### TEXT SEARCHABLE DOCUMENT 2009

Data Evaluation Report on the Acute Toxicity of Dimethyl Disulfide to Aquatic Vascular Plants, Lemna gibba PMRA Submission Number {......} EPA MRID Number 47471204 Data Requirement: PMRA DATA CODE *{.....*} **EPA DP Barcode** 355006 OECD Data Point {.....} **EPA MRID** 47471204 **EPA** Guideline OPPTS 850.4400 (123-2) Test material: Dimethyl Disulfide Purity: 99.6% Common name Chemical name: IUPAC: Not reported CAS name: Not reported CAS No. 624-92-0 Synonyms: Not reported Moncie V Wright 9/08 Eu S Mysn Primary Reviewer: Moncie Wright Signature: Staff Scientist, Cambridge Environmental **Date:** 09/09/08 Secondary Reviewer: Teri S. Myers Signature: Senior Scientist, Cambridge Environmental **Date:** 11/03/08 Primary Reviewer: Edward Odenkirchen {EPA/OECD/PMRA} Secondary Reviewer(s): Valerie Woodard {EPA/OECD/PMRA} Reference/Submission No.: {..... **Company Code** [For PMRA] {.....} **Active Code** [For PMRA] {.....} **Use Site Category:** [For PMRA]

CITATION: Minderhout, T., Kendall, T.Z., and H.O. Krueger. 2008. Dimethyl Disulfide: A 7-Day Static-Renewal Toxicity Test with Duckweed (*Lemna gibba* G3). Unpublished study performed by Wildlife International, Easton, MD. Laboratory Project No.: 524A-122. Study sponsored by Arkema, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Study completed June 3, 2008.

**EPA PC Code** 

029088

**Date Evaluation Completed:** {dd-mm-vvvv}

**<u>DISCLAIMER</u>**: This document provides guidance for EPA and PMRA reviewers on how to complete a data evaluation record after reviewing a scientific study concerning the acute toxicity of a pesticide to aquatic vascular plants. It is not intended to prescribe conditions to any external party for conducting this study nor to establish absolute criteria regarding the assessment of whether the study is scientifically sound and whether the study satisfies any applicable data requirements. Reviewers are expected to review and to determine for each study, on a case-by-case basis, whether it is scientifically sound and provides sufficient information to satisfy applicable data requirements. Studies that fail to meet any of the conditions may be accepted, if appropriate; similarly, studies that

PMRA Submission Number	{	}	

EPA MRID Number 47471204

meet all of the conditions may be rejected, if appropriate. In sum, the reviewer is to take into account the totality of factors related to the test methodology and results in determining the acceptability of the study.

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

In a 7-day acute toxicity study, the freshwater floating aquatic vascular plants Duckweed (*Lemna gibba*) were exposed to dimethyl disulfide at nominal concentrations of 0 (negative control), 3.1, 6.3, 13, 25, 50, and 100 mg a.i./L under static renewal conditions. Time-weighted average concentrations were <2.00 (<LOQ, control), 3.2, 5.6, 12, 24, 48, and 95 mg a.i./L.

The 7-Day NOAEC and EC<sub>50</sub> values for frond density, the most sensitive endpoint, were 3.2 and 28 mg a.i./L, respectively. The % growth inhibition in frond density, in the treated algal culture as compared to the negative control, ranged from 2.6 to 86%.

Chlorosis was observed at all treatment levels and was more widespread in the highest two treatment levels. Necrosis was observed in all treatment levels except the lowest test concentration, and was more prevalent in the three highest treatment levels. Mortality was mostly observed at the highest treatment level.

This toxicity study is classified as scientifically sound and satisfies the guideline requirement for a Tier II vascular plant toxicity study with the freshwater species, *Lemna gibba*.

#### **Results Synopsis**

Test Organism: Lemna gibba

Test Type (Flow-through, Static, Static Renewal): Static renewal

Frond density

EC<sub>05</sub>: 6.0 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 3.3 to 11 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 28 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 22 to 36 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 3.2 mg a.i./L Probit Slope: 2.45 ± 0.302

**Growth rate** 

EC<sub>05</sub>: 9.7 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 5.8 to 16 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 34 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 28 to 42 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 12 mg a.i./LProbit Slope:  $2.98 \pm 0.383$ 

Biomass (Dry weight)

EC<sub>05</sub>: 17 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 14 to 21 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 48 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 44 to 52 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 12 mg a.i./LProbit Slope:  $3.69 \pm 0.258$ 

Endpoint(s) Affected: frond density, growth rate, and biomass

### I. MATERIALS AND METHODS

**GUIDELINE FOLLOWED:** 

This study was conducted following US EPA Series 850 - Ecological Effects Test Guidelines OPPTS Number 850.4400, ASTM Standard Guide 1415-91 E (1991), and the OECD Guideline 221: Lemna sp. Growth Inhibition Test. The following deviations from OPPTS 850.4400 were noted:

PMRA Submission Number {.......

EPA MRID Number 47471204

- 1. The physicochemical properties of the test material were not reported.
- 2. Pretest health of the test species was not reported.
- 3. At test initiation and termination, the pH of the solutions ranged from 7.8 to 8.0 and 8.3 to 9.0, respectively, well above the pH suggested by OPPTS guidelines of 7.5.

These deviations do not affect the acceptability of this study.

**COMPLIANCE:** 

Signed and dated No Data Confidentiality, GLP, and Quality Assurance statements were provided. A certificate of analysis was also provided. This study was conducted in compliance with U.S. EPA GLP standards (40 CFR Parts 160 and 792), OECD Principles of GLP and JMAFF GLP (1999), with the following exception: Periodic water screening analysis for potential contaminants was performed using a certified laboratory and standard US EPA analytical methods.

#### A. MATERIALS:

1. Test material

Dimethyl Disulfide

**Description:** 

Liquid.

Lot No./Batch No.:

05.03.06 (Batch no.)

**Purity:** 

99.6%

Stability of compound

under test conditions:

The day 0-7 reviewer-calculated mean-measured concentrations yielded recoveries of 89-105% of the nominal test concentrations, indicating that

dimethyl disulfide was relatively stable under the test conditions.

(OECD recommends water solubility, stability in water and light, pKa, Pow, and vapor pressure of test compound)

### Storage conditions of

test chemicals:

Test material was stored under ambient conditions.

Physicochemical properties of Dimethyl Disulfide.

Parameter	Values	Comments
Water solubility at 20EC	Not reported.	
Vapor pressure	Not reported.	
UV absorption	Not reported.	
pKa	Not reported.	
Kow	Not reported.	

PMRA Submission Number {......

EPA MRID Number 47471204

### 2. Test organism:

Name: Duckweed (Lemna gibba) EPA requires a vascular species: Lemna gibba.

Strain, if provided: G3

Source: In-house cultures originally obtained from the USDA.

Age of inoculum: At least 2 weeks

Method of cultivation: Grown under test conditions (20X-AAP)

#### **B. STUDY DESIGN:**

### 1. Experimental Conditions

a. Range-finding study: A range-finding study was not reported.

b. Definitive Study

**Table 1: Experimental Parameters** 

Parameter	Details	Remarks
		Criteria
Acclimation period:	Continuous.	
Culturing media and conditions: (same as test or not)  Health: (any mortality observed)	Temperature and photoperiod appeared to be the same as test conditions.  Not reported.	
Test system Static/static renewal Renewal rate for static renewal	Static renewal  Test solutions were renewed on days 3 and 5.	EPA expects the test concentrations to be renewed every 3 to 4 days (one renewal for the 7 day test, 3-4 renewals for the 14 day test).
Incubation facility	Test vessels were placed in a temperature-controlled environmental chamber.	
Duration of the test	7 days	
		EPA requires a duration of 14 days. Seven day studies will be accepted for review by the Agency.

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Parameter	Details	Remarks
		Criteria
Test vessel Material: (glass/stainless steel) Size: Fill volume:	Glass 300 mL 200 mL	
Details of growth medium name pH at test initiation: pH at test termination: Chelator used: Carbon source:	7.8-8.0 8.3-9.0 Yes NaHCO <sub>3</sub>	EPA recommends the following culture media: Modified Hoagland's E+ or 20X-AAP. Chelating agents (e.g. EDTA) are recommended in the nutrient medium for optimum cell growth. Lower concentrations of chelating agents (down to one-third of the normal concentration recommended for AAP medium) may be used in the nutrient medium used for test solution preparation if it is suspected that the chelator will interact with the test material. ASTM reference, E1415-91and D 3978-80 (reapproved 1987).
If non-standard nutrient medium was used, detailed composition provided (Yes/No)	Yes	
Dilution water source/type: pH: water pretreatment (if any): Total Organic Carbon: particulate matter: metals: pesticides: chlorine:	Purified well water Adjusted to 7.5 ± 0.1. Filter-sterilized. Not reported. Not reported. ND-34.9 mg/L ND Not reported.	EPA recommends a pH of ~5.0. A solution pH of 7.5 is acceptable if type 20X-AAP nutrient media is used.
Indicate how the test material is added to the medium (added directly or used stock solution)	Test material was added directly into the medium.	

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Parameter	Details	Remarks
		Criteria
Aeration or agitation	Neither.	
Sediment used (for rooted aquatic vascular plants) Origin: Textural classification (%sand, silt, and clay): Organic carbon (%): Geographic location:	N/A	
Number of replicates Control: Solvent control: Treatments:	3 N/A 3	
Number of plants/replicate	4 plants	
		EPA requires 5 plants.
Number of fronds/plant	3 fronds per plant	EPA requires 3 fronds per plant.
Test concentrations Nominal:  Measured:	0 (negative control), 3.1, 6.3, 13, 25, 50, and 100 mg a.i./L <2.00 ( <loq, 12,="" 24,="" 3.2,="" 48,="" 5.6,="" 95="" a.i.="" and="" control),="" l<="" mg="" td=""><td>Time-weighted average concentrations were nearly identical to the mean-measured concentrations, which were calculated as the arithmetic average of all old and new samples for a given concentration.</td></loq,>	Time-weighted average concentrations were nearly identical to the mean-measured concentrations, which were calculated as the arithmetic average of all old and new samples for a given concentration.
		EPA requires at least 5 test concentrations with a dose range of 2X or 3X progression.
Solvent (type, percentage, if used)	N/A	

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Parameter	Parameter Details	
		Criteria
Method and interval of analytical verification	All exposure solution, calibration standards, and matrix blank samples were analyzed using HPLC with UV detection (200 nm). Test solutions were analyzed at time 0, before renewal on days 3 and 5, after renewal on days 3 and 5, and at test termination.	
Test conditions Temperature: Photoperiod: Light intensity and quality:	23.5-25.2°C Continuous. 4310 to 5410 lux Warm-white fluorescent lighting	
Reference chemical (if used) name: concentrations:	N/A	
Other parameters, if any	None.	

### 2. Observations:

**Table 2: Observation parameters** 

Parameters	Details	Remarks/Criteria
Parameters measured (e.g.,: number of fronds, plant dry weight or other toxicity symptoms)	Number of fronds, growth rate, and biomass	
Measurement technique for frond number and other end points	Visual counts were used for frond density. Dry weight (biomass) was determined by drying fronds for 2 days and then weighing. Growth rate was determined based on cell density and biomass.	
Observation intervals	Days 0, 3, 5, and 7.	
Other observations, if any	See Inhibitory Effects.	
Indicate whether there was an exponential growth in the control	Yes. Frond density was 116 fronds/replicate in the negative	

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Parameters	Details	Remarks/Criteria
	control at test termination.	
Were raw data included?	Yes.	

#### **II. RESULTS and DISCUSSION:**

#### A. INHIBITORY EFFECTS:

By test termination, frond density averaged 116 fronds/rep in the negative control, yielding inhibitions of 2.6, 8.9, 11, 37, 84, and 86% when compared to the negative control in the mean-measured 3.2, 5.5, 12, 24, 48, and 95 mg a.i./L treatment groups, respectively. Based on frond density, the study author's NOAEC and  $EC_{50}$  values were 5.5 and 31 mg a.i./L, respectively.

Growth rate based on frond density averaged 0.324 days<sup>-1</sup> in the negative control, yielding inhibitions of 1.2, 4.3, 5.3, 20, 80, and 87% when compared to the negative control. Based on growth rate, the NOAEC and EC<sub>50</sub> values were 5.5 and 36 mg a.i/L, respectively.

Biomass (dry weight) averaged 9.5 mg in the negative control, yielding inhibitions of 4.6, 7.7, 8.4, 18, 53, and 87% when compared to the negative control. Based on biomass, the NOAEC and EC<sub>50</sub> values were 5.5 and 46 mg a.i/L, respectively.

The study authors also analyzed growth rate based on biomass, which resulted in an average growth rate of 0.336 days in the negative control, yielding inhibitions of 1.8, 3.3, 3.4, 7.4, 28, and 67% when compared to the negative control. Based on growth rate due to biomass, the NOAEC and EC<sub>50</sub> values were 5.5 and 75 mg a.i/L, respectively.

The study authors used mean-measured concentrations for calculations of endpoints, and compared frond density, growth rate, and biomass treatment groups to the negative control.

Chlorosis was observed at all treatment levels and was more widespread in the highest two treatment levels. Necrosis was observed in all treatment levels except the lowest test concentration, and was more prevalent in the three highest treatment levels. Mortality was mostly observed at the highest treatment level.

Table 3: Effect of Dimethyl Disulfide on frond number of Duckweed, Lemna gibba

TWA and	Initial frond	frond numbe	r at		
(Nominal) number/test solution			7 days		
(mg a.i./L)				frond number	% inhibition
Negative control	12	38	71	116	N/A
3.2 (3.1)	12	35	65	113	2.6
5.6 (6.3)	12	32	. 59	105	8.9
12 (13)	12	33	60	103	11

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

TWA and	Initial frond	frond numb	er at				
(Nominal) number/test concentrations solution				7 days			
(mg a.i./L)	,			frond number	% i	nhibition	
24 (25)	12	27	43	73		37	
48 (50)	12	17	18	19		84	
95 (100)	12	16	16	16		86	
Reference chemical (if used)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	٠.

Table 4: Effect of Dimethyl Disulfide on growth of Duckweed, Lemna gibba

TWA and (Nominal) Concentrations mg ai/L	Initial frond number/test solution	Growth rate (days -1, mean)	Growth rate % Inhibition	Biomass, dry weight (mg, mean)	Biomass % Inhibition
Negative control	12	0.324	N/A	9.5	N/A
3.2 (3.1)	12	0.320	1.2	9.1	4.6
5.6 (6.3)	12	0.310	4.3	8.8	7.7
12 (13)	12	0.307	5.3	8.7	8.4
24 (25)	12	0.258	20	7.8	18
48 (50)	12	0.065	80	4.4	53
95 (100)	12	0.044	87	1.2	87
Reference chemical (if used)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A- not applicable

Table 5: Statistical endpoint values.\*

Statistical Endpoint	Frond No.	Growth rate (Frond no.)	Biomass
NOAEC or EC <sub>05</sub> (mg a.i./L)	5.5	5.5	5.5
LOAEC (mg a.i./L)	12	12	12
IC <sub>50</sub> or EC <sub>50</sub> (mg a.i./L) (95% C.I.)	31 (25-34)	36 (33-38)	46 (41-50)

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Statistical Endpoint	Frond No.	Growth rate (Frond no.)	Biomass	
Other (IC <sub>25</sub> /EC <sub>25</sub> )	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Reference chemical NOAEC IC <sub>50</sub> /EC <sub>50</sub>	N/A	N/A	N/A	

<sup>\*</sup>Study author-reported values

#### **B. REPORTED STATISTICS:**

Day 7 EC50 values were determined using linear interpolation with treatment response and exposure concentration data. The data were tested for normality using Shapiro-Wilks' Test, and for homogeneity of variance using Levene's Test. Treatment group means were compared to the control using ANOVA and Dunnett's t-test. The NOAEC and LOAEC were determined from the statistical analyses and evaluation of concentration-response patterns. All statistical analyses were conducted using Toxstat Version 3.5.

#### C. VERIFICATION OF STATISTICAL RESULTS:

Statistical Method: The reviewer tested the normality of the data using the Chi-square and Shapiro Wilks tests and homogeneity of variance using the Hartley and Bartlett's test. If the data met the assumptions of ANOVA, the NOAEC values were determined using the parametric Williams' and Dunnett's tests. If the data did not meet the assumptions of ANOVA, the NOAEC values were determined using the non-parametric Steele's or Kruskal-Wallis test and visual interpretation of the data. The ECx values and probit slopes were determined using the probit analysis. All analyses were conducted using the reviewer calculated time weighted average mean-measured concentrations and Nuthatch statistical software.

Values input for growth rate were multiplied by 1000 to eliminate means with a zero value.

#### Frond density

 $\begin{array}{lll} EC_{05} \!\!: & 6.0 \text{ mg a.i./L} \\ EC_{50} \!\!: & 28 \text{ mg a.i./L} \\ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{lll} 95\% \text{ C.I.: } 3.3 \text{ to } 11 \text{ mg a.i./L} \\ 95\% \text{ C.I.: } 22 \text{ to } 36 \text{ mg a.i./L} \\ \end{array}$ 

NOAEC: 3.2 mg a.i./LProbit Slope:  $2.45 \pm 0.302$ 

#### Growth rate

EC<sub>05</sub>: 9.7 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 5.8 to 16 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 34 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 28 to 42 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 12 mg a.i./L Probit Slope: 2.98 ± 0.383

#### Biomass (Dry weight)

EC<sub>05</sub>: 17 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 14 to 21 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 48 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 44 to 52 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 12 mg a.i./LProbit Slope:  $3.69 \pm 0.258$ 

#### D. STUDY DEFICIENCIES:

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

There were no study deficiencies that would impact the outcome of the study.

#### **E. REVIEWER=S COMMENTS:**

The reviewer's results were similar to the study authors', and probit slopes were additionally calculated for all endpoints. Therefore, the reviewer's results are presented in the Executive Summary and Conclusions sections of this DER.

At test initiation and termination, the pH of the solutions ranged from 7.8 to 8.0 and 8.3 to 9.0, respectively, well above the pH suggested by OPPTS guidelines of 7.5. However, the pH varied similarly across all treatment and control levels.

The reviewer independently calculated the time-weighted average of the six test concentrations, and used those numbers in the statistical analyses. These values were nearly identical to the mean-measured values.

The in-life portion of the test was conducted from February 22 to 29, 2008.

Periodic water screening analysis for potential contaminants was not conducted under any accepted GLP standards.

#### F. CONCLUSIONS:

The study is acceptable. The 7-Day NOAEC and  $EC_{50}$  values for frond density, the most sensitive endpoint, were 3.2 and 28 mg a.i./L, respectively.

#### Frond density

EC<sub>05</sub>: 6.0 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 3.3 to 11 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 28 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 22 to 36 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 3.2 mg a.i./LProbit Slope:  $2.45 \pm 0.302$ 

#### Growth rate

EC<sub>05</sub>: 9.7 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 5.8 to 16 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 34 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 28 to 42 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 12 mg a.i./L Probit Slope: 2.98 ± 0.383

#### Biomass (Dry weight)

EC<sub>05</sub>: 17 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 14 to 21 mg a.i./L EC<sub>50</sub>: 48 mg a.i./L 95% C.I.: 44 to 52 mg a.i./L

NOAEC: 12 mg a.i./LProbit Slope:  $3.69 \pm 0.258$ 

Endpoint(s) Affected: frond density, growth rate, and biomass

PMRA Submission Number {......

EPA MRID Number 47471204

### **III. REFERENCES:**

- 1. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1996. Series 850 Ecological Effects Test Guidelines (Draft), OPPTS Number 850.4400: Aquatic Plant Toxicity Test using Lemna spp., Tiers I and II. Washington, D.C.
- 2. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Working Draft of a Proposal for a New Guideline 221A *Lemna sp.* Growth Inhibition Test. Circulated 9 April 2004.
- 3. ASTM Standard Guide 1415-91E. 1991. Standard Guide for Conducting Static ToxicityTtests with Lemna gibba G3. American Society for Testing and Materials. Philadelphia, PA.
- 4. Microsoft Corporation, Microsoft Excel 2000. Copyright 1985-1989.
- 5. West, Inc. and D.D. Gulley. 1996. TOXSTAT® Version 3.5. Western Ecosystems Technology, Inc. Cheyenne, Wyoming.
- 6. Norberg-King, T.J. 1993. A Linear Interpolation Method for Sublethal Toxicity: The Inhibition Concentration (ICp) Approach. Version 2.0. U.S. EPA. National Effluent Toxicity Center. Duluth, Minnesota. Technical Report 03-93.

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

### APPENDIX I. OUTPUT OF REVIEWER'S STATISTICAL VERIFICATION:

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Chi-square test for normality: actual and expected frequencies

INTERVAL	<-1.5	-1.5 to <-0.5	-0.5 to 0.5	>0.5 to 1.5	>1.5
EXPECTED OBSERVED	1.407	5.082 7	8.022 6	5.082 8	1.407

Calculated Chi-Square goodness of fit test statistic = 5.7230 Table Chi-Square value (alpha = 0.01) = 13.277

Data PASS normality test. Continue analysis.

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Shapiro Wilks test for normality

D = 505.333

W = 0.978

Critical W (P = 0.05) (n = 21) = 0.908Critical W (P = 0.01) (n = 21) = 0.873

Data PASS normality test at P=0.01 level. Continue analysis.

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Hartley test for homogeneity of variance

Calculated H statistic (max Var/min Var) = 46.43 Closest, conservative, Table H statistic = 1705.0 (alpha = 0.01)

Used for Table H ==> R (# groups) = 7, df (# reps-1) = 2 Actual values ==> R (# groups) = 7, df (# avg reps-1) = 2.00

Data PASS homogeneity test. Continue analysis.

NOTE: This test requires equal replicate sizes. If they are unequal but do not differ greatly, the Hartley test may still be used as an approximate test (average df are used).

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Bartletts test for homogeneity of variance

Calculated B statistic = 7.67

Table Chi-square value = 16.81 (alpha = 0.01) Table Chi-square value = 12.59 (alpha = 0.05)

Arramana de ugad in galaulation ..... de /arra a

Average df used in calculation ==> df (avg n - 1) = 2.00 Used for Chi-square table value ==> df (#groups-1) = 6

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Data PASS homogeneity test at 0.01 level. Continue analysis.

NOTE: If groups have unequal replicate sizes the average replicate size is used to calculate the B statistic (see above).

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	
Between	6	33853.905	5642.317	156.319	
Within (Error)	14	505.333	36.095		
Total	20	34359.238			7-

Critical F value = 2.85 (0.05,6,14) Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L)
File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

		Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>			
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	sIG
1	Neg control	115.667	115.667		
2	3.258	112.667	112.667	0.612	
3	5.601	105.333	105.333	2.107	
4	11.8	102.667	102.667	2.650	*
5	24.436	73.000	73.000	8.698	*
. 6	48.2	19.000	19.000	19.706	*
7	95.314	16.333	16.333	20.250	*

Dunnett table value = 2.53 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=14.6)

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

	DUNNETTS	TEST - T	ABLE 2 OF	2 но:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENT	IFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1		Neg control	3			
2		3.258	3	12.411	10.7	3.000
. 3		5.601	3	12.411	10.7	10.333
4		11.8	3	12.411	10.7	13.000
. 5		24.436	3	12.411	10.7	42.667
6	•	48.2	3	12.411	10.7	96.667
7		95.314	3	12.411	. 10.7	99.333

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L)
File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	Neg control	3	115.667	115.667	115.667
2	3.258	3	112.667	112.667	112.667
3	5.601	3.	105.333	105.333	105.333
4	11.8	3	102.667	102.667	102.667
5	24.436	3	73.000	73.000	73.000
6	48.2	3	19.000	19.000	19.000
7	95.314	3	16.333	16.333	16.333

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) File: 1204f Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS	TEST	(Isotonic	regression	model)	TABLE 2	2 01	F 2	
 								-

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
Neg control	115.667				
3.258	112.667	0.612		1.76	k = 1, v = 14
5.601	105.333	2.106	*	1.85	k = 2, v = 14
11.8	102.667	2.650	*	1.88	k = 3, v = 14
24.436	73.000	8.698	*	1.89	k = 4, $v = 14$
48.2	19.000	19.706	*	1.90	k = 5, v = 14
95.314	16.333	20.250	*	1.91	k = 6, v = 14

s = 6.008

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower .	Upper	· ".	/Estimate	
EC5	6.0	3.3	11.	0.12	0.55	
EC10	8.5	5.0	14.	0.11	0.60	
EC25	15.	10.	22.	0.079	0.68	

Page 16 of 24

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

EC50

28.

22. 36.

0.051

0.78

Slope = 2.45 Std.Err. = 0.302

4.00

!!!Poor fit: p < 0.001 based on DF=

1204F : Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba frond no. (mg/L) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

 Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00	3.00	116.	116.	0.0737	100.	0.00
3.26	3.00	113.	114.	-1.67	98.9	1.09
5.60	3.00	105.	111.	-5.31	95.7	4.28
11.8	3.00	103.	95.1	7.54	82.3	17.7
24.4	3.00	73.0	64.8	8.20	56.1	43.9
48.2	3.00	19.0	32.9	-13.9	28.4	71.6
95.3	3.00	16.3	11.3	5.05	9.77	90.2

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION File: 1204g

Chi-square test for normality: actual and expected frequencies

INTERVAL	<-1.5	-1.5 to <-0.5	-0.5 to 0.5	>0.5 to 1.5	>1.5
EXPECTED OBSERVED	1.407	5.082 7	8.022 6	5.082 8	1.407

Calculated Chi-Square goodness of fit test statistic = 5.7230 Table Chi-Square value (alpha = 0.01) = 13.277

Data PASS normality test. Continue analysis.

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Shapiro Wilks test for normality

D = 1802.000

W =0.953

Critical W (P = 0.05) (n = 21) = 0.908Critical W (P = 0.01) (n = 21) = 0.873

Data PASS normality test at P=0.01 level. Continue analysis.

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

PMRA Submission Number {......

EPA MRID Number 47471204

Hartley test for homogeneity of variance

Calculated H statistic (max Var/min Var) = 11.08 Closest, conservative, Table H statistic = 1705.0 (alpha = 0.01)

Used for Table H ==> R (# groups) = 7, df (# reps-1) = 2 Actual values ==> R (# groups) = 7, df (# avg reps-1) = 2.00

Data PASS homogeneity test. Continue analysis.

NOTE: This test requires equal replicate sizes. If they are unequal but do not differ greatly, the Hartley test may still be used as an approximate test (average df are used).

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204a Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Bartletts test for homogeneity of variance

Calculated B statistic = 2.71
Table Chi-square value = 16.81 (alpha = 0.01)
Table Chi-square value = 12.59 (alpha = 0.05)

Average df used in calculation ==> df (avg n - 1) = 2.00 Used for Chi-square table value ==> df (#groups-1) = 6

Data PASS homogeneity test at 0.01 level. Continue analysis.

NOTE: If groups have unequal replicate sizes the average replicate size is used to calculate the B statistic (see above).

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

#### ANOVA TABLE

\_\_\_\_\_\_

COLIDGE		~~	340		
SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	ļ.,
Between	6	274634.286	45772.381	355.613	
Within (Error)	14	1802.000	128.714		
Total	20	276436.286			

Critical F value = 2.85 (0.05, 6, 14)Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho: All groups equal

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

TRANSFORMED MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS T STAT SIGNAL UNITS T STAT SIGNAL ORIGINAL UNITS T STAT SIGNAL	. 1	DUNNETTS TEST - TA	BLE 1 OF 2	Ho:Control <tr< th=""><th>eatment</th><th></th></tr<>	eatment	
2     3.258     319.333     319.333     0.468       3     5.601     310.000     310.000     1.475       4     11.8     306.333     306.333     1.871       5     24.436     257.667     257.667     7.125 *       6     48.2     65.333     65.333     27.888 *	GROUP	IDENTIFICATION			T STAT	sig
3     5.601     310.000     310.000     1.475       4     11.8     306.333     306.333     1.871       5     24.436     257.667     257.667     7.125 *       6     48.2     65.333     65.333     27.888 *	1	Neg control	323.667	323.667		
4       11.8       306.333       306.333       1.871         5       24.436       257.667       257.667       7.125 *         6       48.2       65.333       65.333       27.888 *	2	3.258	319.333	319.333	0.468	
5 24.436 257.667 257.667 7.125 * 6 48.2 65.333 65.333 27.888 *	3	5.601	310.000	310.000	1.475	
6 48.2 65.333 65.333 27.888 *	4	11.8	306.333	306.333	1.871	;
	5	24.436	257.667	257.667	7.125	*
7 95.314 43.667 43.667 30.227 *	6	48.2	65.333	65.333	27.888	*
	7	95.314	43.667	43.667	30.227	*

Dunnett table value = 2.53 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=14,6)

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - T	2 но:	Ho:Control <treatment< th=""></treatment<>		
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	Neg control	3			
2	3.258	3	23.436	7.2	4.333
. 3	5.601	3	23.436	7.2	13.667
4	11.8	.3	23.436	7.2	17.333
5	24.436	3	23.436	7.2	66.000
6	48.2	3	23.436	7.2	258.333
7	95.314	3	23.436	7.2	280.000

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1 2 3 4 5 6	Neg control 3.258 5.601 11.8 24.436 48.2 95.314	3 3 3 3 3	323.667 319.333 310.000 306.333 257.667 65.333 43.667	323.667 319.333 310.000 306.333 257.667 65.333 43.667	323.667 319.333 310.000 306.333 257.667 65.333 43.667

Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L) File: 1204g Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

ISOTONIZED CALC. SIG TABLE DEGREES OF

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

IDENTIFICATION	MEAN	WILLIAMS	P=.05	WILLIAMS	FREEDOM	ŀ
 Neg control	323.667					Ī
3.258	319.333	0.468		1.76	k=1, v=14	ŀ
5.601	310.000	1.475		1.85	k = 2, v = 14	İ
11.8	306.333	1.871		1.88	k = 3, v = 14	
24.436	257.667	7.125	*	1.89	k = 4, v = 14	
48.2	65.333	27.888	*	1.90	k = 5, v = 14	ļ.
95.314	43.667	30.227	*	1.91	k = 6, v = 14	
the state of the s				and the second second		!

s = 11.345

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

#### Estimates of EC%

 Parameter
 Estimate
 95% Bounds
 Std.Err.
 Lower Bound

 Lower
 Upper
 /Estimate

 EC5
 9.7
 5.8
 16.
 0.10
 0.60

 EC10
 13.
 8.3
 20.
 0.090
 0.65

 EC25
 20.
 15.
 28.
 0.066
 0.73

 EC50
 34.
 28.
 42.
 0.043
 0.81

Slope = 2.98 Std.Err. = 0.383

!!!Poor fit: p < 0.001 based on DF= 4.00 14.0

1204G : Dimethyl disulfide & L. gibba growth rate (mg/L)

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00	3.00	324.	325.	-1.29	100.	0.00
3.26	3.00	319.	325.	-5.26	99.9	0.114
5.60	3.00	310.	322.	-11.9	99.1	0.940
11.8	3.00	306.	298.	8.33	91.7	8.30
24.4	3.00	258.	218.	39.5	67.1	32.9
48.2	3.00	65.3	108.	-42.5	33.2	66.8
95.3	3.00	43.7	30.5	13.1	9.39	90.6

Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L) File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

Chi-square test for normality: actual and expected frequencies

INTERVAL	<-1.5	-1.5 to <-0.5	-0.5 to 0.5	>0.5 to 1.5	>1.5
EXPECTED OBSERVED	1.407	5.082	8.022 6	5.082 8	1.407

Calculated Chi-Square goodness of fit test statistic = 5.7230 Table Chi-Square value (alpha = 0.01) = 13.277

Data PASS normality test. Continue analysis.

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

```
Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L)
File: 1204b
                 Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION
Shapiro Wilks test for normality
D = 4.187
W = 0.936
Critical W (P = 0.05) (n = 21) = 0.908
Critical W (P = 0.01) (n = 21) = 0.873
Data PASS normality test at P=0.01 level. Continue analysis.
Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L)
File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION
Hartley test for homogeneity of variance
Calculated H statistic (max Var/min Var) = 19.19
Closest, conservative, Table H statistic = 1705.0 (alpha = 0.01)
Used for Table H ==> R (\# groups) = 7,
                                                 df (\# reps-1) =
Actual values => R (# groups) = 7, df (# avg reps-1) = 2.00
Data PASS homogeneity test. Continue analysis.
NOTE: This test requires equal replicate sizes. If they are unequal
      but do not differ greatly, the Hartley test may still be used
      as an approximate test (average df are used).
Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L)
File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION
Bartletts test for homogeneity of variance
Calculated B statistic = 6.99
Table Chi-square value = 16.81 (alpha = 0.01)
Table Chi-square value = 12.59 (alpha = 0.05)
Average df used in calculation ==> df (avg n - 1) = 2.00 Used for Chi-square table value ==> df (#groups-1) = 6
Data PASS homogeneity test at 0.01 level. Continue analysis.
NOTE: If groups have unequal replicate sizes the average replicate size is
      used to calculate the B statistic (see above).
Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L)
File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION
```

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

#### ANOVA TABLE

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F
Between	6	172.256	28.709	96.017
Within (Error)	14	4.187	0.299	
Total	20	176.443		

Critical F value = 2.85 (0.05,6,14)

Since F > Critical F REJECT Ho:All groups equal

Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L) File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

DUNNETTS TEST - TABLE 1 OF 2 Ho:Control<Treatment

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	TRANSFORMED MEAN	MEAN CALCULATED IN ORIGINAL UNITS	T STAT	SIG
1	Neg control	9.500	9.500		
2	3.258	9.067	9.067	0.971	
3	5.601	8.767	8.767	1.643	
4	11.8	8.700	8.700	1.792	
5	24.436	7.833	7.833	3.733	*
6	48.2	4.433	4.433	11.348	*
7	95.314	1.200	1.200	18.590	*

Dunnett table value = 2.53 (1 Tailed Value, P=0.05, df=14,6)

Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L) File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

	DUNNETTS TEST - T	PABLE 2 OF	2 Ho:	Control <t< th=""><th>reatment</th></t<>	reatment
GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	NUM OF REPS	Minimum Sig Diff (IN ORIG. UNITS)	% of CONTROL	DIFFERENCE FROM CONTROL
1	Neg control	3			
2	3.258	3	1.130	11.9	0.433
3	5.601	3	1.130	11.9	0.733
4	11.8	3	1.130	11.9	0.800
5	24.436	- 3	1.130	11.9	1.667
6	48.2	3	1.130	11.9	5.067
7	95.314	3	1 130	11.9	8 300

Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L) File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 1 OF 2

PMRA Submission Number {......}

EPA MRID Number 47471204

GROUP	IDENTIFICATION	N	ORIGINAL MEAN	TRANSFORMED MEAN	ISOTONIZED MEAN
1	Neg control	L 3	9.500	9.500	9.500
2	3.258	3 3	9.067	9.067	9.067
3	5.601	L 3	8.767	8.767	8.767
4	11.8	3	8.700	8.700	8.700
5	24.436	5 3	7.833	7.833	7.833
6	48.2	3	4.433	4.433	4.433
7	95.314	1 3	1.200	1.200	1.200

Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L) File: 1204b Transform: NO TRANSFORMATION

WILLIAMS TEST (Isotonic regression model) TABLE 2 OF 2

IDENTIFICATION	ISOTONIZED MEAN	CALC. WILLIAMS	SIG P=.05	TABLE WILLIAMS	DEGREES OF FREEDOM
Neg control	9.500				
3.258	9.067	0.971		1.76	k= 1, v=14
5.601	8.767	1.642		1.85	k = 2, v = 14
11.8	8.700	1.792		1.88	k = 3, v = 14
24.436	7.833	3.733	*	1.89	k = 4, v = 14
48.2	4.433	11.347	*	1.90	k = 5, v = 14
95.314	1.200	18.589	*	1.91	k = 6, v = 14

s = 0.547

Note: df used for table values are approximate when v > 20.

#### Estimates of EC%

Parameter	Estimate	95% Bou	nds	Std.Err.	Lower Bound	
		Lower	Upper		/Estimate	
EC5	17.	14.	21.	0.044	0.81	
EC10	21.	18.	26.	0.038	0.83	
EC25	31.	27.	36.	0.027	0.88	
EC50	48.	44.	52.	0.017	0.92	

Goodness of fit: p = 0.64 based on DF= 4.0 14.

1204B : Dimethyl Disulfide & L. gibba 7-day Biomass (mg/L)

Observed vs. Predicted Treatment Group Means

Dose	#Reps.	Obs. Mean	Pred. Mean	Obs. -Pred.	Pred. %Control	%Change
0.00	3.00	9.50	9.05	0.448	100.	0.00
3.26	3.00	9.07	9.05	0.0145	100.	0.000853
5.60	3.00	8.77	9.05	-0.283	100.	0.0301
11.8	3.00	8.70	8.94	-0.237	98.7	1.27
24.4	3.00	7.83	7.76	0.0729	85.7	14.3
48.2	3.00	4.43	4.45	-0.0158	49.1	50.9

PMRA Submissio	n Number	{}			EPA MRID Number 47471204			
				·				
95.3	3.00	1.20	1.20 0.00	13.	2 86.8			