Food and Chemical Toxicology 164 (2022) 113111

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Food and Chemical Toxicology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/foodchemtox

RIFM fragrance ingredient safety assessment, 10-oxahexadecanolide, CAS Registry Number 1725-01-5

A.M. Api [a], D. Belsito [b], D. Botelho [a], M. Bruze [c], G.A. Burton Jr. [d], M.A. Cancellieri [a], H. Chon [a], M.L. Dagli [e], M. Date [a], W. Dekant [f], C. Deodhar [a], A.D. Fryer [g], L. Jones [a], K. Joshi [a], M. Kumar [a], A. Lapczynski [a], M. Lavelle [a], I. Lee [a], D.C. Liebler [h], H. Moustakas [a], M. Na [a], T.M. Penning [i], G. Ritacco [a], J. Romine [a], N. Sadekar [a], T.W. Schultz [j], D. Selechnik [a], F. Siddiqi [a], I.G. Sipes [k], G. Sullivan [a,*], Y. Thakkar [a], Y. Tokura [l]

[a] *Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc., 50 Tice Boulevard, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, 07677, USA*
[b] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Columbia University Medical Center, Department of Dermatology, 161 Fort Washington Ave., New York, NY, 10032, USA*
[c] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Malmo University Hospital, Department of Occupational & Environmental Dermatology, Sodra Forstadsgatan 101, Entrance 47, Malmo, SE-20502, Sweden*
[d] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, School of Natural Resources & Environment, University of Michigan, Dana Building G110, 440 Church St., Ann Arbor, MI, 58109, USA*
[e] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, University of Sao Paulo, School of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science, Department of Pathology, Av. Prof. dr. Orlando Marques de Paiva, 87, Sao Paulo, CEP 05508-900, Brazil*
[f] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, University of Wuerzburg, Department of Toxicology, Versbacher Str. 9, 97078, Würzburg, Germany*
[g] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Oregon Health & Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd., Portland, OR, 97239, USA*
[h] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Department of Biochemistry, Center in Molecular Toxicology, 638 Robinson Research Building, 2200 Pierce Avenue, Nashville, TN, 37232-0146, USA*
[i] *Member of Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, University of Pennsylvania, Perelman School of Medicine, Center of Excellence in Environmental Toxicology, 1316 Biomedical Research Building (BRB) II/III, 421 Curie Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA, 19104-3083, USA*
[j] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, The University of Tennessee, College of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Comparative Medicine, 2407 River Dr., Knoxville, TN, 37996-4500, USA*
[k] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Department of Pharmacology, University of Arizona, College of Medicine, 1501 North Campbell Avenue, P.O. Box 245050, Tucson, AZ, 85724-5050, USA*
[l] *Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, The Journal of Dermatological Science (JDS), Editor-in-Chief, Professor and Chairman, Department of Dermatology, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, 1-20-1 Handayama, Higashi-ku, Hamamatsu, 431-3192, Japan*

ARTICLE INFO

Handling Editor: Dr. Jose Luis Domingo

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: gsullivan@rifm.org (G. Sullivan).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2022.113111
Received 3 February 2022; Accepted 2 May 2022
Available online 6 May 2022

Version: 020222. Initial publication. All fragrance materials are evaluated on a five-year rotating basis. Revised safety assessments are published if new relevant data become available. Open access to all RIFM Fragrance Ingredient Safety Assessments is here: fragrancematerialsafetyresource.elsevier.com**.**

Name: 10-Oxahexadecanolide
CAS Registry Number: 1725-01-5



Abbreviation/Definition List:

2-Box Model - A RIFM, Inc. proprietary *in silico* tool used to calculate fragrance air exposure concentration
AF - Assessment Factor
BCF - Bioconcentration Factor
CNIH – Confirmation of No Induction in Humans test. A human repeat insult patch test that is performed to confirm an already determined safe use level for fragrance ingredients (Na et al., 2021)
Creme RIFM Model - The Creme RIFM Model uses probabilistic (Monte Carlo) simulations to allow full distributions of data sets, providing a more realistic estimate of aggregate exposure to individuals across a population (Comiskey et al., 2015, 2017; Safford et al., 2015a; Safford et al., 2017) compared to a deterministic aggregate approach
DEREK - Derek Nexus is an *in silico* tool used to identify structural alerts
DRF - Dose Range Finding
DST - Dermal Sensitization Threshold
ECHA - European Chemicals Agency
ECOSAR - Ecological Structure-Activity Relationships Predictive Model
EU - Europe/European Union
GLP - Good Laboratory Practice
IFRA - The International Fragrance Association
LOEL - Lowest Observed Effect Level
MOE - Margin of Exposure
MPPD - Multiple-Path Particle Dosimetry. An *in silico* model for inhaled vapors used to simulate fragrance lung deposition
NA - North America
NESIL - No Expected Sensitization Induction Level
NOAEC - No Observed Adverse Effect Concentration
NOAEL - No Observed Adverse Effect Level
NOEC - No Observed Effect Concentration
NOEL - No Observed Effect Level
OECD - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECD TG - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Testing Guidelines
PBT - Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic
PEC/PNEC - Predicted Environmental Concentration/Predicted No Effect Concentration
Perfumery - In this safety assessment, perfumery refers to fragrances made by a perfumer used in consumer products only. The exposures reported in the safety assessment include consumer product use but do not include occupational exposures.
QRA - Quantitative Risk Assessment
QSAR - Quantitative Structure-Activity Relationship
REACH - Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation, and Restriction of Chemicals
RfD - Reference Dose
RIFM - Research Institute for Fragrance Materials
RQ - Risk Quotient
Statistically Significant - Statistically significant difference in reported results as compared to controls with a $p < 0.05$ using appropriate statistical test
TTC - Threshold of Toxicological Concern
UV/Vis spectra - Ultraviolet/Visible spectra
VCF - Volatile Compounds in Food
VoU - Volume of Use
vPvB - (very) Persistent, (very) Bioaccumulative
WoE - Weight of Evidence

The Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety* concludes that this material is safe as described in this safety assessment.

This safety assessment is based on the RIFM Criteria Document (Api et al., 2015), which should be referred to for clarifications.

Each endpoint discussed in this safety assessment includes the relevant data that were available at the time of writing (version number in the top box is indicative of the date of approval based on a 2-digit month/day/year), both in the RIFM Database (consisting of publicly available and proprietary data) and through publicly available information sources (e.g., SciFinder and PubMed). Studies selected for this safety assessment were based on appropriate test criteria, such as acceptable guidelines, sample size, study duration, route of exposure, relevant animal species, most relevant testing endpoints, etc. A key study for each endpoint was selected based on the most conservative endpoint value (e.g., PNEC, NOAEL, LOEL, and NESIL).

*The Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety is an independent body that selects its own members and establishes its own operating procedures. The Expert Panel is comprised of internationally known scientists that provide RIFM with guidance relevant to human health and environmental protection.

Summary: The existing information supports the use of this material as described in this safety assessment.

10-Oxahexadecanolide was evaluated for genotoxicity, repeated dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity, local respiratory toxicity, phototoxicity/photoallergenicity, skin sensitization, and environmental safety. Data from read-across analogs 11-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 3391-83-1) and hexadecanolide (CAS # 109-29-5) show that 10-oxahexadecanolide is not expected to be genotoxic. Data from analog oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3) provided a Margin of Exposure (MOE) > 100 for the repeated dose and reproductive toxicity endpoints. Data from analog 12-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 6707-60-4) show that there are no safety concerns for 10-oxahexadecanolide for skin sensitization under the current declared levels of use. The phototoxicity/photoallergenicity endpoints were evaluated based on data and ultraviolet (UV) spectra; 10-oxahexadecanolide is not expected to be phototoxic/photoallergenic. The local respiratory toxicity endpoint was evaluated using the Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) for a Cramer Class III material; exposure is below the TTC (0.47 mg/day). For the environmental endpoints, 10-oxahexadecanolide was found not to be Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic (PBT) as per the International Fragrance Association (IFRA) Environmental Standards; its risk quotients, based on its current volume of use in Europe and North America (i.e., Predicted Environmental Concentration/Predicted No Effect Concentration [PEC/PNEC]), are <1.

(*continued on next page*)

(*continued*)

Human Health Safety Assessment	
Genotoxicity: Not expected to be genotoxic.	(RIFM, 1979; RIFM, 1999c)
Repeated Dose Toxicity: NOAEL = 250 mg/kg/day.	RIFM (1998)
Reproductive Toxicity: NOAEL = 1000 mg/kg/day.	(RIFM, 2003b; RIFM, 2003a)
Skin Sensitization: Not a concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared use levels.	(RIFM, 1982; RIFM, 1978a; ECHA REACH Dossier: 12-Oxahexadecan-16-olide; ECHA, 2017a; RIFM, 1977b; Klecak, 1985; RIFM, 1977a)
Phototoxicity/Photoallergenicity: Not phototoxic/not expected to be photoallergenic.	(UV Spectra; RIFM Database; RIFM, 1978b; Ohkoshi et al., 1981; RIFM, 1981)
Local Respiratory Toxicity: No NOAEC available. Exposure is below the TTC.	
Environmental Safety Assessment	
Hazard Assessment:	
Persistence: Critical Measured Value: 100% (OECD 301B)	RIFM (1997)
Bioaccumulation: Screening-level: 791.1 L/kg	(EPI Suite v4.11; US EPA, 2012a)
Ecotoxicity: Screening-level: 96 h Algae EC50: 0.286 mg/L	(ECOSAR; US EPA, 2012b)
Conclusion: Not PBT or vPvB as per IFRA Environmental Standards	
Risk Assessment:	
Screening-level: PEC/PNEC (North America and Europe) > 1	(RIFM Framework; Salvito et al., 2002)
Critical Ecotoxicity Endpoint: 9-h Algae EC50: 0.286 mg/L	(ECOSAR; US EPA, 2012b)
RIFM PNEC is: 0.0286 μg/L	
• Revised PEC/PNECs (2015 IFRA VoU): North America and Europe <1	

1. Identification

1. **Chemical Name:** 10-Oxahexadecanolide
2. **CAS Registry Number:** 1725-01-5
3. **Synonyms:** 1,8-Dioxacycloheptadecan-9-one; 9-[(6-Hydoxyhexyl) oxy]nonanoic acid o-lactone; Oxalide; １０ - オキサ - ヘキサデカノリド; 10-Oxahexadecanolide
4. **Molecular Formula:** $C_{15}H_{28}O_3$
5. **Molecular Weight:** 256.38 g/mol
6. **RIFM Number:** 89
7. **Stereochemistry:** No stereoisomer possible.

2. Physical data

1. **Boiling Point:** 380.27 °C (EPI Suite)
2. **Flash Point:** >93 °C (Globally Harmonized System)
3. **Log K_{OW}:** 4.9 (EPI Suite)
4. **Melting Point**: 46.8 °C (EPI Suite)
5. **Water Solubility:** 1.433 mg/L (EPI Suite)
6. **Specific Gravity:** 0.976–0.984 at 25 °C (RIFM), 0.990 (Fragrance Materials Association)
7. **Vapor Pressure:** 0.00000775 mm Hg at 20 °C (EPI Suite v4.0), 1.58e-005 mm Hg at 25 °C (EPI Suite)
8. **UV Spectra:** No absorbance between 290 and 400 nm; molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark (1000 L mol^{-1} • cm^{-1})
9. **Appearance/Organoleptic:** Colorless to pale yellowish viscous liquid; sweet, soft, and extremely tenacious, discretely animal-musky odor. Colorless viscous liquid. Practically insoluble in water, soluble in alcohol, and miscible with all perfume materials. Sweet, soft, and extremely tenacious discretely animal-musky odor (Arctander, 1969).

3. Volume of use (Worldwide Band)

1. 1–10 metric tons per year (IFRA, 2015)

4. Exposure to fragrance ingredient (Creme RIFM aggregate exposure model v1.0)

1. **95**th **Percentile Concentration in Fine Fragrance:** 0.46% (RIFM, 2017)
2. **Inhalation Exposure*:** 0.000030 mg/kg/day or 0.0022 mg/day (RIFM, 2017)
3. **Total Systemic Exposure**:** 0.0031 mg/kg/day (RIFM, 2017)

*95th percentile calculated exposure derived from concentration survey data in the Creme RIFM Aggregate Exposure Model (Comiskey et al., 2015; Safford et al., 2015; Safford et al., 2017; and Comiskey et al., 2017).

**95th percentile calculated exposure; assumes 100% absorption unless modified by dermal absorption data as reported in Section V. It is derived from concentration survey data in the Creme RIFM Aggregate Exposure Model and includes exposure via dermal, oral, and inhalation routes whenever the fragrance ingredient is used in products that include these routes of exposure (Comiskey et al., 2015; Safford et al., 2015; Safford et al., 2017; and Comiskey et al., 2017).

5. Derivation of systemic absorption

1. **Dermal:** Assumed 100%
2. **Oral:** Assumed 100%
3. **Inhalation:** Assumed 100%

6. Computational toxicology evaluation

6.1. *Cramer classification*

Class III, High

Expert Judgment	Toxtree v3.1	OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2
III	III	III

6.2. Analogs selected

a. **Genotoxicity:** 11-Oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 3391-83-1); Hexadecanolide (CAS # 109-29-5)
b. **Repeated Dose Toxicity:** Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3)
c. **Reproductive Toxicity:** Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3)
d. **Skin Sensitization:** 12-Oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 6707-60-4)
e. **Phototoxicity/Photoallergenicity:** None
f. **Local Respiratory Toxicity:** None
g. **Environmental Toxicity:** None

6.3. Read-across Justification

See Appendix below

7. Metabolism

Not considered for this risk assessment and therefore not reviewed except where it may pertain in specific endpoint sections as discussed below.

Additional References

None.

8. Natural occurrence

10-Oxahexadecanolide is not reported to occur in foods by the VCF*.

*VCF (Volatile Compounds in Food): Database/Nijssen, L.M.; Ingen-Visscher, C.A. van; Donders, J.J.H. (eds). – Version 15.1 – Zeist (The Netherlands): TNO Triskelion, 1963–2014. A continually updated database containing information on published volatile compounds that have been found in natural (processed) food products. Includes FEMA GRAS and EU-Flavis data.

9. REACH dossier

10-Oxahexadecanolide has been pre-registered for 2010; no dossier available as of 02/02/22.

10. Conclusion

The existing information supports the use of this material as described in this safety assessment.

11. Summary

11.1. Human health endpoint summaries

11.1.1. Genotoxicity

Based on the current existing data, 10-oxahexadecanolide does not present a concern for genotoxicity.

11.1.1.1. Risk assessment. 10-Oxahexadecanolide was assessed in the BlueScreen assay and found positive for cytotoxicity (positive: <80% relative cell density) without metabolic activation, negative for cytotoxicity with metabolic activation, and negative for genotoxicity with and without metabolic activation (RIFM, 2013). BlueScreen is a human cell-based assay for measuring the genotoxicity and cytotoxicity of chemical compounds and mixtures. Additional assays on a more reactive read-across material were considered to fully assess the potential mutagenic or clastogenic effects of the target material.

There are no studies assessing the mutagenic activity of 10-oxahexadecanolide. 11-Oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 3391-83-1; see Section VI) was identified as a sufficient analog for use as read-across. The mutagenicity of 11-oxahexadecanolide was assessed in an Ames study conducted similar to OECD TG 471 using the standard plate incorporation method, *Salmonella typhimurium* strains TA1535, TA1537, TA1538, TA98, and TA100 were treated with 11-oxahexadecanolide in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) at concentrations up to 25 mg/plate in the presence and absence of metabolic activation. No significant increases in the number of revertant colonies were detected in the strains at any of the concentrations tested (RIFM, 1979). Based on the criteria of the assay, 11-oxahexadecanolide is considered non-mutagenic in the Ames assay, and this can be extended to 10-oxahexadecanolide.

There are no studies assessing the clastogenicity of 10-oxahexadecanolide. The clastogenicity of a read-across chemical hexadecanolide (CAS # 109-29-5; see Section VI) was assessed in an *in vitro* chromosome aberration study conducted in compliance with GLP regulations and in accordance with OECD TG 473. Human peripheral blood lymphocytes were treated with hexadecanolide in DMSO at concentrations up to 2000 μg/mL in the presence and absence of exogenous metabolic activation. No significant increases in the frequency of cells with structural chromosomal aberrations or polyploid cells were observed with any dose of the test material, either with or without S9 metabolic activation (RIFM, 1999c). Under the conditions of the study, hexadecanolide was considered to be non-clastogenic to human cells, and this can be extended to 10-oxahexadecanolide.

Based on the available data on read-across chemicals, which does not present a concern for genotoxic potential, this can be extended to 10-oxahexadecanolide.

Additional References: RIFM, 1999a; RIFM, 1999b.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/11/21.

11.1.2. Repeated dose toxicity

The MOE for 10-oxahexadecanolide is adequate for the repeated dose toxicity endpoint at the current level of use.

11.1.2.1. Risk assessment. There are no repeated dose toxicity data on 10-oxahexadecanolide. Read-across material, oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3; see Section VI), has sufficient repeated dose toxicity data. An OECD 408 gavage 90-day subchronic toxicity study was conducted in rats. Groups of 15 Sprague Dawley Crl:CD BR strain rats/sex/dose were administered via gavage the test material, oxacyclohexadecen-2-one at doses of 0, 50, 250, or 1000 mg/kg/day in 0.5% carboxymethyl cellulose for 90 days. Two recovery groups of 10 rats/sex were gavaged with 0 or 1000 mg/kg/day for 90 days and then maintained without treatment for a further 28 days. There were no treatment-related mortalities or toxicologically significant changes in any of the parameters measured during the study. Two males treated with 1000 mg/kg/day were found dead on days 34 and 85, and the cause of death was considered to be due to mal-dosing. However, there were no signs of mal-dosing during histopathology. Thus, the NOAEL was considered to be 250 mg/kg/day, based on mortality reported among high-dose group animals (RIFM, 1998). In a 4-week gavage toxicity study followed by a 2-week recovery period conducted in rats, groups of 6 Crl:CD(SD)BR strain (VAF plus) rats/sex/dose were administered via gavage test material, oxacyclohexadecen-2-one at doses of 0, 500, 750, or 1000 mg/kg/day in 0.5% carboxymethyl cellulose. Two recovery groups of 6 rats/sex were added to the control and highest dose group and then maintained without treatment for 2-weeks. There were no treatment-related effects up to the highest dose tested; thus, the NOEL for systemic toxicity was considered to be 1000 mg/kg/day (RIFM, 1996). In another OECD/GLP 407 gavage 28-day toxicity study followed

by a 2-week recovery period conducted in rats, groups of 5 Crl:CD rats/sex/dose were administered via gavage test material, oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (Globalide) at doses of 0, 100, 300, or 1000 mg/kg/day in 0.8% aqueous hydroxypropylmethylcellulose gel for 28 days. Two recovery groups of 5 rats/sex were added to the control and highest dose group and then maintained without treatment for 2 weeks. Salivation was observed in males and females treated at 1000 mg/kg/day, which began 3 min after test material administration and lasted for 30 min. Apart from salivation, no other effects on functional, hematological, clinical, and pathological parameters were observed. Thus, the NOAEL for systemic toxicity was considered to be 1000 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested (RIFM, 2005). The NOAEL of 250 mg/kg/day from the OECD 408 study was considered for this safety assessment. **Therefore, the 10-oxahexadecanolide MOE for the repeated dose toxicity endpoint can be calculated by dividing the oxacyclohexadecen-2-one NOAEL in mg/kg/day by the total systemic exposure to 10-oxahexadecanolide, 250/0.0031, or 80645.**

Additional References: RIFM, 2011b; RIFM, 2011a; RIFM, 1995.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/08/21.

11.1.3. Reproductive toxicity

The MOE for 10-oxahexadecanolide is adequate for the reproductive toxicity endpoint at the current level of use.

11.1.3.1. Risk assessment. There are no developmental toxicity data on 10-oxahexadecanolide. Read-across material oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3; see Section VI) has sufficient developmental toxicity data. An OECD/GLP 414 gavage developmental toxicity study was conducted in rats. Groups of 24 mated Sprague Dawley CD strain female rats/dose were administered via gavage the test material, oxacyclohexadecen-2-one at doses of 0, 50, 250, or 1000 mg/kg/day in 0.5% carboxymethyl cellulose from days 5–19 of gestation. There were no significant treatment-related effects on fetal viability, growth, and development up to the highest dose tested. The NOAEL for developmental toxicity was considered to be 1000 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested (RIFM, 2003b). **Therefore, the 10-oxahexadecanolide MOE for the developmental toxicity endpoint can be calculated by dividing the oxacyclohexadecen-2-one NOAEL in mg/kg/day by the total systemic exposure to 10-oxahexadecanolide, 1000/0.0031, or 322581.**

There are no fetility data on 10-oxahexadecanolide. Read-across material oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3; see Section VI) has sufficient reproductive toxicity data. An OECD/GLP 415 gavage 1-generation reproductive toxicity study was conducted in rats. Groups of 28 Sprague Dawley Crl:CD(SD) IGS BR strain rats/sex/dose were administered via gavage test material, oxacyclohexadecen-2-one at doses of 0, 50, 250, or 1000 mg/kg/day in 0.5% carboxymethyl cellulose daily, throughout pre-mating, mating, gestation, and lactation. The males were dosed for 72 days, and females were dosed for 16 days prior to mating. There were no effects on the reproductive organs, fertility, or mating performance up to the highest dose tested. Thus, the NOAEL for reproductive toxicity was considered to be 1000 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested (RIFM, 2003a). **Therefore, the 10-oxahexadecanolide MOE for the reproductive toxicity endpoint can be calculated by dividing the oxacyclohexadecen-2-one NOAEL in mg/kg/day by the total systemic exposure to 10-oxahexadecanolide, 1000/0.0031, or 322581.**

Additional References: RIFM, 2011b; RIFM, 2011a; RIFM, 1995.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/08/21.

11.1.4. Skin sensitization

Based on existing data and read-across 12-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 6707-60-4), 10-oxahexadecanolide does not present a concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared levels of use.

11.1.4.1. Risk assessment. Based on the existing data on the target and the read-across material, 10-oxahexadecanolide is not considered a skin sensitizer. The chemical structure of these materials indicates that they would not be expected to react with skin proteins directly (Toxtree v3.1.0; OECD Toolbox v4.2). The read-across material 12-oxahexadecanolide was not predicted to react with skin proteins in an *in vitro* direct peptide reactivity assay (DPRA) (ECHA, 2017a). The read-across material was not predicted to be a skin sensitizer in KeratinoSens (ECHA, 2017a). A guinea pig maximization test with 10-oxahexadecanolide did not induce skin sensitization in 10 test group animals (RIFM, 1982). In guinea pig Freund's Complete Adjuvant test (FCAT) and an open epicutaneous test (OET), the read-across material 12-oxahexadecanolide did not result in reactions classifiable as sensitization (RIFM, 1977b; Klecak, 1985). In a human maximization study, no sensitization reactions were observed in response to 10% (6900 μg/cm^2) 10-oxahexadecanolide (RIFM, 1978a). In a separate human maximization study, no sensitization reactions were observed in response to 10% (6900 μg/cm^2) read-across material, 12-oxahexadecanolide (RIFM, 1977a).

Based on the weight of evidence (WoE) from structural analysis and *in vitro*, animal, and human studies on the target material and the read-across material, 10-oxahexadecanolide, do not present a concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared levels of use.

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/12/21.

11.1.5. Phototoxicity/photoallergenicity

Based on the UV absorbance spectrum along with available *in vivo* study data, 10-oxahexadecanolide would not be expected to present a concern for phototoxicity. Based on the UV absorbance spectrum, 10-oxahexadecanolide would not be expected to present a concern for photoallergenicity.

11.1.5.1. Risk assessment. UV absorption spectra indicate no absorption between 290 and 400 nm. The corresponding molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark of concern for phototoxicity and photoallergenicity (Henry et al., 2009). *In vivo* phototoxicity studies were conducted in guinea pigs and indicated that 10-oxahexadecanolide does not present a concern for phototoxicity (RIFM, 1978b; Ogoshi et al., 1980; Ohkoshi et al., 1981; RIFM, 1981). Based on the study data and the lack of UV absorbance, 10-oxahexadecanolide does not present a concern for phototoxicity. Based on the lack of UV absorbance, 10-oxahexadecanolide does not present a concern for photoallergenicity.

11.1.5.2. UV spectra analysis. The available UV spectrum indicates no significant absorbance in the range of 290–400 nm. The molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark of concern for phototoxic effects, 1000 L mol^{-1} • cm^{-1} (Henry et al., 2009).

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/10/21.

11.1.6. Local Respiratory Toxicity

The MOE could not be calculated due to a lack of appropriate data. The exposure level for 10-oxahexadecanolide is below the Cramer Class III TTC value for inhalation exposure local effects.

11.1.6.1. Risk assessment. There are no inhalation data available on 10-oxahexadecanolide. Based on the Creme RIFM Model, the inhalation exposure is 0.0022 mg/day. This exposure is 213.6 times lower than the Cramer Class III TTC value of 0.47 mg/day (based on human lung weight of 650 g; Carthew et al., 2009); therefore, the exposure at the current level of use is deemed safe.

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/12/21.

11.2. Environmental endpoint summary

11.2.1. Screening-level assessment

A screening-level risk assessment of 10-oxahexadecanolide was performed following the RIFM Environmental Framework (Salvito et al., 2002), which provides 3 tiered levels of screening for aquatic risk. In Tier 1, only the material's regional VoU, its log K_{OW}, and its molecular weight are needed to estimate a conservative risk quotient (RQ), expressed as the ratio Predicted Environmental Concentration/Predicted No Effect Concentration (PEC/PNEC). A general QSAR with a high uncertainty factor applied is used to predict fish toxicity, as discussed in Salvito et al. (2002). In Tier 2, the RQ is refined by applying a lower uncertainty factor to the PNEC using the ECOSAR model (US EPA, 2012b), which provides chemical class-specific ecotoxicity estimates. Finally, if necessary, Tier 3 is conducted using measured biodegradation and ecotoxicity data to refine the RQ, thus allowing for lower PNEC uncertainty factors. The data for calculating the PEC and PNEC for this safety assessment are provided in the table below. For the PEC, the range from the most recent IFRA Volume of Use Survey is reviewed. The PEC is then calculated using the actual regional tonnage, not the extremes of the range. Following the RIFM Environmental Framework, 10-oxahexadecanolide was identified as a fragrance material with the potential to present a possible risk to the aquatic environment (i.e., its screening-level PEC/PNEC >1).

A screening-level hazard assessment using EPI Suite v4.11 (US EPA, 2012a) did not identify 10-oxahexadecanolide as possibly persistent or bioaccumulative based on its structure and physical–chemical properties. This screening-level hazard assessment considers the potential for a material to be persistent *and* bioaccumulative *and* toxic, or very persistent *and* very bioaccumulative as defined in the Criteria Document (Api et al., 2015). As noted in the Criteria Document, the screening criteria applied are the same as those used in the EU for REACH (ECHA, 2012). For persistence, if the EPI Suite model BIOWIN 3 predicts a value < 2.2 and either BIOWIN 2 or BIOWIN 6 predicts a value < 0.5, then the material is considered potentially persistent. A material would be considered potentially bioaccumulative if the EPI Suite model BCFBAF predicts a fish BCF $\geq$2000 L/kg. Ecotoxicity is determined in the above screening-level risk assessment. If, based on these model outputs (Step 1), additional assessment is required, a WoE-based review is then performed (Step 2). This review considers available data on the material's physical–chemical properties, environmental fate (e.g., OECD Guideline biodegradation studies or die-away studies), fish bioaccumulation, and higher-tier model outputs (e.g., US EPA's BIOWIN and BCFBAF found in EPI Suite v4.11). Data on persistence and bioaccumulation are reported below and summarized in the Environmental Safety Assessment Section prior to Section 1.

11.2.2. Risk assessment

Based on the current Volume of Use (2015), 10-oxahexadecanolide presents a risk to the aquatic compartment in the screening-level assessment.

11.2.2.1. Key studies. Biodegradation

RIFM, 1997: Biodegradability was evaluated by the carbon dioxide (CO_2) evolution test, based on OECD 301B guidelines. The rate of degradation after 28 days was 100%.

Ecotoxicity

No data available.

Other available data

10-oxahexadecanolide has been pre-registered for REACH with no additional data at this time.

11.2.3. Risk assessment refinement

Ecotoxicological data and PNEC derivation (all endpoints reported in mg/L; PNECs in μg/L).

Endpoints used to calculate PNEC are underlined.

	LC50 (Fish) (mg/L)	EC50 (*Daphnia*) (mg/L)	EC50 (Algae) (mg/L)	AF	PNEC (μg/L)	Chemical Class
RIFM Framework Screening-level **(Tier 1)**	1.037			1000000	0.001037	
ECOSAR Acute Endpoints **(Tier 2)** v1.11	0.697	1.062	0.286	10000	0.0286	Esters
ECOSAR Acute Endpoints **(Tier 2)** v1.11	0.527	0.391	0.880			Neutral Organics SAR

Exposure information and PEC calculation (following RIFM framework: Salvito et al., 2002)

Exposure	Europe (EU)	North America (NA)
Log K_{ow} Used	4.9	4.9
Biodegradation Factor Used	1	1
Dilution Factor	3	3
Regional Volume of Use Tonnage Band	<1	<1
Risk Characterization: PEC/PNEC	**<1**	**<1**

Based on available data, the RQ for this material is < 1. No further assessment is necessary.

The RIFM PNEC is 0.0286 μg/L. The revised PEC/PNECs for EU and NA are <1; therefore, the material does not present a risk to the aquatic environment at the current reported VoU.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 02/02/21.

12. Literature Search*

- **RIFM Database:** Target, Fragrance Structure-Activity Group materials, other references, JECFA, CIR, SIDS
- **ECHA:** https://echa.europa.eu/
- **NTP:** https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/
- **OECD Toolbox:** https://www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/risk-assessment/oecd-qsar-toolbox.htm
- **SciFinder:** https://scifinder.cas.org/scifinder/view/scifinder/scifinderExplore.jsf
- **PubMed:** https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed
- **National Library of Medicine's Toxicology Information Services:** https://toxnet.nlm.nih.gov/
- **IARC:** https://monographs.iarc.fr
- **OECD SIDS:** https://hpvchemicals.oecd.org/ui/Default.aspx
- **EPA ACToR:** https://actor.epa.gov/actor/home.xhtml
- **US EPA HPVIS:** https://ofmpub.epa.gov/oppthpv/public_search.publicdetails?submission_id=24959241&ShowComments=Yes&sqlstr=null&recordcount=0&User_title=DetailQuery%20Results&EndPointRpt=Y#submission
- **Japanese NITE:** https://www.nite.go.jp/en/chem/chrip/chrip_search/systemTop
- **Japan Existing Chemical Data Base (JECDB):** http://dra4.nihs.go.jp/mhlw_data/jsp/SearchPageENG.jsp
- **Google:** https://www.google.com
- **ChemIDplus:** https://chem.nlm.nih.gov/chemidplus/

Search keywords: CAS number and/or material names.

*Information sources outside of RIFM's database are noted as appropriate in the safety assessment. This is not an exhaustive list. The links listed above were active as of 02/02/22.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper. We wish to confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this publication and there has been no significant financial support for this work that could have influenced its outcome. RIFM staff are employees of the Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc. (RIFM). The Expert Panel receives a small honorarium for time spent reviewing the subject work.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2022.113111.

Appendix

Read-across Justification

Methods

The read-across analogs were identified using RIFM fragrance materials chemical inventory clustering and read-across search criteria (RIFM, 2020). These criteria follow the strategy for structuring and reporting a read-across prediction of toxicity as described in Schultz et al. (2015) and are consistent with the guidance provided by OECD within Integrated Approaches for Testing and Assessment (OECD, 2015) and the European Chemical Agency read-across assessment framework (ECHA, 2017b).

- First, materials were clustered based on their structural similarity. Second, data availability and data quality on the selected cluster were examined. Third, appropriate read-across analogs from the cluster were confirmed by expert judgment.
- Tanimoto structure similarity scores were calculated using FCFC4 fingerprints (Rogers and Hahn, 2010).
- The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analogs were calculated using EPI Suite v4.11 (US EPA, 2012a).
- J_{max} values were calculated using RIFM's Skin Absorption Model (SAM). The parameters were calculated using the consensus model (Shen et al., 2014).
- DNA binding, mutagenicity, genotoxicity alerts, oncologic classification, ER binding, and repeat dose categorization predictions were generated using OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2 (OECD, 2018).
- Developmental toxicity was predicted using CAESAR v2.1.7 (Cassano et al., 2010).
- Protein binding was predicted using OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2 (OECD, 2018) and skin sensitization was predicted using Toxtree.
- The major metabolites for the target material and read-across analogs were determined and evaluated using OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2 (OECD, 2018).
- To keep continuity and compatibility with *in silico* alerts, OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2 was selected as the alert system.

	Target Material	Read-across Material	Read-across Material	Read-across Material	Read-across Material
Principal Name	10-Oxahexadecanolide	11-Oxahexadecanolide	Hexadecanolide	12-Oxahexadecanolide	Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one
CAS No.	1725-01-5	3391-83-1	109-29-5	6707-60-4	34902-57-3
Structure	O=C1CCCCCCCCOCCCCCCO1	O=C1CCCCCCCCCOCCCCCO1	O=C1CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCO1	O=C1CCCCCCCCCCOCCCCO1	O=C1CCCCCCCCCCCCCCO1
Similarity (Tanimoto Score)		1.0	0.85	1.0	0.85
Endpoint		Genotoxicity	Genotoxicity	Skin sensitization	Reproductive toxicity Repeated dose toxicity
Molecular Formula	$C_{15}H_{28}O_3$	$C_{15}H_{28}O_3$	$C_{16}H_{30}O_2$	$C_{15}H_{28}O_3$	$C_{15}H_{28}O_2$
Molecular Weight (g/mol)	256.39	256.39	254.41	256.39	240.39
Melting Point (°C, EPI Suite)	46.80	46.80	33.75	46.80	32.00
Boiling Point (°C, EPI Suite)	380.27	380.27	377.14	380.27	364.47
Vapor Pressure (Pa @ 25 °C, EPI Suite)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
Water Solubility (mg/L, @ 25 °C, WSKOW v1.42 in EPI Suite)	1.43	1.43	0.05	1.43	0.15
Log K_{OW}	4.90	4.90	6.65	4.90	6.15
J_{max} (μg/cm^2/h, SAM)	0.13	0.13	0.01	0.13	0.02
Henry's Law (Pa·m^3/mol, Bond Method, EPI Suite)	2.07	2.07	312.08	2.07	235.07
Genotoxicity					
DNA Binding (OASIS v1.4, QSAR Toolbox v4.2)	No alert found	No alert found	No alert found		
DNA Binding (OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2)	No alert found	No alert found	No alert found		
Carcinogenicity (ISS)	No alert found	No alert found	No alert found		
DNA Binding (Ames, MN, CA, OASIS v1.1)	No alert found	No alert found	No alert found		
In Vitro Mutagenicity (Ames, ISS)	No alert found	No alert found	No alert found		
In Vivo Mutagenicity (Micronucleus, ISS)	No alert found	No alert found	No alert found		
Oncologic Classification	Lactone-type Reactive Functional Groups	Lactone-type Reactive Functional Groups	Lactone-type Reactive Functional Groups		
Repeated Dose Toxicity					
Repeated Dose (HESS)	Not categorized				Not categorized
Reproductive Toxicity					
ER Binding (OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2)	Non-binder, without OH or NH2 group				Non-binder, without OH or NH2 group
Developmental Toxicity (CAESAR v2.1.6)	Non-toxicant (good reliability)				Non-toxicant (moderate reliability)
Skin Sensitization					
Protein Binding (OASIS v1.1)	No alert found			No alert found	
Protein Binding (OECD)	Acylation|Acylation ≫ Direct Acylation Involving a Leaving group|Acylation ≫ Direct Acylation Involving a Leaving group ≫ Acetates			Acylation|Acylation ≫ Direct Acylation Involving a Leaving group|Acylation ≫ Direct Acylation Involving a Leaving group ≫ Acetates	
Protein Binding Potency	Not possible to classify according to these rules (GSH)			Not possible to classify according to these rules (GSH)	
Protein Binding Alerts for Skin Sensitization (OASIS v1.1)	No alert found			No alert found	
Skin Sensitization Reactivity Domains (Toxtree v2.6.13)	No skin sensitization reactivity domains alerts identified.			No skin sensitization reactivity domains alerts identified.	
Metabolism					
Rat Liver S9 Metabolism Simulator and Structural Alerts for Metabolites (OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2)	See Supplemental Data 1	See Supplemental Data 2	See Supplemental Data 3	See Supplemental Data 4	See Supplemental Data 5

Summary

There are insufficient toxicity data on the 10-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 1725-01-5). Hence, *in silico* evaluation was conducted to determine read-across analogs for this material. Based on structural similarity, reactivity, metabolism data, physical–chemical properties, and expert judgment, hexadecanolide (CAS # 109-29-5), 11-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 3391-83-1), 12-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 6707-60-4), and oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3) were identified as read-across materials with sufficient data for toxicological evaluation.

Conclusion

- Hexadecanolide (CAS # 109-29-5) and 11-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 3391-83-1) were used as read-across analogs for the target material 10-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 1725-01-5) for the genotoxicity endpoint.
  - o The target material and the read-across analogs belong to the structural class of macrocyclic lactones.

- The key difference between the target material and the read-across analogs is that the target material has an ether functional group at the 10-position in the macrocyclic ring, whereas the 11-oxahexadecanolide has the ether functionality at the 11-position. In contrast, hexadecanolide has no ether substitution. These structural differences between the target material and the read-across analogs do not affect consideration of the toxicity endpoint.
- The similarity between the target material and the read-across analogs is indicated by the Tanimoto scores in the above table. Differences between the structures that affect the Tanimoto score do not affect consideration of the toxicity endpoint.
- The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analogs are sufficiently similar to enable comparison of their toxicological properties.
- Differences are predicted for J_{max}, which estimates skin absorption. The J_{max} values translate to 80% skin absorption for the target material and 40% absorption for read-across analog hexadecanolide (CAS # 109-29-5). While percentage skin absorption estimated from J_{max} values indicate exposure to the substance, they do not represent hazard or toxicity parameters. Therefore, the J_{max} of the target material and the appropriate read-across analogs are not used directly in comparing substance hazard or toxicity. However, these parameters provide context to assess the impact of bioavailability on toxicity comparisons between the individual materials.
- According to the QSAR OECD Toolbox (v4.2), structural alerts for toxicity endpoints are consistent between the target material and the read-across analogs.
- The target and the read-across analog have been classified as lactone-type reactive functional groups in oncologic classification. There are no other classification alerts. The data described in the genotoxicity section shows that the read-across analog does not pose a concern for the genotoxicity endpoint. Therefore, this prediction will be superseded by the availability of the data.
- The target material and the read-across analogs are expected to be metabolized similarly, as shown by the metabolism simulator.

- Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (CAS # 34902-57-3) was used as a read-across analog for the target material 10-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 1725-01-5) for the reproductive toxicity and repeated dose toxicity endpoints.
  - The target material and the read-across analog belong to the structural class of macrocyclic lactones.
  - The key difference between the target material and the read-across analog is that the target has a double bond in conjugation with the ester carbonyl carbon in the macrocyclic ring compared to the read-across analog. This structure difference confers a potentially greater reactivity of the read-across analog, which is appropriate for application to the skin sensitization endpoint.
  - The similarity between the target material and the read-across analog is indicated by the Tanimoto score in the above table. Differences between the structures that affect the Tanimoto score do not affect consideration of the toxicity endpoints.
  - The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analog are sufficiently similar to enable comparison of their toxicological properties.
  - According to the QSAR OECD Toolbox (v4.2), structural alerts for toxicity endpoints are consistent between the target material and the read-across analog.
  - The target material and the read-across analog are expected to be metabolized similarly, as shown by the metabolism simulator.
- 12-Oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 6707-60-4) was used as a read-across analog for the target material 10-oxahexadecanolide (CAS # 1725-01-5) for the skin sensitization endpoint.
  - The target material and the read-across analog belong to the structural class of macrocyclic lactones.
  - The key difference between the target material and the read-across analogs is that the target material has an ether functional group at the 10-position in the macrocyclic ring, whereas 12-oxahexadecanolide has the ether functionality at the 12-position. This structural difference between the target material and the read-across analogs does not affect consideration of the toxicity endpoint.
  - The similarity between the target material and the read-across analog is indicated by the Tanimoto score in the above table. Differences between the structures that affect the Tanimoto score do not affect consideration of the toxicity endpoints.
  - The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analog are sufficiently similar to enable comparison of their toxicological properties.
  - According to the QSAR OECD Toolbox (v4.2), structural alerts for toxicity endpoints are consistent between the target material and the read-across analog.
  - The target material and the read-across analog are predicted to be sensitizers by the CAESAR model for skin sensitization. There are no other protein binding alerts for skin sensitization. The data described in the skin sensitization section shows that the read-across analog does not pose a concern for the skin sensitization endpoint. Therefore, the prediction will be superseded by the availability of the data.
  - The target material and the read-across analog are expected to be metabolized similarly, as shown by the metabolism simulator.

References

Api, A.M., Belsito, D., Bruze, M., Cadby, P., Calow, P., Dagli, M.L., Dekant, W., Ellis, G., Fryer, A.D., Fukayama, M., Griem, P., Hickey, C., Kromidas, L., Lalko, J.F., Liebler, D.C., Miyachi, Y., Politano, V.T., Renskers, K., Ritacco, G., Salvito, D., Schultz, T.W., Sipes, I.G., Smith, B., Vitale, D., Wilcox, D.K., 2015. Criteria for the Research Institute for fragrance materials, Inc. (RIFM) safety evaluation process for fragrance ingredients. Food Chem. Toxicol. 82, S1–S19.

Arctander, S., 1969. Perfume and Flavor Chemicals (Aroma Chemicals), vols. I and II. Published by the author: Montclair, NJ (USA).

Carthew, P., Clapp, C., Gutsell, S., 2009. Exposure based waiving: the application of the toxicological threshold of concern (TTC) to inhalation exposure for aerosol ingredients in consumer products. Food Chem. Toxicol. 47 (6), 1287–1295.

Cassano, A., Manganaro, A., Martin, T., Young, D., Piclin, N., Pintore, M., Bigoni, D., Benfenati, E., 2010. CAESAR models for developmental toxicity. Chem. Cent. J. 4 (Suppl. 1), S4.

Comiskey, D., Api, A.M., Barratt, C., Daly, E.J., Ellis, G., McNamara, C., O'Mahony, C., Robison, S.H., Safford, B., Smith, B., Tozer, S., 2015. Novel database for exposure to fragrance ingredients in cosmetics and personal care products. Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol. 72 (3), 660–672.

Comiskey, D., Api, A.M., Barrett, C., Ellis, G., McNamara, C., O'Mahony, C., Robison, S.H., Rose, J., Safford, B., Smith, B., Tozer, S., 2017. Integrating habits and practices data for soaps, cosmetics and air care products into an existing aggregate exposure model. Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol. 88, 144–156.

ECHA, 2012. Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment. November 2012 v2.1. http://echa.europa.eu/.

ECHA, 2017a. 12-Oxahexadecan-16-olide registration dossier. Retrieved from. https://echa.europa.eu/lt/registration-dossier/-/registered-dossier/20729/1/2.

ECHA, 2017b. Read-across assessment framework (RAAF). Retrieved from. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13628/raaf_en.pdf/614e5d61-891d-4154-8a47-87efebd1851a.

Henry, B., Foti, C., Alsante, K., 2009. Can light absorption and photostability data be used to assess the photosafety risks in patients for a new drug molecule? J. Photochem. Photobiol. B Biol. 96 (1), 57–62.

IFRA (International Fragrance Association), 2015. Volume of Use Survey, February 2015.

Klecak, G., 1985. The Freund's Complete adjuvant test and the open epicutaneous test in: Curr. Probl. Dermatol. 14, 152–171.

Na, M., Ritacco, G., O'Brien, D., Lavelle, M., Api, A., Basketter, D., 2021. Fragrance skin sensitization evaluation and human testing: 30-year experience. Dermatitis 32 (5), 339–352, 2021 Sep-Oct 01.

OECD, 2015. Guidance document on the reporting of integrated Approaches to testing and assessment (IATA). ENV/JM/HA(2015)7. Retrieved from. http://www.oecd.org/.
OECD, 2018. The OECD QSAR Toolbox, v3.2–4.2. Retrieved from http://www.qsartoolbox.org/. .
Ogoshi, K., Tanaka, N., Sekine, A., 1980. A study on the phototoxicity of musk type fragrances. Unpublished. A paper presented at S.C.C.J.,. Nov. 17 (1980), 1–7.
Ohkoshi, K., Watanabe, A., Tanaka, N., 1981. Phototoxicity of musks in perfumery. J. Soc. Cosmet. Chem. Jpn. 15 (3), 207–213.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1977a. Report on Human Maximization Studies. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Report to RIFM. RIFM report number 1702.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1977b. Skin Irritation and Capacity of Allergenic Sensitization Determined by the Open Epicutaneous Test (OET) of 12-oxahexadecanolide on guinea Pigs. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Givaudan-Roure Corporation. RIFM report number 29838.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1978a. Report on Human Maximization Studies. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Report to RIFM. RIFM report number 1698.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1978b. Phototoxicity of Synthetic Musks. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Shiseido Laboratories. RIFM report number 4415.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1979. Evaluation of 11-oxahexadecanolide in the Salmonella/microsome Mutagenicity Test. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Quest International. RIFM report number 29829.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1981. Primary Skin Irritation Study and Phototoxicity Study in guinea Pigs of 10-oxahexadecanolide. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Takasago International Corporation. RIFM report number 32633.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1982. Delayed Contact Hypersensitivity Study in guinea Pigs of 10-oxahexadecanolide. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Takasago International Corporation. RIFM report number 32632.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1995. 7-Day Oral (Gavage) Dose Rangefinding Study of Oxacyclohexadecen-2-One in the Rat. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Firmenich Incorporated. RIFM report number 31511.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1996. 4-Week Oral (Gavage) Toxicity Study of Oxacyclohexadecen-2-One in the Rat Followed by a 2 Week Treatment-free Period. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Firmenich Incorporated. RIFM report number 31512.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1997. Determination of "Ready" Biodegradability: Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Evolution Test (Modified Sturm Test) with 10-oxahexadecanolide. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Takasago International Corporation. RIFM report number 32634.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1998. 90-Day Oral (Gavage) Toxicity Study of Oxacyclohexadecen-2-One (Habanolide) in the Rat. [Addendum Attached]. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Firmenich Incorporated. RIFM report number 32224.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1999a. Hexadecanolide: Summary Report of Bacterial Mutation Assay. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.. Unpublished report from International Flavors and Fragrances. RIFM report number 54400.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1999b. Hexadecanolide: Bacterial Mutation Assay. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from International Flavors and Fragrances. RIFM report number 54401.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 1999c. Hexadecanolide: in Vitro Mammalian Chromosome Aberration Test in Human Lymphocytes. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.. Unpublished report from International Flavors and Fragrances. RIFM report number 54402.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2003a. Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one: Oral Gavage One Generation Reproduction Study in the Rat. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Firmenich SA. RIFM report number 44313.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2003b. Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one: Oral Gavage Teratology Study in the Rat. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Firmenich SA. RIFM report number 44314.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2005. Oxacyclohexadecen-2-one (Globalide): 28-Day Repeated Dose Oral Toxicity Study in Rats. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Symrise. RIFM report number 68029.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2011a. A Toxicological and Dermatological Assessment of Macrocyclic Lactone and Lactide Derivatives when Used as Fragrance Ingredients. The RIFM Expert Panel. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.. RIFM report number 63118.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2011b. Fragrance Material Review on Oxacyclohexadecen-2-One(E- and Z-Oxacyclohexadec-12(+13)-En-2-One). RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.. RIFM report number 63139.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2013. Report on the Testing of 10-oxahexadecanolide in the BlueScreen HC Assay (-/+ S9 Metabolic Activation). RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. RIFM report number 66002.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2017. Exposure Survey 15, March 2017.
RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2020. Clustering a Chemical Inventory for Safety Assessment of Fragrance Ingredients: Identifying Read-Across Analogs to Address Data Gaps. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.. RIFM report number 76272.
Rogers, D., Hahn, M., 2010. "Extended-Connectivity fingerprints.". J. Chem. Inf. Model. 50 (5), 742–754.
Safford, B., Api, A.M., Barratt, C., Comiskey, D., Daly, E.J., Ellis, G., McNamara, C., O'Mahony, C., Robison, S., Smith, B., Thomas, R., Tozer, S., 2015. Use of an aggregate exposure model to estimate consumer exposure to fragrance ingredients in personal care and cosmetic products. Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol. 72, 673–682.
Safford, B., Api, A.M., Barratt, C., Comiskey, D., Ellis, G., McNamara, C., O'Mahony, C., Robison, S., Rose, J., Smith, B., Tozer, S., 2017. Application of the expanded Creme RIFM consumer exposure model to fragrance ingredients in cosmetic, personal care and air care products. Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol. 86, 148–156.
Salvito, D.T., Senna, R.J., Federle, T.W., 2002. A Framework for prioritizing fragrance materials for aquatic risk assessment. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 21 (6), 1301–1308.
Schultz, T.W., Amcoff, P., Berggren, E., Gautier, F., Klaric, M., Knight, D.J., Mahony, C., Schwarz, M., White, A., Cronin, M.T., 2015. A strategy for structuring and reporting a read-across prediction of toxicity. Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol. 72 (3), 586–601.
Shen, J., Kromidas, L., Schultz, T., Bhatia, S., 2014. An *in silico* skin absorption model for fragrance materials. Food Chem. Toxicol. 74, 164–176.
US EPA, 2012a. Estimation Programs Interface Suite for Microsoft Windows, v4.0–v4.11. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, USA.
US EPA, 2012b. The ECOSAR (ECOlogical Structure Activity Relationship) Class Program for Microsoft Windows. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, USA, v2.0.