

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



- acclimated for ten days. Their condition, size, maturity and breeding state were not given.
- B. Dose- Intramuscular injection of 20% pyrethrum extract and propylene glycol
- C. Design:  
There were an unknown number of birds in each of five nominal dose levels; 10,20,30,40 and 50 mg/kg body weight.
- D. Statistics- The LD<sub>50</sub> was not determined.
12. REPORTED RESULTS- None reported.
13. STUDY AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS/QA MEASURES:  
No LD<sub>50</sub>s (mg/kg) were given and there were no statements about quality assurance.
14. REVIEWER'S DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY:
- A. Test Procedures:  
The procedures were not in accordance with the guidelines for avian single-dose oral LD<sub>50</sub>.
- B. Statistical Analysis:  
There were no raw data; therefore LD<sub>50</sub>s could not be calculated.
- C. Discussion/Results:  
This study does not address any questions which must be answered for registration.
- D. Adequacy of the Study:  
Classification- Invalid.  
Rational- The Blue rock pigeon is not a standard species; there is insufficient information on the experimental subjects; it is not clear what "20% pyrethrum extract" means; no raw data is supplied; an LD<sub>50</sub> is not presented and; there is no requirement for an intramuscular LD<sub>50</sub>  
Repair- N/A.
15. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER FOR STUDY- No.
16. CBI APPENDIX- N/A.



acclimated for ten days. Their condition, size, maturity and breeding state were not given.

B. Dose- Intramuscular injection of 20% pyrethrum extract and propylene glycol

C. Design:

There were an unknown number of birds in each of five nominal dose levels; 10,20,30,40 and 50 mg/kg body weight.

D. Statistics- The LD<sub>50</sub> was not determined.

12. REPORTED RESULTS- None reported.

13. STUDY AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS/QA MEASURES:

No LD<sub>50</sub>s (mg/kg) were given and there were no statements about quality assurance.

14. REVIEWER'S DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY:

A. Test Procedures:

The procedures were not in accordance with the guidelines for avian single-dose oral LD<sub>50</sub>.

B. Statistical Analysis:

There were no raw data; therefore LD<sub>50</sub>s could not be calculated.

C. Discussion/Results:

This study does not address any questions which must be answered for registration.

D. Adequacy of the Study:

Classification- Invalid.

Rational- The Blue rock pigeon is not a standard species; there is insufficient information on the experimental subjects; it is not clear what "20% pyrethrum extract" means; no raw data is supplied; an LD<sub>50</sub> is not presented and; there is no requirement for an intramuscular LD<sub>50</sub>

Repair- N/A.

15. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER FOR STUDY- No.

16. CBI APPENDIX- N/A.

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

1. TEST MATERIAL- Pyrethrins.
2. STUDY MATERIAL:

"Pyrethrum powder containing 1.3% pyrethrums".

It is not known if this means 1.3% pyrethrum flowers, 1.3% of the Chemicals pyrethrin I and II or 1.3% of all six pyrethrin chemicals.
3. STUDY TYPE - Avian Dietary Single-dose Oral LD<sub>50</sub>.

Species tested- House sparrow (Passer domesticus).
4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Saxena, P. and S.C. Saxena. 1973. Effect of pyrethrum on body and organ weights, food consumption, and faeces production of the house sparrow, Passer domesticus. Pyrethrum Post, 12:76.
5. REVIEW BY:

James J. Goodyear                      Signature: James Goodyear  
Biologist                                      Date: May 3, 1988  
Ecological Effects Branch                      Hazard Evaluation Division (TS796C)
6. APPROVED BY:

Raymond W. Matheny                      Signature: Ray W Matheny  
Head, Section 1                                      Date: MAY 3 1988  
Ecological Effects Branch                      Hazard Evaluation Division (TS796C)
7. CONCLUSIONS:

This study does not fulfill any of the registration requirements.
8. RECOMMENDATIONS- N/A.
9. BACKGROUND- Registration of crushed pyrethrum flowers.
10. DISCUSSION OF INDIVIDUAL TEST- N/A.

11. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

A. Test animals:

The source, condition, size, maturity, breeding state and length of conditioning are not mentioned.

B. Dose:

Doses 26,39 and 52 mg pyrethrins/kg were administered orally.

C. Design- An unstated number of birds were caged singly.

D. Statistics- The LD<sub>50</sub> was not calculated.

12. REPORTED RESULTS- Not reported.

13. STUDY AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS/QA MEASURES- None.

14. REVIEWER'S DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY:

A. Test Procedures:

The procedures were not in accordance with the guidelines for avian single-dose oral LD<sub>50</sub>.

B. Statistical Analysis:

No raw data was supplied, therefore, the LD<sub>50</sub> was not calculated.

C. Discussion/Results:

This study does not address any of the questions which must be answered for registration.

D. Adequacy of the Study:

Classification- Invalid.

Rational- The sparrow is not a standard species; there is no information on the experimental subjects; the test material is not clear: no raw data is supplied and an LD<sub>50</sub> is not provided.

Repair- N/A.

15. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER FOR STUDY- No.

16. CBI APPENDIX- N/A.

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

1. TEST MATERIAL- Pyrethrins.
2. STUDY MATERIAL:

"Pyrethrum powder containing 1.3% pyrethrums".

It is not known if this means 1.3% pyrethrum flowers, 1.3% of the chemicals pyrethrin I and II or 1.3% of all six pyrethrin chemicals.
3. STUDY TYPE - Avian Dietary Single-dose Oral LD<sub>50</sub>.

Species tested- House sparrow (Passer domesticus).
4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:

Saxena, P. and S.C. Saxena. 1973. Effect of pyrethrum on body and organ weights, food consumption, and faeces production of the house sparrow, Passer domesticus. Pyrethrum Post, 12:76.
5. REVIEW BY:

James J. Goodyear                      Signature: James Goodyear  
Biologist  
Ecological Effects Branch              Date: May 3, 1988  
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS796C)
6. APPROVED BY:

Raymond W. Matheny                      Signature: Ray W Matheny  
Head, Section 1  
Ecological Effects Branch              Date: MAY 3 1988  
Hazard Evaluation Division (TS796C)
7. CONCLUSIONS:

This study does not fulfill any of the registration requirements.
8. RECOMMENDATIONS- N/A.
9. BACKGROUND- Registration of crushed pyrethrum flowers.
10. DISCUSSION OF INDIVIDUAL TEST- N/A.

---

Pyrethrum

11. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

A. Test animals:

The source, condition, size, maturity, breeding state and length of conditioning are not mentioned.

B. Dose:

Doses 26,39 and 52 mg pyrethrins/kg were administered orally.

C. Design- An unstated number of birds were caged singly.

D. Statistics- The LD<sub>50</sub> was not calculated.

12. REPORTED RESULTS- Not reported.

13. STUDY AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS/QA MEASURES- None.

14. REVIEWER'S DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE STUDY:

A. Test Procedures:

The procedures were not in accordance with the guidelines for avian single-dose oral LD<sub>50</sub>.

B. Statistical Analysis:

No raw data was supplied, therefore, the LD<sub>50</sub> was not calculated.

C. Discussion/Results:

This study does not address any of the questions which must be answered for registration.

D. Adequacy of the Study:

Classification- Invalid.

Rational- The sparrow is not a standard species; there is no information on the experimental subjects; the test material is not clear: no raw data is supplied and an LD<sub>50</sub> is not provided.

Repair- N/A.

15. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER FOR STUDY- No.

16. CBI APPENDIX- N/A.