – development	Repr. Cat. 1; R61	R61 Specific concentration limit is needed; to be added when discussions on method for deriving SCLs are finalized		
Toxicity to reproduction – breastfed babies. Effects on or via lactation				conclusive but not sufficient for classification
Environment	N, R50/53	C≤25%: R50/53 25%≤C≤2.5%: R51/53 2.5%≤C≤0.25%: R52/53		

Proposed classification according to DSD Table 4:

¹⁾ Including SCLs
 ²⁾ Data lacking, inconclusive, or conclusive but not sufficient for classification

Labelling: Indication of danger: T+, N R-phrases: R: 61-26/27/28-48/23/24/25-50/53 S-phrases: 53-45-60-61

2 BACKGROUND TO THE CLH PROPOSAL

2.1 History of the previous classification and labelling

Bromadiolone is not currently classified in Annex I of Council Directive 67/548/EEC or according to Annex VI of Regulation (EC) no 1907/2006 (REACH). There is, however, a proposal for classification which has been developed in the biocides review programme, see 2.4.2 below. The classification proposal of bromadiolone was agreed by TC C&L in November 2006.

2.2 Short summary of the scientific justification for the CLH proposal

Physico-chemical hazards

Bromadiolone is shown not to contain any chemical groups associated with explosive properties. Also, available data is sufficient to conclude that bromadiolone is not highly flammable, and since it does not contain any metals or metalloids it can be concluded that it is not expected to emit flammable gases in contact with water. Bromadiolone appears to have been safely handled in various testing and it appears possible to conclude that it should not be classified as a pyrophoric solid, and it is also shown not to contain any chemical groups known to possess oxidizing properties. Based on the structural properties, experience in use and available data on thermal stability and relative self-ignition temperature it seems possible to conclude that bromadiolone shall not be classified as "self-reactive substances and mixtures", "self-heating substances and mixtures" or "substances and mixtures corrosive to metals".

Human health hazards

Bromadiolone is acutely toxic at low doses. The oral LD50 is between 0.56 and 0.84 mg/kg bw which are below ≤ 25 mg/kg bw for required labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrases R 28 'Very toxic if swallowed'. The dermal LD50 is 1.71 mg/kg bw or 23.3 mg/kg bw which are both ≤ 50 mg/kg bw which requires labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrase R27 'Very toxic in contact with skin'. The LC50 value was estimated to be 0.43 µg/L i.e ≤ 0.25 mg/L which requires labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrase R26 'Very toxic by inhalation'. The oral LD50 is also less than the ATE ≤ 5 mg/kg bw for an acute toxicity hazard category 1. The dermal LD50 is 1.75 mg/kg bw (sexes combined) and 23.3 mg/kg (sexes combined) which are far below the ATE ≤ 50 mg/kg bw for an acute toxicity hazard category 1. The inhalational LC50 of 0.43 µg/l is far below the ATE ≤ 0.05 mg/l for an acute toxicity hazard category 1.

A death rate of 100% occurred after repeated dose treatment with bromadiolone at 50 µg/kg bw in both rats and dogs which is far below the classification limit of 5 mg/kg bw for R48/25: Toxic: danger of serious damage to health by prolonged exposure if swallowed. No repeated dose studies were available for the dermal or inhalational route with bromadiolone. However, based on the oral data and extrapolation from the acute data for dermal and inhalational data, classification also as R48/23/24 would be warranted. Serious effects were observed in the 28 day rat study and 90-day dog study at levels below the criterion of "oral, rat \leq 10 mg/kg bw/day for 90-days" used for classification with STOT Rep. 1 H372 for the oral route. For classification for the dermal and inhalatory routes, oral data can be used. Further, there is a large margin between the oral dose levels indicating severe effects and the limit value for STOT RE 1. Also, the acute LD50 values for all three routes were already below the limits for classification as toxic after repeated exposure. Based

on these findings, we propose to classify bromadiolone with STOT RE 1 without a specific route and stating the blood as the main affected organ: H372: "Causes damage to the blood through prolonged or repeated exposure".

No human data exists for bromadiolone. Bromadiolone was teratogenic in rabbit, inducing CNS effects in offspring, similar to what has been observed in humans after Warfarin treatment. Due to the structural similarity to and the same mode of action as the known developmental toxicant warfarin, read across to warfarin is applied and Repr. Cat. 1; R61 (according to the DSD) and Repr. 1A, H360D (according to CLP) is therefore required.

Since bromadiolone is very toxic at low doses, specific concentration limits are needed for acute-, repeated-, and developmental toxicity.

Environmental hazards

According to the CLP criteria a substance should be assigned to hazard class Acute **Category** 1 if EC_{50} of the most sensitive organism is lower than 1 mg/L. RMS concludes, taking into account expert judgement, that this criterion is fulfilled for bromadiolone. Consequently, bromadiolone fulfils the criteria for hazard class **Chronic Category** 1, since it is not rapidly degradable and has potential to bioaccumulate.

2.3 Current harmonised classification and labelling

No decision on harmonised classification.

2.3.1 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.1 in the CLP Regulation

2.3.2 Current classification and labelling in Annex VI, Table 3.2 in the CLP Regulation

2.4 Current self-classification and labelling

2.4.1 Current self-classification and labelling based on the CLP Regulation criteria

2.4.2 Current self-classification and labelling based on DSD criteria

The following classification proposal has been used in the biocides review programme (Directive 98/8/EC):

Classification	as in Directive 67/548/EEC	
Class of danger	T+, N	
R phrases R26 /27/28: Very toxic by inhalation, in contact with skin and if sw R48/23/24/25: Toxic: Danger of serious damage to health by prolo exposure through inhalation, in contact with skin and if swallowed R61: May cause harm to the unborn child. R50/53: Very toxic to aquatic organisms, may cause long-term adv in the aquatic environment.		
S phrases	 S45: In case of accident or if you feel unwell, seek medical advice immediately. Show label where possible. S53: Avoid exposure – obtain special instructions before use. S60: This material and its container must be disposed of as hazardous waste. S61: Avoid release to the environment. Refer to special instructions/safety data 	

	sheet.		
Specific	C≥0.5%	T+;R61-26/27/28 - T; R48/23/24/25	
concentration limits	0.25%≤C<0.5%	T+; R26/27/28 – T; R48/23/24/25	
	0.025%≤C<0.25%	T; R23/24/25 – T; R48/23/24/25	
	$0.0025\% \le C < 0.025\%$	Xn; R20/21/22 - R48/20/21/22	

Bromadiolone is thermally stable below 200°C, its melting point. It is not classified as highly flammable and does not undergo self ignition below its melting point. It is not considered to be explosive or to have oxidising properties. There is no record that it has reacted with any storage container during many years of industrial production. It is concluded therefore, that there are no hazards associated with its physico-chemical properties under normal conditions of use.

The safety phrases proposed are based on the classification and risk phrases. The human health classification is based on toxicological studies summarised in III-A section 6 which indicate that bromadiolone is very toxic by inhalation, when swallowed or in contact with skin in acute accidental or intentional exposure and harmful by repeat exposure. Based on the structural similarities to and the same mechanism as warfarin, read-across from this substance is proposed, which would lead to classification for developmental toxicity. Regarding human health effects a provisional classification with R61 was decided in November 2006 by the TC C&L, but without a final decision on the category to be used (Repr.Cat 1 or Repr.Cat 2). The proposed classification for bromadiolone for acute and repeated dose toxicity was agreed upon.

3 JUSTIFICATION THAT ACTION IS NEEDED AT COMMUNITY LEVEL

Not applicable for biocides.

Part B.

SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THE DATA

1 IDENTITY OF THE SUBSTANCE

1.1 <u>Name and other identifiers of the substance</u>

EC number:	249-205-9
EC name:	3-[3-(4'-bromo[1,1'-biphenyl]-4-yl)-3- hydroxy-1-phenylpropyl]-4-hydroxy-2- benzopyrone
CAS number (EC inventory):	28772-56-7
CAS number:	28772-56-7
CAS name:	2H-1-Benzopyran-2-one, 3-[3-(4'-bromo[1,1'- biphenyl]-4-yl)-3-hydroxy-1-phenylpropyl]-4- hydroxy-
IUPAC name:	3-[3-(4'-Bromo[1,1'-biphenyl]-4-yl)-3- hydroxy-1-phenylpropyl]-4-hydroxy-2H-1- benzopyran-2-one
CLP Annex VI Index number:	
Molecular formula:	$C_{30}H_{23}BrO_4$
Molecular weight range:	527.40 g/mol

Table 5:Substance identity

Structural formula:



1.2 <u>Composition of the substance</u>

Table 6: Constituents (non-confidential information)

Constituent	Typical concentration	Concentration range	Remarks
bromadiolone	Confidential (is found in IUCLID section 1.2)	Confidential (is found in IUCLID section 1.2)	

Current Annex VI entry:

Table 7: Impurities (non-confidential info	ormation)
--	-----------

Impurity	Typical concentration	Concentration range	Remarks
No impurities present at ≥1% and none of the impurities present at lower levels are considered relevant for the classification of the substance (all impurities are listed as Confidential in IUCLID section 1.2)		-	-

Current Annex VI entry:

Table 8: Additives (non-confidential information)

Additive	Function	Typical concentration	Concentration range	Remarks
None	-	-	-	-

Current Annex VI entry:

1.2.1 Composition of test material

The test material used in the studies reported for the physico-chemical properties were of purified (99.2 - $\sim 100\%$ w/w) or technical ($\geq 98\%$ w/w) quality. No further information (e.g. content and identity of impurities and diastereomeric ratio) is available on the composition of the batches used in testing of the physico-chemical properties.

1.3 <u>Physico-chemical properties</u>

Property	Value	Reference	Comment (e.g. measured or estimated)
State of the substance at 20°C and 101,3 kPa	Solid (white powder)	Farrell, 2002- A3.3.1/01 (LiphaTech) Drake, 2005- A3.4/02 (Task Force)	
Melting/freezing point	172.0-202.1°C (98.8% purity) 198.3-199.8°C (~100% purity)	Mullee and O'Connor, 2006 - A3.1.1/02 (Task Force) Pesselman, 1990a- A3.1.1/02 (LiphaTech)	Broad melting range due to the mixture of diastereomers.
Boiling point	Decomposes, without boiling, above the melting point.	Jackson, 2002- A3.1.2 (LiphaTech) Mullee and O'Connor, 2006a - A3.1.1/02 (Task Force)	
Density	1.45 g/cm ³ at 20-21°C	Sarff and Locke, 2001-A3.1.3/01 (LiphaTech) Mullee and O'Connor, 2006a - A3.1.1/02 (Task Force)	
Vapour pressure	2.13 x 10 ⁻⁸ Pa at 25°C (extrapolated) 0.05 x 10 ⁻³ Pa at 45°C (direct measurement)	Pesselman, 1991a- A3.2/01 (LiphaTech) Fabrini, 1997- A3.2/01 (Task Force)	Extrapolated value derived from vapour pressure curve generated by measurements in the range 87-97°C
Surface tension	71.2-72.1 mN/m at 20- 21°C and a concentration of 1.47- 17.4 mg/l	Mullee and O'Connor, 2005 - A3.13/01 (Task Force) de Campos, 2007- A3.13/01 (LiphaTech)	

Water solubility	In buffered solutions at 20°C: pH 4-5: 0.10-0.11 mg/l pH 7: 18.4 mg/l pH 9: 0.18 g/l pH 10: 1.23 g/l In purified water: 12.5 mg/l at 25°C 2.48 mg/l at 20°C	Pesselman, 1992- A3.5/02 (LiphaTech) Hahn, 2002a- A3.5/01 (LiphaTech) Mullee and O'Connor, 2006a - A3.5/02 (Task Force)	
Partition coefficient n- octanol/water	pH 4-5: $\log P_{ow} = >5$ (20-25°C) pH 6-7: $\log P_{ow} = 3.8$ - 4.1 (20-25°C) pH 9-10: $\log P_{ow} = 2.5$ - 3.2 (20-25°C) In purified water: $\log P_{ow} = 4.3$ at 23°C (pH not stated)	Pesselman, 1991b- A3.9/02 (LiphaTech) Sarff, 2002b- A3.9/01 (LiphaTech) Mullee and O'Connor, 2006b - A3.9/02 (Task Force)	
Flash point	Not applicable as bromadiolone as manufactured is a solid with a melting point >40°C		Valid justification
Flammability	Not highly flammable Bromadiolone is also not flammable in contact with water nor has it pyrophoric properties	Tremain, 2003- A3.11/01 (LiphaTech)	
Explosive properties	Bromadiolone is not considered explosive	Tremain, 2003- A3.15/01 (LiphaTech)	Theoretical considerations based on the structure
Self-ignition temperature	No self-ignition below the melting point	Tremain, 2003- A3.11/01 (LiphaTech)	
Oxidising properties	Bromadiolone is not considered oxidizing	Tremain, 2003- A3.16/01 (LiphaTech)	Theoretical considerations based on the structure
Granulometry	No data available		
Stability in organic solvents and identity of relevant degradation products	No data available		Data not considered relevant as bromadiolone as manufactured does not contain organic solvents and as bromadiolone is not formulated in organic solvents.
Dissociation constant	pKa ₁ =4.5 (deprotonation of the hydroxyl-group in the coumarine moiety of the enolic form of bromadiolone)	ACD/PhysChem Suite	Predicted values as experimental testing is technically not feasible due to the low water solubility.

	pKa ₂ =9.06 (deprotonation of the carbon between the ketone and the lactone in the coumarine moiety of the keto form of bromadiolone)	
Viscosity	Not applicable as bromadiolone as manufactured is a solid with a melting point >40°C	Valid justification

2 MANUFACTURE AND USES

2.1 Manufacture

Information on the manufacture of bromadiolone is provided in the confidential annex of the biocides Competent Authority Reports.

2.2 Identified uses

Bromadiolone is used as a rodenticide for pest control, mainly for the control of rats and mice, by both professional and amateur users. It belongs to Product type 14 (rodenticides) Main Group 03, according to the Biocidal Products Directive 98/8/EC. The content of bromadiolone in typical products is 0.005% w/w.

3 CLASSIFICATION FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Theoretical considerations based on the structural properties (i.e. as described in EEC A.14 and CLP Appendix I, part 2, paragraph 2.1.4.3)	Bromadiolone contains no chemical groups associated with explosive properties		Tremain, 2003- A3.15/01 (LiphaTech)
EEC A.10 (flammable solids) The initial screening test was conducted which is identical to the one described in the recommended test method (UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, Manual of Tests and Criteria, Part III, sub-section 33.2.1.4.3.1)	Bromadiolone did not ignite during the test period	The moisture content of the substance was 0.34%. Bromadiolone should not be classified as highly flammable according to DSD or a flammable solid according to CLP	Tremain, 2003- A3.11/01 (LiphaTech)
OECD 113 (DSC; both air and N ₂ - atmosphere)	Bromadiolone is stable up to at least 150°C in air and N ₂ - atmosphere	Data not sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP. However, experience in use indicates that bromadiolone as manufactured is not a pyrophoric substance	Woolley and Mullee, 2003- A3.10/01 (LiphaTech) Mullee B.J., O'Connor D.M., 2006b-A3.10/02 (TaskForce)
EEC A.16 (relative self-ignition temperature of solids)	Bromadiolone does not have a self-ignition below its melting point (~210°C)	Data not sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP	Tremain, 2003- A3.11/01 (LiphaTech)
Theoretical considerations based on the structural properties	Bromadiolone contains no chemical groups known to possess oxidizing properties		Tremain, 2003- A3.16/01 (LiphaTech)

 Table 10:
 Summary table for relevant physico-chemical studies

3.1 Physico-chemical hazards

3.1.1 Summary and discussion of physico-chemical hazards

Technical bromadiolone has been tested for physico-chemical hazards according to the requirements of the DSD. Accordingly bromadiolone has been shown not be highly flammable, have a relative self-ignition temperature below its melting point and to be thermally stable up to at least 150°C in air and N₂-atmosphere based on experimental testing. Furthermore it has been judged not to be explosive or to possess oxidizing properties based on the structural properties of bromadiolone, which are acceptable grounds for data waiving according to the DSD.

3.1.2 Comparison with criteria

Explosivity

Bromadiolone is shown not to contain any chemical groups associated with explosive properties, which are sufficient data waivers both under DSD and CLP. Bromadiolone shall thus not be classified as an explosive under DSD or CLP.

Flammability

The available data is sufficient to conclude that bromadiolone is not highly flammable (F, R11) under DSD and that it is not a flammable solid under CLP (H228).

Moreover, based on the fact that the structure of bromadiolone does not contain any metals or metalloids it can be concluded that it should not be classified as a "substance and mixture which, in contact with water, emit flammable gases" (H260 or H261). Under DSD, data waiving possibilities for this parameter seems not to be explicitly stated. However, based on the structure and the fact that bromadiolone has been tested for water solubility it seems possible to conclude that it should also not be assigned the risk phrase "contact with water liberates extremely flammable gases" (R15) under DSD.

Moreover, based on the fact that bromadiolone appears to have been safely handled in various testing it appears possible to conclude that it should not be assigned the risk phrase "Spontaneously flammable in air" (R17) under DSD and that it should not be classified as a pyrophoric solid (H250).

Oxidizing properties

Bromadiolone is shown not to contain any chemical groups known to possess oxidizing properties, which is a sufficient data waiver under DSD. Furthermore, as bromadiolone only contains oxygen, fluorine or chlorine that is chemically bonded to carbon or hydrogen it shall also not be classified as an oxidizing solid under CLP.

Other physico-chemical hazards

All physico-chemical hazard classes under DSD have been addressed above.

There is not sufficient information available to conclude on the classification of technical bromadiolone under any other physico-chemical hazard classes in CLP. However, based on the structural properties, experience in use and available data on thermal stability and relative self-ignition temperature it seems possible to conclude that bromadiolone shall not be classified as "self-reactive substances and mixtures" (H240, H241 or H242), "self-heating substances and mixtures" (H251 or H252) or "substances and mixtures corrosive to metals" (H290).

3.1.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling

No classification is proposed for technical bromadiolone in relation to its physico-chemical properties based on the available data and information.

RAC evaluation of physical hazards

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

Bromadiolone is not highly flammable, does not contain any chemical groups known to possess oxidizing properties, does not undergo self-ignition below its melting point (~210°C), and is thermally stable up to at least 150°C in air and nitrogen-atmosphere. Therefore, it is not classified for physico-chemical properties.

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented on.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

Since Bromadiolone does not have explosive, oxidising or self-ignition properties, RAC supported the non-classification for physico-chemical properties, as proposed by the DS.

4 HUMAN HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

The summaries included in this proposal are partly copied from the Competent Authority Reports, Document IIA prepared in the context of the possible inclusion of bromadiolone in Annex I to Council Directive 98/8/EC (June 2010 and older versions, applicant Task Force, March 2008 and older versions, applicant Lipha Tech, RMS Sweden). Summaries are only copied if relevant for the classification and labelling of the substance. References to individual studies (given as study numbers) should be seen as references to the respective CAR, Document IIA.

4.1 Toxicokinetics (absorption, metabolism, distribution and elimination)

4.1.1 Non-human information

The active substance, bromadiolone, belongs to a group of substances, the anti-vitamin K rodenticides (AVKs). A summary of the mode of action for this group, taken from the WHO IPCS Environmental Health Criteria 175 Anticoagulant Rodenticides (WHO Geneva, 1995 ISBN 92 4 157175 6) is presented below.

Anticoagulant rodenticides such as Bromadiolone function by inhibiting the ability of the blood to clot at the site of a haemorrhage, by blocking the regeneration of vitamin K in the liver. Death is due to haemorrhage.

Blood clots form when the soluble protein fibrinogen, normally present in the blood, is converted by the enzyme thrombin) to the insoluble fibrous protein fibrin, which binds platelets and blood cells to form a solid mass referred to as a blood clot, sealing the site of the haemorrhage and preventing further blood loss. Fibrinogen is present in the blood, but thrombin is not. Thrombin is formed at the site of injury from prothrombin (factor II) which is present in the blood. Conversion of prothrombin to thrombin occurs via the coagulation cascade, in which the blood clotting factors are employed. Without these blood factors clotting cannot take place, and the haemorrhage will not be controlled by clot formation. If the blood vessel is large and/or serves a vital organ, the

haemorrhage will be fatal. The synthesis of a number of blood coagulation factors (factors II [prothrombin], VII [proconvertin] IX [Christmas factor], X [Stuart-Prower factor] and the coagulation inhibiting proteins C and S) is dependent upon vitamin K, which acts as a co-enzyme.

Vitamin K hydroquinone is the active co-enzyme, and its oxidation to vitamin K 2,3-epoxide provides the energy required for the carboxylation reaction where glutamate (Glu) in the precursor is converted to γ -carboxyglutamate (Gla) to make the activated clotting factor.

The anticoagulant rodenticide active substances such as bromadiolone work by blocking the regeneration of vitamin K 2,3-epoxide to vitamin K hydroquinone. The Glu \rightarrow Gla conversion does not take place.

Bromadiolone is a hydroxycoumarin (Fig 4.1.1-3) with significant structural similarity to the forms of vitamin K. This structural similarity is responsible for the ability to interfere with i.e. block the enzymes used to regenerate vitamin K.

Figure 4.1.1-3 The structure of bromadiolone



The amount of vitamin K in the body is finite, and progressive blocking of the regeneration of vitamin K will lead to an increasing probability of a fatal haemorrhage. In general terms, progressive intake of anticoagulants results in death.

A series of toxicokinetic studies were performed on bromadiolone to meet Guideline requirements.

In the most recent study on bromadiolone (A 6.2(1), applicant Task Force), bromadiolone was absorbed fairly slowly after oral administration with peak levels noted at 4-8h post dose in all rats administered 0.5 or 0.05 mg/kg bw. The absorption was between 71-77% of the administered dose, based on (carcass, bile- and urinary excretion). The major route of excretion was via the faeces accounting for ca 50-60% of the dose. Bile investigations showed that biliary elimination plays a major role in the excretion. Pilot studys showed that only neglible amounts of radioactivity were excreted in exhaled air, and was therefore not further investigated. The pattern of excretion and retention of radioactivity following both low and high dose administration and repeated low dose administration were similar although there was an indication that radioactivity was more readily excreted from male rats and at higher dose levels. Low dose animals excreted, in 168h, 54.3% (males) and 49.0% (females) in faeces and 5.1% (males) and 3.4% (females) in urine. High dose animals excreted, in 168h, 65.5% (males) and 56.7% (females) in faeces and 3.7% (males) and 2.5% (females) in urine. Repeated dose animals excreted, in 168h, 55.9% (males) and 51.8% (females) in faeces and 3.3 (males) and 1.4% (females) in urine. A large amount was retained in the animal at 7 days post dose, accounting for 33-48% of the dose, and was mainly retained in the liver. The amount ranged between 15 and 37% with the highest levels after repeated dosing and in

females. No parent bromadiolone was observed in urine or bile. The amount bromadiolone in faeces was around 20% of the oral dose and could therefore be accounted for as unabsorbed. The chromatographic analysis of faeces, liver and kidney showed that the majority of the radioactivity present was chromotographically similar to bromadiolone. Several metabolite fractions were identified but not structurally determined. No metabolic pathway was therefore proposed in this study.

Groups of male rats were dosed orally with 14C-bromadiolone on a single occasion at a level of 5.0 mg/kg bw (A 6.2-01, applicant Lipha Tech). Three areas were investigated, mass balance, biliary excretion and protein binding. Samples of urine, faeces and bile (from cannulated rats) were collected up to sacrifice at 48 hours after dosing. Blood was collected at 1, 2 and 4 hours after dosing. Extracts were prepared from faeces and gastro-intestinal tract samples. At 1, 2 and 4 hours after dosing radioactivity was extensively (>98.8%) bound to plasma proteins. No change in the degree of binding was observed up to 4 hours. The only tissue sample examined was the gastrointestinal tract; radioactivity in the G.I tract at 48 hours accounted for 18.0% of the administered dose. Distribution in other tissues or loss in expired carbon dioxide was not measured in the study, hence no exact oral absorption value could be set. Faecal excretion accounted for 53.3% of the radioactive dose after 48 hours while only 0.86% of dose was present in the urine in the first 48 hours following dosing. Radioactivity in the bile duct of cannulated rats accounted for 46.5% of the dose after 48 hours, with urine and faeces from these animals containing 19.4% of the dose. Bromadiolone was rapidly absorbed by rats. Absorbed radioactivity was excreted relatively slowly and almost entirely via the bile and faeces. Urinary excretion represented a minor route of elimination. Analysis of faecal and gastro-intestinal tract extracts showed a single major metabolite, up to 10 minor components and polar radioactivity remaining at the origin of the TLC plate plus unchanged bromadiolone. The unchanged parent, bromadiolone, accounted for ca 22% of the dose in faeces and a further ca 6% of the dose in the G.I. tract. The single major metabolite accounted for ca 15% of the dose in the faeces and ca 4% of the dose in the G.I. tract. Polar radioactivity accounted for > 80% of the sample radioactivity in bile. Treatment of bile with β -glucuronidase reduced the polar fraction to 45% of the sample radioactivity, with unchanged bromadiolone and the single major metabolite amongst the components released. MS analysis suggested the single metabolite was a hydroxylated anologue of bromadiolone; hydroxylation was proposed on the benzylic carbon atom. This is consistent with other similar molecules in the AVK class. None of the metabolites of this class of compounds has been shown to be more, or as, toxic as the unchanged parent.

A second study (A 6.2-02, applicant Lipha Tech) investigated liver and plasma levels after low (0.8 mg/kg) and high (3 mg/kg) doses administered orally to groups of four female rats. Blood, liver and kidney samples were collected from animals sacrificed at 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 24, 48, 72 and 97 hours after dosing. The bromadiolone plasma concentration recorded 1 h after dosing at 0.8 mg/kg was 0.12 µg/mL. Maximum levels were attained between 6 and 9 h after dosing. Plasma concentrations fell in a biexponential way with terminal half-lives of 25.7 h after dosing at 0.8 mg/kg and 57.5 h after dosing at 3 mg/kg. Plasma clearance was 0.1 and 0.12 L/h/kg and volume of distribution was 3.7 and 10.3 L/kg for the 0.8 and 3.0 mg/kg treatment levels, respectively. Hepatic bromadiolone concentrations increased rapidly after dosing, reaching maximum levels after 9 hours and remaining relatively constant during the first 24 hours. After 72 hours bromadiolone levels were 1.08 and 1.60 μ g/g for the low and high dose treatments respectively. Liver to plasma ratios ranged between 15 and 35 for the 0.8 mg/kg dose and between 14 and 46 for the 3.0 mg/kg dose. Levels in the kidneys were 0.08 and 0.35 μ g/g, for the 0.8 and 3.0 mg/kg doses; slightly higher than the plasma levels. The study concluded that bromadiolone is eliminated primarily via the liver. This is consistent with other findings and studies with similar molecules where biliary excretion via faeces after elimination from the liver is the major route of elimination.

In a third study (A 6.2-04, applicant Lipha Tech) groups of three male rats were sequentially sacrificed at 1, 3, 7, 14, 28, 50, 100, 150 and 200 days after oral dosing with bromadiolone at 0.2 mg/kg bw. At each point the liver was analysed for bromadiolone. Bromadiolone concentrations reached a maximum mean level of 0.98 μ g/g one day after dosing. Initial elimination half life (in first 28 days) was calculated to be 17 days. This slowed in subsequent period and the half-life calculated over 50 to 200 days was 318 days.

A non-guideline study in three cows was completed (A 6.2-03, applicant Lipha Tech). Bromadiolone was administered by intra-ruminal injection at dose levels of 1.0 or 3.0 mg/kg bw on a single occasion. Blood and milk samples were taken at intervals up to 13 days after dosing and analysed for bromadiolone. Maximum plasma levels for bromadiolone reached 0.46 and 1.86 μ g/mL after 24 hours for low and high dose groups respectively. The levels declined thereafter to < 0.1 μ g/mL after 92 and 192 hours, respectively. Clotting times were affected 24 hours after treatment, increasing to 2 – 2.5 times the T0 values between 120 and 216 hours after dosing. Concentrations of bromadiolone in milk were less than the limit of detection (0.05 ppm) at all sampling intervals at both treatment levels.

4.1.2 Human information

No data.

4.1.3 Summary and discussion on toxicokinetics

Bromadiolone was absorbed fairly slowly after oral administration with peak levels noted at 4-8h post dose in all rats administered 0.5 or 0.05 mg/kg bw (A.6.2(1), applicant Task Force). It is extensively bound to plasma proteins (>98.8 %, A 6.2-01, applicant Lipha Tech). Bromadiolone has a short plasma half-life (2.3 days, A 6.2-02, applicant Lipha Tech), but a longer liver half-life (approximately 318 days, A 6.2-04, applicant Lipha Tech). The absorption was > 70% of the administered dose, based on carcass, bile- and urinary excretion, A.6.2(1), applicant Task Force. Bromadiolone is widely distributed (based on measurable levels in blood and organs). The major route of excretion was via the faeces accounting for ca 50-60% of the dose. Bile investigations showed that biliary elimination plays a major role in the excretion. Urinary excretion represents a minor route of elimination and there is no excretion via expired air. No parent bromadiolone was excreted in bile or urine. The main retention site was the liver.

4.2 Acute toxicity

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
EPA 81-1, Oral, Rat Sprague- Dawley 10 males and 10 females/group. Single dose at 0, 0.17, 0.25, 0.38, 0.56, 0.84 and 1.26 mg/kg bw. Post exposure period, 21 days.	The LD_{50} was estimated to be between 0.56 and 0.84 mg/kg bw.	Not on pure active substance Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 6.1.1/01 (Lipha Tech)
OECD 401, Oral, Rat Wistar 5 males and 5 females /group. Single dose by gavage at 0.3, 0.6, 0.9, 1.2	The LD_{50} was estimated to be for males: 1.43 mg/kg bw, for females: 1.25 mg/kg bw and	Clinical signs and necropsy findings consistent with	A6.1.1(Task Force)

 Table 11:
 Summary table of relevant acute toxicity studies

and 1.5 mg/kg bw, 14 day post exposure period	combined: 1.31 mg/kg bw	internal haemorrhaging. Purity of the a.s. 96% Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	
EPA 86-1, Oral, Dog, Beagle 4 males and 4 females/group Single dose at 2, 5, 12.5 or 19.8 mg/kg bw. Post exposure period 31 days.	Acute median lethal dose estimated to be 8.1 mg/kg for combined sexes. No apparent difference between males and females.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 6.1.1/02 (Lipha Tech)
EPA 81-2, Dermal Rabbit New Zealand White 5 males and 5 females/group Single dose of 0.5, 1, 2 and 4 mg/kg bw applied in corn oil. 0.2-0.4 mg/cm2. Exposure to as large an area as possible for 24 hrs. Post exposure period 21 days.	LD ₅₀ (95% confidence limits) Combined sex: 1.71 (1.18 to 2.5) mg/kg bw Males: 1.3 (0.7 to 2.4) mg/kg bw Females: 2.38 (1.58 to 3.59) mg/kg bw	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 6.1.2/01 (Lipha Tech)
OECD 402, Dermal Rat Wistar 5 males and 5 females /group 10% of body surface exposed to 5.0, 10.0, 15.0, 20.0 or 25.0 mg/kg bw. Post exposure period 18 days	The LD ₅₀ was estimated to be for males: 20.62 mg/kg bw, for females: 32.08 mg/kg bw and combined: 23.31 mg/kg bw	Clinical signs and necropsy findings consistent with internal haemorrhaging. Purity of the a.s. 96% Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.1.2 (Task Force)
EPA 81-3, Inhalation Rat Sprague- Dawley 5-8 males and 5-8 females/group One group of 5 males and females via whole body exposure. Other groups via nose- only methods, with variable numbers per group. Whole body: 89.2 mg/m ³ . Nose only: 0.20, 0.33, 0.46, 1.63, 3.35 and 23.3 µg/L. Exposure period 4 hours. Observation period 21 days.	Males: $0.46 \ \mu g/L \ (95\% \ fiducial limits)$ $0.40 \ to \ 0.52 \ \mu g/L)$ Females: $> 0.33 \ and < 0.46 \ \mu g/L$ Combined sexes: $0.43 \ \mu g/L \ (95\% \ fiducial limits)$ $0.40 \ to \ 0.47 \ \mu g/L).$	Not on pure active substance Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 6.1.3/01 (Lipha Tech)

4.2.1 Non-human information

4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral

Bromadiolone was very toxic to rats with an oral LD50 of >0.56 (A 6.1.1-01, applicant Lipha Tech). Most deaths occurred between day 3 and 10. Clinical signs were limited to rats dosed 0.84 mg/kg bw or higher. The symptoms were observed 1-2 days prior to death and included signs of

internal haemorrhage (pale mucous membranes and physical weakness). The necropsies confirmed the occurrence of internal haemorrhage. Similar results were observed in data for applicant Task Force where bromadiolone also was highly toxic to the rat, with a combined sexes LD50 value of 1.31 mg/kg following oral exposure. Clinical signs of toxicity were reported day 4 and onward and included paleness, squatting, dyspnea and external haemorrhaging. Deaths occurred in the 1.3 mg/kg and 1.5 mg/kg dose group, between postexposure day 6- 14. A dose-dependent decrease in mean bw and mean bw gain and covering all dose groups, was observed in both sexes day 7 and 14. Necropsy findings included internal haemorrhaging. Some animals died without showing severe clinical symptoms.

Bromadiolone is slightly less toxic to dogs with a LD50 value of 8.1 mg/kg bw (A6.1.1-02, applicant Lipha Tech). Also in this study clinical observations were typical of a haemorrhagic syndrome and haemorrhagic events were confirmed by necropsy findings. Deaths occurred between 6 and 12 days after dosing.

A dog study was performed where one objective was to assess the acute oral toxicity and determine an antidotal regimen after single lethal dose (A 6.10-03, applicant Lipha Tech). This study was of low reliability but gives some information and is consistent with other studies. For the dogs treated only with bromadiolone death occurred at 15 and 20 mg/kg bw and similar ante mortem signs of a haemorrhagic syndrome were observed. In the acute trials, using doses of at least five times the dose required to induce intoxication, an antidotal therapy with intravenous administration of vitamin K1 followed by repeated oral administration of the antidote was shown to be effective.

4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation

A study on inhalation toxicity was performed in rats with bromadiolone as undiluted powder, 4h exposure (A6.1.3-01, applicant Lipha Tech). The LC50 value was estimated to be 0.43 μ g/L (combined sexes) with deaths occurring between day 4 and 9.

4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal

The dermal toxicity study in rabbits resulted in a LD50 value of 1.71 mg/kg bw for combined sexes (A 6.1.2-01, applicant Lipha Tech). Deaths occurred from day 6 to day 14 in dose groups at 1.0 mg/kg bw and higher. Like in the oral studies clinical signs and necropsy were consistent with internal haemorrhaging. Similar results were also observed in data for applicant Task Force, where bromadiolone also was highly toxic to the rat following dermal exposure, with a combined sexes LD50 value of 23.3 mg/kg. The clinical signs and necropsy findings were consistent with internal haemorrhaging. In most cases the onset of symptoms occurred on the 5th - 7th post exposure day, but in some cases symptoms appeared on the 10th-14th day. Deaths occurred in this study between the 5th- 14th post exposure day and in all dose groups.

4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes

4.2.2 Human information

No data.

4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity

Bromadiolone is acutely very toxic by the oral, dermal and inhalation routes. Death is a result of internal haemorrhage, which is the declared mode of action of the active substance. Bromadiolone requires classification and labelling according to DSD and CLP criteria.

4.2.4 Comparison with criteria

The oral LD50 is between 0.56 and 0.84 mg/kg bw which are below ≤ 25 mg/kg bw for required labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrases R 28 'Very toxic if swallowed'. The dermal LD50 is 1.71 mg/kg bw or 23.3 mg/kg bw which are both ≤ 50 mg/kg bw which requires labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrase R27 'Very toxic in contact with skin'. The LC50 value was estimated to be 0.43 µg/L i.e ≤ 0.25 mg/L which requires labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrase R26 'Very toxic by inhalation'.

The oral LD50 is also less than the ATE \leq 5 mg/kg bw for an acute toxicity hazard category 1. The dermal LD50 is 1.75 mg/kg bw (sexes combined) and 23.3 mg/kg (sexes combined) which are far below the ATE \leq 50 mg/kg bw for an acute toxicity hazard category 1. The inhalational LC50 of 0.43 µg/l is far below the ATE \leq 0.05 mg/l for an acute toxicity hazard category 1.

4.2.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Bromadiolone requires labelling with the symbol T+ and the risk phrases R 28 'Very toxic if swallowed', R27 'Very toxic in contact with skin' and R26 'Very toxic by inhalation', according to 67/548/EEC criteria.

TC-CL conclusion, November 2006 the following classification was agreed: T+: R26/27/28 and specific concentration limits for acute toxicity was agreed in may 2007: $0.25\% \le C < 0.5\%$: T+; R26/27/28-48/23/24/25 $0.025\% \le C < 0.25\%$: T; R23/24/25-48/23/24/25 $0.0025\% \le C < 0.025\%$: Xn; R20/21/22-48/20/21/22

According to the CLP criteria bromadiolone should be classified in the acute toxicity hazard category 1 (oral, dermal and inhalational route), hazard statement 300, 310, 330 and labelled with pictogram GHS09, signal word danger and hazard statement 300, 310, 330.

Specific concentration limits are not applicable for acute toxicity classification according to regulation EC 1272/2008. Rather, the relative potency of substances is implicitly taken into account in the additivity formula.

RAC evaluation of acute toxicity

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

Three acute oral toxicity studies (two in rats, one in dogs), two acute dermal toxicity studies (one in rats, one in rabbits), and one acute inhalation toxicity study (in rats) are available.

Acute oral toxicity

Two acute oral toxicity studies in <u>rats</u> (in accordance with US EPA Guideline 81-1, equivalent to OECD 401) showed that Bromadiolone was very toxic with an oral LD_{50} of >0.56 mg/kg:

- in the first study in rats LD_{50} values were estimated to be between 0.56 and 0.84 mg/kg bw;
- in the second study in rats LD₅₀ values were estimated to be 1.43 mg/kg bw for males, 1.25 mg/kg bw for females and 1.31 mg/kg bw for combined sexes.

Most deaths occurred between post-exposure days 3 and 10 in the first study, and day 6 and 14 in the second study. The necropsies confirmed the occurrence of internal haemorrhage.

Acute oral toxicity studies in <u>dogs</u> (in accordance with US EPA Guideline 86-1) showed no apparent difference between males and females, with acute LD_{50} estimated to be 8.1 mg/kg for combined sexes. Deaths occurred between post-exposure days 6 and 12, due to internal haemorrhage.

An acute dermal toxicity study in <u>rabbit</u> (in accordance with US EPA Guideline 81-2, equivalent to OECD 402) showed LD_{50} values of 1.3 mg/kg bw for males, 2.38 mg/kg bw for females and 1.71 mg/kg bw for combined sexes. Deaths occurred between post-exposure days 6 and 14, due to internal haemorrhage.

Acute dermal toxicity

An acute dermal toxicity study in <u>rats</u> (in accordance with OECD 402) showed LD_{50} values of 20.62 mg/kg bw for males, 32.08 mg/kg bw for females and 23.31 mg/kg bw for combined sexes. Deaths occurred between post-exposure days 5 and 14, due to internal haemorrhage.

Acute inhalation toxicity

An acute inhalation toxicity study in <u>rats</u> (in accordance with US EPA Guideline 81-3, equivalent to OECD 403) was conducted with Bromadiolone as an undiluted powder (4h exposure period, nose only). Study results showed LC_{50} values of 0.46 µg/L for males, >0.33 and <0.46 µg/L for females and 0.43 µg/L for combined sexes. Deaths occurred between post-exposure days 4 and 9, due to internal haemorrhage.

It was concluded by the DS that Bromadiolone is acutely toxic by the oral, dermal and inhalation routes, causing death as a result of internal haemorrhages and that it should be classified in the acute toxicity hazard category 1 (oral, dermal and inhalational route) with the hazard statements H300, H310 and H330 (respectively).

Comments received during public consultation

Two Member States supported the proposed classification.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

Following a comparison of the available acute oral, dermal and inhalation LD_{50} and LC_{50} values with the classification criteria, RAC supports the conclusion of the dossier submitter that, according to CLP Regulation, Bromadiolone should be classified in Category 1 for acute oral, dermal and inhalation toxicity as follows:

- Acute Tox. Cat. 1 H300: Fatal if swallowed (acute oral LD₅₀ between 0.56 and 1.43 mg/kg in rats are lower than ATE \leq 5 mg/kg)
- Acute Tox. Cat 1 H310: Fatal in contact with skin (acute dermal LD₅₀ of 1.71 mg/kg bw for combined sexes in rabbits and of 23.31 mg/kg bw for combined sexes in rats are both lower than ATE ≤ 50 mg/kg)
- Acute Tox. Cat 1 H330: Fatal if inhaled (LC_{50} value of 0.00043 mg/L for combined sexes in rats is lower than ATE \leq 0.05 mg/L for dusts and mists).

4.3 Specific target organ toxicity – single exposure (STOT SE))

No data.

4.3.1 Summary and discussion of Specific target organ toxicity – single exposure

Not applicable.

4.3.2 Comparison with criteria

Not applicable.

4.3.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling

No proposal on specific target organ toxicity – single exposure because no data was available.

RAC evaluation of specific target organ toxicity – single exposure (STOT SE)

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

There was no proposal for specific target organ toxicity – single exposure because no data was available.

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented on.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

In the opinion of RAC, the blood coagulation system is affected after single exposure since it was the main cause of mortality in acute studies. However, classification for STOT-SE for Bromadiolone is not warranted since it is covered by the classification as Acute Tox. 1.

4.4 Irritation

4.4.1 Skin irritation

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Rabbit, 6/group FHSLA, CFR 21, 191.11. In line with EC method B.4, 0.5 g test material	Average score 24, 48, 72 h for erythema: 0.00 Oedema: 0.00	No irritation observed. Bromadiolone is not classified as a skin irritant. Reversibility was not assessed.	A 6.1.4-01 (LiphaTech)
Rabbit, NZ White, 3 female and 3 male. EPA 81-5, OPPTS 870.500	Average score 24, 48, 72 h for erythema: 0.00 Oedema: 0.00	None Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.1.4/01 (Task Force)

	Table 12:	Summary	table of	relevant skin	irritation	studies
--	-----------	---------	----------	---------------	------------	---------

4.4.1.1 Non-human information

The skin irritation study is of low reliability (applicant Lipha Tech). Abraded sites on the skin are used, the reporting of methods and results is inadequate and the assessment times do not cover full range of EC guideline criteria. However, the study gives no indications on irritation, which is supported by the studies on the product.

The rabbit skin irritation study (applicant Task Force) had some minor deviations from EU Method B.4. However, these deviations should not affect the outcome of the study. The results indicate that Bromadiolone does not cause irritation when in contact with rabbit epidermis.

4.4.1.2 Human information

No data.

4.4.1.3 Summary and discussion of skin irritation

The results indicate that Bromadiolone does not cause irritation when in contact with rabbit epidermis.

4.4.1.4 Comparison with criteria

Average score was for 24, 48, 72 h for erythema: 0.00 Oedema: 0.00 i.e. bromadiolone does not fulfil the criteria to be classified as a skin irritant according to the 67/548/EEC criteria or the regulation EC 1272/2008 criteria.

4.4.1.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Bromadiolone does not fulfil the CLP or DSD criteria to be classified as a dermal irritant.

RAC evaluation of skin corrosion/irritation

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

The results of two skin irritation studies conducted in rabbits were considered by the DS. Study results showed average scores of zero for both erythema and oedema in all animals at 24, 48 and 72 h after application.

The first study is of low reliability since abraded sites on the skin were used, the reporting of methods and results was inadequate and the assessment times do not cover full range of EC guideline criteria. However, no indications of irritation were found. Studies on the product supported the absence of skin irritation according to the DS but the concentration of Bromadialone in the products was not given.

The second study had some minor deviations from the OECD TG 404 (e.g. minor decrease in purity level, the test site was not examined immediately after protective patch was removed, all six animals were treated simultaneously). In that study, approximately 0.5 g of Bromadiolone was moistened with 2.0 ml of deionised water and applied to an area of at least 8 cm x 8 cm on the dorsal area of the trunk, No indication of irritation was observed.

The DS considered that these deviations should not affect the outcome of the 2nd study, and concluded that Bromadiolone does not cause irritation when it is in contact with rabbit epidermis. Bromadiolone does not fulfil the CLP criteria for classification as a skin irritant.

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented on.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

The results of skin irritation studies in rabbits showed zero average score for erythema and oedema in all animals at all time points (24, 48 and 72 h).

Also, in a skin sensitisation Buehler test in guinea pigs no visible changes were found after induction and challenge applications of Bromadiolone at a concentration of 5%. In the pilot test, 0.5 ml of test formulation with 0.001, 0.1, 0.1, 1, 5, 10, 25 or 50% Bromadiolone produced no reaction on guinea pigs' skin.

Although in the acute dermal toxicity study in rabbits skin reactions were observed (erythema was found in one male and one female and oedema in one male), they appeared at the highest dose applied (4.0 mg/kg bw, 24-hour exposure) at which four males and all five females died.

Since no skin reactions were observed in dermal irritation studies in rabbits and in a skin sensitisation study in Guinea pigs and erythema and oedema in acute dermal toxicity study in rabbits were found only at the dose with 90% mortality (at dermal exposure duration of 24 hours), RAC supports the conclusion of the DS that Bromadiolone should not be classified for skin irritation.

4.4.2 Eye irritation

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Rabbit, 9 animals in total, Comparable to EC Method B.5	Average score 24, 48, 72h: Cornea: 0.0 (rinsed, unrinsed) Iris: 0.28 (unrinsed), 0.0 (rinsed) Redness: 0.72 (unrinsed), 0.0 (rinsed)	Study of low reliability due to poor reporting.	A 6.1.4/02(Lipha Tech)
	Chemosis: 0.72 (unrinsed), 0.0 (rinsed) Iridial and conjunctival reactions had largely resolved by Day 4 and all reactions had resolved by Day 7.		
Rabbit, NZ White, 3 male and 3 female EPA 81-4, OPPTS 870.2400	Average score 24, 48, 72h: Cornea: 0.11, Reaction reported in 5/6 animals, reversed by 48hrs. Iris: 0.0 Conjunctiva Redness: 0.44, All animals affected, reversed by 4th post exposure day. Conjunctiva Chemosis: 0.17, All animals affected, reversed by 72hrs.	All signs of irritation were reversed by post exposure day 4. Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.1.4-02Task Force

 Table 13:
 Summary table of relevant eye irritation studies

4.4.2.1 Non-human information

The eye irritation test is also of low reliability (applicant Lipha Tech). In this case the major deficiency is poor reporting. However, the study gives some information and the result does not indicate any substantial eye irritating properties. This is supported by studies on the product.

The eye irritation study by the applicant Task Force shows that bromadiolone is mildly irritating to the rabbit eye, but that the irritation reaction is reversible by post-exposure day 4.

4.4.2.2 Human information

No data.

4.4.2.3 Summary and discussion of eye irritation

The results of the *in vivo* rabbit studies show that bromadiolone is at most only mildly irritating to the eye.

4.4.2.4 Comparison with criteria

The average score at 24, 48, 72h was at most 0.11(cornea) reaction reported in 5/6 animals, reversed by 48hrs. 0.44(conjunctiva redness), all animals were affected, reversed by 4th post exposure day.

0.17 (conjunctiva chemosis), all animals were affected, reversed by 72hrs. Bromadiolone does therefore not fulfil the criteria to be classified as an eye irritant according to the 67/548/EEC criteria or the regulation EC 1272/2008 criteria.

4.4.2.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Bromadiolone does not fulfil the CLP or DSD criteria to be classified as an eye irritant.

RAC evaluation of eye corrosion/irritation

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

Two eye irritation studies in rabbits were presented by the DS in the CLH report. The first study was not considered suitable for the evaluation of eye irritation properties of Bromadiolone, primarily due to poor reporting. Study results do not indicate substantial eye irritating properties, which is supported by studies on the product according to the DS but the concentration of Bromadialone in the products was not given..

The second study was conducted in accordance with US EPA Guideline 81-4, equivalent to OECD TG 405. Study results showed that Bromadiolone was mildly irritating to the rabbit eye, but that the irritation reaction was reversible by post-exposure day 4. Therefore, the DS concluded that Bromadiolone does not fulfil the CLP criteria for classification as an eye irritant.

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

RAC evaluated the results obtained in the second study. The results summarised in the table below have been obtained from the CAR IIIA document

	Cornea	Iris	C	onjunctiva	
			Redness	Chemosis	Discharge
60 min	0.17	0	2	1.33	1.17
24 h	0.17	0	0.83	0.33	0.33
48 h	0.17	0	0.33	0.17	0.17
72 h	0	0	0.17	0	0
Average (24, 48 and 72h)	0.11	0	0.44	0.17	0.17
Povorcibility.	complete		complete	complete	complete
Reversibility	(in 72 h) -	(in 4 days)	(in 72 h)	(in 72 h)	

The average scores following grading at 24, 48 and 72 hours after instillation of the test material were lower than 1 for corneal opacity and iritis, lower than 2 for conjunctival redness and chemosis, and were fully reversible within 4 days of the study. Therefore, RAC agreed with the DS that Bromadiolone does not warrant classification for eye corrosion/irritation, because the observed effects did not meet the classification criteria under CLP.

4.4.3 Respiratory tract irritation

No data.

4.4.3.1 Non-human information

4.4.3.2 Human information

4.4.3.3 Summary and discussion of respiratory tract irritation

Not applicable.

4.4.3.4 Comparison with criteria

Not applicable.

4.4.3.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

No proposal on respiratory tract irritation because no data was available.

4.5 Corrosivity

The skin irritation/corrosion studies are mentioned in section 4.4.1

Table 14: Summary table of relevant corrosivity studies

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
See section 4.4.1 above.			

4.5.1 Non-human information

The skin irritation/corrosion studies are mentioned in section 4.4.1.

4.5.2 Human information

No data.

4.5.3 Summary and discussion of corrosivity

No visible skin damage or irreversible skin damage was observed in the irritation/corrosion studies mentioned in section 4.4.1.

4.5.4 Comparison with criteria

No visible skin damage or irreversible skin damage was observed in the irritation/corrosion studies mentioned in section 4.4.1. Bromadiolone therefore does not fulfil the criteria to be classified as corrosive according to the 67/548/EEC criteria or the regulation EC 1272/2008 criteria.

4.5.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Bromadiolone does not fulfil the CLP or DSD criteria to be classified as corrosive.

4.6 Sensitisation

4.6.1 Skin sensititsation

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Guinea Pig, EPA 81-6 Buehler test	Number of animals sensitized/total number of animals: Vehicle controls – 6 males in three groups of 2 (test material challenge, vehicle challenge and unchallenged negative control). Test group-10 males. Positive control group- 6 males.	Bromadiolone did not elicit reactions typical of skin sensitisation. Study of low reliability (deviating from guideline and inadequate positive control response)	A 6.1.5/01 (Lipha Tech)
Guinea pig, EPA 81-6, Buehler test OPPTS 870.2600	No results could be obtained due to stained skin.	Study of low reliability due to staining of test site by test substance.	A6.1.5/1 (Task Force)
Guinea pig, OECD 406	Number of animals sensitised/total number of animals: Vehicle controls- 10 females, test group- 20 females, positive control group-20 females	Bromadiolone did not cause skin sensitisation. Study of high reliability Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.1.5/2 (Task Force)

 Table 15:
 Summary table of relevant skin sensitisation studies

4.6.1.1 Non-human information

Despite the major deficiencies the study (applicant Lipha Tech) gives an indication that bromadiolone is not a skin sensitiser. This is supported by another study of high reliability, where five percent bromadiolone was applied as solution (in 4% ethanol and 1% methyl cellulose) for induction and challenge (applicant Task Force). Eight dose levels were used in a preliminary dose finding study ranging between 0.001% and 50%. No skin reactions were observed in the preliminary test. The preliminary study was extended and the animals were treated on the 2nd, 3rd and 4th weeks after the first treatment. After the 2nd treatment mortality was observed amongst animals of the higher doses >10%. Therefore 5% was used for induction/challenge. Positive reactions were seen in 15/20 animals in a reliability study, treated at induction/challenge with potassium dichromate. No reactions were seen in control animals treated with vehicle when challenged with potassium dichromate. The skin sensitisation studies indicate that bromadiolone does not cause skin sensitisation.
4.6.1.2 Human information

No data.

4.6.1.3 Summary and discussion of skin sensitisation

Bromadiolone did not cause significant reactions in the skin sensitisation tests performed on guinea pigs.

4.6.1.4 Comparison with criteria

Positive reactions in the animals did not exceed 15% of the animals (no skin reaction was observed in the treated animals). Bromadiolone does therefore not fulfil the criteria to be classified as sensitising according to the 67/548/EEC criteria or the regulation EC 1272/2008 criteria.

4.6.1.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Bromadiolone does not fulfil the CLP or DSD criteria to be classified as sensitising.

RAC evaluation of skin sensitisation

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

The skin sensitising potential of Bromadiolone was tested in three Buehler tests in guinea pigs conducted in accordance to US EPA Guideline 81-6, equivalent to OECD TG 406. The study results are as follows:

- in the first study Bromadiolone did not elicit reactions typical of skin sensitisation, but the study is of low reliability due to OECD test guideline deviations and inadequate positive control response
- in the second study no results could be obtained due to stained skin by test substance
- in the third study which is of high reliability, Bromadiolone did not cause skin sensitisation. Topical inductions and challenge were performed by Bromadiolone in concentration of 5%, since at concentrations ≥10% mortality was observed in the pilot test. No skin sensitisation reactions were noted in treated or control animals, while positive reactions were seen in 15/20 positive control animals treated with potassium dichromate.

Overall, the DS concluded that Bromadiolone does not cause skin sensitisation and does not fulfil the CLP criteria for classification as a skin sensitiser.

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

RAC evaluated the results obtained in the third Buehler test. In that study zero scores at 24 and 48h after challenge were recorded in all treated and vehicle control animals (according to Magnusson and Kligman grading scale), while 75% of positive control animals showed positive results (with the mean score of 1.85 and 1.80 at 24 and 48 hours after challenge, respectively).

RAC therefore supports DS proposal that Bromadiolone should not be classified as skin sensitiser.

4.6.2 Respiratory sensitisation

No data.

Table 16: Summary table of relevant respiratory sensitisation studies

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
No data			

4.6.2.1 Non-human information

No data.

4.6.2.2 Human information

No data.

4.6.2.3 Summary and discussion of respiratory sensitisation

Not applicable.

4.6.2.4 Comparison with criteria

Not applicable.

4.6.2.5 Conclusions on classification and labelling

No proposal on respiratory sensitation because no data was available.

4.7 Repeated dose toxicity

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference	
Oral 45 days, Pig, Belgium Landrace or Large White, Sex not reported. 3 animals/group and 3 in total (1/group) in one trial 0.5 mg bromadiolone per pig continuously for 45 days. Comparative study in which other groups were dosed with warfarin (5 mg/pig) or brodifacoum (1 mg/pig). In third phase of the study, three pigs were given 6.25, 12.5 or 25 mg bromadiolone/pig/day for 5 days followed by 15 day rest period followed by further 5 days of dosing	At 0.5 mg bromadiolone /pig/day there were no mortalities during 45 days administration. In the third phase, the first period of five daily doses of bromadiolone resulted in anorexia, difficulty rising and walking and slight increases in prothrombin times for the two animals dosed at 12.5 or 25 mg/pig/day (circa 0.5 or 1 mg/kg/day). Signs resolved during treatment free period. There was no evidence of haemorrhage or death for bromadiolone treated pigs. LO(A)EL>10 mg/kg bw/day. (single animal) NO(A)EL 10 mg/kg bw/day. (single animal)	The study has too many deficiencies to calculate a reliable NOAEL. Non- guideline study with poor reporting.	A 6.3.1/01 (Lipha Tech)	
Oral 35 days (only 5 days exposure) Ferret 5 males and 5 females /group 2.5, 5, 10, 20 or 40 ppm in diet (80g/day diet allocation). Dosed for five consecutive days	Haemorrhages developed from day 4 and death occurred in all groups generally between day 6 and 11. Preceding signs were typical of haemorrhagic syndrome. Prothrombin times increased rapidly during dose administration but returned to normal levels within 9 days of cessation of dosing. LO(A)EL 2.5 ppm (lowest dose tested) NO(A)EL < 2.5 ppm	LC50 value 7.6 ppm corresponding to approximately 0.4 mg/kg bw/day. Study of low reliability (inadequate reporting of test substance and short exposure time).	A 6.3.1/02 (Lipha Tech)	
EPA 82-1B, Oral 90 days Dog Beagle, 3 males and 3 females/group 0, 8, 20 or 50 µg/kg bw/day.	No toxicologically significant effects at dose level of 8 μ g/kg bw per day. Higher doses elicited reactions typical of haemorrhagic syndrome including elevated clotting times, leading to death by haemorrhage. At 20 μ g/kg bw/day 4/6 dogs died between day 64 and 85 of the study. LO(A)EL 20 μ g/kg bw/day based on haemorrhagic events. NO(A)EL 8 μ g/kg bw/day	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 6.4.1/01 (Lipha Tech)	
OECD 407, Oral (gavage) 28 days Rat, Wistar, 5 males, 5 females per group . Study 1: 0, 100, 500, 1000 µg/kg bw/day Study 2: 0. 2.5, 50 µg/kg bw/day	Study 1 All dose groups: Clinical symptoms, body weight depression, 100% mortality Study 2 2.5 µg/kg bw: no clinical symptoms	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.3.1(Task Force)	

Table 17: Summary table of relevant repeated dose toxicity studies

	50 μg/kg bw: General signs of toxicity, bleeding leading to 100% mortality LO(A)EL 50 μg/kg bw/day NO(A)EL 2.5 μg/kg bw/day		
OECD 409, Oral (gavage) 90 daysRabbit, New Zealand white 6 males, 6 females per group0, 0.1, 0.5, 1 µg/kg bw daily	Prolonged prothrombine time seen in the 1 µg/kg bw group.LO(A)EL 1.0 µg/kg bw per day based on prolonged PTT. NO(A)EL 0.5 µg/kg bw per day	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.4.1 (Task Force)

4.7.1 Non-human information

4.7.1.1 Repeated dose toxicity: oral

Two non-guideline studies in the pig and ferret (A 6.3.1-01 and A 6.3.1-02, applicant Lipha Tech) demonstrated that after ingestion of five consecutive doses, without administration of antidote, marked haemorrhagic events occurred within 4-5 days and death occurred by day 6 for ferrets dosed at 5 ppm. The LC50 value was calculated to be 7.6 ppm corresponding to approximately 0.4 mg/kg bw/day. Pigs were less sensitive and survived two dose periods of 5 days separated by a fifteen day rest period at dose levels of up to 1 mg/kg bw/day.

A 90-day study in dogs was conducted (A 6.4.1-01, applicant Lipha Tech). At the highest dose tested (50 μ g/kg bw/day) all dogs developed a haemorrhagic syndrome and died between day 21 and 32 of the study. Lethal effects were seen in doses as low as 20 μ g/kg bw/day. The clinical signs, haematological and post mortem data were consistent with the known pharmacological action of the active substance; impairment of the clotting cascade and increased prevalence of haemorrhage rapidly leading to death. There were no indications of other secondary toxicities: histopathology of the dog revealed no hypertrophy or hyperplasia of the target organ, the liver.

A 28-day repeated dose oral toxicity study (A6.3.1., applicant Task Force) showed that bromadiolone caused general signs of intoxication such as decreased activity, vocalisation, piloerection and also caused paleness, dyspnea and bleeding from nose and eyes, in rats. Common symtoms observed following exposure to a repeated oral dose of 0.05, 0.1, 0.5 and 1 mg/kg in rats were decreased activity, vocalisation, tremor, squatting position, abnormal gait, decreased righting reflex, decreased grip and limb tone, decreased body tone, lachrymation, paleness, piloerection, dyspnoea, bleeding, (nose, eyes), sanuineous urine and cyanotic skin. Also, a depression of body weight and food intake was found in these groups compared to controls. The mortality rate in these groups was 100%. In the low dose group ($2.5\mu g/kg$) of study 2, no clinical symtoms were observed and no effects on food consumption were reported. The only effect on body weight gain was a significant lower bw gain in males during the last week of exposure. However, the summarized bw gain during the exposure period was not different from controls.

Haematological findings included a decreased Mean Corpuscular haemoglobin concentration and monocyte count in male animals of the low dose group $(2.5\mu g/kg)$ compared to controls, and a Red blood cell distribution width decrease in females of the low $(2.5\mu g/kg)$ dose group compared to controls. Also, in the low $(2.5\mu g/kg)$ dose group a significantly increased calcium and chloride concentration was observed in males compared to controls. These minor deviations from control values were not of biological significance, since all values were within the physiological range.

Common necropsy findings in the 0.05, 0.1, 0.5 and 1.0 mg/kg/day dose groups were general haemorrhagic diathesis and serous hepatitis. Centrilobular hepatic necrosis and alveolar emphysema were also reported in these dose groups. In the low $(2.5\mu g/kg)$ dose group in study 2, calcium deposits, uterus dilation and focal proliferation of MPS-cells in the liver were slightly more common than in the control group, but were not of biological significance. Study one showed that at doses at and above 100 $\mu g/kg$ bw/day, clinical signs and decreased body weight were observed. The mortality rate were also 100%. In study two, a dose of 50 $\mu g/kg$ bw/day led to 100% mortality with deaths occurring between day 17 and 27. No clinical signs were observed at the lower dose level.

A 90-day repeated dose toxicity study in rabbits was performed (A6.4.1, applicant Task Force). Two females in the 0.5 µg/kg dose group died during the treatment period. Histopathological examination revealed pleuritis, hepatitis and pneumonia in both animals and an acute bacterial invasion was, in both cases, seen as a probable cause of death. Diarrhoea was observed in four animals in each dose group but was not seen in the control animals. Also, in the highest dose group $(1 \mu g/kg)$ six animals had thin faeces. Pale skin or mucous membranes were seen in females in all dose groups and among males in the intermediate (0.5 μ g/kg) and high dose group (1 μ g/kg.) Haematological investigations showed a significant increase in prothrombin time (PTT) in males and females in the 1µg/kg dose groups compared to controls. This may indicate an effect on homeostasis caused by the exposure to Bromadiolone. Other minor haematological effects were seen in midway blood samples from animals in the highest dose group compared to controls but none were seen in both sexes and no effects persisted until terminal sampling. In terminal blood samples, females of the highest dose group showed significantly decreased MCV (mean corpuscular volume) and MCH (mean corpuscular haemoglobin) values compared to controls. However, no significant differences in MCHC (mean corpuscular haemoglobine concentration), RBC (red blood cell concentration), Htc (haematocrite) or HGB (haemoglobine concentration) were reported, indicating that the decreased MCV and MCH values were not of biological significance. Females in all three dose groups showed significantly higher WBC (white blood cell concentration) values in terminal blood samples compared to controls. However, the mean control value was low, compared to normal values for rats (5-15 x 109 /L) and start and midway sample values, indicating that this deviation was not of biological significance. The only effect on clinical chemistry seen in terminal blood samples was a significant decrease in glucose values in females of all dose groups compared to controls, which may be due to the malabsorption caused by diarrhoea seen in the majority of the exposed animals between day 85-90 of the exposure period. A significantly increased urine volume was seen terminally in females of the 1µg/kg dose group compared to controls but since the control value was low, this difference is not of biological significance. No other dose related effects on urine analysis were seen. There were no treatment related effects on body weight gain, food consumption, ophthalmologic examination or blood marrow smears. The only effects on organ weights among males were a significantly lower testes weight in the 1.0 µg/kg dose group compared to controls. In females, the pituitary weight was increased in all dose groups compared to controls. This effect was not seen in males. Pin-prick sized lung haemorrhages, lung abscesses and nutmeg-like pattern in the liver were slightly more common in females and males of the $1 \mu g/kg$ dose group compared to controls. However, no organ weight deviations or necropsy findings were dose related. Pale skin or mucous membranes were seen in females in all dose groups and among males in the intermediate (0.5 µg/kg bw) and high dose group (1 µg/kg). Haematological investigations showed a significant increase in prothrombin time in males and females in the 1 µg/kg dose groups compared to controls. These findings are consistent with the mode of action of bromadiolone as an anticoagulant. The NOAEL was set to 0.5 μ g/kg bw based on the prolonged PTT at 1 μ g/kg bw.

4.7.1.2 Repeated dose toxicity: inhalation

A repeat dose inhalation study is waived (applicant Lipha Tech). An acute inhalation study (A 6.1.3-01, applicant Lipha Tech) showed that bromadiolone is highly toxic by inhalation. The LC50 for male and female rats was 0.46 µg/L. Appropriate protection measures are required to ensure no exposure to the (powdered) technical material or to the products during the production process. There is evidence from a study with one product type (B 6.1.3, applicant Lipha Tech) that acute inhalation is high when a micronised form of the product is aerosolised to generate a toxic inhalable atmosphere (LC50 <0.523 mg/L air). However, the products are either extruded wax blocks or treated grains (the treated grain products have been shown to be dust free) and will not lead to exposure via inhalation. Repeated exposures will very likely result in death by induction of a haemorrhagic syndrome with associated acute clinical signs of reaction to treatment. The mechanism of clotting inhibition caused by hydroxy coumarin-type anticoagulant rodenticides is dependent on inhibition of vitamin K epoxide or vitamin K reductases and is unaffected by route of application. Therefore specific repeat dose inhalation studies would not provide any additional useful information to that obtained in various species in repeat dose and subchronic studies by the oral route. As the outcome of such a study can be predicted from the knowledge on mode of action and acute or short term exposure, performing a repeat administration study would contravene Directive 86/609/EC which militates against unnecessary testing using animals.

The repeat dose inhalation study is waived (applicant Task Force). No acute inhalation study has been performed and route-to-route extrapolation is not feasible. Bromadiolone has a low vapour pressure and exposure via inhalation is expected to be negligible both during production and during the use of bait blocks. Waiving of the repeat dose inhalation study has therefore been accepted.

4.7.1.3 Repeated dose toxicity: dermal

A repeat dose dermal toxicity study is waived (applicant Lipha Tech). The dermal acute study (A 6.1.2-01) showed high dermal toxicity with a LD50 value of 1.71 mg/kg bw for male and female rabbits. Primary irritation studies showed no dermal irritation at abraded or non-abraded sites after a 24 hour exposure period. Lethal effects were apparent following topical application during the sensitisation study preliminary investigations, although the material does not cause delayed contact hypersensitivity and it is unlikely that repeated application would elucidate any longer term allergenic effects that would take precedence over the lethal effects. The highly toxic nature of the material is such that repeated administration studies would certainly result in death at high doses. The highly cumulative nature of the material means that lower doses, administered over several days, can also be predicted to cause death. In all cases death was caused by the specific pharmacological action of the molecule, inducing fatal haemorrhage. The mechanism of clotting inhibition caused by hydroxy coumarin-type anticoagulant rodenticides is dependent on inhibition of vitamin K epoxide or vitamin K reductases and is unaffected by route of application. Therefore specific repeat dose dermal studies would not provide any additional useful information to that obtained in various species in repeat dose and subchronic studies by the oral route. As the outcome of such a study can be predicted from the knowledge on mode of action and acute or short term exposure, performing a repeat administration study would contravene Directive 86/609/EC which militates against unnecessary testing using animals.

The repeat dose dermal toxicity study is waived (applicant Task Force). The short term repeat dose oral study has been performed for bromadiolone in rats and route-to-route extrapolation based on data from the acute oral and dermal studies does not indicate that dermal exposure constitutes a greater risk than oral exposure. Even if the most probable form of exposure to humans is via the

```
ANNEX 1 - BACKGROUND DOCUMENT TO RAC OPINION ON BROMADIOLONE (ISO); 3-[3-(4'-
BROMO[1,1'-BIPHENYL]-4-YL)-3-HYDROXY-1-PHENYLPROPYL]-4-HYDROXY-2H-1-BENZOPYRAN-2-ONE
```

dermal route, based on the use pattern of the product, dermal exposure is expected to be low as the use of gloves when handling the baits is expected, and the waiving has therefore been accepted.

4.7.1.4 Repeated dose toxicity: other routes

No data.

4.7.1.5 Human information

No data.

4.7.1.6 Other relevant information

No data.

4.7.1.7 Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity

Repeat-dose oral studies show that even at doses as low as 20 μ g/kg/day in the dog, lethal effects begin to be seen after 64 to 85 days administration. The clinical signs are consistent with increased clotting time and haemorrhagic events. The effects can be reversed by treatment with vitamin K if given in time. Signs of toxicity following repeat dose exposure to bromadiolone were consistent with the anticoagulant properties of Bromadiolone. In the 90-day oral exposure study in rabbits, a significant increase in prothrombin time was seen in the 1 μ g/kg dose group. The overall NOAEL for repeat dose effects is 0.5 μ g/kg/day based on the absence of adverse effects in this dose group in the 90-day rabbit study.

4.7.1.8 Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification according to DSD

Repeated oral dose treatment with bromadiolone in dogs, rats, ferrets and rabbits caused haemhorrage and death at low doses. The results were consistent with the anticoagulative effects of bromadiolone also seen in the acute oral, dermal and inhalation studies.

4.7.1.9 Comparison with criteria of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification according to DSD

A death rate of 100% occurred after repeated dose treatment with bromadiolone at 50 μ g/kg bw in both rats and dogs which is far below the classification limit of 5 mg/kg bw for R48/25: Toxic: danger of serious damage to health by prolonged exposure if swallowed. No repeated dose studies were available for the dermal or inhalational route with bromadiolone. However, based on the oral data and extrapolation from the acute data for dermal and inhalational data, classification also as R48/23/24 would be warranted.

4.7.1.10 Conclusions on classification and labelling of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification according to DSD

Based on the oral repeated dose toxicity data plus extrapolation from the acute data for the dermal and inhalation route of exposure, bromadiolone should be classified with R48/23/24/25: Toxic: danger of serious damage to health by prolonged exposure through inhalation, in contact with skin and if swallowed.

Agreed by TC C&L, November 2006: T; R48/23/24/25

Specific concentration limits agreed by TC C&L, May 2007: $0.25\% \le C < 0.5\%$: T+; R26/27/28-T; 48/23/24/25 $0.025\% \le C < 0.25\%$: T; R23/24/25-48/23/24/25 $0.0025\% \le C < 0.025\%$: Xn; R20/21/22-48/20/21/22

4.8 Specific target organ toxicity (CLP Regulation) – repeated exposure (STOT RE)

4.8.1 Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification as STOT RE according to CLP Regulation

See section 4.7.1.8 above.

4.8.2 Comparison with criteria of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification as STOT RE

Serious effects were observed in the 28 day rat study and 90-day dog study at levels below the criterion of "oral, rat ≤ 10 mg/kg bw/day for 90-days" used for classification with STOT RE 1 H372 for the oral route. For classification for the dermal and inhalatory routes, oral data can be used. Further, there is a large margin between the oral dose levels indicating severe effects and the limit value for STOT RE. 1. Also, the acute LD50 values for all three routes were already below the limits for classification as toxic after repeated exposure. Based on these findings, we propose to classify bromadiolone with STOT RE 1 without a specific route and stating the blood as the main affected organ: H372: "Causes damage to the blood through prolonged or repeated exposure".

Specific concentration limits

An SCL for STOT RE 1 is proposed of 0.01% based on the LOAEL at 0.001 mg/kg bw/day in the longest study in rabbits. Calculation: 0.001 mg/kg bw/day (effective dose) / 10 mg/kg bw/day (limit) * 100% = 0.01%. STOT RE 2 is proposed between 0.001% and 0.01% using the same data and method of calculation (limit: 100 resp. 10 mg/kg bw/day). This calculation is performed according to the method described in the Guidance on the Application of the CLP Criteria.

4.8.3 Conclusions on classification and labelling of repeated dose toxicity findings relevant for classification as STOT RE

Bromadiolone should be classified as STOT RE 1; H372.

Proposed Specific concentration limits: STOT RE 1; H372 above 0.01% and STOT RE 2; H373 between 0.001 and 0.01%

RAC evaluation of specific target organ toxicity- repeated exposure (STOT RE)

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

Five oral repeated-dose studies conducted on various species (pig, ferret, dog, rat and rabbit) were presented in the CLH dossier.

Studies in pigs and ferrets were non-guideline studies, but demonstrated that pigs were less sensitive than ferrets. In ferrets dosed at 5 ppm, five consecutive doses induced haemorrhages (within 4-5 days) and death (on day 6). The LC_{50} value in ferrets was

calculated to be 7.6 ppm (approximately 0.4 mg/kg bw/day). Pigs survived two dose periods of 5 days separated by a fifteen day rest period at dose levels of up to 1 mg/kg bw/day.

A 90-day oral toxicity study in Beagle dogs (3 animals/sex/group) was conducted in accordance to US EPA Guideline 82-1, equivalent to OECD TG 409. Three dogs per sex per group were dosed with bromadilone at 0, 8, 20 or 50 μ g/kg bw/day in capsules. The following results were obtained:

- At 50 µg/kg bw/day all animals died within 21 to 32 days with the exception of one female who survived despite marked increases in coagulation and prothrombin times, reduced erythrocyte counts and haemoglobin levels, and a marked increase in leukocyte numbers;
- At 20 µg/kg bw/day severe haemorrhages were observed, four (out of six) animals were sacrificed on humane grounds on days 64 to 84 of the study; prothrombin time was 5-fold increased in males and 25-fold increased in females by the end of the study; in males significantly lower erythrocyte counts were observed at week 4;
- At 8 μg/kg bw/day no treatment related clinical signs were observed; body weights, weight gains and food consumption were similar to controls; prothrombin and coagulation times were not significantly different from controls and no treatment-related macroscopic or histopathological changes were found at necropsy.

In surviving animals there were no toxicologically significant effects in the ophthalmological examinations, ECGs and blood pressure measurements, or clinical chemistry and urinalysis (sampled at week 4 or week 13). There were no effects of treatment on relative organ weights. There were no indications of other toxic effects, and histopathology revealed no hypertrophy or hyperplasia of the liver. The results from two preliminary studies support the findings in the main study.

In the main study, LOAEL of 20 μ g/kg bw/day (based on haemorrhagic events) and NOAEL of 8 μ g/kg bw/day were determined.

A 28-day oral (gavage) toxicity study in Wistar rats was performed in accordance to OECD TG 407. The study was performed in two parts, Study 1 and Study 2, in 5 rats per sex, per dose: Study 1 (doses of 0, 0.1, 0.5, and 1 mg/kg bw/day) and Study 2 (doses of 0, 0.0025, 0.05 mg/kg bw/day).

All animals dosed at 0.05, 0.1, 0.5 and 1 mg/kg bw/day died prematurely. At necropsy haemorrhagic events , serious hepatitis (at all dose levels), and centrilobular hepatic necrosis (at 0.05 and 0.5 mg/kg/day in males) were observed.

At 0.0025 mg/kg bw/day (Study 2) there were no significant treatment-related effects on average body weights or daily mean food intake. In males there was a decrease in the mean corpuscular haemoglobin concentration (MCHC) and in the monocyte count whereas in females there was a decreased red blood cell distribution width. Prothrombin time was not reported to be significantly different in treated rats compared to controls. At necropsy, calcium deposits, uterus dilation and focal proliferation of mononuclear phagocyte system cells in the liver were slightly more common in treated rats than in controls, but were considered of no biological significance.

Based on Study 1 and Study 2, a LOAEL of 0.05 mg/kg bw/day (based on 100% mortality due to internal haemorrhages), and a NOAEL of 0.0025 mg/kg bw/day were

determined.

A 90-day oral toxicity study in New Zealand white rabbits was performed in accordance to OECD 409. Bromadiolone was administered by gavage at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 0.5, and 1 μ g/kg bw/day to 6 animals/sex/group. No treatment-related mortality was observed. At 0.5 μ g/kg bw/day two females died due to acute bacterial invasion, not considered to be due to treatment. Bromadiolone infrequently produced diarrhoea in treated rabbits.

Paleness of the skin or mucous membranes was seen in females in all dose groups, and in males dosed at 0.5 and 1 $\mu g/kg$ bw, with a clear dose-response relationship in both genders.

There were no treatment related effects on body weight gain, food consumption, ophthalmologic examination or blood marrow smears. No prominent pathological organ changes were observed at necropsy: pituitary weight was increased in all dose groups compared to controls (21-34%) without a clear dose-response, and pin-prick sized lung haemorrhages, lung abscesses and nutmeg-like pattern in the liver were slightly more common in rabbits treated at 1 μ g/kg bw/day compared to controls. A significant prolongation in partial prothrombin time (PPT) was measured only in males and females dosed at 1 μ g/kg bw/day.

Based on the above, a LOAEL of 1 $\mu g/kg$ bw/day (based on prolonged PTT), and a NOAEL of 0.5 $\mu g/kg$ bw/day were determined.

Overall, the significant prolongation in PTT observed at a level of 0.001 mg/kg bw/day in rabbits occurred below the criterion used for classification as STOT RE 1; H372 for the oral route. Based on this finding, the DS proposed to classify Bromadiolone as STOT RE 1 without a specific route and stating the blood as the main affected organ: H372: "Causes damage to the blood through prolonged or repeated exposure".

An SCL of 0.01% for STOT RE 1 (H372) was proposed by the DS using the following calculation: 0.001 mg/kg bw/day (effective dose) / 10 mg/kg bw/day (limit) * 100% = 0.01%. An SCL for STOT RE 2 (H373) between 0.001% and 0.01% was proposed using the same data and method of calculation. This calculation was performed according to the method described in the Guidance on the Application of the CLP Criteria.

Comments received during public consultation

Two Member States supported the proposed classification and specific concentration limits.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

RAC supports dossier submitter's proposal for NOAEL and LOAEL values in repeated dose toxicity studies:

- LOAEL of 0.020 mg/kg bw/day based on severe haemorrhagic effects, and NOAEL of 0.008 mg/kg bw/day at which no toxicologically significant effects were found, including on (partial) prothrombin time, in 90-day oral toxicity in dogs;
- LOAEL of 0.05 mg/kg bw/day (based on 100% mortality due to haemorrhages), and NOAEL of 0.0025 mg/kg bw/day at which no substance-related toxicity was found, including the effects on (partial) prothrombin time, in a 28-day oral toxicity study in rats;

LOAEL of 0.001 mg/kg bw/day (based on prolonged PTT), and NOAEL of 0.0005 mg/kg bw/day at which no substance-related toxicity was found, including the effects on (partial) prothrombin time, in a 90-day oral toxicity study in rabbits.

RAC supports the dossier submitter's proposal for STOT RE 1; H372 (Causes damage to the blood through prolonged or repeated exposure) classification, since:

- serious effects were observed in the 28-day rat study (mortality) and 90-day dog study (severe haemorrhagic effects) at levels more than one order of magnitude below the guidance values (C ≤ 10 mg/kg bw/day for 90-day oral study in rats and C ≤ 30 mg/kg bw/day for 28-day oral rat study if Haber's rule is applied) used for classification as STOT RE 1;
- oral data can be used for classification for the two other routes of exposure (dermal and inhalation): acute LD₅₀ values in dermal and inhalation toxicity studies (in which deaths occurred due to internal haemorrhages) were below the limits for classification for STOT RE 1, and there is a large margin between the oral dose levels indicating severe effects and the limit value for STOT RE 1.

Regarding the DS proposal for setting SCLs based on the significant prolongation in PPT without other adverse effects, RAC is of the opinion that this parameter *per se* is not an effect severe enough to be considered as a basis for the effective dose in the SCL calculation.

Since adverse effects observed at LOAELs derived from repeated-dose toxicity studies were either too severe (the majority of exposed dogs in the 90-day oral toxicity study presented severe haemorrhages, and 100% mortality was observed in the 28-day oral toxicity study in rats) or too mild (prolonged PTT without other adverse effects in the 90-day oral toxicity study in rabbits), specific concentration limits for STOT-RE could be derived from the rabbit teratogenicity study (Biocidal product applicant Task Force). In this study, at the lowest dose applied of 2 μ g/kg bw/day, no mortality was observed, but haemorrhages (bleeding around body orifices, kidney haemorrhage) occurred in 3 out of 18 treated rabbits (17%). This dose level was set as an effective dose (ED), and calculation of the SCLs was performed applying Haber's rule (90 days:22 days = 4.1):

ED = 0.002 mg/kg bw/day (haemorrhages in 3 out of 18 treated rabbits)

SCL for STOT RE 1 = ED/GV1(41) x 100% = 0.005%SCL for STOT RE 2 = ED/GV1(410) x 100% = 0.0005%

4.9 Germ cell mutagenicity (Mutagenicity)

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
OECD 471, Bacterial Reverse Mutation Test, S. typhimurium: TA 98, TA 100, TA 102 TA 1535, TA 1537 0, 39.06, 78.13, 156.25, 312.50, 625, 1250, 2500 and 5000 µg/plate	Negative ±S9 mix.	Bromadiolone is considered to be non-mutagenic in the studied test system. Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.6.1 (Task Force)
OECD 473, Mammalian Chromosome Aberration Test Mammalian cell lines CHO 0, 1.0, 7.5, 15.0 µg/ml	Negative ±89 mix.	Bromadiolone is considered to be non-clastogenic in the metaphase chromosome aberration assay in Chinese Hamster Ovary cells. Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.6.2 (Task Force)
OECD 476, Mammalian Cell Gene Mutation Test Chinese hamster ovary (CHO) 0, 1,0, 10.0, 20.0 and 30 µg/ml	Negative ±89 mix.	Bromadiolone is considered to be non-mutagenic in the CHO-HPRT Forward Mutation Assay, both with and without metabolic activation. Bromadiolone was toxic at 80 μ g/ ml without activation and 40 μ g/ml with activation. Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A6.6.3(Task Force)
EPA 84-2, Bacterial reverse mutation test S. typhimurium: TA 98, TA 100, TA 1535, TA 1537, TA 153810, 33.3, 100, 333, 1000 and 3330 μ g/plate with S9 and 3.33, 10, 33.3, 100, 333 and 1000 μ g/plate without S9.	PA 84-2, Bacterial reverse tation test S. typhimurium: TA, TA 100, TA 1535, TA 1537, A 153810, 33.3, 100, 333, 1000 d 3330 μ g/plate with S9 and 33, 10, 33.3, 100, 333 and 1000 /plate without S9.		A 6.6.1/01 (Lipha Tech)

 Table 18:
 Summary table of relevant in vitro and in vivo mutagenicity studies

		of S9. Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	
EPA 84-2, Mammalian chromosome aberration test Whole blood human lymphocytes 30 hour without activation: 7.49, 9.99, 25, 50 and 74.9 μg/mL 30 hour with activation: 37.5, 50, 74.9 and 99.9 μg/mL	Negative ±S9 mix.	Bromadiolone did not induce chromosomal aberrations under conditions of metabolic activation or non-activation. Bromadiolone considered negative for mutagenicity. Cytotoxicity was seen in the assay without activation, at 74.9 μ g/mL. With activation, doses up to 99.9 μ g/mL provided sufficient cultures for analysis although at higher doses (in the range finding study) there was evidence of cytotoxicity. Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 6.6.2/01(Lipha Tech)
EPA 84-2Mammalian cell gene mutation test, Chinese hamster ovary (CHO) Cytotoxicity assay with and without activation: 1.95, 3.91, 7.81, 15.6, 31.3, 62.5, 125, 250, 500 and 1000 μg/mL Main study without activation: 20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 125 and 150 μg/mL Main study with activation: 10, 20, 40, 60, 80 and 90 μg/mL	Negative ±S9 mix.	Bromadiolone did not induce mutagenic effects in CHO cells at the HGPRT locus either in the presence or absence of metabolic activation. Bromadiolone was toxic at 200 µg/mL without activation, and at 100 µg/mL with activation Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study).	A 6.6.3/01(Lipha Tech)
EPA 84-2, Micronucleus test (bone marrow), Mouse ICR, 5 of each sex per group. Additional 15 of each sex for completion of the micronucleus bioassay. Dosing of 400 mg/kg bw	Bromadiolone did not induce an increase in micro-nucleated polychromatic erythrocytes in comparison with the vehicle control. The positive control did significantly increase the number of micro-nucleated cells	Bromadiolone was considered negative in the mouse micronucleus test. Data sufficient for classification	A 6.6.4/01 (Lipha Tech)

for 3 consecutive days, sampling 24 hours after the last dose	in both sexes confirming method sensitivity.	purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	
---	--	--	--

4.9.1 Non-human information

4.9.1.1 In vitro data

The results for genotoxicity in *in vitro* tests (applicant Task Force) were all negative. The doses tested in A.6.6.2 were selected on basis of a cytotoxicity test. The results of a CHO clonal cytotoxicity test showed that > 50 µg/ml resulted in less than 10% survival and 10 µg/ml resulted in 63% survival in presence of metabolic activation and 10 µg/ml resulted in 57% survival without metabolic activation. The doses used in A.6.6.3 were selected on basis of a cytotoxicity assay. CHO clonal toxicity data showed that 40 µg/l resulted in a relative survival of 33% in absence of S9 and 0% survival in presence of S9 mix. 20 µg/ml resulted in 62-66% ±S9 mix.

The results for in vitro bacterial gene mutation (A 6.6.1); in vitro cytogenicity in mammalian cells (A 6.6.2) and in vitro mammalian cell gene mutation (A 6.6.3) tests were all negative (applicant Lipha Tech).

4.9.1.2 In vivo data

The mouse micronucleus test (A 6.6.4, Lipha Tech) was also negative.

4.9.2 Human information

No data.

4.9.3 Other relevant information

No data.

4.9.4 Summary and discussion of mutagenicity

Bromadiolone was not genotoxic based on the above tests, hence no classification for mutagenicity is proposed.

4.9.5 Comparison with criteria

Bromadiolone was not genotoxic based on the above tests, hence no classification for mutagenicity according to the criteria in 67/548/EEC and regulation EC 1272/2008 is proposed.

4.9.6 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Bromadiolone was not genotoxic based on the above tests, hence no classification for mutagenicity according to DSD and CLP is proposed.

RAC evaluation of germ cell mutagenicity

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

In *in vitro* genotoxicity studies - Ames test, mammalian chromosome aberration test, and mammalian cell gene mutation test (CHO-HGPRT) – Bromadiolone did not induce mutagenic effects with or without metabolic activation.

In an *in vivo* bone marrow chromosome aberration test in ICR mice, Bromadiolone did not induce significant increases in micronucleated bone marrow polychromatic erythrocytes.

The DS concluded that no classification for mutagenicity is required.

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

RAC therefore supports DS proposal that Bromadiolone should not be classified for mutagenicity under CLP.

4.10 Carcinogenicity

No data.

Table 19: Summary table of relevant carcinogenicity studies

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
No data availale			

4.10.1 Non-human information

Bromadiolone is highly toxic (T+) to the target species, the rat, making it technically difficult to perform long-term exposure studies in which signs of toxicity are identified, but keeping the level of lethality low so as not to mask any toxic effects caused by test substance exposure. Also, one long-term study has been performed for bromadiolone. This study was not accepted due to the fact that dose levels were so low that no toxic effects were seen. The performance of long-term studies on bromadiolone is thus not justified. Waiving of the chronic toxicity and carcinogenicity data was accepted when evaluated under the 98/8/EC directive. Also, no genotoxic potential has been identified for bromadiolone in *in vitro* tests of genotoxicity.

4.10.1.1 Carcinogenicity: oral

No data.

4.10.1.2 Carcinogenicity: inhalation

No data.

4.10.1.3 Carcinogenicity: dermal

No data.

4.10.2 Human information

No data.

4.10.3 Other relevant information

No data.

4.10.4 Summary and discussion of carcinogenicity

No data available. Read-across with warfarin and other structural related coumarin derivatives were not done for carcinogenicity. Bromadiolone is considered to be non-genotoxic. No classification is proposed for both legislation 67/548/EC and the new regulation EC 1272/2008.

4.10.5 Comparison with criteria

No data available. Read-across with warfarin and other structural related coumarin derivatives were not done for carcinogenicity. Bromadiolone is considered to be non-genotoxic. No classification is proposed for both legislation 67/548/EC and the new regulation EC 1272/2008.

4.10.6 Conclusions on classification and labelling

No data, no classification proposed according to DSD and CLP.

RAC evaluation of carcinogenicity

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

No data are available for carcinogenicity. Bromadiolone is considered to be non-genotoxic and no classification is proposed

Comments received during public consultation

This endpoint was not commented.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

Bromadiolone was not genotoxic/mutagenic in *in vitro* **and** *in vivo* studies. There were no indications of hypertrophy or hyperplasia in 90-day oral toxicity studies in dogs and rabbits.

RAC, therefore, supports DS proposal that Bromadiolone should not be classified for carcinogenicity under CLP.

4.11 Toxicity for reproduction

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
OECD 416, Rat Wistar Oral (gavage), 25 males and 25 females/dose group 10 weeks before mating, 2 weeks mating, pregnancy until termination on postpartal day 22 0, 1, 2.5 and 5 µg/day	No toxicity occurred at the highest dose level and a reliable NOAEL could therefore not be concluded on the basis of this study.	Data not sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP	A6.8.2 (Task Force)
OECD 414, Oral (gavage) Rabbit New Zealand White 22 females per dose group Day 7- 28 for 2 and 4 µg/kg bw Day 7-20 for 8 µg/kg bw 0, 2, 4, 8 µg/day	Maternal mortality was 22%. Clinical signs: bleeding around the body orifices. Two fetuses with severe malformations and increased incidence of skeletal variations were reported (4 μ g/kg) and one with hydrocephalus in the high dose group. NO(A)EL (maternal) < 2 μ g/kg/day NO(A)EL Teratogenicity/Embryotoxicity 2 μ g/kg/day	Data not sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study) ¹	A6.8.1(Task Force)
EPA 83-3, Oral, Rat, Sprague- Dawley Female 25 per group10 doses, Day 6 to 15, 0, 17.5, 35 or 70 μg/kg bw per day	Death occurred in the high dose group (48%). Ante-mortem signs included vaginal haemorrhage, metrorrhagia, hypertonicity and pale eyes. There were no mortalities and no clinical signs of reaction to treatment in the other groups. No signs of embryo toxicity or macroscopic evidence of teratology NO(A)EL (maternal) 35 µg/kg bw per day µg/kg/day µg/kg/day NO(A)EL Teratogenicity/Embryotoxicity7 0 µg/kg bw per day (highest dose tested)	Data not sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study) ¹	A 6.8.1(Lipha Tech)
EPA 83-3, Oral, Rabbit New Zealand White, Female, 19-20 per group. 13 doses – Day 6 to 180, 2.0, 4.0 or 8.0 µg/kg bw per day	Maternal toxicity was evident at 8 µg/kg bw per day where metrorrhagia was found in 8/19 dams. No embryofoetal toxicity and no developmental toxicity indicative of teratogenicity.NO(A)EL (maternal) 4 µg/kg bw per day NO(A)EL Teratogenicity/Embryotoxicity 8 µg/kg bw per day (highest dose tested)	Data not sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study) ¹	A 6.8.1/02 (Lipha Tech)

 Table 20:
 Summary table of relevant reproductive toxicity studies

¹The study is performed according to the guideline, with a high reliability and considered a key study but are not sufficient for classification purposes for this type of chemicals due to reasons stated in setion 4.11.3

4.11.1 Effects on fertility

4.11.1.1 Non-human information

The two-generation reproduction toxicity study is of low reliability (applicant Task Force). According to EC Method B35 "the highest dose level should be chosen with aim to induce toxicity but not death". In this study, no clinical signs were seen in any dose group and no dose-related effects were reported. Therefore, reproductive effects following bromadiolone exposure can not be excluded based on the results from this study. However, the 90-day study in rabbits showed no adverse effects on the gonads. Also, since long term exposure studies are technically hard to perform for such highly toxic substances as bromadiolone, no new study was required. A multigeneration study is waived for both applicants. Due to the high toxicity and the anticoagulant effect this kind of study may not be possible to conduct with a reliable result. The progressive accumulation of the substance leads to an increased probability of death by haemorrhage. Several events in the reproductive cycle are associated with haemorrhage, which would increase the risk. The high toxicity also means that very low doses are needed to keep the animals alive, but if the doses are too low there will be no toxic response. The dose-response curve seems to be steep, which complicates the dose setting.

As mentioned before bromadiolone is structurally similar to warfarin and share the same mode of action. Warfarin is not classified as toxic to fertility. There is also long term experience in humans with warfarin with no association with adverse effects on fertility (i.e. mating performance) of either sex (IPCS Environmental Health Criteria 175, 1995).

Additionally, the 90 day study in dogs showed no adverse effects on the reproductive organs (macroscopic condition, organ weight and histology, applicant Lipha Tech).

4.11.1.2 Human information

No data.

4.11.2 Developmental toxicity

4.11.2.1 Non-human information

A teratogenicity study on bromadiolone was performed using the rabbit as test species (applicant Task Force). The mortality rate for the dams was 0, 0, 27 and 46% for the controls, 2 μ g/kg, 4 μ g/kg and 8 μ g/kg groups respectively. The incidence and severity of clinical signs were dose related. Autopsy findings showed three animals with kidney haemorrhaging. In the 4 μ g/kg/day and the 8 μ g/kg/day dose groups common clinical observations were bleeding around body orifices (6/22 in the 4 μ g/kg group and 10/22 in the 8 μ g/kg dose group), reduced activity (1-2 does/dose group) and pale mucous membranes (5/22 in the 4 μ g/kg group and 11/22 in the 8 μ g/kg dose group). Autopsy findings revealed uterine haemorrhaging, reddish mottled lungs, haemorrhaging in the kidney and bloody discharge from body orifices (or in the thorax) in both dose groups. No dose related effects on fertility or fetal development were reported apart from a significantly increased incidence of post-implantational loss and total intrauterine mortality in the 4 μ g/kg dose group

compared to controls. Also, a significantly increased incidence of one small placental lobe was seen in the $8 \mu g/kg$ dose group compared to controls.

	Control	2 µg/kg	4 μg/kg	8 μg/kg (Only dosed to GD20)
Number of does	19	18	14	9
Number of viable fetuses	165	138	98	68
Number of foetuses examined for malformations	165	138	87	68
Corpora lutea	187	161	132	75
Preimplantation loss ¹	11%	14%	17%	8%
Dead fetuses ¹	0	0	7%**	1%
Postimplantation loss ¹	1	0	10%**	1%
Total intrauterine mortality ¹	12	14	26%**	9%

Table 4.11.2-1: Pregnancy outcome

¹Data compared to no. of implantations, **=p<0.01 CH2

The maternal mortality rate was high, 19/88 does died. Clinical signs were observed starting on the second week of exposure. The symptoms were related to the anticoagulant property of bromadiolone and comprised of bleeding around body orifices, pale mucous membranes and reduced activity. Autopsy findings revealed uterine haemorrhaging, reddish mottled lungs. Haemorrhaging in the kidney and bleeding discharge from body orifices. The two fetuses with malformations had absent mesencephalon and proencephalone, rudimentary cerebrellum and absent vitrous body. The high dose group 8 μ g/kg day were only dosed up to day 20 of gestation for the surviving animals due to mortalities from day 18. There are no information in the study report relating to any bleedings observed in the surviving foetuses. The observed malformations were not discussed, in the study report, in relation to historical control data.

Based on the severe fetal malformations reported in this study, following exposure to maternally toxic levels of bromadiolone, exposure to bromadiolone may constitute a possible risk to the unborn child.

Doe	Dose group	No of foetuses malformed (total no of foetuses)	Observed malformation (s)	Maternal observations at autopsy	Placenta findings	Maternal body weight gain (day 29 compared to day 1 and corrected for uterine weight)
31905116	4 μg/kg	1/8	Absence of mesencephalon and proencephalon. Rudimentary cerebrellum. Facial scull bones and scull cap missing, hypoplastic mandibule, arch I-III cervical vertebrae fused, on the scull base rudimentary vertebrae –like bones	Haemhorrhages in uterine horns, pin sized haemhorraghes in lungs	No abnormalities reported	-1.1%
1105036	4 μg/kg	1/1	Absence of vitreous body, absence of retinal folds (both sides)	None reported	Data missing in report	-9.3%
64204506	8 μg/kg	1/6	Internal hydrocephaly	Haemhorrhages in uterine horns, pin sized haemhorraghes in lungs	Tumor-like formation in one lobe	+2.5%

Table 4.11.2-2:	Malformations	observed in	n relation to	maternal	toxicity	observed
1 abic 7.11.2-2.	manon	UDSCI VCU II	i i ciation to	mattinai	UNICITY	UDSCI VCU

Two teratogenicity studies in rat and rabbit were also performed by applicant Lipha Tech and both were negative. It should be noted though that these studies were performed in 1981 with shorter dosing period, which may contribute to the differences in the rabbit teratogenicity results.

4.11.2.2 Human information

No data.

4.11.3 Other relevant information

The structural similarity of bromadiolone and the same mode of action as the known developmental toxicant warfarin need attention. Warfarin causes a specific kind of embryopathy when administered to humans in the first trimester. The deformities consist of skeletal anomalies including severe nasal hypoplasia, stippled epiphyses and hypoplasia of the extremities. The mechanism behind these anomalies is considered to be the vitamin K-deficiency. Vitamin K is essential for clotting proteins in the liver. However, extrahepatic tissues/organs i.e. cartilage and bone also contain vitamin K dependent proteins. In humans the development of bone structure is early in the pregnancy, whereas for rats it is late or even postnatally. This means that teratogenicity studies in rats can be negative because they are not exposed at the most critical period with the current guideline methods. Another problem is the high toxicity, making it difficult to give high enough doses without maternal deaths. Studies have been conducted with warfarin together with high doses of vitamin K. This treatment leads to an extrahepatic vitamin K deficiency, while the vitamin K dependent processes in the liver of the dams would have been preserved. In these studies the teratogenic effects of warfarin was confirmed. Without vitamin K supplementation and adapted study protocol, results on the teratogenic effects of warfarin have been equivocal. Based on warfarin data, human fetuses also seem to be much more vulnerable to vitamin K deficiency than rodent fetuses.

In 2006 the Commission Working Group of Specialised Experts in the field of Reproductive Toxicity (ECBI/51/07) concluded: "Warfarin is an established human teratogen classified as Repr. Cat. 1; R61. It is uncertain whether teratogenicity of warfarin can be detected in pre-natal developmental toxicity studies (including OECD guideline 414). The teratogenic mechanism of warfarin is likely to involve maternal Vitamin K depletion and/or direct effects on embryo/foetus via transplacental exposure. Given the vitamin K inhibition, there is concern that other anti-vitamin K (AVK) compounds could cause similar teratogenic effects as warfarin in humans.

The other AVK rodenticides have not shown teratogenic effects in conventional rat and rabbit developmental studies and there is no data in humans. Given the uncertainties surrounding the ability of the standard pre-natal developmental toxicity studies to detect warfarin teratogenicity the predictive value to humans of these studies is uncertain.

On the basis of currently available data, there are no convincing arguments that other AVKs including the second generation compounds could not pass the placenta. Both the mechanism of action and the possible placental passage give reason for concern of possible teratogenicity in human.

Considering all the available information the Specialised Experts unanimously agreed that the AVK rodenticides should collectively be regarded as human teratogens. Therefore the other AVK rodenticides should be classified as Repr. Cat. 1; R61".

The CEFIC Rodenticide Data Development Group has recently performed a study on warfarin in rats, to establish if the current OECD 414 guideline can detect the teratogenic potential of warfarin. This study was not requested by the competent authority in Sweden. The study was performed on the initiative of the CEFIC Rodenticide Data Development Group and is summarised in the warfarin dossier.

4.11.4 Summary and discussion of reproductive toxicity

The bromadiolone study in rats (applicant Lipha Tech) had a treatment protocol corresponding to the TP1 protocol of the new warfarin study, where cataracts were only found in the top dose group with 1/99 findings i.e the sensitivity of the TP1 protocol to capture these effects seem rather low. No study similar to the TP2 protocol is available in rats in the bromadiolone dossiers and therefore it cannot be fully concluded whether bromadiolone can produce cataracts in the rat or not. Another factor complicating this issue is also that the dose span was rather narrow in the warfarin study and it is generally believed that the second generation AVK's are more toxic and thus have an even narrower window of effects. Therefore it is very difficult to assess any dose response of effects and also to distinguish if effects occur in presence or absence of maternal effects. Furthermore effects could be obscured by the high frequency of deaths in the mothers. No cataracts were reported in the rabbit studies for bromadiolone nor were bleedings in the fetuses reported.

The more recent teratogenicity study in rabbits shows some effects i.e. absent mesencephalon and proencephalone, rudimentary cerebrellum and absent vitrous body but the mortality in this study where high, leading to treatment of the high dose group for only 20 days and may therefore mask any clear trend of effects, further substantiating the difficulty of studying these highly toxic molecules in animal models. But these observed effects substantiate that there are significant concern that bromadiolone could cause warfarin like syndroms in humans and that read-across to warfarin should be made due to lack of human data and suitable animal studies. It also cannot be concluded that the warfarin study in rats show that there are a difference in effects in the OECD 414 studies of bromadiolone and warfarin. In addition the effects seen, though to a limited extent in the bromadiolone study, were on the CNS, which has also been described in the literature as congenital effects of warfarin.

The conclusion therefore is that bromadiolone is considered to be a possible developmental toxicant based on read across to human teratogenicity data for warfarin and requires the classification as Reprotoxic with the labelling R61, may cause harm to the unborn child and corresponding labeling according to CLP.

Read across rationale

Bromadiolone is a hydroxycoumarin with significant structural similarity to warfarin and forms of vitamin K. It is considered that this structural similarity is responsible for the ability to interfere with i.e. block the enzymes used to regenerate vitamin K. Human fetuses have much lower vitamin K levels than rat fetuses and mothers.



Bromadiolone Mw 527.40

Warfarin Mw 308.25

Fig. 4.11.4-1 Structural similarity of bromadiolone and warfarin, with the vitamin K similar part marked.

Anticoagulant rodenticides such as Bromadiolone function by inhibiting the ability of the blood to clot at the site of a haemorrhage, by blocking the regeneration of vitamin K in the liver. Death is due to haemorrhage. The anticoagulant rodenticide active substances such as bromadiolone work by blocking the regeneration of vitamin K 2,3-epoxide to vitamin K hydroquinone. The Glu \rightarrow Gla conversion does not take place (WHO Geneva, 1995 ISBN 92 4 157175 6).

The structural similarity of bromadiolone and the same mode of action as the known developmental toxicant warfarin need attention. Warfarin causes a specific kind of embryopathy when administered to humans in the first trimester (summarised below, detailed information can be found in the warfarin dossier). The deformities consist of skeletal anomalies including severe nasal hypoplasia, stippled epiphyses and hypoplasia of the extremities. The mechanism behind these anomalies is considered to be the vitamin K-deficiency. Humans are more sensitive

Two separate mechanisms have been proposed for the specific embryopathy of warfarin identified following first trimester exposure and the adverse CNS effects seen with second/third trimester exposure, according to the warfarin dossier.

Two vitamin K-dependent proteins have been characterised in the skeleton i.e. osteocalcin, (bone gla [γ -carboxyglutamic acid]), which is associated with hydroxyapatite crystals in the extracellular matrix, and matrix gla protein (MGP) that predominates in embryonic bone and cartilage extracellular matrix. It has been proposed that in the presence of Warfarin, γ -carboxylation of glutamate residues in osteocalcin is inhibited by preventing the reduction of vitamin K epoxide, resulting in poor calcium binding and the observed anomalies in bone formation. In normally developing cartilage MGP, which is synthesised in the growth plate cartilage, remains decarboxylated; this prevents the calcification of cartilage. In the presence of Warfarin, inappropriate calcification of cartilage occurs. Evidence has been provided to show that abnormal calcification of the nasal septum may be the underlying cause of this particular symptom of Warfarin embryopathy (Howe and Webster, 1992¹). In this study rats were given daily s.c. doses of sodium warfarin (100 mg/kg) and vitamin K1 (10 mg/kg) for up to 12 weeks from birth. All rats survived without any signs of haemhorrage. The warfarin treated rats developed a marked maixillonasal hypoplasia with reduction in nasal bone length, large areas of calcification in the nasal septum, and abnormal calcium bridges in the epiphyseal cartilages of the vertebrae and long bones i.e. effects similar to the first trimester effects observed in warfarin syndrome in humans.

Inhibition of carboxylation of vitamin K-dependent clotting factors leading to intracranial haemorrhage is considered responsible for the CNS effects seen following exposure during the second and third trimesters (Pati and Holmbrecht, 1994²). No specific pattern of CNS abnormalities has been identified, and there is no correlation between time of exposure and CNS effects in humans (Hall et al., 1980). In a study where pregnant rats were treated with 100 mg/kg daily oral doses of sodium warfarin, supplemented with i.m vitamin K1(10 mg/kg), on day 9 to day 20 of gestation, haemhorrhage of fetal brain, face, eyes, ear and occasionaly limbs were observed. No haemhorraghes were observed in the mothers. The brain hemhorrhages were frequently intraventricular and caused various degrees of hydrocephaly. No bone defects were observed. The hemhorrhage in the walls of cerebral hemispheres caused restricted areas of brain destruction, and

¹ Howe, A.M. and Webster, W.S. (1992), The Warfarin embryopathy: A rat model showing maxillonasal hypoplasia and other skeletal disturbances. Teratology 46, 379-390.

² Pati S, and Helmbrecht G.D.(1994), Congenital schizencephaly associated with in utero warfarin exposure. Reprod Toxicol. Mar-Apr;8(2), 115-20.

haemhorraghes in the eye and ear were similarily associated with tissue distortion and destruction (Howe and Webster, 1990)³. Coumarins, during the first trimester, were associated with a high rate of spontaneous abortions, in addition to the incidences of specific embryopathy. Likewise, exposure during the first and second trimesters was also associated with a high rate of spontaneous abortion, stillbirths and related complications (developmental abnormality) (Hall et al., 1980⁴).

Teratogenicity studies of bromadiolone in animals are inconclusive due to the high toxicity observed. A study with bromadiolone and vitamin K supplementation to prevent mortality would have been useful but has not been performed. No human data on teratogenicity are available for bromadiolone. Therefore, based on the structural similarity of bromadiolone and warfarin, same mechanism of action and toxicity pattern, a read across to the human data on teratogenicity for warfarin is considered appropriate.

4.11.5 Comparison with criteria

No human data exist for bromadiolone. Bromadiolone was teratogenic in rabbit, inducing CNS effects in offspring, similar to what has been observed in humans after Warfarin treatment. Due to the structural similarity to and the same mode of action as the known developmental toxicant warfarin, read across to warfarin is applied and Repr. Cat. 1; R61 (according to the DSD) and Repr. 1A, H360D (according to CLP) is therefore required.

4.11.6 Conclusions on classification and labelling

Based on read across data from warfarin bromadiolone is considered to be a possible developmental toxicant. Classification as Reprotoxic Cat.1, with the labelling R61, may cause harm to the unborn child is required according to the DSD. Furthermore, Repr. 1A, H360D is required according to CLP.

Proposed specific concentration limits, taking into account acute, repeated dose toxicity and reproductive effects (DSD):

C≥0.5% T+;R61-26/27/28 - T; R48/23/24/25

 $0.25\% \le C < 0.5\%$ T+; R26/27/28 - T; R48/23/24/25

0.025%≤C<0.25% T; R23/24/25 – T; R48/23/24/25

0.0025% << < < 0.025% Xn; R20/21/22 - R48/20/21/22

Proposed specific concentration limits, taking into account acute, repeated dose toxicity and reproductive effects (CLP): The discussion on how to set specific concentration limits for reproductive effects are currently under discussion and therefore no proposal is added at this point. But a specific concentration limit is needed for bromadiolone for reproductive toxicity.

RAC evaluation of reproductive toxicity

³ Howe, A.M. and Webster, W.S. (1990), Exposure of the pregnant rat to warfarin and vitamin K1: an animal model of intravetricular hemhorrhage in the fetus. Teratology 42, 413-420.

⁴ Hall, J. G., Pauli, R. M., & Wilson, K. M. (1980). Maternal and fetal sequelae of anticoagulation during pregnancy. The American Journal of Medicine , 68, S. 122-140.

Summary of the Dossier submitter's proposal

Four reproductive toxicity studies were considered in CLH report:

- Two-generation oral (gavage) study in Wistar rats in accordance to OECD TG 416
- Oral teratogenicity toxicity in New Zealand white rabbit in accordance to OECD TG 414
- Oral teratogenicity toxicity in Sprague-Dawley rat in accordance to US EPA 83-3
- Oral teratogenicity toxicity in New Zealand white rabbit in accordance to US EPA 83-3.

Two-generation oral (gavage) study in Wistar rats in accordance to OECD TG 416:

According to the DS, the two-generation reproduction toxicity study in rats is of low reliability and suitable for classification since no clinical signs were observed at any dose level and no dose-related effects were reported (according to OECD test guideline "the highest dose level should be chosen with aim to induce toxicity but not death"). The dossier submitter therefore concluded that reproductive effects of Bromadiolone cannot be excluded based on the problematic dose selection.

Oral teratogenicity study in rabbits conducted in accordance to OECD TG 414 (2004): This study is considered suitable for classificationand showed indications of developmental toxicity.

Maternal toxicity

Clinical signs and pathological signs on necropsy related to haemorrhages were observed in rabbits already exposed to the lowest dose applied, i.e. 2 μ g/kg bw/day. A mortality rate of 27% was present at the next dose level, i.e. 4 μ g/kg bw/day, and increased to 46% at the highest dose level (8 μ g/kg bw/day). A maternal NOAEL < 2 μ g/kg bw/day was determined.

Developmental effects

Significantly increased incidences of post-implantation loss and total intrauterine mortality were observed at 4 μ g/kg bw/day compared to controls. At 8 μ g/kg bw/day significantly increased incidence of one small placental lobe was observed. The DS also presented (in the table below) the type of malformation in relation to maternal toxicity observed in three foetuses from different litters, at doses of 4 and 8 μ g/kg bw/day:

Dose (µg/kg bw/day)	N of affected foetuses/N of foetuses in litter	Observed malformations	Maternal necropsy findings	Placenta findings	Maternal bw gain (day 29)
4	1/8	absence of mesencephalon and proencephalon; rudimentary cerebellum; facial skull bones and skull cap missing, hypoplastic mandibule, arch I-III cervical vertebrae fused, on the skull base rudimentary vertebrae-like bones	haemorrhages in uterine horns, pin sized haemorrhages in lungs	NR	-1.1%
4	1/1	absence of vitreous body, absence of retinal folds (both sides)	NR	no data	-9.3%
8	1/6	internal hydrocephaly	haemorrhages in uterine horns, pin sized haemorrhages in	tumour- like formation in one	+2.5%

lungs lobe				
lange		lungs	lobe	

NR = none remarkable

There was no information in the study report relating to haemorrhages in the surviving foetuses. No comparison with historical control data was presented.

Although limited in number, the presence of severe malformations of which some has been reported as congenital effects of Warfarin (e.g. CNS), indicates that Bromadiolone could pose a risk for unborn child at maternally toxic concentrations. A teratogenicity/Embryotoxicity NOAEL of 2 µg/kg bw/day was determined.

Teratogenicity studies performed in rats and rabbits according to US-EPA Guidelines: Both of these studies were negative (detailed data not shown):

- in a rat teratogenicity study 48% maternal mortality at the high dose was observed, and there were no mortalities and other treatment-related changes in lower dose groups. No embryotoxicity or macroscopic signs of teratogenicity were noted. Maternal NOAEL of 35 µg/kg bw/day and teratogenicity/embryotoxicity NOAEL of 70 µg/kg bw/day (highest dose tested) were determined.
- in a rabbit teratogenicity study maternal toxicity was noted at 8 µg/kg bw per day (haemorrhages), and no developmental toxicity was observed. Maternal NOAEL of 4 µg/kg bw/day and teratogenicity/embryotoxicity NOAEL of 8 µg/kg bw/day (highest dose tested) were determined.

The DS pointed out that the two studies above were performed in 1981 with shorter dosing periods, which could have contributed to different outcomes relative to the rabbit teratogenicity study from 2004.

It was concluded by the DS that Bromadiolone was teratogenic in rabbit, inducing CNS effects in offspring similar to those observed in humans after Warfarin treatment. Taking into account? the structural similarity and the same MoA as the known developmental toxicant Warfarin, classification as Repr. Cat. 1; R61 (according to the DSD) and Repr. 1A, H360D (according to CLP) was proposed.

It was noted that a specific concentration limit is needed for Bromadiolone for reproductive toxicity.

Comments received during public consultation

Seven industry organisations opposed classification for reproductive toxicity, mainly with the justification that read-across to Warfarin is not scientifically based since a new OECD 414 study (Kubaszky 2009) showed that the OECD TG 414 protocol is able to reveal reproductive effects of AVKs.

Six Member States supported proposed Repr. 1A (H360D) classification, due to the same MoA of Warfarin (known human teratogen) and other AVKs, similarity in physicochemical properties and the mammalian toxicity profile between Warfarin and second generation AVKs, and because the concern remained that studies performed according to OECD TG 414 cannot adequately show developmental effects of AVKs.

Additional key elements

In the open literature, a study on developmental effects of sub-lethal doses on Bromadiolone and Chlorophacinone was found (Rady et al., 2013). The study was not conducted in accordance with OECD guidelines, i.e. the active substance used is of unknown purity, the number of dams at each time point is not stated and the number of pups is unknown. Bromadiolone was orally applied to 10 pregnant dams per group on the 3^{rd} gestational day at the dose level of 1/4 (0.2805 mg/kg bw) and 1/10 (0.1122 mg/kg bw) of its acute oral LD₅₀ (purity of the test substance not stated). An unspecified number of dams (probably 3-4 per time point) was sacrificed at 9th and 18th day of gestation, and the others were allowed to deliver spontaneously. In dams, dose-dependent increase in liver enzymes, bilirubin, creatinine, urea and cholesterol, and histopathological changes in liver (degenerative changes at lower dose and centrilobular necrosis at higher dose) and kidneys (oedema, inflammation, swelling of the lining glomerular endothelia, proliferation) were observed, indicating maternal toxicity, although presumably not to the level of mortality. Developmental effects included generalised oedema and haemorrhages in foetuses and dose-dependent prolongation of gestational period, decrease in the number of foetuses and newborn rats, decrease in foetal body weight, prolongation of time to eye opening and fur coating, and shorter survival time after birth. The majority of these effects were statistically significant (Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) test).

Overall, the study can only be used as supportive evidence indicating that the offspring may be more severely affected than the dams after a single administration of Bromadiolone during gestation at maternally sub-lethal doses.

Assessment and comparison with the classification criteria

RAC agrees with the dossier submitter that the two-generation oral (gavage) study in rats is not suitable for assessment of reproductive toxicity (both fertility and developmental toxicity) of Bromadiolone. Namely, no treatment-related effect was observed in parents and offspring at any dose levels (1, 2.5 and 5 μ g/kg/day), and prothrombin time was similar in the control and 5 μ g/kg bw/day group (the highest dose tested).

Effects on fertility

Although the aforementioned two-generation reproduction toxicity study in rats cannot provide relevant data for fertility assessment, a 90-day study in rabbits with Bromadiolone showed no adverse effects on the gonads. In addition, Warfarin did not show any effect on fertility after many years of human use or in a two generation reproduction study in rats with Vitamin-K supplementation.

RAC, therefore, supports the proposal of the DS not to classify Bromadiolone for fertility according to CLP.

Developmental toxicity

RAC agrees with the DS that the significantly increased incidence of post-implantational loss and total intrauterine mortality observed at 4 μ g/kg bw/day, could indicate that Bromadiolone poses a risk for the unborn child at a level inducing maternal toxicity.

Although poorly reported, the study of Rady et al. (American-Eurasian Journal of Toxicological Sciences 2013;5:7-14; please see the study summary in the BD) in rats could present supportive evidence that *in utero* Bromadiolone exposure could lead to foetotoxic effects at the dose levels that do not induce mortality in mothers.

There is a debate as to whether the standard OECD TG 414 study design is able to reveal developmental toxicity effects of anticoagulant rodenticides, especially after a new study appeared (Kubaszky, 2009), carried out according to the updated OECD 414 Guideline. In Kubaszky (2009), an increased incidence of subcutaneous and internal foetal haemorrhages, foetal ocular effects and some indications of reduced ossification of skull bones were observed. Haemorrhages and skeletal malformations were also described in Mirkova and Antov (1983), although without clear reporting of a relationship with

maternal toxicity.

Foetal haemorrhages were not observed in teratogenicity studies with Bromadiolone. Haemorrhages in uterine horns in rabbits were reported at doses that induced maternal mortality, but there was no information in the study report relating to haemorrhages in the surviving foetuses, either in control or exposed animals.

The study conducted by Kubaszky (2009) commissioned by the CEFIC Rodenticide Data Development Group (RDDG), was specifically dedicated to assess potential anticoagulant effects on foetuses In order to address the capability of OECD TG 414 protocol to detect adverse effects on embryos and foetuses due to maternal exposure to Warfarin. The study reported dose-related increases in foetal haemorrhages compared to 2% incidence of haemorrhages in foetuses from the control group. In teratogenicity studies with other AVKs no foetal haemorrhage in control animals was reported.

Increased incidence of skeletal malformations was not found in teratogenicity studies with Bromadiolone. Skeletal malformations (nasal hypoplasia, stippled epiphyses, growth retardation) are the most often reported malformations in neonates of mothers undergoing coumarin therapy during gestation. However, in animal studies with Warfarin that generally followed the OECD TG 414 test design, a clear effect on foetal bone and cartilage was not routinely observed. In the Kubazsky study (2009), skeletal malformations were also not a prominent teratogenic feature - only one litter at mid-dose (0.150 mg/kg bw/day) had foetuses showing facial skeletal malformations (malformed skulls with wide nasal and/or frontal bone/cartilage), unossified nasal bone, malformed vertebra and malformed sternum.

Foetal ocular effects were found in Warfarin exposed foetuses in the Kubaszky study (2009). Yellowish discolouration in the lens was observed, shown to be a central cataract – an extremely rare malformation in rats. An ocular effect of this type was not observed in teratogenicity studies with Bromadiolone, nor in other studies with Warfarin.

Overall, based on the known developmental toxicity of the AVK rodenticide Warfarin in humans (Repr. Cat 1A), the reproductive toxicity of Bromadiolone has been analysed in detail. It is acknowledged that the animal developmental toxicity studies on Warfarin were weakly positive and that the animal developmental toxicity studies on Bromadiolone were negative. However, in comparison with Warfarin, Bromadiolone and other 2nd generation AVKs have higher acute and repeated dose toxicity, steeper dose-response curves, and much longer half-lives in the exposed organisms, making the evaluation of developmental effects of all 2nd generation AVK rodenticides difficult. Thus, relatively low doses in repeated exposure during gestation lead to maternal toxicity and lethality which hinders the detection of developmental toxicity at higher doses.

As there were no data on the outcome of maternal exposure to Bromadiolone in humans, classification as Repr. 1A is not considered to be applicable for Bromadiolone.

Based on the assumption that all AVK rodenticides, including Warfarin and other anticoagulant coumarin pharmaceuticals (see below) share the same MoA, namely inhibition of vitamin K epoxide reductase (VKOR), the assessment of Bromadiolone includes consideration of the whole database for the AVKs. A weight of evidence assessment by RAC resulted in the conclusion that Bromadiolone has the capacity to adversely affect the human *in utero* development. Therefore, a classification with Repr. 1B is proposed with the reasoning given below:

- Bromadiolone shares the same MoA as expressed by other anticoagulant AVK rodenticides and coumarin pharmaceuticals
- Warfarin and 2 other coumarin pharmaceuticals (acenocoumarol,

phenprocoumon) have been shown to cause developmental toxicity in humans.

- One of the 2nd generation AVK rodenticides (Brodifacoum) has been shown to cause foetal effects in humans, possibly after one or a few exposures.
- For AVK rodenticides with a long half-life in the body, even single exposures might suffice to trigger developmental effects. However, such studies are normally not conducted and effects of single dose exposure cannot be detected in standard OECD TG 414 test whereas the repeated exposure may lead to maternal mortality with a steep dose-response relationship.
- The standard animal studies will not pick up all developmental toxicity effects of the AVK rodenticides, most notably the face and CNS malformations that are characteristic for Warfarin and other AVK coumarin pharmaceuticals.
- The most sensitive window for face malformations in humans is the first trimester. Thus, even if some AVK rodenticides may have a lower degree of placental transfer than Warfarin, this will not affect the face malformation hazard.

Not all steps of the MoA in the target tissues liver and bone have been proven, thus introducing some uncertainty in the assessment. However, the RAC is of the opinion that the uncertainty is not sufficiently big to warrant a Repr. 2 classification.

Reliable evidence of an adverse effect on reproduction in humans, which is required for Repr. 1A, was not available for Bromadiolone, but a potential for human developmental toxicity is presumed based on the above stated weight of evidence assessment, and RAC thus proposes classification as **Repr. Cat 1B**, **i.e.** "presumed human reproductive toxicant".

Setting specific concentration limits (SCLs):

Regarding a SCL for Bromadiolone, it is acknowledged that the specific data on developmental toxicity of Bromadiolone is too scarce to help in setting an SLC.

Classification as Repr. 1B for developmental toxicity for Bromadiolone is supported by the RAC. However, only for Warfarin is there sufficient data to set a SCL for developmental toxicity. Thus, based on human data, doses of 2.5-5 mg/person/day (equivalent to 0.04-0.08 mg/kg/day) may cause developmental toxicity and could be regarded as an ED₁₀ level. This human ED₁₀ value would, if using the guidance for setting SCLs based on animal data, belong to the high potency group (<4 mg/kg/day). The guidance states that for an ED10 <4 mg/kg/day, the SCL is 0.03%, and for ED₁₀ below 0.4 mg/kg/day the SCL becomes 0.003%. Also if starting from an ED₁₀ value obtained from animal studies (0.125 mg/kg/day; Kubaszky et al 2009), it would qualify Warfarin for the high potency group and result in a SCL of 0.003%. Thus, the RAC concluded on a SCL on 0.003% for the developmental toxicity of Warfarin (RAC opinion on Warfarin).

As the other AVK rodenticides were equally or more toxic than Warfarin, it is not considered appropriate to apply the generic concentration limit for these substances (0.3%), but rather to base the SCLs on the SCL proposed for Warfarin. Thus, the RAC is of the opinion that the SCL for Warfarin can be used as a surrogate SCL for the other AVK rodenticides, resulting in a SCL of 0.003% for all AVK rodenticides, including Bromadiolone.

Supplemental information - In depth analyses by RAC

RABBIT TERATOGENICITY STUDY

Oral teratogenicity toxicity in New Zealand white rabbits was performed in accordance to US EPA Guideline 83-3, equivalent to OECD TG 414.

Table 1. Maternal and developmental effects in New Zealand white rabbits

		Bromadiolone (µg/kg bw/day)		
	Control	2	4	8 ^b
Maternal effects				
N of does	19	18	18	19
Clinical signs related to haemorrhage (N of does)	-	+ (3)	+	+
Mortality	0	0	27%	46%
Necropsy (N of does with haemorrhagic changes)	NR	H (3)	Н	Н
Fertility & Development				
Abortions	0	0	2	0
Pregnancy rate (%)	86	86	91	91
Corpora lutea	9.8	8.9	9.4	8.3
Preimplantation loss ^a	11%	14%	17%	8%
Mean foetal wt (g)	37.4	39.8	36.7	38.8
N of viable foetuses	165	138	98	68
N of dead foetuses	0	0	7%**	1%
Postimplantation loss ^a	1	0	10% **	1%
Total intrauterine mortality ^a	12	14	26%**	9%
N of examined foetuses	165	138	87	68
external malformations (%)	0	0	1	0
external anomalies (%)	4	1	8	3
skeletal malformations (%)	1	0	1	0
skeletal anomalies (%)	7	3	16	3
skeletal variations (%)	6	3	15 ^c *	3
visceral malformations (%)	0	0	1	1
visceral anomalies (%)	1	1	1	3
visceral variations (%)	1	1	0	1

NR = not remarkable

H = haemorrhage

^a Data compared to N of implantations

^b Data for the highest dose group are of limited reliability due to shortened exposure period compared to other groups (day 7-20, instead of 7-28, since animals started to die at day 18) and due to high maternal mortality *Significantly different from Control

**Significantly different from Control (Chi square test done by dossier submitter)

^c According to CAR IIIA document skeletal variations at this dose level included displaced, fused or misshaped sternebrae and 13th rib anlage.

Without reported historical control data it is difficult to assess the relevance of increased incidence of skeletal variations. For example, displaced, fused or misshaped sternebrae were reported in 6 animals in the group dosed at 4 μ g/kg bw/day, that would approximately correspond to 7% incidence. In historical control data for New Zealand White rabbits published in open literature (Horimoto et al. Historical control data on prenatal developmental toxicity studies in rabbits: Skeletal variations. A Study Group for Historical Control Data on Prenatal Developmental Toxicity Studies in Rabbits, 2012) the incidence for fused sternebrae only is in the range of 0-12.0% (for period 1994-2000), and for fused sternebrae (junction) in the range of 0-5.10% (for period 2001-2010). However, these data have been derived from laboratories in Japan and are not necessarily valid for NZW rabbit breed used in the study.

Observed severe skeletal, CNS and eye malformations, similar to malformations reported

in human cases of Warfarin teratogenicity, were found in very low number of animals (three) and at doses with overt maternal toxicity (mortality). Lack of historical control data and reduced number of foetuses available for evaluation at these dose levels make the assessment of the teratogenic effect of Bromadiolone uncertain.

Reference:

Rady et al. (American-Eurasian Journal of Toxicological Sciences 2013;5:7-14)

4.12 Other effects

4.12.1 Non-human information

4.12.1.1 Neurotoxicity

There are no indications that bromadiolone may have neurotoxic properties. The toxicological studies do not indicate any neurotoxic effects. A neurotoxicity study would be scientifically unjustified and would not provide any new data. Based on this and animal welfare grounds it is deemed unnecessary to conduct a neurotoxicity study and applicant's justification was accepted.

4.12.1.2 Immunotoxicity

No data.

4.12.1.3 Specific investigations: other studies

The mechanism for bromadiolone as an anticoagulant is well known and no mechanistic studies were considered necessary.

4.12.1.4 Human information

Manufacturing plant personnel are subject to medical surveillance. No illnesses due to anticoagulants have been seen during the period 1987-1999, at two sites involved in rodenticide production (applicant Lipha Tech). Similarly, he applicant applicant Task Force states that no accidents or problems have occurred from 1975.

Many poisoning incidents have been reported for second generation anticoagulants as a group to poisoning control centres etc., but only one of those cited in the dossier is clearly stated to be with bromadiolone. In this case two children were accidentally poisoned, with prolonged coagulation time as a result. Both children recovered after antidotal treatment with Vitamin K. 95 % of the reports for the group anticoagulants at an American poison control centre is stated to be accidental, and most of the remainder is classified as "intentional" and includes attempted suicides. A majority of the reports concerns children <6 years of age. During the time period 1996–1999 a total of 115 calls concerning bromadiolone were received by the Milan Poisons Center, 98 of which involved clinical cases among humans or animals. The most common route of exposure was through ingestion and in 55% of the cases children under the age of four years were exposed. The symptoms were reported in eleven human cases and included vomiting, gastric pyrosis and itching. Only one

case was reported with haematological problems. Therapy included administration of activated charcoal, ipecac syrup, gastric lavage and vitamin K1 phytonadione. Other cases have been described in the literature where most symptoms included an increased tendency to bleed and effects thereof.

The closely-related active substance warfarin has been in use for over forty years as an anticoagulant drug in human medicine. It has been used in patients with clotting disorders, heart disease, atrial valve replacement, and more recently, deep vein thrombosis. Use is life-long for most patients with heart disease, clotting disorders or valve replacement.

There have been no reports of any increase in tumour incidence or of any adverse effects on human fertility. There have been no reports of neurotoxic or neurodegenerative disease, or neuro-muscular disease associated with the use of warfarin. Use during pregnancy is contraindicated.

4.12.2 Summary and discussion

Investigations of other effects do not indicate that any additional classification and labelling according to the DSA or CLP is warranted.

4.12.3 Comparison with criteria

Not applicable.

4.12.4 Conclusions on classification and labelling

See section 4.12.2.

5 ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD ASSESSMENT

5.1 Degradation

Table 21a:	Summary of	f available	information	on degradation
Table 21a.	Summary Of	available	mormation	on degradado

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Hydrolysis. US EPA 161-1	Stable to hydrolysis at pH 7 and 9	30 days test, 25°C Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.1.1.1.1 (LiphaTech)
Hydrolysis. OECD 111	Stable to hydrolysis at pH 7 and 9	120 days test, 50°C Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.1.1.1.1 (Task Force)
Photolysis. OECD draft and US EPA OPPTS 835.2210.	DT_{50} at 25°C 11.5 min. in sterile buffer solution and 14 min. in sterile pond water.	Not relevant for classification.	A 7.1.1.1.2-01 (LiphaTech)
Photolysis. US EPA OPPTS 835.2210.	DT_{50} 2.98 min. Biphasic degradation (fast degradation phase, summer) and 74.5 min. (slower degradation phase, summer)	Not relevant for classification.	A 7.1.1.1.2 (Task Force)
Ready biodegradability. CO_2 evolution measured as TOC. OECD 301B	No measurable degradation (0 % after 28 d), not readily biodegradable.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.1.1.2.1 (LiphaTech)
Ready biodegradability. Closed bottle test. Oxygen content measured and degradation expressed as specific BOD in the percentage of ThOD. OECD 301D	Maximum degradation 31 %, not readily biodegradable	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.1.1.2.1 (Task Force)
Inherent biodegradability. CO ₂ production measured as inorganic carbon. OECD 302D	Maximum degradation 2%, not inherently biodegradable	Not relevant for classification.	A 7.1.1.2.2 (Task Force)

5.1.1 Stability

The hydrolytic degradation of bromadiolone has been investigated under dark conditions at a temperature of 25°C in sterile aqueous buffer solution (1 mg/L) at pH values of 5, 7 and 9 (LiphaTech). The hydrolytic degradation of bromadiolone under sterile aqueous conditions after 30 days at a temperature of 25°C and a pH of 5 amounted to 6.3 %. Due to the poor correlation of the linear regression curve for degradation at this pH the estimated reaction rate constant is not considered reliable enough to calculate a DT₅₀. At pH values of 7 and 9 no significant degradation was observed. Correspondingly, bromadiolone is considered stable to hydrolysis. No significant

degradation products were observed. The study by Task Force was done at a temperature of 50° C, at the pH values of 7 and 9. They justified with a pre-test that testing of hydrolysis at pH 4 was not possible to perform accurately, due to the low solubility of bromadiolone at this pH. The results show that there was no hydrolysis of bromadiolone during the 120 days test.

The LiphaTech photolysis study shows that bromadiolone is degraded in aqueous solution when exposed to a representative artificial light source. The mean estimated photolysis DT_{50} at 25°C was 11.5 minutes in sterile buffer solution and 14 minutes in sterile pond water (estimated overall average 12.8 minutes). The values show good correlation to pseudo first order kinetics. A recalculation of the half-lives to minutes of natural summer sunlight at latitudes 40°N and 50°N resulted in DT_{50} values for the buffer solution of 29 and 28 minutes, respectively. For the sterile pond water the corresponding DT_{50} values were 35 to 36 minutes, respectively. In the study presented by Task Force a dilute (0.0039 mM) aqueous solution of bromadiolone was degraded which was followed by a slower degradation rate, and complete photolysis had occurred after approximately two hours.

LiphaTech also studied photolytic degradation. Photolysis of bromadiolone led to the formation of carbon dioxide (8.8 to 15.4 % of AR) and 15 other degradation products, separated by TLC. Six of these degradation products exceeded 10 % of AR, but none were identified. Maximum levels were between 10.9 and 33.3 % of AR. The applicant's argument for not identifying the major transformation products is that the majority of these metabolites were past their maximum levels after at the end of the study (after 15 days), indicating that they are transient in nature.

5.1.2 Biodegradation

5.1.2.1 Biodegradation estimation

No information.

5.1.2.2 Screening tests

The ready biodegradability of bromadiolone has been investigated by LiphaTech in a laboratory study according to OECD guideline 301B (CO₂ evolution test). The test showed that bromadiolone is not readily biodegradable in the environment, according to the criteria of test. To be classified as biodegradable 60 % or more of the active substance should have been degraded after 28 days whereas in the test there was no measurable degradation of bromadiolone. In the corresponding test by Task Force the maximum degree of degradation was 31 %, which also fulfils the criteria for being not readily biodegradable. Inherent biodegradability was studied by Task Force according to OECD 302D whereby the test substance was incubated in a buffered, mineral salts medium which had been inoculated with a mixed population of micro-organisms. The degradation (inorganic carbon production) was maximum 2% during the test, and minimum 20% is required to pass the test. Bromadiolone is therefore considered as not inherently biodegradable.

5.1.3 Summary and discussion of degradation

No hydrolysis was found at pH 7 or 9, so hydrolysis of bromadiolone is not expected to be a significant process in the environment. Photolysis of bromadiolone in aqueous solution is rapid with a half-life of 12 hours or less. Photolytic degradation was studied by LiphaTech and led to the formation of carbon dioxide and significant levels of six unidentified degradation products which had either reached plateau levels or were declining at the end of the study (15 days). Bromadiolone

is not readily biodegradable under environmentally relevant conditions or during sewage treatment processes. It is also not inherently biodegradable. Therefore, the overall conclusion is that bromadiolone fulfills the criteria for being not biodegradable.

5.2 Environmental distribution

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Adsorption/desorption in soil. US EPA Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, Subdivision N, Paragraph 163-1/ OECD 106	K_{OC} was calculated to 1563 to 1709 mL/g	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.1.3 (LiphaTech)
Adsorption/desorption in soil. OECD 106	K_{OC} was calculated to 3530 to 41600 mL/g	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.1.3 (Task Force)

 Table 21b:
 Summary of available information on distribution

Bromadiolone is strongly adsorbed to soil and K_{OC} values range between 1563 and 41600 mL/g, including results from both applicants, which corresponds to 'slightly mobile' to "non-mobile" according to the SSLRC classification index. Laboratory soil column leaching and aged leaching studies performed by LiphaTech indicate that bromadiolone and any potential degradation products, even if released indirectly to soil in small quantities, are not likely to move through the soil profile and are unlikely to reach groundwater in significant quantities. The rapid photolysis rate in air ($t_{1/2}$ ca 2 hours), the low vapour pressure of bromadiolone and the low Henry's law constant together show that bromadiolone is not expected to volatilise to or persist in air in significant quantities. A strong tendency to adsorb to sediment combined with a high degree of photo-instability means that bromadiolone is unlikely to remain in the water column of surface waters. The information on studies on distribution is summarised in Table 21b.

5.2.1 Adsorption/Desorption

The sorption properties of bromadiolone have been investigated by LiphaTech in a laboratory adsorption/desorption study. The amount of bromadiolone adsorbed to soil was 66.0 to 81.2% during the adsorption phase. The Freundlich soil sorption coefficient normalised for organic carbon content (K_{OC}) was calculated to 1563 to 1709 mL/g (mean value 1632 mL/g). This indicates that bromadiolone is 'slightly mobile' according to the SSLRC classification index (K_{oc} 1000-4000 = slightly mobile and $K_{oc} > 4000$ = non-mobile). Also the Task Force has performed a sorption study, which was conducted with five different soils and the resulting K_{oc} values ranged between 3530 and 41600 with three out of five values being above 4000, which would lead to the conclusion that bromadiolone is practically non-mobile in soil.

5.2.2 Volatilisation

The vapour pressure of bromadiolone at ambient temperature has been determined by LiphaTech to be 2.13 x 10^{-8} Pa (OECD 104) and by. Furthermore, Henry's law constant for bromadiolone has been calculated to 8.99 x 10^{-7} Pa·m³/mol (based on a water solubility of 12.5 mg/L). The corresponding data from Task Force is a vapour pressure of $1*10^{-7}$ Pa and Henry's law constant of 4.25 x 10^{-4} Pa*m³/mol. References to these studies can be found in section 3 above. Based on these

data bromadiolone is not considered volatile and is not expected to partition into air in significant quantities. In addition, the photochemical oxidative degradation half-life of bromadiolone in air has been estimated using the Atmospheric Oxidation Program v1.90 (AOPWIN), which is based on the structural activity relationship (QSAR's) methods developed by Atkinson, R (1985 to 1996). The half-life for the hydroxyl reaction in air (based on a hydroxyl radical concentration of 1.5×10^6 OH radicals per cm³) is estimated to 2.1 hours and the ozone reaction in air is estimated to 2.0 hours (LiphaTech reference A 7.3.1). A similar calculation has been performed by Task force with similar result (Task force reference A 7.3.1). In conclusion, bromadiolone is not expected to volatilise to or persist in air in significant quantities.

5.2.3 Distribution modelling

No information.

5.3 Aquatic Bioaccumulation

Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
Partition coefficient. EEC A.8 (shake-flask method)	Log K _{ow} =4.07 at pH 7, 20°C log BCF _{fish} = $0.85 \cdot \log K_{ow} - 0.70$ BCF = 575	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 3.9/01 (LiphaTech)
Partition coefficient. EEC A.8 and OECD 107 (shake- flask method)	Log K _{ow} =3.8 at pH 7.1, 25°C log BCF _{fish} = 0.85·log K _{ow} – 0.70 BCF = 339	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 3.9 (Task Force)
Bioconcentration in fish. Bluegill sunfish (<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>). General accordance with OECD 305E	BCF 460 for whole fish.	Not reliable due to high mortality (44%) of the test animals compared to 1% in the control.	A 7.4.3.3.1-01 (LiphaTech)
Bioconcentration in fish. Channel catfish (<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>). No guideline compliance claimed.	BCF 74 for whole fish.	Not reliable due to high mortality (47%) of the test animals compared to 0% in the control and lack of analysis of the test substance.	A 7.4.3.3.1-02 (LiphaTech)
Bioconcentration in fish. Rainbow trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>). OECD 305	No results, early termination due to high mortalities.	Not reliable due to high mortality (>30%) of the test animals making early termination of the test necessary. Insufficient data was generated to produce uptake and depuration curves.	A 7.4.3.3.1 (Task Force)

 Table 22:
 Summary of available information on aquatic bioaccumulation

Two studies have been conducted by LiphaTech of bioconcentration in the tissues of fish under artificial conditions in the laboratory. In a study with bluegill sunfish the maximum
bioconcentration factor for bromadiolone was 460 for whole fish. In non-edible tissues the maximum BCF was 1,658 and in edible tissues 161. In a second study with channel catfish, the bioconcentration factors in whole fish ranged from 24 (day 1) to 74 (day 14). In edible and non-edible tissues the maximum bioconcentration factors were 59 and 641, respectively. In both these studies the reliability was low due to major deficiencies in reporting and too high mortality in the exposed group of fish. Also, a fish bioconcentration study with rainbow trout was performed by Task Force, but it failed due to high mortalities of the fish. Taken together, the fish bioconcentration studies are of low reliability, but the references are included for information. Consequently, BCF was derived by calculation from log K_{ow}, using equation 74 in the TGD⁵ (log BCF_{fish} = 0.85·log K_{ow} – 0.70) resulting in BCF values ranging between 339 (based on a log K_{ow} of 3.8 at pH 7.1, Task Force) and 575 (based on a log K_{ow} of 4.07 at pH 7, LiphaTech). The information on studies on aquatic bioaccumulation is summarised in Table 22.

5.3.1 Aquatic bioaccumulation

5.3.1.1 Bioaccumulation estimation

See above (5.3).

5.3.1.2 Measured bioaccumulation data

See above (5.3).

5.3.2 Summary and discussion of aquatic bioaccumulation

Our conclusion is that bromadiolone has potential to bioaccumulate. This is also in line with a conclusion that was drawn as a result of a PBT assessment which was carried out for all existing anticoagulant biocidal active substances (i.e. which are included in the review programme under the directive 98/8/EC) bromadiolone is a potential PBT substance. According to this assessment, which was done by the TCNES Subgroup on Identification of PBT and vPvB Substances and finalised in 2008, bromadiolone is considered persistent and toxic, whilst there was some uncertainty regarding the bioaccumulation criterion and the conclusion therefore was that bromadiolone has potential to bioaccumulate. Hence the designation as potential PBT substance. A comparison with the criteria for bioaccumulating substances, i.e. a BCF > 100 (according to DSD) and BCF > 500 (according to CLP) indicates that bromadiolone fulfills these criteria.

5.4 Aquatic toxicity

Table 23: Summary of relevant information on aquatic toxicity

	Method	Results	Remarks	Reference
--	--------	---------	---------	-----------

⁵ European Commission. 2003. Technical Guidance Document on Risk Assessment in support of Commission Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for new notified substances, Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment for existing substances, and Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market.

Acute toxicity to fish. Oncorhynchus mykiss. Semi-static test. Limit test with only one test concentration. OECD 203	96 h $LC_{50} > 8.0$ mg/L (nominal) Analysis showed that test concentration was 96-102 % of nominal.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.4.1.1-01 (LiphaTech)
Acute toxicity to fish. Oncorhynchus mykiss. Semi-static test. OECD 203	96 h LC ₅₀ = 2.86 mg/L (nominal) Analysis showed that test concentrations were 95-102 % of nominal.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.4.1.1 (Task Force)
Acute toxicity to invertebrates. <i>Daphnia magna</i> . Flow-through test, dim light. US EPA 72-2 (comparable to OECD 202)	48 h LC_{50} = 2.0 mg/L (lethality, mean measured concentration)	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.4.1.2 (LiphaTech)
Acute toxicity to invertebrates. <i>Daphnia magna</i> . Static test, darkness. OECD 202	48 h EC ₅₀ = 5.79 mg/L (immobilization, nominal concentration) Analysis showed that test concentrations were 99-107 % of nominal.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.4.1.2 (Task Force)
Growth inhibition of algae. Scenedesmus subspicatus. Static test. OECD 201	96 h $E_bC_{50} = 0.17 \text{ mg/L}$ (recalculated 72 h $E_rC_{50} > 1$ mg/L) (nominal concentrations) Analysis had deficiencies, but for two test concentrations the values were 97-150 % of nominal. The analysis results of the test substance at the end of the test were below detection, so the degradation rate of the substance in the test is not known. The likely rapid photolytic degradation of the test substance in the test leads to the conclusion that the real EC ₅₀ is below 1 mg/L.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.4.1.3 (LiphaTech)
Growth inhibition of algae. <i>Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata.</i> Static test. OECD 201	72 h E_rC_{50} 1.14 mg/L (geometric mean test concentration calculated from the initial measurements and half of the LOQ of 0.3 mg/L) The analysis results of the test substance at the end of the test were below detection, so the degradation rate of the substance in the test is not known. The likely rapid photolytic degradation of the test substance in the test leads to the conclusion that the real EC ₅₀ is below 1 mg/L.	Data sufficient for classification purposes under DSD or CLP (key study)	A 7.4.1.3 (Task Force)

5.4.1 Fish

5.4.1.1 Short-term toxicity to fish

Based on the results of acute toxicity studies, bromadiolone is toxic to fish (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). In the LiphaTech study, rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) was exposed to bromadiolone under semi-static conditions during 96 hours in darkness. The study was performed as a limit test with only one test concentration of 8.0 mg/L and a solvent control group. The result was that 96 h LC₅₀ exceeded 8.0 mg/L, the single concentration applied and confirmed by analysis. Analysis of the test concentration was performed after 0, 24 and 96 hours and the measured concentration was found to be 96-102 % of the nominal concentration. No fish died at the limit concentration. In the Task Force study rainbow trout was exposed to bromadiolone during 96 h under semi-static conditions with a light regime of 12 hour dim light/12 hour darkness. 96 h LC₅₀ was 2.86 mg/L (nominal concentrations of bromadiolone were measured before and after each change of medium and the measured concentrations were all within the range 95-102 % of nominal).

5.4.1.2 Long-term toxicity to fish

Not available. Studies waived due to limited exposure to the aquatic environment.

5.4.2 Aquatic invertebrates

5.4.2.1 Short-term toxicity to aquatic invertebrates

The acute toxicity of bromadiolone to invertebrates has been tested by LiphaTech in a 48-hour flow-through study with *Daphnia magna*. Analysis of the test concentration was performed after 0 and 48 hours and was found to be 74-92 % of the nominal concentration. The study was performed with a 16 hours photoperiod in dim light. In a corresponding study by Task Force the acute toxicity to *Daphnia magna* was determined in a static system. The study was conducted in the dark due to the photosensitivity of the test material. *Daphnia magna* was similar in sensitivity to fish, with a 48 h EC₅₀ of 5.79 mg/L (Task Force) and a 48 h LC₅₀ of 2.0 mg/L (LiphaTech). The LiphaTech endpoint was based on lethality rather than immobilisation and on mean measured concentrations of bromadiolone in the test media. It is possible that the value would be somewhat lower if the endpoint were based on immobility. The Task Force result is based on nominal concentrations, but the actual test concentrations in water were measured at 0 and 48 h and the recovery rate was 99-107 %.

5.4.2.2 Long-term toxicity to aquatic invertebrates

Not available. Studies waived due to limited exposure to the aquatic environment.

5.4.3 Algae and aquatic plants

The effect of bromadiolone on algal growth has been tested by LiphaTech in a laboratory study using the green alga *Scenedesmus subspicatus* and 6 different concentrations of bromadiolone together with control and solvent control. Light conditions were 8000 lux continuous light. Concentrations of bromadiolone were reduced to below the limit of quantification under the conditions of the 96 h test. Also, the analysis of bromadiolone during the test had deficiencies and resulted in useful values for only two of the initial test concentrations, and the rest were below detection (including the highest initial concentration). The light intensity used represents about 80

% of the light intensity that was reported in the photolysis study and it is therefore reasonable to assume that extensive photolytic degradation of bromadiolone took place during the study, and that the level of bromadiolone has decreased to below LOQ much earlier than after 96 h... However, given the conditions of the recommended guideline, it is difficult to avoid degradation of the test substance. Further, there is no feasible alternative to a static test regime, since it is not practicable to renew the test medium or arrange a flow through system with microalgae as test organisms. The 96 h E_bC_{50} for *Scenedesmus subspicatus* was 0.17 mg/L and the NOEC with respect to biomass yield was 0.037 mg/L. Levels of growth inhibition recalculated to specific growth rates were included by LiphaTech at a later stage and the resulting 72 h E_rC_{50} of >1 mg/L, with 39.3 % inhibition at 72 h at thishighest tested concentration, is presented for comparison. The NOEC value, however, remains unchanged. Due to the shortcomings of this study described above RMS considers that there is a large uncertainty regarding the reported effect values and that they lead to a significant underestimation of the toxicity.

In the Task Force study the toxicity of bromadiolone was determined over 72 h with *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata* as test alga. The test was performed in a static system with continuous light at 5500 lux and DMSO was used to increase the solubility of bromadiolone. The resulting 72 h E_rC_{50} was 1.14 mg/L. Due to the rapid photolysis of the test substance, the test concentrations used to express the results were calculated by the Task Force according to the OECD Guidance document on aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances and mixtures (the geometric mean test concentrations were calculated from the initial measurements and half of the LOQ of 0.3 mg/L). However, it is likely that the photolytic degradation is much faster than what can be seen as a value below LOQ after 72 h. The photolytic half-life reported from the Task Force algal study may be estimated to ca 1/20 of that in the photolysis study (full sunlight). Therefore, it is possible that the test concentrations used in the algal test may have decreased to below LOQ much earlier than after 72 h. Although this study is better performed than the LiphaTech study the RMS still considers that the resulting effect value (E_rC_{50}) may be a significant underestimation of toxicity.

Algae represented the most sensitive of the three aquatic trophic levels tested, in spite of the fact that the conditions necessary in algal growth inhibition tests are the ones most likely of all the aquatic acute toxicity tests to result in lowering of exposure concentrations, based on the photo-instability of bromadiolone in aqueous solution. Therefore, RMS considers that it is highly likely that the actual test concentrations that cause 50% inhibition of algal growth are below 1 mg/L, particularly in the LiphaTech study but also in the Task Force study.

Taken together, the RMS considers that it is highly likely that the real 72 h E_rC_{50} for bromadiolone is lower than 1 mg/l.

5.4.4 Other aquatic organisms (including sediment)

No information.

5.5 Comparison with criteria for environmental hazards (sections 5.1 – 5.4)

According to the CLP criteria a substance should be assigned to hazard class Acute **Category** 1 if EC_{50} of the most sensitive organism is lower than 1 mg/L. According to the conclusion above (5.4.3) which takes into account expert judgement (as denoted in the guidance document "Guidance on the application of the CLP criteria" section 4.1.3.3.1) this is considered fulfilled for bromadiolone. Consequently, bromadiolone also fulfils the criteria for hazard class **Chronic Category** 1, since it is not rapidly degradable and has potential to bioaccumulate.

Since the submission of this CLH report, ATP2 (second adaption to technical progress) to CLP has been published, and brings in new criteria for classification of long-term hazards for the aquatic environment (e.g. the use of chronic toxicity data). The only chronic toxicity data available for bromadiolone is the NOEC from the algal study, which is not a true chronic study, although it may according to the TGD be considered as chronic if chronic data from another taxonomic group is also available. In any case, the chronic NOEC of 0.037 mg/L would according to ATP 2 lead to the classification Chronic category 1, and will thus not affect the environmental classification.

5.6 Conclusions on classification and labelling for environmental hazards (sections 5.1 – 5.4)

The suggested classification for bromadiolone is Acute Category 1, M-factor 1 and Chronic Category 1, M-factor 1. This is in line with the classification of bromadiolone which was agreed by TC C&L in November 2006.

RAC evaluation of environmental hazards Summary of Dossier submitter's proposal

Bromadiolone is currently not included in Annex VI of the CLP Regulation. The dossier submitter (DS) proposes to classify Bromadiolone as Aquatic Acute 1, H400 (M=1) and Aquatic Chronic 1, H410 (M=1) according to CLP.

Degradation

Degradation was studied in two hydrolysis tests, two photolysis tests in water, two ready biodegradability tests, and finally one inherent biodegradation test.

The DS considered Bromadiolone as hydrolytically stable because no significant degradation was observed at pH 7-9, after 30 days, a degradation of just 6.5% was observed at pH 5. Bromadiolone is also rapidly photodegradable with an experimental half-life of minutes. It was degraded rapidly in the atmosphere by reaction with ozone and OH radicals ($DT_{50} = 2.0$ and 2.1 hours, respectively), although the presence of this compound in air is not expected due to its low vapour pressure.

Bromadiolone is not readily biodegradable according to OECD TG 301B. To be classified as biodegradable, 60 % or more of the active substance should have been degraded after 28 days whereas in the test there was no measurable degradation of Bromadiolone. In a second test, performed according to OECD guideline 301D the maximum degree of degradation was 31% which also fulfils the criteria for being not readily biodegradable. Inherent biodegradability was studied according to OECD 302D, the degradation was maximum 2% during the test, and minimum 20% is required to pass the test. Bromadiolone is therefore considered as not inherently biodegradable.

Based on the available data a non-rapid/ready degradation was proposed for Bromadiolone.

Bioaccumulation

Two experimental log K_{ow} values were calculated with the shake-flask method and the results were 4.07 at pH 7, 20°C and 3.8 at pH 7.1, 25°C. Three experimental bioconcentration studies were included in the CLH. In the first study with bluegill sunfish, the maximum bioconcentration factor for Bromadiolone was 460 for whole fish. In non-edible tissues the maximum BCF was 1658 and in edible tissues 161. In a second study with channel catfish, the bioconcentration factors in whole fish ranged from 24 (day 1) to 74 (day 14). In edible and non-edible tissues the maximum bioconcentration factors were

59 and 641, respectively. In both of these studies, the reliability was low due to major deficiencies in reporting and high mortality in the exposed group of fish. Also, a fish bioconcentration study with rainbow trout was performed, but it failed due to high mortalities. Because of these deficiencies, the experimental BCFs were not used to establish the potential of bioaccumulation of this substance and the BCFs were derived by using the equation $log BCF_{fish} = 0.85 * log K_{ow} - 0.70$. The resulting calculated BCF values were 339 (based on a log K_{ow} of 3.8) and 575 (based on a log K_{ow} of 4.07).

The DS concluded that Bromadiolone has potential to bioaccumulate. This conclusion is in agreement with the assessment made by the Technical Committee on New and Existing Substances (TCNES) subgroup on Identification of PBT and vPvB substances, where Bromadiolone is considered persistent and toxic, and although there was some uncertainty regarding the bioaccumulation criterion they finally concluded that Bromadiolone has potential to bioaccumulate.

Aquatic toxicity

Two acute toxicity studies for each trophic level were reported by the DS, i.e. in fish (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, OECD TG 203); invertebrates (*Daphnia magna*, OECD TG 202) and algae (*Desmodesmus subspicatus* and *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*, OECD TG 201). There are not available long-term tests in fish and invertebrates but the algae tests submitted in the CLH report can be considered acute (EC_{50}) and chronic (NOEC), although, only a NOEC value of 0.037 mg/L for *Desmodesmus subspicatus* appears in the CLH report as a chronic endpoint.

All the acute endpoints (EC_{50}) reported in the CLH dossier for the three trophic levels are higher than 1 mg/L: fish LC_{50} (96h) = 2.86 and > 8 mg/L; invertebrate EC_{50} (48h) = 2.0 and 5.79 mg/L and algae E_rC_{50} (72h) = > 1 and 1.14 mg/L. For fish the results were based on nominal concentrations because the analysis showed that the test concentrations were 95-102% of nominal. For daphnia one test was based on nominal concentration (99-107% of nominal) and the second test was based on mean measured concentrations. In the case of algae, which is the most sensitive species, the analysis of the concentrations of the test performed with *Desmodesmus subspicatus* had deficiencies and the results were based on nominal concentrations. However, the results of the test performed with Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata were based on geometric mean from the initial measurements (t = 0 h) and half of the LOQ of 0.3 mg/L (t = 72h). For both algae tests, the analysis results of the test substance at the end of the test were below the limit of quantification and therefore the degradation rate of the substance in the test is not known. The likely rapid photolytic degradation of the test substance in the study lead to the conclusion that the real EC_{50} is below 1 mg/L, and therefore, an EC_{50} < 1 mg/L was used to establish a classification under CLP of Aquatic Acute 1 and Aquatic Chronic 1, both with an M = 1. The chronic NOEC of 0.037 mg/L lead to the same classification, and will thus not influence the above environmental classification.

Comments received during public consultation

Three Member States supported the environmental classification proposed by the DS without any additional comments. One Member State suggested other E_rC_{50} s for the algae test in agreement with the combined Assessment Report for Bromadiolone dated "30 May 2008, revised 16 December 2010",.

In their response to comments document (RCOM), the DS explained that the E_rC_{50s} for algae which appear in the CLH report are in agreement with the correct version of the combined Assessment Report for Bromadiolone dated "30 May 2008, revised 16 December 2010", so DS disagreed with this comment.

RAC assessment and comparison with criteria

Degradation

RAC agreed with DS that Bromadiolone can be considered hydrolytically stable and rapidly photodegradable based on the information provided in the CLH report.

RAC also agreed that Bromadiolone is not readily or inherently biodegradable under test conditions, with a level of degradation of 31% after 28 days in the best case.

Based on these data, RAC agreed with the DS that Bromadiolone should be considered **not rapidly degradable** according to CLP.

Bioaccumulation

There is an experimental log K_{ow} for Bromadiolone of 4.07, pH 7 and 20°C which is above the cut-off values of log $K_{ow} \ge 4$ (CLP), therefore RAC agreed with the DS that Bromadiolone has **high potential for bioaccumulation**.

This decision, as it was explained by the DS, is in agreement with the assessment made by the TCNES subgroup on identification of PBT and vPvB substances.

Aquatic toxicity

Under CLP, the acute toxicity category should be based on the lowest EC_{50} , in this case, algae is the most sensitive species. Two algae tests were summarised in the CLH report. The first one was performed with *Desmodesmus subspicatus*, and toxicity values of $E_rC_{50} > 1 \text{ mg/L}$, E_bC_{50} of 0.17 mg/L and a NOE_rC of 0.037 mg/L were reported, however, these values are based on nominal concentrations. Three concentrations were measured at the beginning and at the end of the test (96h) but at the end were below the lowest calibration point (assumed to be 0.004 mg/L), therefore, the endpoints based on nominal concentrations are based on nominal concentrations. This test has been used as additional information, in order to support that the acute toxicity of algae is lower than 1. Many assumptions have been discussed but no final value was obtained (see "*In depth analyses by the RAC"* section).

In the second test performed with *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*, which has been used as key study, the toxicity results were E_rC_{50} 1.14 mg/L and E_bC_{50} of 0.66 mg/L based on geometric mean concentrations. In this case all concentrations were measured at the beginning and at the end of the test (72 h) and as well as the first test, the concentrations at the end were below limit of quantification. The geometric means were calculated from the measured concentrations at the beginning of the test and from half of the limit of quantification (LOQ: 0.3 mg/L) at all other measuring points (i.e. 48h and 72h) according to the Technical Guidance Note (TGN): "Assessment of environmental effects of biocidal active substances that rapidly degrade in environmental compartments of concern" (CA-May08-Doc.6.5).

Bromadiolone is rapidly photodegradable with an experimental half-life between 3-36 min, so it is possible that the test concentrations used in the algae test may have decreased to below LOQ much earlier than after 72h and therefore the toxicity is underestimated. The light conditions in the *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata* test may be estimated to 1/20 of that in the photolysis study, therefore it is reasonable to assume that extensive photolytic degradation of bromodialone took place during the study, and that the level of bromodialone has decreased to below LOQ much earlier than after 96h and 72h.

According to the OECD TG 201, for unstable substances, additional samplings for analysis

at 24 hour intervals during the expose period are recommended in order to better define loss of the test substance, unfortunately these tests did not follow this recommendation. Nevertheless it is possible to assume that at 48h the measured concentrations are lower than the LOQ, because as it has been explained above, the photolytic half-life reported from the DS is expressed in minutes and the light conditions of the algae study may be estimated to 1/20 of that in the photolysis study. In fact in one photolysis study, a complete photolysis occurred after approximately two hours. According to this approach an $E_rC_{50}=0.633$ mg/L was obtained, clearly lower than 1 mg/L (see "In depth analyses by the RAC" section).

Furthermore, the $E_bC_{50}s$, which have been reported above, are lower than 1 mg/L, thus supporting the results of the discussed approach. Nevertheless, the classification shall be based on the $E_rC_{50}s$, which were reported to be slightly above 1 mg/L in the studies.

On the other hand, structurally similar substances, such a brodifacoum, have algae toxicity lower than 1 mg/L ($ErC_{50} = 0.04 mg/L$), which supports the view that the toxicity of Bromadiolone in algae is underestimated.

In conclusion and based on these explanations, regarding aquatic acute toxicity, RAC agreed with the DS and considered that it is highly likely that the actual test concentrations that cause 50% inhibition of algae growth were below 1 mg/L for both studies, therefore, the E_rC_{50} was assumed to be below 1 mg/L.

Regarding chronic toxicity, no adequate chronic data is available. Only chronic toxicity (NOEC) from the first test of algae (*Desmodesmus subspicatus*) appears in the CLH report. The chronic endpoints from this test as well as the acute endpoint were underestimated and the uncertainly of these values are high as it has been explained before. A surrogate approach from the most sensitive species as determined in the acute studies (algae, *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*) was carried out in order to conclude on aquatic chronic classification. According to the results of this surrogate approach, $E_rC_{50} < 1 \text{ mg/L}$ (0.633 mg/L) and taking into account that the substance is not rapidly degradable, a classification under CLP as Aquatic Chronic 1, H410 with an M-factor of 1 is justified.

In conclusion, RAC agreed with the DS's proposal to classify Bromadiolone according to CLP criteria as Aquatic Acute 1 (H400) with an M-factor of 1 based on the acute toxicity in algae (EC₅₀ < 1mg/L) and Aquatic Chronic 1 (H410) with an M-factor of 1 based on the surrogate approach for algae (*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*; E_rC_{50} < 1 mg/L (0.633mg/L)) and taking into account that substance is not rapidly degradable.

In depth analyses by the RAC

Test 1: Growth inhibition test on algae (Desmodesmus subspicatus).

Nominal concentration of	Measured conce	Initial	
Bromadiolone [mg/L]	0 h	96 h	concentration as % of nominal
Control	0.001	**	-
Solvent control	0.005	**	-
0.004	0.006	**	150
0.037	0.036	**	97.3
0.333	**	**	-

Table 1: Analytical results

* Peak heights below lowest calibration point.

Considering that 0.004 mg/L is the lowest calibration point and equal to the reported LOQ and that all the concentrations are between 0.004 to 0.333 mg/L at the beginning of the study and are lower than the LOQ at the end of the study, the geometric mean could be calculated. This can be done by using the measured concentration at the beginning of the test and half of the limit of quantification (LOQ: 0.004 mg/L), i.e. 0.002 mg/l for all other time points (in this case 96 h) which were below the LOQ. This is according to the Technical guidance note (TGN) to calculate time weighted average (TWA): "Assessment of environmental effects of biocidal active substances that rapidly degrade in environmental compartments of concern" (CA-May08-Doc.6.5:http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/ 16960215/bpd_guid_guidance_rapidly_degrading_substances_twa_2009_en.pdf).

The geometric mean concentrations would be (the reported values adopted from the Competent Auhtority Report (CAR) of bromadiolone, Document III-A, 2008):

Nominal concentration of Bromadiolone	Measured an concentration	Geometric mean concentrations		
[mg/L]	0 h (measured)	96 h (assumed)	[mg/L]	
0.004	0.006	< LOQ	0.003	
0.012	0.036	< LOQ	0.008	
0.037	0.037	< LOQ	0.009	
0.111	0.111	< LOQ	0.015	
0.333	0.333	< LOQ	0.026	
1.000	1.000	_*	<< 1.000*	

Table 2: Analytical results (assumptions)

*There is no information about the concentration at 96h, nevertheless, it is expected to be lower than 1 mg/L, considering that the reduction of the concentration in the second highest concentration is from 0.333 mg/L to a concentration below the LOQ. Therefore, the geometric mean is expected to be also lower than 1 mg/L.

Geometric mean concentrations [mg/L]	72 h In X _j	0 h In X _i	In X _j - In X _i	mean specific growth rate μ _{i-i}	rate reduction ^a	% inhibition ^a
Control	12.42	9.21	3.21	1.07	-	-
Solvent control	12.42	9.21	3.21	1.07	-	-
0.003	12.35	9.21	3.14	1.05	0.02	1.9
0.008	12.64	9.21	3.43	1.14	-0.07	-6.5
0.009	12.72	9.21	3.51	1.17	-0.10	-9.3
0.015	11.89	9.21	2.68	0.89	0.18	16.8
0.026	11.49	9.21	2.28	0.76	0.31	29.0
<< 1.000	11.15	9.21	1.94	0.65	0.42	39.3

Table 3: Inhibition of growth rate, days 0-3

Relative to mean solvent control; negative values = growth stimulation.

Geometric	96 h In	0 h ln	In X.	mean	rate	9/2
mean concentrations	X _j	X _i	- In X _i	specific growth	reduction ^a	inhibition ^a
Control	13.14	9.21	3.93	0.98	-	-
Solvent control	12.89	9.21	3.68	0.92	-	-
0.003	12.79	9.21	3.58	0.90	0.02	2.2
0.008	13.00	9.21	3.79	0.95	-0.03	-3.3
0.009	13.25	9.21	4.04	1.01	-0.09	-9.8
0.015	12.25	9.21	3.04	0.76	0.16	17.4
0.026	12.07	9.21	2.86	0.72	0.20	21.7
<< 1.000	11.74	9.21	2.53	0.64	0.28	30.4

Relative to mean solvent control; negative values = growth stimulation.

In conclusion, as the geometric mean concentration for the last point tested which would be quite lower than 1 mg/L showed a % of inhibition higher than 30, it is expected that the E_rC_{50} would be still lower than 1 mg/L.

It is not possible to establish conclusive E_rC_{50} and NOE_rC values with this approach. It is just an approach which confirms the underestimation of the acute and chronic endpoints.

Test 2: Growth inhibition test on algae (Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata).

Nominal concentration of	Measured co [mg	Geometric mean	
Bromadiolone [mg/L]	0 h	72 h	[mg/L]
Control	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""></loq<>
Solvent control	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""></loq<>
12	12.5	<loq< td=""><td>1.37</td></loq<>	1.37
6	6.79	<loq< td=""><td>1.01</td></loq<>	1.01
3	3.41	<loq< td=""><td>0.72</td></loq<>	0.72
1.5	1.73	<loq< td=""><td>0.51</td></loq<>	0.51
0.75	0.82	<loq< td=""><td>0.35</td></loq<>	0.35

Table 1: Analytical results

The geometric mean concentration was calculated from the initial measurement and half of the LOQ at 72h, in accordance with the TGN: "Assessment of environmental effects of biocidal active substances that rapidly degrade in

environmental compartments of concern" (CA-May08-Doc.6.5).

However, Bromadiolone is rapidly photodegradable, and this degradation is much faster than what can be seen as a value below LOQ (0.3 mg/L) after 72h. The reported photolytic half-life is expressed in minutes, and the light conditions of the algae study may be estimated to approximately 1/20 of that in the photolysis study. Therefore, it is possible that the test concentrations used in the algal test may have decreased to below LOQ much earlier than after 72h. According to the OECD TG 201, if the substance is unstable, additional samplings for analysis at 24 hour intervals during the exposure period are recommended to better define loss of the test substance. If a reduction below LOQ at 48 hour is assumed, according to the explanation above, the geometric mean concentrations would be in Table 2 as follow:

Nominal concentration of Bromadiolone	Measu	red concen [mg/L]	Geometric mean	
[mg/L]	0 h	48h	72 h	[mg/L]
Control	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""></loq<>
Solvent control	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""></loq<>
12	12.5	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>0.655</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>0.655</td></loq<>	0.655
6	6.79	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>0.535</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>0.535</td></loq<>	0.535
3	3.41	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>0.425</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>0.425</td></loq<>	0.425
1.5	1.73	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>0.339</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>0.339</td></loq<>	0.339
0.75	0.82	<loq< td=""><td><loq< td=""><td>0.264</td></loq<></td></loq<>	<loq< td=""><td>0.264</td></loq<>	0.264

Table 2: Analytical results (assumptions)

Table 3: Inhibition of growth rate, days 0-3

а

Geometric mean concentrations	72 h In X _j	0 h In X _i	In X _j - In X _i	mean specific growth	% inhibition ^a
	40 500				
0.655	10.523	9.038	1.486	0.495	68.539
0.535	11.911	9.038	2.873	0.958	39.167
0.425	13.060	9.038	4.023	1.341	14.820
0.339	13.395	9.038	4.358	1.453	7.728
0.264	13.705	9.038	4.667	1.556	1.169
Control	13.760	9.038	4.723	1.574	-
Solvent control	13.784	9.038	4.746	1.582	-
Relative to mean so	lvent contr	ol; negati	ve values	= growth s	timulation.

According to this new approach and assumptions, and using GraphPad Prism 6 to calculate the E_rC_{50} , the E_rC_{50} is 0.633 mg/L, which is clearly lower than 1 mg/L, as well as in the first test.

It is not possible to establish conclusive E_rC_{50} and NOE_rC values with this approach. It is just an approach confirming the underestimation of the acute and chronic endpoints.

6 OTHER INFORMATION

7 ANNEXES

Annexed to the CLH report are robust study summaries of relevant studies in the form of excerpts of Document III level from biocides CA reports. The study summaries have been slightly edited in order to remove some sensitive information. The study summaries are grouped with respect to the two applicants and to subject (phys/chem, toxicology and ecotoxicology) and are available in a separate document to the CLH report. The following annexes are included:

Annex no.	Annex name	Contents
7.1	Study summaries of physico-chemical studies, LiphaTech	DOCUMENT III-A Section 3: Physical and Chemical Properties (LiphaTech)
7.2	Study summaries of physico-chemical studies, Task Force	DOCUMENT III-A Section 3: Physical and Chemical Properties (Task Force)
7.3	Study summaries of toxicology studies (human health), LiphaTech	DOCUMENT III-A Section 6: Toxicological and metabolic studies (LiphaTech)
7.4	Study summaries of toxicology studies (human health), Task Force	DOCUMENT III-A Section 6: Toxicological and metabolic studies (Task Force)
7.5	Study summaries of environmental studies, LiphaTech	DOCUMENT III-A Section 7: Ecotoxicological profile including environmental fate and behaviour (LiphaTech)
7.6	Study summaries of environmental studies, Task Force	DOCUMENT III-A Section 7: Ecotoxicological profile including environmental fate and behaviour (Task Force)