ENVIRONMENTAL FATE AND EFFECTS DIVISION
ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS BRANCH

List B Phase 4 - Response on Existing Studies Reviewed

CHEMICAL AI NAME: Brodifacoum
CHEMICAL NO.: 112701

CASE NO.: 2755

REVIEWER’S NAME: James J. Goodyear
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 703-557-7726
DATE: January 4, 1991

USE PATTERN(S): In and around buildings.


TITLE: Brodifacoum: The acute oral toxicity (LD$_{50}$) of Broadifacoum to the Mallard duck. Huntingdon Research Centre, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire, UK. Submitted by ICI Americas, Inc., Agricultural Products, Wilmington, Delaware 19897. ICI’s Study No. ICI 308 WL/791275. EPA MRID 415633-03.

MRIDS AND DATES OF FULLY ACCEPTABLE STUDIES: Same.

COMMENTS: LD$_{50}$ = 0.26 mg/kg (95% CI, 0.0-0.8 mg/kg), NOEL < 0.2 mg/kg.

The registrant lumped data from two tests before doing the LD$_{50}$ analysis. This is not statistically acceptable. EEB recalculated the LD$_{50}$ using only the data from the first test done. The test was classified as "Core" and meets the requirements for reregistration.
BRODIFACOUM

Avian Oral Acute Toxicity Test

1. TEST MATERIAL: Brodifacoum.

2. STUDY MATERIAL - Brodifacoum, technical grade.
   [3-(3-[4'-bromo- (1,1'-biphenyl) -4-yl]1,2,3,4-
   tetrahydro-1-naphtalenyl)-
   4-hydroxy-2H-1- benzopyran -2-one  97.6% W/W
   Inert ingredients  2.4
   100%

   Species tested- Mallard duck
   Anas platyrhynchos

4. STUDY IDENTIFICATION:
   of Broadifacoum to the Mallard duck. Huntingdon Research Centre, Huntingdon,
   Cambridgeshire, UK. Submitted by ICI Americas, Inc., Agricultural Products, Wilmington,
   Delaware 19897. ICI's Study No. ICI 308 WL/791275. EPA MRID 415633-03.

5. REVIEWED BY:
   James J. Goodyear
   Biologist, Section 1
   Ecological Effects Branch
   Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)

6. APPROVED BY:
   Leslie W. Touart
   Acting Head, Section 1
   Ecological Effects Branch
   Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)

7. CONCLUSIONS:
   ICI used lumped values to make the calculations; this is not statistically acceptable. Therefore,
   EEB recalculated the LD₅₀ based upon the larger single series of nine concentrations. The
   results are accepted as "Core." LD₅₀ = 0.26 mg/kg (95% CI, 0.0 -0.8 mg/kg); NOEL <0.2
   mg/kg.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS- N/A.

9. BACKGROUND:
The study was submitted to meet the requirements for the reregistration of Brodifacoum and its TEPs.

10. DISCUSSION OF INDIVIDUAL TEST- N/A.

11. MATERIALS AND METHODS:

A. TEST ANIMALS:

Sixty female and 63 male Mallards were obtained from a local game farm. The birds were given adequate food and shelter before (14 days), during and after the test. "A normal daylight pattern was followed." Therefore, the 16 hour light and 8 hour dark pattern was not followed.

B. DOSE:

The dosage levels in the food with a corn oil vehicle were 0 (control), 0.20, 0.80, 1.4, 2.00, 2.60, 3.20, 3.80, 4.40, and 5.00 mg/kg by oral gavage. Twenty-one days after the original group was dosed, "Extra groups were added to improve the spread of mortalities." These groups were dosed with 0.10 and 0.25 mg/kg. EEB regards these sets of dosage groups as two separate studies.

C. DESIGN:

The subjects were assigned to experimental groups of 5 males and 5 females by an unknown method. "The post dose observation period lasted for 28 days and the following observations were made: Mortalities (daily), bird health (daily), bodyweight (... Days -14, -7, 0, 3, 7, 14, 21 and 28), Food consumption by groups [in weekly intervals] and gross postmortem at death or at the termination of the study."

D. STATISTICS:

Litchfield and Wilcoxon, 1949. The data from the two studies was pooled.

12. REPORTED RESULTS:

LD$_{50}$ = 0.31 mg/kg (95% CI, 0.19-0.50), LD$_{50}^d$ = 0.36 mg/kg (0.19-0.67), LD$_{50}^e$ = 0.30 (0.17-0.53). The NOEL was not given.

13. STUDY AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS/QA MEASURES:

"This report has been accepted by the QA Unit as being an accurate presentation of the findings of the study." * ***

"The LD$_{50}$ value for male and female birds for brodifacoum to the Mallard duck was calculated to be 0.31 mg/kg (95% confidence limits 0.19 - 0.50 mg/kg)."

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

A. TEST PROCEDURES:

There were a few minor errors in the housing, photoperiod, etc., but none of these are enough to invalidate the results of the study.

The two test groups did not experience the same environmental factors or have physiological condition. The relationship of the two test groups to their respective controls is not the same
(in fact, it isn't clear if the second study had a control). Therefore, their data can not be lumped.

EEB recalculated the LD$_{50}$ using only the original, single series data.

B. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

EEB used C.E. Stephen's computer method to confirm the LD$_{50}$ calculations.

LD$_{50}$ = 0.26mg/kg (95% CI, 0.0-0.8 mg/kg) NOEL < 0.2 mg/kg.

C. DISCUSSION/RESULTS:

The original tests used a range of concentrations that were too high. Additional tests were done, but the data generated cannot be lumped with the previous data. It isn't clear if the second study had a control group.

EEB used the original, single series data to recalculate the LD$_{50}$. The result was not as satisfactory as EEB would have liked, but it was acceptable. This method had no "zero mortality" experimental group and too few "partial mortality" groups.

The last death occurred on day-23 of the 28 day study. There were no more birds in this group, so no more could have died. There were no mortalities in the other groups for the last ten days.

D. ADEQUACY OF THE STUDY:

Classification- Core.

Rational- The data was recalculated to meet statistical standards.

Repair- None.

15. COMPLETION OF ONE-LINER FOR STUDY- Yes.

16. CBI APPENDIX- N/A.
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