EFFICACY REVIEW

080301

DATE: IN 9-29-89 OUT 1-31-90

FILE OR REG. NO. 2596-114

PETITION OR EXP. PERMIT NO.

DATE DIV. RECEIVED September 18, 1989

DATE OF SUBMISSION September 13, 1989

DATE SUBMISSION ACCEPTED

TYPE PRODUCT(S): (I), D, H, F, N, R, S

DATA ACCESSION NO(S). 412382-01; 412382-02; 412382-03; Record Number: 252174; Action Code: 305

PRODUCT MGR. NO. 15-LaRocca

PRODUCT NAME(S) Hartz® Blockade® for Cats

COMPANY NAME The Hartz Mountain Corporation

SUBMISSION PURPOSE Provide performance data obtained according to a company devised protocol in support of claims of toxicity to and repellency of deer tick on cats.

CHEMICAL & FORMULATION

| | |
|---|---|
| N,N-Diethyl-m-toluamide | 8.55% |
| Other isomers | 0.45% |
| Cyano (3-phenoxyphenyl) methyl-4-chloro-alpha-(1-methylethyl) benzeneacetate | 0.09% |

(non-aqueous pressurized liquid spray, 7 or 13 fl. oz.)

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS The data presented in EPA Accession (MRID) Number 412382-01, having been obtained according to a company devised protocol which incorporates all essential requirements of § 95-9(a)(2) and (3) on p. 263 and meets the standard of § 95-9(b)(2)(i) on p. 264 of the Product Performance Guidelines, are adequate to demonstrate the effectiveness of the subject product in repelling and killing the deer tick, Ixodes dammini, the carrier of Lyme disease, when applied according to label directions. The data presented in MRID Number 412382-02, having been obtained according to a company devised protocol which incorporates essential requirements of § 95-9(a)(3) on p. 264 of the Guidelines, are adequate to demonstrate the effectiveness of the subject product as a repellent to the deer tick on dogs when applied according to label directions. The data presented in MRID Number 412382-03, having been obtained according to a company devised protocol which incorporates essential requirements of § 95-9(a)(2) and (3) on p. 263 and meets the standard of § 95-9(b)(2)(i) on p. 264 of the Guidelines, are adequate to demonstrate the effectiveness of the subject product in killing the deer tick on dogs when applied according to label directions. The data indicate that the in vitro method overestimates the amount of spray required per pound of animal body weight by about 5% when applied as a repellent but underestimates the amount required when applied as a toxicant by about 23%. Also, the "2 seconds per pound of body weight" overestimates the time to cover a shorthaired animal and underestimates the time to cover a longhaired animal but neither is significant. The acceptability of these claims on cats in the absence of data on cats is conditional upon the rate applied being safely below the no effect level for toxicity to cats as established after the toxicity 'scare' of recent years.

RL Dana L. McFarland, IRB