



## RIFM fragrance ingredient safety assessment, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate, CAS Registry Number 61931-81-5

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

<sup>a</sup> Research Institute for Fragrance Materials Inc., 50 Tice Boulevard, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, 07677, USA

<sup>b</sup> Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Columbia University Medical Center, Department of Dermatology, 161 Fort Washington Ave., New York, NY, 10032, USA

<sup>c</sup> Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Malmö University Hospital, Department of Occupational & Environmental Dermatology, Sodra Forstadsgatan 101, Entrance 47, Malmö, SE-20502, Sweden

<sup>d</sup> Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, School of Natural Resources & Environment, University of Michigan, Dana Building G110, 440 Church St., Ann Arbor, MI, 48109, USA

<sup>e</sup> 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

<sup>f</sup> Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, University of Würzburg, Department of Toxicology, Versbacher Str. 9, 97078, Würzburg, Germany

<sup>g</sup> Member Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety, Oregon Health & Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd., Portland, OR, 97239, USA

<sup>h</sup> 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

<sup>i</sup> 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

<sup>j</sup> 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

<sup>k</sup> 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


<sup>l</sup> 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

**Version:** 032122. 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](http://fragrancematerialsafetyresource.elsevier.com).

**Name:** *cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate



(continued on next column)

(continued)

**CAS Registry Number:** 61931-81-5

#### 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)

(continued on next page)

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [gsullivan@rifm.org](mailto:gsullivan@rifm.org) (G. Sullivan).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2022.113242>

Received 21 March 2022; Accepted 14 June 2022

Available online 17 June 2022

0278-6915/© 2022 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

(continued)

**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, 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.**

*cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate was evaluated for genotoxicity, repeated dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity, local respiratory toxicity, phototoxicity/photoallergenicity, skin sensitization, and environmental safety. Data show that *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate is not genotoxic. The repeated dose, reproductive, and local respiratory toxicity endpoints were evaluated using the Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) for a Cramer Class I material, and the exposure to *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate is below the TTC (0.03, 0.03 mg/kg/day, and 1.4 mg/day). The skin sensitization endpoint was completed using Dermal Sensitization Threshold (DST) for non-reactive materials (900  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ ); exposure is below the DST. The phototoxicity/photoallergenicity

(continued)

endpoints were evaluated based on ultraviolet/visible (UV/Vis) spectra; *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate is not expected to be phototoxic/photoallergenic. The environmental endpoints were evaluated; *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate was found not to be Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic (PBT) as per the IFRA Environmental Standards, and 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  $<1$ .

#### Human Health Safety Assessment

**Genotoxicity:** Not genotoxic.

(RIFM, 2021a; RIFM, 2021b)

**Repeated Dose Toxicity:** No NOAEL available. Exposure is below the TTC.

**Reproductive Toxicity:** No NOAEL available. Exposure is below the TTC.

**Skin Sensitization:** Not a concern for skin sensitization. Exposure is below the DST.

**Phototoxicity/Photoallergenicity:** Not expected to be phototoxic/photoallergenic. (UV/Vis Spectra; RIFM Database)

**Local Respiratory Toxicity:** No NOAEC available. Exposure is below the TTC.

#### Environmental Safety Assessment

**Hazard Assessment:**

**Persistence:** Screening-level: 3.4 (BIOWIN 3) (EPI Suite v4.11; US EPA, 2012a)

**Bioaccumulation:** Screening-level: 5.0 L/kg (EPI Suite v4.11; US EPA, 2012a)

**Ecotoxicity:** Screening-level: Fish LC50: 549.7 mg/L (RIFM Framework; Salvitto et al., 2002)

**Conclusion:** Not PBT or vPvB as per IFRA Environmental Standards

**Risk Assessment:**

**Screening-level:** PEC/PNEC (North America and Europe)  $<1$  (RIFM Framework; Salvitto et al., 2002)

**Critical Ecotoxicity Endpoint:** Fish LC50: 549.7 mg/L (RIFM Framework; Salvitto et al., 2002)

**RIFM PNEC is:** 0.5497  $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$

• **Revised PEC/PNECs (2015 IFRA VoU):** North America and Europe: Not applicable; cleared at the screening-level

## 1. Identification

- Chemical Name:** *cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate
- CAS Registry Number:** 61931-81-5
- Synonyms:** *cis*-3-Hexenyl 2-hydroxypropanoate; (Z)-3-Hexenyl lactate; Propanoic acid, 2-hydroxy-, 3-hexenyl ester, (Z)-; Hex-3-en-1-yl 2-hydroxypropanoate; *cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate
- Molecular Formula:**  $\text{C}_9\text{H}_{16}\text{O}_3$
- Molecular Weight:** 172.22 g/mol
- RIFM Number:** 5016
- Stereochemistry:** *Cis* isomer specified.

## 2. Physical data

- Boiling Point:** 96 °C at 7 mm Hg (Fragrance Materials Association [FMA]), 249.96 °C (EPI Suite)
- Flash Point:** 200 °F; CC (FMA)
- Log Kow:** 1.57 (EPI Suite)
- Melting Point:** 16.69 °C (EPI Suite)
- Water Solubility:** 8925 mg/L (EPI Suite)
- Specific Gravity:** 0.77 (FMA)
- Vapor Pressure:** 0.00188 mm Hg at 20 °C (EPI Suite v4.0), 0.1 mm Hg at 20 °C (FMA), 0.00326 mm Hg at 25 °C (EPI Suite)
- UV Spectra:** No significant absorbance between 290 and 700 nm; molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark (1000  $\text{L mol}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$ )
- Appearance/Organoleptic:** Not Available

## 3. Volume of use (Worldwide band)

- 0.1–1 metric tons per year (IFRA, 2015)

(continued on next column)

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

1. **95th Percentile Concentration in Fine Fragrance:** 0.019% (RIFM, 2017)
2. **Inhalation Exposure\*:** 0.00017 mg/kg/day or 0.012 mg/day (RIFM, 2017)
3. **Total Systemic Exposure\*\*:** 0.0023 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., 2015a; 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., 2015a; 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

##### 1. Cramer Classification: Class I, Low

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

2. **Analogs Selected:**
  - a. **Genotoxicity:** None
  - b. **Repeated Dose Toxicity:** None
  - c. **Reproductive Toxicity:** None
  - d. **Skin Sensitization:** None
  - e. **Phototoxicity/Photoallergenicity:** None
  - f. **Local Respiratory Toxicity:** None
  - g. **Environmental Toxicity:** None
3. **Read-across Justification:** None

#### 7. Metabolism

No relevant data available for inclusion in this safety assessment.

**Additional References:** None.

#### 8. Natural occurrence

*cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate is reported to occur in the following foods by the VCF\*:

Grape Brandy.

\*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

*cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate has been pre-registered for 2010; no dossier

available as of 03/21/22.

#### 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, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate does not present a concern for genotoxicity.

**11.1.1.1. Risk assessment.** *cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate was assessed in the BlueScreen assay and found negative for both cytotoxicity (positive: <80% relative cell density) and 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 were considered to fully assess the potential mutagenic or clastogenic effects of the target material.

The mutagenic activity of *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate has been evaluated in a bacterial reverse mutation assay conducted in compliance with GLP regulations and in accordance with OECD TG 471 using the pre-incubation method. *Salmonella typhimurium* strains TA98, TA100, TA1535, TA1537, and *Escherichia coli* strain WP2uvrA were treated with *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) at concentrations up to 5000 µg/plate. Increases in the mean number of revertant colonies were observed in strains WP2uvrA and TA1537 in the absence of S9 and TA1535 in the presence of S9; however, these results were not considered biologically relevant due to lack of dose responsiveness, being within their respective historical control limits, and lack of reproducibility (RIFM, 2021b). Under the conditions of the study, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate was not mutagenic in the Ames test.

The clastogenic activity of *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate was evaluated in an *in vitro* micronucleus test conducted in compliance with GLP regulations and in accordance with OECD TG 487. Human peripheral blood lymphocytes were treated with *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate in DMSO at concentrations up to 1770 µg/mL in the dose range finding (DRF) study; micronuclei analysis was conducted at concentrations up to 1770 µg/mL in the presence and absence of metabolic activation. *cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate did not induce binucleated cells with micronuclei when tested up to cytotoxic levels or the maximum concentration in either the presence or absence of an S9 activation system (RIFM, 2021a). Under the conditions of the study, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate was considered to be non-clastogenic in the *in vitro* micronucleus test.

Based on the data available, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate does not present a concern for genotoxic potential.

**Additional References:** RIFM, 2008.

**Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On:** 12/11/21.

##### 11.1.2. Repeated dose toxicity

There are insufficient repeated dose toxicity data on *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate or any read-across materials. The total systemic exposure to *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate is below the TTC for the repeated dose toxicity endpoint of a Cramer Class I material at the current level of use.

**11.1.2.1. Risk assessment.** There are no repeated dose toxicity data on *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate or any read-across materials that can be used to support the repeated dose toxicity endpoint. The total systemic exposure to *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate (2.3 µg/kg/day) is below the TTC (30 µg/kg/day; Kroes et al., 2007) for the repeated dose toxicity endpoint of a Cramer Class I material at the current level of use.

**Additional References:** None.

**Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On:** 11/04/21.

### 11.1.3. Reproductive toxicity

There are insufficient reproductive toxicity data on *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate or any read-across materials. The total systemic exposure to *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate is below the TTC for the reproductive toxicity endpoint of a Cramer Class I material at the current level of use.

**11.1.3.1. Risk assessment.** There are no reproductive toxicity data on *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate or any read-across materials that can be used to support the reproductive toxicity endpoint. The total systemic exposure to *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate (2.3 µg/kg/day) is below the TTC (30 µg/kg/day; Kroes et al., 2007; Laufersweiler et al., 2012) for the reproductive toxicity endpoint of a Cramer Class I material at the current level of use.

**Additional References:** None.

**Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On:** 08/10/21.

### 11.1.4. Skin sensitization

Based on the application of DST, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate does not present a safety concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared levels of use.

**11.1.4.1. Risk assessment.** No skin sensitization studies are available for *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate. The chemical structure of this material indicates that it would not be expected to react with skin proteins directly (Roberts et al., 2007; Toxtree v3.1.0; OECD Toolbox v4.2). Due to the lack of data, the reported exposure was benchmarked utilizing the non-reactive DST of 900 µg/cm<sup>2</sup> (Safford, 2008; Safford et al., 2011; Roberts et al., 2015; Safford et al., 2015b). The current exposure from the 95th percentile concentration is below the DST for non-reactive materials when evaluated in all QRA categories. Table 1 provides the maximum acceptable concentrations for *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate that present no appreciable risk for skin sensitization based on the non-reactive DST. These levels represent maximum acceptable concentrations based on the DST approach. However, additional studies may show it could be used at higher levels.

**Additional References:** None.

**Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On:** 11/20/20.

### 11.1.5. Phototoxicity/photoallergenicity

Based on the available UV/Vis spectra, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate would not be expected to present a concern for phototoxicity or photoallergenicity.

**11.1.5.1. Risk assessment.** There are no phototoxicity studies available for *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate in experimental models. UV/Vis absorption spectra indicate minor absorbance between 290 and 700 nm. The corresponding molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark of concern for phototoxicity and photoallergenicity (Henry et al., 2009). Based on the lack of absorbance, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate does not present a concern for phototoxicity or photoallergenicity.

**11.1.5.2. UV spectra analysis.** UV/Vis absorption spectra (OECD TG 101) were obtained. The spectra indicate no significant absorbance in the range of 290–700 nm. The molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark of concern for phototoxic effects, 1000 L mol<sup>-1</sup> • cm<sup>-1</sup> (Henry et al., 2009).

**Additional References:** None.

**Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On:** 12/04/20.

**Table 1**

Maximum acceptable concentrations for *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate that present no appreciable risk for skin sensitization based on non-reactive DST.

IFRA Category <sup>a</sup>	Description of Product Type	Maximum Acceptable Concentrations in Finished Products Based on Non-reactive DST	Reported 95th Percentile Use Concentrations in Finished Products
1	Products applied to the lips	0.069%	NRU <sup>b</sup>
2	Products applied to the axillae	0.021%	NRU <sup>b</sup>
3	Products applied to the face using fingertips	0.41%	0.004%
4	Fine fragrance products	0.39%	0.019%
5	Products applied to the face and body using the hands (palms), primarily leave-on	0.10%	0.035%
6	Products with oral and lip exposure	0.23%	0.005%
7	Products applied to the hair with some hand contact	0.79%	5.4 × 10 <sup>-5</sup> %
8	Products with significant anogenital exposure	0.041%	No Data <sup>c</sup>
9	Products with body and hand exposure, primarily rinse-off	0.75%	0.12%
10	Household care products with mostly hand contact	2.7%	0.08%
11	Products with intended skin contact but minimal transfer of fragrance to skin from inert substrate	1.5%	No Data <sup>c</sup>
12	Products not intended for direct skin contact, minimal or insignificant transfer to skin	No Restriction	0.3%

Note.

<sup>a</sup> For a description of the categories, refer to the IFRA/RIFM Information Booklet.

<sup>b</sup> No reported use.

<sup>c</sup> Fragrance exposure from these products is very low. These products are not currently in the Creme RIFM Aggregate Exposure Model.

### 11.1.6. Local Respiratory Toxicity

The margin of exposure could not be calculated due to a lack of appropriate data. The exposure level for *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate is below the Cramer Class I TTC value for inhalation exposure local effects.

**11.1.6.1. Risk assessment.** There are no inhalation data available on *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate. Based on the Creme RIFM Model, the inhalation exposure is 0.012 mg/day. This exposure is 117 times lower than the Cramer Class I TTC value of 1.4 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:** 11/18/20.

## 11.2. Environmental endpoint summary

### 11.2.1. Screening-level assessment

A screening-level risk assessment of *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate 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 volume of use, 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

	LC50 (Fish) (mg/L)	EC50 ( <i>Daphnia</i> ) (mg/L)	EC50 (Algae) (mg/L)	AF	PNEC ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ )	Chemical Class
RIFM Framework Screening-level (Tier 1)	<u>549.7</u>			1000000	0.5497	

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, *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate was identified as a fragrance material with no potential to present a possible risk to the aquatic environment (i.e., its screening-level PEC/PNEC is < 1).

A screening-level hazard assessment using EPI Suite v4.11 (US EPA, 2012a) did not identify *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate 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).

### 11.2.2. Risk assessment

Based on the current volume of use (2015), *cis*-3-hexenyl lactate does not present a risk to the aquatic compartment in the screening-level assessment.

### 11.2.2.1. Key studies

11.2.2.1.1. Biodegradation. No data available.

11.2.2.1.2. Ecotoxicity. No data available.

11.2.2.1.3. Other available data. *cis*-3-Hexenyl lactate 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  $\mu\text{g/L}$ ).

Endpoints used to calculate PNEC are underlined.

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

Exposure	Europe	North America
Log $K_{ow}$ Used	1.57	1.57
Biodegradation Factor Used	0	0
Dilution Factor	3	3
Regional Volume of Use Tonnage Band	<1	<1
<b>Risk Characterization: PEC/PNEC</b>	<b>&lt;1</b>	<b>&lt;1</b>

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

The RIFM PNEC is 0.5497  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . The revised PEC/PNECs for EU and NA are not applicable. The material was cleared at the screening-level and therefore does not present a risk to the aquatic environment at the current reported volume of use.

**Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 11/30/20.**

## 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://hpcchemicals.oecd.org/ui/Default.aspx>
- **EPA ACToR:** <https://actor.epa.gov/actor/home.xhtml>
- **US EPA HPVIS:** [https://ofmpub.epa.gov/opthpv/public\\_search\\_publicdetails?submission\\_id=24959241&ShowComments=Yes](https://ofmpub.epa.gov/opthpv/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](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](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 03/21/22.

### 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.

### 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.
- 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.
- 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/>.
- 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.*
- Kroes, R., Renwick, A.G., Feron, V., Galli, C.L., Gibney, M., Greim, H., Guy, R.H., Lhuguenot, J.C., van de Sandt, J.J.M., 2007. Application of the threshold of toxicological concern (TTC) to the safety evaluation of cosmetic ingredients. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 45 (12), 2533–2562.
- Laufersweiler, M.C., Gadagbui, B., Baskerville-Abraham, I.M., Maier, A., Willis, A., et al., 2012. Correlation of chemical structure with reproductive and developmental toxicity as it relates to the use of the threshold of toxicological concern. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 62 (1), 160–182.
- 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.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2008. Cell Mutation Assay at the Thymidine Kinase Locus (TK +/-) in Mouse Lymphoma L5178Y Cells with Propanoic Acid, 2-hydroxy-, 5-Methyl-2-(1-Methylethyl)cyclohexyl Ester (Frescolat® ML). RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. Unpublished report from Symrise. RIFM report number 57751.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2013. Report on the Testing of Cis-3-Hexenyl Lactate in the BlueScreen HC Assay (-/+ S9 Metabolic Activation). RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. RIFM report number 66728.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2017. Exposure Survey 15, March 2017.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2021a. cis-3-Hexenyl Lactate: in Vitro Mammalian Cell Micronucleus Assay in Human Peripheral Blood Lymphocytes (HPBL). RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. RIFM report number 78300.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2021b. cis-3-Hexenyl Lactate: Bacterial Reverse Mutation Assay. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA. RIFM report number 78303.
- Roberts, D.W., Api, A.M., Safford, R.J., Lalko, J.F., 2015. Principles for identification of high potency category chemicals for which the dermal sensitization threshold (DST) approach should not be applied. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 72 (3), 683–693.
- Roberts, D.W., Patlewicz, G., Kern, P.S., Gerberick, F., Kimber, I., Dearman, R.J., Ryan, C. A., Basketter, D.A., Aptula, A.O., 2007. Mechanistic applicability domain classification of a local lymph node assay dataset for skin sensitization. *Chem. Res. Toxicol.* 20 (7), 1019–1030.
- 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., 2015b. 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.
- Safford, R.J., 2008. The dermal sensitisation threshold—A TTC approach for allergic contact dermatitis. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 51 (2), 195–200.
- Safford, R.J., Api, A.M., Roberts, D.W., Lalko, J.F., 2015a. Extension of the dermal sensitization threshold (DST) approach to incorporate chemicals classified as reactive. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 72 (3), 694–701.
- Safford, R.J., Aptula, A.O., Gilmour, N., 2011. Refinement of the dermal sensitisation threshold (DST) approach using a larger dataset and incorporating mechanistic chemistry domains. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 60 (2), 218–224.
- 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.
- 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, v2.0.* United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, USA.