

.\_3 .

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

007054

FEB 27 1989

OFFICE OF
PESTICIDES AND TOXIC SUBSTANCES

#### MEMORANDUM

1 6

SUBJECT: Metiram (Polytam) - EPA ID No. 014601

Caswell No.: 41A MRID No.: 407114+00 409310-01

FROM:

E.Cha ( 2.10.19

George 2. Ghali, Fh.D. Science Analysis and Coodination Franch

Health Effects Division (TS-7690)

TO:

Geraldine Werdig, PM 50

Data Call-In Branch Registration Division (TS-767C)

THRU:

John Quest, Ph.D. JA Quest 2/21/87 Science Analysis and Coordination Branch Health Effects Division (TS-769C)

and

Reto Engler, Ph.D., Chief Science Analysis and Coordination Branch Health Effects Division (TS-7690)

Registrant: BASE Corporation Farsippany, NJ 07054

#### Action Peruested

Review and evaluation of a developmental toxicity study in rabbits submitted to the Agency in response to the Data Call-In (DCI) Notice of April 1, 1987 for EBPCs.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

This study was submitted by the registrant in response to: the DCI Notice for EEDCs. The study was evaluated by Dynamac Comporation under EPA Contract No. 68080056, Task No. 112-E, Tynamac Report dated January 19, 1989.

1 6

According to Dynamac's report, maternal toxicity was observed at 40 and 120 mg/kg. A raternal NOEL of 10 mg/kg, the lowest dose tested, was identified. A definitive assessment of the developmental toxic potential of metiram was precluded by the inadequate examination of intracranial structures in fetuses from all groups.

"The HDT produced excessive maternal toxicity and maternal abortions. Only six litters with live fetuses were available for examination at this dose level. The intracranial structures of fetuses in all dose groups were not systematically examined; only fetuses showing gross external malformations were examined intracranially. This deficiency precluded the assessment of development toxicity at all dose levels."

The study was classified as Core-Supplementary.

1

007054

CONSTRUCT SEE THIS POST MATCH : 

! .

EFA: 68D80056 DYNAMAC No.: 112-8 January 18, 1989

## DATA EVALUATION RECORD

METIRAM

Developmental Toxicity Study in Razs Kalik. 6:

STUDY IDENTIFICATION: Hellwig, J. Report on the study of the prenatal toxicity of metiram-premix 95% in rabbits after oral (gavage) administration. (Unpublished study No. 88/0154 by BASF Corporation, Tarsippany, NJ; dated May 1988.) Accession No. 407114-01.

#### APPROVED BY:

Robert J. Weir, Ph.D. Program Manager Dynamac Corporation

Signature: William J. m. Lesanton Date: Jaw 18 1939

| 1. | CHEMICAL: Metiram: tris[ammin carbamato]]zinc[2] [tetrahydr dithione] polymer.  | ne[ethylenebis(dithic+<br>o-1,2,4,7-dithiadiazocine+3,5-  |
|----|---|---|
| 2. | TEST MATERIAL: Metiram-premix pure and described as a light   | 95%, technical grade, was 97.9% yellow solid.   |
| 3. | STUDY/ACTION TYRE: Developmen   | ntal texicity study in rabbits.   |
| 4. | prenatal toxicity of metiram-p  | y, J. Report on the study of the premix 95% in rabbits after oral published study No. 88/0154 by NJ; dated May 1988.) Accession |
| 5. | REVIEWED BY:  |   |
|    | Guillermo Millicovsky, Ph.D. Principal Reviewer Dynamac Corporation   | Date: 2000 18 283   |
|    | Patricia A. Turck, M.S.<br>Independent Reviewer<br>Dynamac Corporation  | Signature: Patricia Link  Date: Patricia 2 223  |
| 6. | APPROVED BY:  I. Cecil Felkner, Ph.D.  Developmental and Reproductive Toxicology Studies Technical Quality Control  Dynamac Corporation | Signature: <u>L. Cuil Belieue</u> Pate: <u>I-16-87</u>  |
|    | George Ghali, Ph.D.<br>EPA Reviewer   | Signature:  |
|    | Reto Engler, Ph.D. EPA Branch Chief Towicology Branch T   | Signature:  |

## DATA EVALUATION REPORT

STUDY TYPE: Developmental Toxicity

TOX CHEM. NO .:

Guideline §83-3.

ACCESSION NUMBER: 407114-01.

TEST MATERIAL: Metitam-premix 95%.

SYNONYMS: Tris[ammime[ethylenebis(dithiocarbamato)]zinc [2] [tetrahydro-1,2,4,7-dithiadiazocine-3,8-dithione] polymer.

STUDY NUMBER: 68/0154.

1 1

SPONSOR: BASE Corporation.

TESTING FACILITY: BASF Aktiengeschaft.

TITLE OF REPORT: Report on the study of the prenatal toxicity of metiram-premix 95% in rabbits after oral (gavage) administration.

AUTHOR(S): J. Hellwig.

REPORT ISSUED: May 1988.

CONCLUSIONS: Maternal toxicity was observed at 40 and 120 mg/kg; a maternal NOEL of 10 mg/kg, the lowest dose tested, was identified. A definitive assessment of the developmental toxic potential of retiram was precluded by the inadequate examination of intracranial structures in fetuses from all groups.

CLASSIFICATION: Core Supplementary.

#### A. MATERIALS

1 4

Test Compound: Purity: 97.9%

Description: Light yellow solid

Batch No.: 765

Contaminants: Not reported.

Vehicle(s): Double-distilled water with 0.5% carboxymethyl

cellulose.

Test Animals: Species: Rabbit

Strain: Himalayan Chbb: HM Source: Carl Thomae, FRG

Age: Between 34 and 44 Weeks old at gestation

day (GD) 0.

Weight: Approximately 2700 g at GD 0.

### B. STUDY DESIGN

This study was designed to assess the developmental toxicity potential of metiram-premix 95% when administered by gavage on GD 7 through 19, inclusive.

Mating: By artificial insemination. GD 0 was designated as the day of insemination.

### Group Arrangement:

[Animals were randomly assigned to test groups.]

| Dose Level<br>(mg/kg/day)  | Number Assigned      |  |
|--|----------------------|--|
| an an ang digantan ang mga manang mang mga ng m |                      |  |
| 0  | 15                   |  |
| 10   | 15                   |  |
| 40   | 15                   |  |
| - 20   | 15                   |  |
|  | (mg/kg/day)  ) 0  10 |  |

## <u>Posing</u>:

All dose suspensions were in a volume of 10 mL/kg of body weight and prepared daily during the dosing period. Results of a range-finding study were provided to support dose selection. Dosing was performed in the mornings. The dosing solutions were analyzed for concentration and stability. Dosing was based on body weight at GD 7.

#### Observations:

1 1

The animals were checked daily for mortality or abnormal condition throughout gestation. Food consumption was measured daily and body weights were measured every 2 or 3 days during the gestation period. Dams were sacrificed and fetuses were delivered by cesarean section on GD 29. Examinations at sacrifice consisted of:

- Gross necropsy of dams.
- Measurement of gravid uterine weight.
- Number of dorpora lutea.
- Number and distribution of plantation sites.
- Numbers of early/late resorptions and dead fetuses.
- Number of live fetuses.

The fetuses were examined in the following manner:

- Fetal weights were measured.
- Fetal sex was determined. .
- Fetal viability and external abnormalities were recorded.
- Condition of placental membranes/fluids was noted.
- Placental weight was measured.
- Contents of fetal thoracic and abdominal cavities were examined fresh.
- Heads of fetuses having severe external malformations were fixed in Bouin's solution and examined by Wilson's method.
- Skeletons were examined by Dawson's method.

## Statistical Analysis:

The following statistical analyses were used:

- Dunnett test: food consumption, body weight/weight gain, corrected body weight gain, gravid uterine weight, placental weight, fetal weight, corpora lutea, implantations, implantation losses, resorptions, and live fetuses.
- Fisher exact test: conception rate, maternal mortality, and fetal findings.

#### Compliance:

- A signed Statement of Confidentiality Claim was provided.
- A signed Statement of Compliance with EPA's GLPs was provided.
- A signed Quality Assurance Statement was provided.

#### C. RESULTS

! :

## 1. Maternal Toxicity:

Mortality: Only one female from the HDT group died during this study; this death occurred on GD 25 and was associated with apathy and abdominal distention.

Abortions: A total of 0, 0, 2, and 8 females aborted in the control, LDT, MDT, and HDT groups, respectively. The indreased incidence of abortions was considered to be compound related.

Clinical Observations: A dose-related decrease in defecation that was directly associated with reduced food consumption (see below) was reported for the MDT and HDT groups. Other findings conjunctivitis, skin lesions, and alopecia) were regarded as incidental since they occurred sporadically in all groups.

Body Weight: Significant (p  $\leq$ 0.01) reductions in body weight were noted during the dosing and postdosing periods for the HDT group. Values for the MDT group were also reduced, but the differences were not statistically significant.



TABLE I: Body Weight Gains and Corrected Body Weight (g)

| Group    | Prior to<br>Cosing<br>Period | Dosing<br>Period | Post-<br>Dosing<br>Period | Entire<br>Gestation<br>Period | Corrected<br>Body Weight<br>Entire Sestation<br>Period |
|----------|------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Cartrol: | 7.9 ± 37.4                   | 32.4 : 57.2      | %.2 ± 53.3                | 134.4 : 85.4                  | 2584.8:137.6   |
| .51      | 27.4 2 60.8                  | 17.1 : 72.5      | 109.5 ± 75.2              | 153.0 ± 123.1                 | 2542.0:143.5   |
| MOT      | 22.1 : 71.1                  | -20.5 ± 314.5    | 130.1 2 89.6              | 145.7 ± 191.9                 | 2500.1:207.6   |
| HDT      | 18.6 ± 49.3                  | -161.3 : 162.7** | 157.5 ± 57.7              | 148.2 ± 212.0                 | 2459.4:118.0   |

Tata were extracted from CB: Tables 007 and 008.

! !

Prior to dosing, the maternal weight gain for controls was approximately one half that of the HDT. However, during the dosing period (statistically significant differences occurred only for the HDT group), a dose-related reduction in maternal body weight gain and a compensatory postdose increase in weight gain was noted when compared to the control group. No significant differences in corrected body weight were reported.

Food Consumption: Significant (p  $\leq$ 0.01) reductions in food consumption were observed during the dosing and postdosing periods for the HDT group. In the LDT and MDT groups, significant (p  $\leq$ 0.01) decreases were also noted during the dosing period. A significant (p  $\leq$ 0.01) dose+related trend towards reduced food consumption was evident after analysis by the reviewers (Table II).

The corrected body weight gain for the entire gestation period was the body weight gain at term minus gravid uterine weight.

<sup>&</sup>quot;Significantly different from control value (p <0.01).

TABLE II: Food Consumption Data (g/animal/day)

|                   | â.                           |                |                |                |
|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   |                              |                |                |                |
| Gestation<br>Cays | Control                      | LDT            | KCT            | TCH            |
| C-6               | 109.34 ± 14.00               | 116.9 : 25.17  | 1:7.5:24.35    | 112.4 : 23.98  |
| 7-19              | 89.9 : 24.76b <sup>2**</sup> | 75.7 ± 33.95** | 57.0 ± 38.79** | 34.9 : 40.51** |
| 20-29             | 100.0 : 25.585**             | 106.4 : 31.08  | 92.8 ± 47.14   | 63.3 : 64.46** |

That a extracted from CB1 Tables 001, 002, and 003. Values represent mean 2 S.C. \$%\$

1 4

Gress Pathological Chservations: The investigators supplied the following data: several animals in the MDT and HDT groups exhibited distention of the large intestine, no feces in the rectum, and stomach filled with very hard dry food. These findings were related to reductions in food consumption and body weight. In addition, some females that aborted (and the female that died) had fatty liver degeneration. Other findings (liquid in abdominal cavity, blind-ending uterine horns, and uterine mucosal cysts) occurred sporadically among some females in all groups and, therefore, were not considered to be compound related.

<sup>&</sup>quot;Significantly different from controls by Kruskal-Wallis monparametric analysis of variance  $(p \le 0.01)$ .

E-\*A significant regative trend with increasing dose denoted at the control by regression analysis (p <0.01).

## Caesarean Section Observations:

1 4

TABLE III: Caesarean Section Observations\*

|                      |                      | Group    |          |          |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Observations         | Control              | LDI      | MDT      | HDT      |
| No. animals assigned | 15                   | 15       | 15       | 15       |
| No. animals mated    | 15                   | 15       | 15       | 15       |
| Pregnancy rate (%)   | 93                   | 100      | 93       | 100      |
| Maternal wastage     | ı                    |          |          |          |
| Nc. died             | 0                    | C        | 0        | 1        |
| No. died/pregnant    | 0                    | 0        | 0        | 1        |
| No. nonpregnant      | 1                    | C        | 1        | 0        |
| No. aborted          | G                    | · 0      | 2        | .8       |
| No. premature        |                      |          |          |          |
| delivery             | 0                    | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| No. animals with     |                      |          |          | 4        |
| live fetuses.        | 14                   | 15       | 12       | 6        |
| Corpora lutea/dam    | 7.6±1.4 <sup>5</sup> | 7.5±1.0  | 8.0±1.4  | 6.5=0.8  |
| Implantations/dam '  | 5.5±2.0              | 5.8±2.1  | 6.4±1.1  | 5.3±1.9  |
| Total live fetuses   | 63                   | 75       | 69       | 26       |
| Live fetuses/dam     | 4.5±2.4              | 5.C±2.0  | 5.8±1.4  | 4.3±1.9  |
| Total resorptions    | 14                   | 12       | 8        | 6        |
| Early                | 10                   | 10       | 6        | 5        |
| Late                 | 4                    | 2        | 2        | 1        |
| Resorptions/dam      | 1.G±1.0              |          | 0.7:0.7  | 1.0±0.9  |
| Total dead fetuses   | 0                    | 0        | 0        | O        |
| Dead fetuses/dam ".  | 0                    | 0        | 0        | O        |
| Mean fetal weight(g) | 44.0±3.6             | 43.7=5.0 | 41.0±7.3 | 38.5=8.6 |
| Preimplantation      |                      |          |          |          |
| loss (%)             | 28.5                 | 23.4     | 19.3     | 18.8     |
| Fostimplantation     |                      |          |          |          |
| loss (%)             | 21.1                 | 11.3     | 11.1     | 17.9     |
| Sex ratio (% rale)   | 36.8                 | 51.2     | 45.9     | 29.2     |

Data was extracted from CBI Tables 013, 014, 015, and 016.

Mean rS.D.

# 2. Developmental Toxicity:

External Examinations:

1 6

ABLE IV: External Fetal Examinations\*

|   | 1              | Gro              |        |                 |
|---|----------------|------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Observations  | Control        | LDT              | 708    | HET             |
| io, litters evaluated   | 14             | 15               | 12     | 6               |
| ic. fetuses évaluated   | 63             | 75               | 69     | 26              |
| Seuccarkylosis (forelin<br>ic. (%) fetuses<br>ic. (%) litters | <b>©)</b><br>G | 1(1,3)<br>1(6,7) | 0<br>0 | 1(3.8)<br>1(17) |

Tata estracted from CB: Table 019.

No compound-related effects on external findings were noted from the above data.

Visceral Examinations:

TABLE V: Viscenal Examinations\*

| Cosenvations            | Control       | <u>Grou</u><br>(DT | HC?            | HC?     |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|
| No. Cottens evaluated   | ₩ 14          | 15                 | 12             | 6       |
| so, fetuses evaluated   | 63            | 75                 | £ <del>9</del> | 26      |
| myboblasia of spicem    |               |                    | •              | _       |
| No. (%) fetuses         | <u>0</u><br>0 | 1(1.3)             | 3              | ō       |
| As. (%) litte's         | С             | 1(0.7)             | 0              | ε       |
| toenesia of gattblexcer |               |                    |                |         |
| No. (%) fetuses         | Ċ             | 1(*.3)             | C              | : (3.8) |
| No. (%) litters         | 0             | 1(6,7)             | .C             | 1(37)   |
| Separated on girl of    |               |                    |                |         |
| No. (%) fetuses         | 37(59)        | 39(52)             | 25(36)*        | 12(46)  |
| No. (%) litters         | 12/36)        | 14(93)             | 11(92)         | 3:50:   |
| ocal hechosis of liver  |               |                    |                |         |
| Ac. (%) fetuses         | 2(3.2)        | 0                  | 2              | 5       |
| No. (%) litters         | 2(14)         | , D                | 3              | S       |

(continued)

TABLE Vs. Visceral Examinations (continued)

|                             | Group   |        |        |     |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------|--------|-----|
| Oclservations               | Control | LDT    | M27    | HET |
|                             |         |        |        |     |
| ks stoagutum around<br>ksem | •       | 1(1.3) | 1(1.4) | Ġ   |
| (ম) fetuses<br>(ম) litters  | Ü       | 1(6.7) | 1(8.3) | ě   |

<sup>&</sup>quot;Data extracted from CBI Tables 022, 023, and 025.

A significant (p  $\le$ 0.05) decrease in fetal incidence of separated origin of the carotids was seen in the MDT group. This was not considered to be compound related because a similar increase was not observed at the HDT.

<sup>&</sup>quot;dignificantly different from control value (p 50.05).

# Skeletal Examinations:

TABLE VI: Fetal Skeletal Examinations\*

| Descriptions   |              |
|--|--------------|
| No.  | -01          |
|  | 6<br>26      |
| No. (%) fetuses   0   1(1.3)   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   0   |              |
| No. (%) fetuses  O   |              |
| tia si eletar malformations No. (%) fetuses No. (%) fetuses No. (%) fetuses No. (%) fetuses No. (%) litters No | 0            |
| No. (%) fetuses  No. (%) litters  O  1(13)  O  No. (%) litters  O  1(13)  O  No. (%) fetuses  O  1(13)  O  1(14)  No. (%) fetuses  O  1(167)  1(67)  1(63)  Index o   | O            |
| Second   S   | c            |
| partite stemabrate)  partite stemabrate)  politics  poli | ÷            |
| No. (%)   fetuses   0   1(1.3)   1(7.4)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.7)   1(8.3)   1(8.   |              |
| No. (%) litters  O 1(6.7) 1(6.3)  regular shaped stemebra(e) No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 2:2.7) 3(4.3) No. (%) litters 1(7.1) 2:33 3(25)  used stemebrae No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 10:13: 2(2.9) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(6.3)  stepsory rib(s) No. (%) litters 1(7.1) 2(3) 1(6.3)  stepsory rib(s) No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 2(2.7) 1(1.4) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 2(3) 1(8.3)  consessory rib(s) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 2(3) 1(1.4) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 2(3) 1(1.6) No. (%) fetuses 2(1.4) 5(53) 5(42)  Sternebra(e, incomplicately possified or reduced in size 1(7.7) 24(32) 10:67) 10:63)  Sternebra(e, incomplicately possified No. (%) fetuses 12(21) 10:67) 10:63)  Sternebra(e) not ossified No. (%) fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)  | G            |
| No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 2(2.7) 3(4.3) No. (%) fitters 1(7.1) 2(13) 3(25)  Sused sternebrae No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 10(13) 2(2.9) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(6.3)  Successory ribts) No. (% fetuses 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(1.4) No. (% fetuses 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Fotal fetal skeletal variations No. (%) fetuses 2(1.4) 5(53) 5(42)  Sternebra(e: innomplietely cassified or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 10(67) 10(83)  Sternebra(e) not essified No. (%) fetuses 12(21) 10(67) 10(83)   |              |
| No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 2(2.7) 3(4.3) No. (%) fitters 1(7.1) 2(13) 3(25)  Sused sternebrae No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 10(13) 2(2.9) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(6.3)  Successory ribts) No. (% fetuses 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(1.4) No. (% fetuses 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Fotal fetal skeletal variations No. (%) fetuses 2(1.4) 5(53) 5(42)  Sternebra(e: innomplietely cassified or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 10(67) 10(83)  Sternebra(e) not essified No. (%) fetuses 12(21) 10(67) 10(83)   |              |
| No. (%) litters 1(1.6) 2(2.7) 3(4.3) No. (%) litters 1(7.1) 2(13) 3(25)  Fused sternebrae No. (%) fetuses 1(1.6) 10(13) 2(2.9) No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(6.3)  No. (%) fetuses 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(6.3)  No. (% fetuses 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Fotal fetal skeletal variations No. (%) fetuses 2(1.6) 14(19) 7(10) No. (%) litters 2(1.4) 5(53) 5(42)  Sternebra(e: innomizetely cossified or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 10(83) No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 10(83) No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 10(83)  Sternebra(e) not cossified No. (%) fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)  | A14          |
| Fused stemebrae  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.5)  No. (%) fetuses  1(7.1)  No. (%) litters  1(7.1)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.6)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.6)  No. (%) litters  1(7.1)  2(3.7)  1(1.4)  No. (%) litters  1(7.1)  2(13)  14(19)  7(10)  No. (%) litters  2(14)  Sign parameters  1(1.7)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.7)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.7)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.7)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.7)  No. (%) litters  1(1.7)  No. (%) fetuses  1(1.5)  1(1.5)  22(32)  Sign parameters  1(1.5)   | 4(1)<br>3(5) |
| Sternebrate   Incompletely   Incom   | د اد         |
| No. (%) fetuses 1(1.5) 10/13: 2(2.9) No. (%) litters 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(8.3)  Docessory ribits) No. (% fetuses 1(1.5) 2(2.7) 1(1.4) No. (% fetuses 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Cotal fetal skeletal variations No. (%) fetuses 3 4.8) 14/19; 7(10) No. (%) litters 2(14) 5(53) 5(42)  Sternebra(e, incomplicately possified or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) No. (% fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 10(63) No. (% fetuses 12(2.9) 10(67) 10(93)  Sternebra(e) not described 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)   |              |
| No. (%) litters 1(7.1) 7(47) 1(8.3)  Accessory rib(s) No. (% fetuses 1(1.6) 2(2.7) 1(1.4) No. (% litters 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Cotal fetal skeletal variations No. (% letuses 3.4.8) 14(19) 7(10) No. (% litters 2.14) 5(53) 5(42)  Sternebra(e: incompletely sasified or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 23(33) 10(83) No. (% fetuses 4.29) 10(67) 10(63)  Sternebra(e) not ossified No. (% fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)  | 2.7          |
| No. (% fetuses 1(1.6) 2(3.7) 1(1.4) No. (% litters 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3) 1 | * (1         |
| No. (% fetuses 1(1.6) 2(2.7) 1(1.4) No. (% litters 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Total fetal skeletal variations No. (% litters 2.14) 7(10) 7 |              |
| No. (% litters 1(7.1) 2(13) 1(8.3)  Total fetal skeletal variations No. (% letuses 3 4.8) 14/19) 7(10) No. (% litters 2(14) 5:53 5:42)  Sternebra(e, incompletely cassified or reduced in size 10 (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 10(83) No. (% litters 4(29) 10/87) 10(83)  Sternebra(e) not ossified No. (% fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)  | 2(7          |
| No. (%) tetuses 3 4.8) 14*19; 7(10) No. (%) litters 2(14) 5:53: 5:42)  Sternebra(e: incompletely sassified or reduced in size (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33). No. (%) litters 4(29) 10:67) 10(83).  Sternebra(e) not ossified (%) fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)   | 2(3          |
| No. (%) tetuses 3 4.8) 14*19; 7(10) No. (%) litters 2(14) 5:53: 5:42)  Sternebra(e: incompletely sassified or reduced in size (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33). No. (%) litters 4(29) 10:67) 10(83).  Sternebra(e) not ossified (%) fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)   | *            |
| No. (%) litters 2:14) 5:53: 5:421  Sternebra(e: incompletely passified or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 10(83) 10( | 6:2          |
| 24(32)   23(33)   33(33)   3   | 4,6          |
| Sisting or reduced in size 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 23(33) 24(32) 10(67) 10(63) 24(32) 23(33) 24(32) 24( |              |
| No. (%) fetuses 11(17) 24(32) 23(33) 10(83) No. (%) litters 4(29) 10(87) 10(83) No. (%) fetuses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)   |              |
| No. (% litters 4,29) 10/67) 10(93)  Sternebrale) not ossified No. (% feruses 13(21) 11(15) 22/32)  | 3.1          |
| Sternebrate) not ossified No. (% feruses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)  | 3.5          |
| No. (%) feruses 13(21) 11(15) 22(32)   |              |
| 140 12 6 0363  | ė.           |
| No. (% unters (5°43) 9 50; 9(15)   | 8.0<br>5.0   |
|  | 3.           |
| Total skeletal retardations No. 192 (et. ses 24;38) 35;47) 45;65)**  | 11:          |
| No. (% (ners 8(57) 35(47) 45(50) 11(50)  | 6:           |

aData entered from CBI Tables 027, 028, and 029.

<sup>\*</sup>Significantly different from control value (p. < 0.05).

<sup>&</sup>quot;\*Significantly different from control value (p < 0.01).

No significant increases in the incidence of skeletal malformations were observed in the test groups when compared to controls. However, significant (p  $\leq 0.05$ ) increases in fetal and litter incidences of fused sternebrae at the IDT and of total skeletal variations at the HDT were noted. The fetal and litter incidences of incompletely ossified or small sternebrae were also significantly (p  $\leq 0.05$ ) increased at the MDT when compared to controls. However, since no apparent dose-related pattern was evident and incidences were within the range of historical control data, increases were not considered to be compound related.

## D. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION:

X s

- a. <u>Maternal Toxicity</u>: The HDT was associated with an excessive incidence of abortions (8 out of 15 animals), severe reductions in body weight and food consumption, and related clinical signs and necropsy findings. Similar, but less severe, findings were noted at the MDT. No clear patterns of maternal toxicity were evident at the LDT.
- b. <u>Developmental Toxicity</u>: No developmental effects that could be attributed to the administration of metiram-premix 95% were reported in this study.
  - i. <u>Deaths/Resorptions</u>: No compound-related effects were noted.
  - ii. Altered Growth: A slight, nonsignificant trend in fetal body weight reduction was noted; weights for the control, LDT, MDT, and HDT groups were 44.0, 43.7, 41.0, and 38.5, respectively. This was probably due to excessive maternal toxicity at the MDT and HDT.
  - iii. <u>Developmental Anomalies</u>: No compound-related effects were noted.
    - iv. <u>Malformations</u>: No compound-related effects were noted.

- c. Study Deficiencies: 1. The HDT produced excessive maternal toxicity and maternal abortions. Only six litters with live fetuses were available for examination at this dose level. 2. The intracranial structures of fetuses in all dose groups were not systematically examined; only fetuses showing gross external malformations were examined intracranially. This deficiency precluded the assessment of developmental toxicity at all dose levels.
- E. CLASSIFICATION: Supplementary data.

Maternal NOEL = 10 mg/kg (LDT).

Maternal LOEL = 40 mg/kg (MDT).

Developmental Texicity NOEL = could not be established.

Developmental Texicity LCEL = could not be established.

F. RISK ASSESSMENT: Not applicable.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY