112701	
Shaughnessy	No.

## Data Evaluation Record

## **BRODIFACOUM**

Wild Mammal Toxicity Test

REASON FOR SUBMISSION:  FIFRA '88 Reregistration.  RESULTS- Valid	CITATION: Ringer, R.K. and Richard J. Aulerich. Date no given, but, c. 1979. Determination o oral LD <sub>50</sub> of Brodifacoum for mink. Submitted by ICI Americas, Inc., Agricultural Products Wilmington, Delaware 19897. RR 90-292 B.					nation of Products,	
FIFRA '88 Reregistration.  RESULTS- Valid							
RESULTS- Valid Invalid Supplemental _X Not Satisfied Not Satisfied X  DISCUSSION:  No DER was found in EEB's files for this study. The two highest concentrations are too widel separated to be of use. Each successively larger concentration should be 1.66 times that of the on before (or be about 0.6 of the one larger than itself). The sixth group is so much larger (4.7 times mg/kg (1.66 X 2.24 mg/kg) and the animals had still died, the LD <sub>50</sub> meaningless. If it had been 3.7 though the mortality remained the same. We cannot tell the difference between the two possibilities and 3.24 mg/kg. If it was believed that a higher range of concentrations was needed, then the entire range should have been increased, not just its highest member.  Some animals had bloody stools even at the 0.116 mg/kg level, therefore, the NOEL = 0.04 mg/kg.  If, as stated, the species presented a difficulty because food passes through their digestive tract to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally conclusions:  CONCLUSIONS:  The study is classified as "Supplementary" No LD <sub>50</sub> but a NOEL 0.04 mg/kg.  REVIEWED BY:  James J. Goodyear  Signature:							
GUIDELINE-  Satisfied Partially Satisfied Not Satisfied X  DISCUSSION:  No DER was found in EEB's files for this study. The two highest concentrations are too widel separated to be of use. Each successively larger concentration should be 1.66 times that of the on before (or be about 0.6 of the one larger than itself). The sixth group is so much larger (4.7 times mg/kg (1.66 X 2.24 mg/kg) and the animals had still died, the LD <sub>50</sub> meaningless. If it had been 3.7 though the mortality remained the same. We cannot tell the difference between the two possibilities and 3.24 mg/kg. If it was believed that a higher range of concentrations was needed, then the entire same should have been increased, not just its highest member.  Some animals had bloody stools even at the 0.116 mg/kg level, therefore, the NOEL = 0.04 mg/kg.  If, as stated, the species presented a difficulty because food passes through their digestive tract to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally and, therefore, the high LD <sub>50</sub> accurately reflects the conditions in the wild.  CONCLUSIONS:  The study is classified as "Supplementary" No LD <sub>50</sub> but a NOEL 0.04 mg/kg.  REVIEWED BY:  James J. Goodyear  Biologist, Section 1  Signature:  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart  Acting Head, Section 1  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:	RESULTS.						
DISCUSSION:  No DER was found in EEB's files for this study. The two highest concentrations are too widel separated to be of use. Each successively larger concentration should be 1.66 times that of the on before (or be about 0.6 of the one larger than itself). The sixth group is so much larger (4.7 times mg/kg (1.66 X 2.24 mg/kg) and the animals had still died, the Loso would drop to 3.73 mg/kg ever though the mortality remained the same. We cannot tell the difference between the two possibilities and 3.24 mg/kg. If it was believed that a higher range of concentrations was needed, then the entire same should have been increased, not just its highest member.  Some animals had bloody stools even at the 0.116 mg/kg level, therefore, the NOEL = 0.04 mg/kg.  If, as stated, the species presented a difficulty because food passes through their digestive tract to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally and, therefore, the high LD <sub>50</sub> accurately reflects the conditions in the wild.  CONCLUSIONS:  The study is classified as "Supplementary" No LD <sub>50</sub> but a NOEL 0.04 mg/kg.  REVIEWED BY:  James J. Goodyear Biologist, Section 1  Signature:  Signature:  Date:  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart  Acting Head, Section 1  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:			Invalid _		Supplemental	Sunnlemental	
No DER was found in EEB's files for this study. The two highest concentrations are too widely separated to be of use. Each successively larger concentration should be 1.66 times that of the one before (or be about 0.6 of the one larger than itself). The sixth group is so much larger (4.7 times mg/kg (1.66 X 2.24 mg/kg) and the animals had still died, the LD <sub>50</sub> meaningless. If it had been 3.7 though the mortality remained the same. We cannot tell the difference between the two possibilities and 3.24 mg/kg. If it was believed that a higher range of concentrations was needed, then the entire range should have been increased, not just its highest member.  Some animals had bloody stools even at the 0.116 mg/kg level, therefore, the NOEL = 0.04 mg/kg.  If, as stated, the species presented a difficulty because food passes through their digestive tract to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally and, therefore, the high LD <sub>50</sub> accurately reflects the conditions in the wild.  CONCLUSIONS:  The study is classified as "Supplementary" No LD <sub>50</sub> but a NOEL 0.04 mg/kg.  REVIEWED BY:  James J. Goodyear  Biologist, Section 1  Signature:  Date:  Mary 19 91  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart  Acting Head, Section 1  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:		Satisfied	Partially	Satisfied	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
No DER was found in EEB's files for this study. The two highest concentrations are too widel separated to be of use. Each successively larger concentration should be 1.66 times that of the one before (or be about 0.6 of the one larger than itself). The sixth group is so much larger (4.7 times mg/kg (1.66 X 2.24 mg/kg) and the animals had still died, the LD <sub>50</sub> meaningless. If it had been 3.7 though the mortality remained the same. We cannot tell the difference between the two possibilities from this study. The "Protocol for determination of oral LD <sub>50</sub> for Mink" specifies .04, .12, .36, 1.08 range should have been increased, not just its highest member.  Some animals had bloody stools even at the 0.116 mg/kg level, therefore, the NOEL = 0.04 mg/kg.  If, as stated, the species presented a difficulty because food passes through their digestive tract to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally and, therefore, the high LD <sub>50</sub> accurately reflects the conditions in the wild.  CONCLUSIONS:  The study is classified as "Supplementary" No LD <sub>50</sub> but a NOEL 0.04 mg/kg.  REVIEWED BY:  James J. Goodyear  Biologist, Section 1  Ecological Effects Branch  Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart  Acting Head, Section 1  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:	DISCUSSION:					X	
to quickly, another subject should be chosen. Although, this may be a trait of the Mustelids generally and, therefore, the high LD <sub>50</sub> accurately reflects the conditions in the wild.  CONCLUSIONS:  The study is classified as "Supplementary" No LD <sub>50</sub> but a NOEL 0.04 mg/kg.  REVIEWED BY:  James J. Goodyear  Biologist, Section 1  Ecological Effects Branch  Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart  Acting Head, Section 1  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:  Signature:	though the mortal from this study. T and 3.24 mg/kg. It range should have	ity remained the same the "Protocol for deter it was believed that a been increased, not	e. We cannot the carrier of of of a higher range institute higher	died, the $LD_{50}$ we ell the difference ral $LD_{50}$ for Mink of concentrations	between the two possib "specifies .04, .12, .36, was needed, then the	en 3.73 g even pilities , 1.08,	
James J. Goodyear Biologist, Section 1 Ecological Effects Branch Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart Acting Head, Section 1  Signature: famos flecología  Date: fam 9, 1991  Signature: Signature:	to quickly, another and, therefore, the	ne species presented is subject should be choose high LD <sub>50</sub> accurately	a difficulty because. Although y reflects the c	ause food passes; , this may be a tra onditions in the v	through their digestive it of the Mustelids gene wild.		
James J. Goodyear Biologist, Section 1 Ecological Effects Branch Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart Acting Head, Section 1  Signature: famos flecología  Date: fam 9, 1991  Signature: Signature:	The study is classifi	ied as "Supplementa	ry" No LD <sub>50</sub> b	ut a NOEL 0.04 r	na/ka		
Biologist, Section 1  Ecological Effects Branch Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)  APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart Acting Head, Section 1  Signature: fames fleethypess  Date: fame fleethypess  Date: fame fleethypess  Signature: fames fleethypess  Signature: fames fleethypess  Signature: fames fleethypess  Date: fames fleethypess  Signature: fames fle	REVIEWED BY:			0.04 1	ng/kg.		
APPROVED BY:  Leslie W. Touart  Acting Head, Section 1  Signature:	Biologist, Section 1 Ecological Effects B	ranch and Effects Division	Signa	ture: <u>famos</u> Date: <u>fa</u>	- Seedyen 29, 1991		
Leslie W. Touart Acting Head, Section 1 Signature:			· · · - • · · · · ·	•	,		
Environmental Fate and Effects Division (H7507C)  Date: /- 9 - 9 /	Leslie W. Touart Acting Head, Section Ecological Effects Br	anch			4-91	· ·	

Pag	e is not included in this copy.
Page	es 2 through 3 are not included in this copy.
The info	material not included contains the following type of ormation:
	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.
	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.
	Claimed Confidential by submitter upon submission to the Agency.
he ir y pro ontac	nformation not included is generally considered confidential oduct registrants. If you have any questions, please to the individual who prepared the response to your request.