OPP OFFICIAL RECORD HEALTH EFFECTS DIVISION SCIENTIFIC DATA REVIEWS EPA SERIES 361

Primary Review by: Stephen C. Dapson, Ph.D. St

DATA EVALUATION RECORD

Study Type: Multigeneration Reproduction

Species: rat Guideline: §83-4

EPA ID #(s).: EPA MRID No. 00031684

EPA Pesticide Chemical Code 030703

Toxicology Chemical No. 780A

Test Material: Alanap Technical

Synonyms: Sodium N-1-naphthylphthalamate, naptalam

Sponsor: Uniroyal Chemical Co., Research and Development, Bethany CT 06525

Testing Facility: Food and Drug Research Laboratories, Inc.

Title of Report: Multigeneration Evaluation of Alanap Technical

in the Sprague-Dawley Rat

Study Number(s): 5847

Author(s): Larry Gephart, Francis J. Foschier, Richard A. Parent

Report Issued: January 11, 1980

Conclusions: Albino rats of the Sprague-Dawley BLU: (SD) strain from Blue Spruce Farms, Inc. (Alamont, NY 12009) received either 0, 120, 600, or 3000 ppm of Alanap Technical in the diet. No specific treatment related effects were noted on maternal/paternal parameters measured, although there was a slight effect on body weight gains in the high dose group. The reproductive parameters were unaffected by treatment. Possible systemic toxicity was noted in the offspring in the form of statistically significantly reduced mean pup body weights in the high dose group.

PARENTAL/SYSTEMIC TOXICITY NOEL = 600 ppm PARENTAL/SYSTEMIC TOXICITY LOEL = 3000 ppm

REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY NOEL ≥ 3000 ppm REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY LOEL > 3000 ppm

Core Classification: Core Minimum Data

This study satisfies the 1984 Pesticide Assessment Guideline (40 CFR §158.340, §83-4) for a multigeneration reproduction study in rats.

8

Part Valley

83-4

I. Materials and Methods: A copy of the "materials and methods" section from the investigators report is appended.

2

And the same of th

Test Compound: Alanap s Technical

Purity: 91 %

Density: not provided Description: not provided

Lot No.: BL 9328 CC0005, BL 9351 CC0002 Receipt date: 4/4/78, 11/27/78, 12/18/78

Contaminants: not provided

Vehicle(s): test compound added to the diet

Test Animal(s): Species: Albino rat

Strain: Sprague-Dawley BLU: (SD)

Source: Blue Spruce Farms, Inc., Alamont, NY 12009

Age: unknown - "weanling"

Body Weight: 93.6-98.2 g - males; 89.4-93.9 g

- females at start of study

INFO on males: same as above

The rats were acclimated for a period of 5 days before they were placed into the study.

Animal Husbandry:

Animals were kept under standard animal care conditions and received Agway Charles River RHM 3200 commercial laboratory chow (Agway, Waverly, NY) and tap water ad libitum.

Mating Procedure:

One male was caged with 1 female from the same test group for 6 days or until a sperm plug was noted in the cage pan. This was considered as Gestation Day 0. If a sperm plug was not found after 6 days observation, the first male was removed and replaced by another male, this was repeated again if necessary. Brothersister matings were avoided.

After successful mating, each pregnant female was individually placed into a cage with a solid bottom and bedding where they were kept through gestation and lactation.

The F_0 parental animals were given test diets for 10 weeks before they were mated. Selection of parents for the F_1 generation was made when the pups were 21 days of age, and the mated animals in the study were approximately 100 days of age at mating.

Group Arrangement:

 F_0 animals were randomly assigned to test groups as follows:

| | groups Designation | Dose (ppm)* | Animals Males | per group** Females |
|---|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Control | 0 | 20 | 20 |
| 2 | Low (LDT) | 120 | 20 | 20 |
| 3 | Mid (MDT) | 600 | 20 | 20 |
| 4 | High (HDT) | 3000 | 20 | 20 |

^{*} Diets were administered from the beginning of the study until the animals were sacrificed.

Dose Administration:

Test diets were analyzed for homogeneity of mixtures and chemical stability in dietary mixtures .

Observations:

Parental animals:

Observations and the schedule for those observations is summarized from the report as follows:

| Type of observation | Number of animals per sex per group | Frequency |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Mortality and signs of toxicity | All | Daily |
| Detailed clinical observations | A11 | Daily |
| Body weight | All | Weekly from initiation to mating |
| | Maternal animals | Gestation Days 1, 8, 15, 28, 35 & 42 |
| | Paternal animals | not stated |
| Food consumption | All | as for body weight |

^{** 25} animals were picked from the F_{1a} litters as parents for the F_1 and F_2 generations.

Reproductive performance:

Parental reproductive performance was assessed from breeding and parturition records of animals in the study. A mating was considered successful if a sperm plug was found on the cage pan.

The fertility index (# pregnancies/# matings) and gestation index (# litters cast alive/# pregnancies) were calculated.

Litter observations:

According to the report, the following litter observations were made:

| | Time of | observation | (lactation day) |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Observation | Birth | Day 4 | Day 21 |
| Number of live pups | X | X - | x |
| Pup weight | X | X | X |
| External alterations | not stated | | |
| Number of dead pups | assumed all | time points | • |
| Sex of each pup | | X | X |

It is assumed that dead pups were examined grossly for external and internal abnormalities, and a possible cause of death was determined for pups born or found dead.

The viability index (# pups alive at 4 days/# pup cast alive) and lactation index (# pups alive at 21 days/# pups culled to at 4 day or percent of dams able to maintain all pups after culling until weaning at 21 day) Were calculated.

Necropsy

Parental animals:

It was assumed that all surviving parental males were sacrificed and all maternal animals were sacrificed after the last litter of each generation was weaned and subjected to post mortem examinations.

Offspring:

The F_1 , and F_3 offspring were sacrificed at 21 days of age. These animals were subjected to post mortem examinations. The F2 weanlings were ...inadvertently discarded (this was discussed with the Agency, letter which describes phone conversation with R.Engler and T.A.Re was included).

83-4

Necropsy observations:

Gross necropsy consisted of external and internal examinations including the cervical, thoracic, and abdominal viscera. The following tissues were prepared for microscopic examination: brain, pituitary gland, eyes, thyroid glands, parathyroid glands, lungs, heart, liver, spleen, kidneys, adrenal glands, stomach, pancreas, large intestine, small intestine, testes or ovaries, epididymides, prostate and seminal vesicles or uterus and vagina, mammary glands (2), altered tissues, and tissue masses.

Statistical analysis:

The following statistical methodology was used (from the investigators report):

continuous reproductive data were evaluated using an Analysis of Variance with one-way classification. Treatment differences were declared significant when the probability of committing at Type I error was less than or equal to 5% (pi0.05) (Least Significant Difference Test).

The control. Differences wire declared significant and large.

- Penisyles, Fig. Scherk, M.A., Contisting With Assistance to the Thelorital and Health Sciences, Prentise-Hall, Int., Englances Classes, NV (1977).
- 2 Sherieger, C.W. and Cochran, W.S., 95% confidence intervely pergent for sincrial distribution in statistical methods, full ed., p. 5, lowe State University press, Ames, Iowa (1967)

Historical control data were not provided to allow comparison with concurrent controls.

Compliance:

A signed statement of confidentiality claims was not provided.

A signed statement of compliance with EPA GLP's FR 40 Part 160 was not provided (partially under FDA GLP's).

A signed quality assurance statement was provided.

A signed Flagging Statement for Potential Adverse Effects under 40 CFR 158.34 was not provided.

83-4

II. Results:

A. Analysis of test diets:

Provided information was difficult to interpret.

B. Parental animals

1. Mortality and clinical signs:

There was no indication if any animals died on study. The investigators reported that there were no daily observations that were related to treatment with the test compound; however, no data were provided.

2. Body weight and food consumption:

Reported body weight and selected food consumption results are summarized as follows:

| | | Dose gro | опъ | |
|------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-------|
| Observation & study we | k Control | Low | Mid | High |
| F ₀ Ge | neration Mal | es - Pre- | mating | |
| Mean body weight (g) | | | | |
| 0 | 97.3 | 93.6 | 98.2 | 96.7 |
| 10 | 404.8 | 395.3 | 406.1 | 401.0 |
| Mean weight gain (g) | 101.0 | 333.3 | 100.1 | 101.0 |
| 0 - 10 | 307.5 | 301.7 | 307.9 | 304.3 |
| Mean food consumption | | | 307.9 | 204.2 |
| | · • | | 105 1 | 100 0 |
| 1 | 128.7 | 122.9 | 125.3 | 123.3 |
| 2 | 155.4 | 153.6 | 153.8 | 148.6 |
| 10 | 167.6 | 169.5 | 168.0 | 167.8 |
| F ₀ Gen | eration Fema | iles - Pre | -mating | |
| Mean body weight (g) | | | | |
| 0 | 90.9 | 93.9 | 90.0 | 89.4 |
| 10 | 238.9 | 239.2 | 242.6 | 232.2 |
| Mean weight gain (g) | 230.3 | 233.2 | | |
| 0 - 10 | 148.0 | 145.3 | 152.6 | 142.8 |
| Mean food consumption | | | | |
| 1 | 110.0 | 112.4 | 111.4 | 108.3 |
| 2 | 121.2 | 124.9 | 126.5 | 121.7 |
| | | | | |
| 5 | 133.1 | 131.8 | 131.3 | 127.5 |
| 7 | 128.6 | 126.3 | 125.5 | 123.7 |
| 10 | 123.4 | 121.6 | 120.8 | 120.6 |
| | | | continue | |
| | | | COLICERIAC | |

83-4

| | | Dose group | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------|
| Observation & study we | ek Control | | High |
| | | es - Pre-mating | |
| · | Metacion Mar | ar and the | |
| Mean body weight (g) | 105 3 | 192.0 193.4 | 182.5 |
| 0 | 195.2 | | |
| 8 | 407.7 | 401.7 418.9 | 387.6 |
| Mean weight gain (g) | 040 = | 222 5 225 5 | |
| 0 - 8 | 212.5 | | 205.1 |
| Mean food consumption | | | |
| 1 | | 165.0 170.0 | |
| 2 | 188.3 | | |
| 4 | 192.6 | 185.9 193.2 | 184.3 |
| 8 | 178.4 | 178.3 178.6 | 174.4 |
| F ₁ Ger | eration Fema | les - Pre-mating | |
| Mean body weight (g) | | | |
| 0 | 140.0 | 141.6 141.0 | 133.4 |
| 8 | 237.6 | 235.7 247.9 | |
| Mean weight gain (g) | 237.0 | 233.7 | 227.0 |
| 0 - 8 | 97.6 | 94.1 106.9 | 94.2 |
| Mean food consumption | | | 74.4 |
| 1 | 128.3 | 128.2 139.4 | 119.6 |
| | 140.6 | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 4 | 148.9 | 148.7 161.0 | |
| 8 | 143.4 | 138.8 145.3 | 136.8 |
| F ₂ Ge | eneration Mal | es - Pre-mating | |
| Mean body weight (g) | | | |
| 0 | 144.8 | 145.0 162.1 | 146.3 |
| 8 | 370.4 | 367.8 389.2 | 359.2 |
| Mean weight gain (g) | | | |
| 0 - 8 | 225.6 | 222.8 227.1 | 212.9 |
| Mean food consumption | (g/rat/week) | | |
| 1 | 160.3 | 158.6 171.6 | 167.3 |
| 2 | 180.5 | 177.4 186.8 | |
| 4 | 185.7 | 183.0 190.6 | |
| 8 | 179.1 | 182.8 189.1 | |
| | | les - Pre-mating | 103.2 |
| • • | TALGETON LAME | - Fre-macing | |
| Mean body weight (g) | 114 " | 110 0 100 0 | 110 6 |
| 0 | 114.5 | | |
| 8 | 227.8 | 224.4 231.4 | 220.1 |
| Mean weight gain (g) | 110.0 | 440 6 400 0 | |
| 0 - 8 | 113.3 | | 101.5 |
| Mean food consumption | | | |
| 1 | 130.8 | 130.2 135.6 | |
| 2 | 140.2 | | |
| 4 | 147.3 | | |
| 8 | 142.7 | | |
| * * P < 0.05 as compared | | | |
| Data extracted from Laborat | ory Report No | . 5847, Tables 11 th | rough 22 |

. .

Selected group mean body weight values for pregnant or nursing dams were summarized in the report as follows:

| | | | | • | Dose grou | P | |
|-------------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Observation | | | Control | . Low | Mid | High | |
| | | | | F ₀ Gen | eration - Li | tter A | |
| Mean | body | weight | (g) | - days | after plug | | |
| 0 | | | | 238.4 | 242.7 | 246.8 | 231.9 |
| 8 | | • | | 261.1 | 268.0 | 271.1 | 260.6 |
| 15 | | | | 287.9 | 300.4 | 304.2 | 289.5 |
| 19 | | | | 329.9 | 342.7 | 343.2 | 326.9 |
| 28 | | | | 285.5 | 291.4 | 291.4 | 278.2 |
| 3 5 | | | | 298.4 | 309.8 | 309.2 | 290.1 |
| 4.2 | | | | 294.4 | 299.1 | 310.2 | 293.8 |
| | | | | F ₁ Gene | eration - Lit | ter A | |
| Mean | body | weight | (g) | - days | after plug | | |
| 0 | | | | 247.1 | | 257.0 | |
| 8 | | | | 273.1 | | | |
| 15 | | | | 303.8 | | 322.4* | 294.2 |
| 19 | | | | 346.0 | | 368.0* | |
| 28 | | | | 298.6 | | 313.1 | |
| 3 5 | | | | | 310.1 | | |
| 42 | | | | 311.3 | | 322.8 | 291.9* |
| | | | | F ₂ Gen | eration - Li | tter A | |
| Mean | body | weight | (g) | | after plug | | |
| 0 | | | | 229.6 | | 236.8 | 224.0 |
| 8 | | | | 259.7 | | 266.9 | 253.7 |
| 15 | | | | 290.0 | | 299.8 | 285.7 |
| 19 | | | | 334.2 | | | 323.2 |
| 28 | | | | 285.2 | | 294.0 | 277.0 |
| 3 5 | | | | | 299.8 | | |
| 42 | | | | 284.6 | 294.0 | 300.0 | 286.4 |
| * * | P < 0. | .05 as co | mpare | d to con | trol | | |
| Data | extrac | ted from | Lab | oratory R | eport No. 5847, | TADIOS 34 | through 20 |

Very slight effects were noted in the high dose males and females; however, only the F_1 and F_2 females were close to a 10% difference from control.

Food consumption was occasionally reduced in the high dose groups.

010741

83-4

3. Test Substance Intake:

Data were not provided by the investigators, direct calculation using a factor of 0.050 to convert ppm into mg/kg/day gives 6, 30, and 150 mg/kg/day for the 120, 600, and 3000 ppm dose groups, respectively.

9

4. Reproductive performance:

Results for the parental animals and offspring are summarized from the report as follows:

| Observation F ₀ | Control Generation | group Low - Litter A | Mid | High |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Precoital interval (days) | not provid | | | |
| Mated | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Fertile | not provid | | | , |
| | Fema1 | | | |
| Number mated | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Number fertile | 17 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Fertility index (%) | 85 | 100* | 100* | 100* |
| Gestation interval (days) | not provid | ded | | |
| Number of litters | | | | |
| Day 1 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Day 4 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 20 |
| Day 21 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| Gestation index (%) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Mean litter size | | | | |
| Birth | 11.4 | 12.3 | 12.9* | 11.0 |
| Day 4 | 11.2 | 11.9 | 12.9 | 10.8 |
| Day 4C | 8.0 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 7.7 |
| Day 21 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 7.7 |
| Number of pups | | | | |
| Day 1 | 193 | 246 | 258 | 220 |
| Day 4 | 191 | 237* | 245* | 213* |
| Day 4C | 136 | 158 | 152 | 154 |
| Day 21 | 135 | 151* | 152 | 154 |
| Pups born dead | 8 | 7 | 1* | 2* |
| Pup deaths (Days 1-21) | 9 | 7 | 1* | 2* |
| Viability Index (%) | 99 | 96* | 95* | 97* |
| | 99 | 96* | 100 | 100 |
| Dam Lactation Index (%) | 100 | 90 | 100 | 100 |
| Mean litter weight (g) | | | | |
| Day 1 | 68.7(2.9) | 77.1(2.6) | , , | |
| Day 4 | 79.8(2.2) | 76.2(3.5) | 77.8(2.0) | • |
| Mean pup weight (g) day 21 | 51.4(1.2) | 52.0(0.7) | 51.4(1.0) continued | 47.5*(1.5) |

10

| 8 | 3 | _ | 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | |

| | Dose | group | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|------------|-----------|------|
| Observation | Control | Low | Mid | High |
| F ₁ | Generation | - Litter A | • | |
| Precoital interval (days) | not provid | ded | | |
| · | Male | | • | |
| Mated | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Fertile | not provid | | | |
| | Femal | | | |
| Number mated | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Number fertile | 23 | 23 | 24 | 23 |
| Fertility index (%) | 92 | 92 | 96 | 92 |
| Gestation interval (days) | not provid | ded | | |
| Number of litters | | | | |
| Day 1 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 23 |
| Day 4 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 23 |
| Day 21 | 23 | 22 | 24 | 23 |
| Gestation index (%) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Mean litter size | | | | |
| Birth | 13.4 | 13.2 | 14.1 | 13.1 |
| Day 4 | 13.4 | 13.1 | 14.0 | 13.1 |
| Day 4C | 9.7 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| Day 21 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| Number of pups | | 224 | 222 | 200 |
| Day 1 | 309 | 304 | 338 | 302 |
| Day 4 | 309 | 301 | 335 | 301 |
| Day 4C | 224 | 230 | 241 | 226 |
| Day 21 | 224 | 229 | 241 | 226 |
| Pups born dead | 1 | 3 | 4* | 1 |
| Pup deaths (Days 1-21) | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Viability Index (%) | 100 | 99* | 99 | 100 |
| Pup Lactation Index (| s) 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Dam Lactation Index (| s) 100 | 90 | 100 | 100 |
| Mean litter weight (g) | | | | |
| Day 1 | , 0 . 1 (3.1) | | 83.1(2.0) | |
| Day 4 | 92.1(2.7) | 96.6(2.2) | | |
| Mean pup weight (g) day 21 | 47.4(1.1) | 46.4(0.6) | 46.1(0.8) | |

continued

| Observation F2 (| Dose group Control | Low - Litter A | Rid | High |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| • | | | | |
| Precoital interval (days) | not provid | | | |
| Mated | 25 | 2 5 | 25 | 25 |
| Pertile Pertile | not provid | - | 23 | 20 |
| 1410114 | Femal | | | |
| Number mated | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Number fertile | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 |
| Fertility index (%) | 96 | 100 | 96 | 96 |
| Gastation interval (days) | not provid | | | - * |
| Number of litters | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | |
| Day 1 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 |
| Day 4 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 |
| Day 21 | 24 | 25 | 23 | 23 |
| Gestation index (%) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Mean litter size | | | | |
| Birth | 12.5 | 13.0 | 12.5 | 12.8 |
| Day 4 | 12.4 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 12.7 |
| Day 4C | 9.8 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Day 21 | 9.8 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| Number of pups | | | | |
| Day 1 | 301 | 326 | 301 | 308 |
| Day 4 | 298 | 322 | 301 | 305 |
| Day 4C | 236 | 249 | 239 | 239 |
| Day 21 | 236 | 247 | 238 | 238 |
| Pups born dead | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Pup deaths (Days 1-21) | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| Viability Index (%) | 99 | 99 | 100 | 99 |
| Pup Lactation Index (%) | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 |
| Dam Lactation Index (%) | 100 | 100 | 96 | 96 |
| Mean litter weight (g) | | | | |
| Day 1 | 74.2(3.1) | 76.1(2.0) | 74.8(2.0) | 75.5(2.2) |
| Day 4 | 97.9(2.9) | 92.0(2.7) | 96.9(2.8) | 92.2(2.1) |
| Mean pup weight (g) day 21 | 48.2(0.9) | 48.4(1.0) | 48.0(0.9) | 42.7*(0.6) |
| * = p < 0.05 as compared to | | | | |
| Data extracted from Laboratory | Report No. | 5847, Tables | 1 - 10 and | 27 - 29. |

The reproductive parameters were unaffected by treatment. The only notable observation in the above data is the statistically significantly reduced mean pup body weights in the high dose group.

5. Necropsy results

a. Organ weights:

Not provided.

b. Pathology

i. Macroscopic examination:

No treatment related effects were noted in the provided data (investigator's summary is attached).

ii. Microscopic examination:

No treatment related effects were noted in the provided data (investigator's summary is attached).

6. Study Deficiencies

This study was conducted prior to the 1984 and 1978 Guidelines; however, the study fulfills the minimum data requirements under the Core Guidelines from 1977 and does have evidence of mimimal systemic toxicity at the high dose.

III. DISCUSSION

No specific treatment related effects were noted on maternal/paternal parameters measured, although there was a slight effect on body weight gains in the high dose group. The reproductive parameters were unaffected by treatment. Possible systemic toxicity was noted in the offspring in the form of statistically significantly reduced mean pup body weights in the high dose group.

PARENTAL/SYSTEMIC TOXICITY NOBL = 600 ppm PARENTAL/SYSTEMIC TOXICITY LOBL = 3000 ppm

REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY NOBL ≥ 3000 ppm REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY LOBL > 3000 ppm

Core Classification: Core Minimum Data

This study satisfies the 1984 Pesticide Assessment Guideline (40 CFR \$158.340, §83-4) for a multigeneration reproduction study in rats.

| Page is not included in this copy. |
|--|
| Pages <u>14</u> through <u>20</u> are not included in this copy. |
| |
| The material not included contains the following type of information: |
| Identity of product inert ingredients. |
| Identity of product impurities. |
| Description of the product manufacturing process. |
| Description of quality control procedures. |
| Identity of the source of product ingredients. |
| Sales or other commercial/financial information. |
| A draft product label. |
| The product confidential statement of formula. |
| Information about a pending registration action. |
| \underline{X} FIFRA registration data. |
| The document is a duplicate of page(s) |
| The document is not responsive to the request. |
| Internal deliberative information. |
| Attorney-Client work product. |
| \underline{X} Claimed Confidential by submitter upon submission to the Agency. |



R058679

Chemical:

Benzoic acid, 2-((1-naphthalenylamino)ca

PC Code:

030702

HED File Code

13000 Tox Reviews

Memo Date:

11/18/93 12:00:00 AM

File ID:

00000000

Accession Number:

412-04-0046

HED Records Reference Center 03/25/2004