Food and Chemical Toxicology 153 (2021) 112181

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Food and Chemical Toxicology

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

Short review

RIFM fragrance ingredient safety assessment, hexadeca-1,5-lactone, CAS Registry Number 7370-44-7

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

[a] *Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc, 50 Tice Boulevard, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, 07677, USA*
[b] *Columbia University Medical Center, Department of Dermatology, 161 Fort Washington Ave., New York, NY, 10032, USA*
[c] *Malmo University Hospital, Department of Occupational & Environmental Dermatology, Sodra Forstadsgatan 101, Entrance 47, Malmo, SE-20502, Sweden*
[d] *School of Natural Resources & Environment, University of Michigan, Dana Building G110, 440 Church St, Ann Arbor, MI, 58109, USA*
[e] *Fraunhofer Institute for Toxicology and Experimental Medicine, Nikolai-Fuchs-Strasse 1, 30625, Hannover, Germany*
[f] *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*
[g] *University of Wuerzburg, Department of Toxicology, Versbacher Str. 9, 97078, Würzburg, Germany*
[h] *Oregon Health Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd., Portland, OR, 97239, USA*
[i] *Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Department of Biochemistry, Center in Molecular Toxicology, 638 Robinson Research Building, 2200 Pierce Avenue, Nashville, TN, 37232-0146, USA*
[j] *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*
[k] *The University of Tennessee, College of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Comparative Medicine, 2407 River Dr., Knoxville, TN, 37996- 4500, USA*
[l] *Department of Pharmacology, University of Arizona, College of Medicine, 1501 North Campbell Avenue, P.O. Box 245050, Tucson, AZ, 85724-5050, USA*
[m] *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: Aristides Tsatsakis

Keywords:
Genotoxicity
Repeated dose
Developmental
And reproductive toxicity
Skin sensitization
Phototoxicity/photoallergenicity
Local respiratory toxicity
Environmental safety

ABSTRACT

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

Hexadeca-1,5-lactone was evaluated for genotoxicity, repeated dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity, local respiratory toxicity, phototoxicity/photoallergenicity, skin sensitization, and environmental safety. Data from the target material and read-across analog hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone (CAS # 3301-94-8) show that hexadeca-1,5-lactone is not expected to be genotoxic. Data from analog δ-decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2) provide a calculated Margin of Exposure (MOE) > 100 for the repeated dose and reproductive toxicity endpoints. Data from analog δ-octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0) show that there are no safety concerns for skin sensitization under the current declared levels of use. The phototoxicity/photoallergenicity endpoints were evaluated based on ultraviolet (UV) spectra; hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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 I material; exposure is below the TTC (1.4 mg/day). For the hazard assessment based on the screening data, hexadeca-1,5-lactone is not Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic (PBT) as per the International Fragrance Association (IFRA) Environmental Standards. Hexadeca-1,5-lactone could not be risk screened as there were no reported volumes of use for either North America or Europe in the 2015 IFRA Survey.

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

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2021.112181
Received 10 February 2021; Accepted 30 March 2021
Available online 8 April 2021

Version: 020921. This version replaces any previous versions.



Name: Hexadeca-1,5-lactone CAS Registry Number: 7370-44-7

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., 2020)
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).

(*continued on next column*)

(*continued*)

*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.

Hexadeca-1,5-lactone was evaluated for genotoxicity, repeated dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity, local respiratory toxicity, phototoxicity/photoallergenicity, skin sensitization, and environmental safety. Data from the target material and read-across analog hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone (CAS # 3301-94-8) show that hexadeca-1,5-lactone is not expected to be genotoxic. Data from analog δ-decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2) provide a calculated Margin of Exposure (MOE) > 100 for the repeated dose and reproductive toxicity endpoints. Data from analog δ-octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0) show that there are no safety concerns for skin sensitization under the current declared levels of use. The phototoxicity/photoallergenicity endpoints were evaluated based on ultraviolet (UV) spectra; hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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 I material; exposure is below the TTC (1.4 mg/day). For the hazard assessment based on the screening data, hexadeca-1,5-lactone is not Persistent, Bioaccumulative, and Toxic (PBT) as per the International Fragrance Association (IFRA) Environmental Standards. Hexadeca-1,5-lactone could not be risk screened as there were no reported volumes of use for either North America or Europe in the 2015 IFRA Survey.

Human Health Safety Assessment

Genotoxicity: Not expected to be genotoxic.	(RIFM, 2008; RIFM, 2015)
Repeated Dose Toxicity: NOAEL = 333 mg/kg/day.	(ECHA REACH Dossier: δ-Decalactone; ECHA, 2013)
Reproductive Toxicity: Developmental toxicity: 1000 mg/kg/day. Fertility: 1000 mg/kg/day.	(ECHA REACH Dossier: δ-Decalactone; ECHA, 2013)
Skin Sensitization: No concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared levels of use.	(ECHA REACH Dossier: Tetrahydro-6-propyl-2H-pyran-2-one; ECHA, 2019)
Phototoxicity/Photoallergenicity: Not expected to be phototoxic/photoallergenic.	(UV Spectra; RIFM Database)

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

Environmental Safety Assessment

Hazard Assessment:

Persistence:	
Screening-level: 3.08 (BIOWIN 3)	(EPI Suite v4.11; US EPA, 2012a)
Bioaccumulation:	
Screening-level: 85.25 L/kg	(EPI Suite v4.11; US EPA, 2012a)
Ecotoxicity:	
Screening-level: Not applicable	

Conclusion: Not PBT or vPvB as per IFRA Environmental Standards

Risk Assessment:

- **Revised PEC/PNECs (2015 IFRA VoU):** North America and Europe: not applicable; no Volume of Use in 2015 reported for Europe and North America

1. Identification

1. **Chemical Name:** Hexadeca-1,5-lactone
2. **CAS Registry Number:** 7370-44-7
3. **Synonyms:**.δ.-Hexadecanolide; 5-Hexadecanolide; 5-Hydroxyhexadecanoic acid lactone; 2H-Pyran-2-one, tetrahydro-6-undecyl-; 6-Undecyltetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-one; δ-Hexadecalactone; Tetrahydro-6-undecyl-2H-pyran-2-one; 6-Undecyltetrahydropyran-2-one; δ-Hexadecanolide; δ-Palmitolactone; 5-Hydroxyhexadecanoic acid δ lactone; Hexadeca-1,5-lactone
4. **Molecular Formula:** $C_{16}H_{30}O_2$
5. **Molecular Weight:** 254.41
6. **RIFM Number:** 1418
7. **Stereochemistry:** Isomer not specified. One chiral center present and 2 total stereoisomers possible.

2. Physical data

1. **Boiling Point:** 362.08 °C (EPI Suite)

2. **Flash Point:** Not Available
3. **Log K_{OW}:** 5.51 (EPI Suite)
4. **Melting Point**: 64.69 °C (EPI Suite)
5. **Water Solubility:** 0.4371 mg/L (EPI Suite)
6. **Specific Gravity:** Not Available
7. **Vapor Pressure:** 2.9e-005 mm Hg at 25 °C (EPI Suite)
8. **UV Spectra:** No significant absorbance between 290 and 700 nm; molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark (1000 L mol^{-1} · cm^{-1})
9. **Appearance/Organoleptic:** Not Available

3. Volume of use (worldwide band)

1. <0.1 metric ton per year (IFRA, 2015)

4. Exposure to fragrance ingredient (Creme RIFM Aggregate Exposure Model v1.0)

1. **95**th **Percentile Concentration in Shampoo:** 0.0090% (RIFM, 2017) (No Reported Use in Fine Fragrance)
2. **Inhalation Exposure*:** <0.0001 mg/kg/day or <0.0001 mg/day (RIFM, 2017)
3. **Total Systemic Exposure**:** 0.00014 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

1. **Cramer Classification:** Class I, Low (Expert Judgment)

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

*Due to potential discrepancies with the current *in silico* tools (Bhatia et al., 2015), the Cramer Class of the target material was determined using expert judgment based on the Cramer decision tree (Cramer et al., 1978). See the Appendix below for further details.

2. **Analogs Selected**:
   a. **Genotoxicity:** Hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone (CAS # 3301-94-8)
   b. **Repeated Dose Toxicity:** δ-Decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2)
   c. **Reproductive Toxicity:** δ-Decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2)
   d. **Skin Sensitization:** δ-Octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0)
   e. **Phototoxicity/Photoallergenicity:** None
   f. **Local Respiratory Toxicity:** None
   g. **Environmental Toxicity:** None
3. **Read-across Justification**: See Appendix below

7. Metabolism

No relevant data available for inclusion in this safety assessment.
Additional References:
None.

8. Natural occurrence (Discrete chemical) or composition (NCS)

Hexadeca-1,5-lactone is reported to occur in the following foods by the VCF*:
Beef.
Cheddar cheese.
Chicken.
Lamb and mutton.
Milk and milk products.
Passion fruit (*Passiflora* species).
*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

hexadeca-1,5-lactone has been pre-registered for 2010; no dossier available as of 02/09/21

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, hexadeca-1,5-lactone does not present a concern for genotoxicity.

11.1.1.1. Risk assessment. The mutagenic activity of hexadeca-1,5-lactone has been evaluated in a bacterial reverse mutation assay conducted in compliance with GLP regulations and in accordance with OECD TG 471 using the standard plate incorporation and preincubation method. *Salmonella typhimurium* strains TA98, TA100, TA1535, TA1537, and TA102 were treated with hexadeca-1,5-lactone in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) at concentrations up to 5000 μg/plate. No increases in the mean number of revertant colonies were observed at any tested concentration in the presence or absence of S9 (RIFM, 2008). Under the conditions of the study, hexadeca-1,5-lactone was not mutagenic in the Ames test.

There are no studies assessing the clastogenic activity of hexadeca-1,5-lactone; however, read-across can be made to hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone (CAS # 3301-94-8; see Section VI).

The clastogenic activity of hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone 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 hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone in DMSO at concentrations of up to 1562.3 μg/mL in the dose range finding (DRF) study; micronuclei analysis was conducted at concentrations up to 1562.3 μg/mL in the presence and absence of metabolic activation. Hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone did not induce binucleated cells with micronuclei when tested in either the presence or absence of an S9 activation system (RIFM, 2015). Under the conditions

of the study, hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone was considered to be non-clastogenic in the *in vitro* micronucleus test, and this can be extended to hexadeca-1,5-lactone.

Based on the data available, hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone does not present a concern for genotoxic potential, and this can be extended to hexadeca-1,5-lactone.

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 10/02/20.

11.1.2. Repeated dose toxicity

The MOE for hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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 hexadeca-1,5-lactone. Read-across material δ-decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2) has sufficient data to support the repeated dose toxicity endpoint. In a GLP/OECD 407-compliant subchronic study, 6 Sprague Dawley rats/sex/dose were administered δ-decalactone via gavage at doses of 0, 250, 500, and 1000 mg/kg/day for 28 days. An additional 6 Sprague Dawley rats/sex/dose at 0 and 1000 mg/kg/day were maintained as recovery groups for 2 weeks after the treatment period. No mortality occurred throughout the study period. No treatment-related effects were observed on clinical signs, body weights, bodyweight gains, food consumption, ophthalmology, hematology, clinical biochemistry, urinalysis, behavior, organ weights, gross pathology, or histopathology. Based on no toxicologically relevant effects seen up to the highest dose, the NOAEL for this study was determined to be 1000 mg/kg/day (ECHA, 2013).

A default safety factor of 3 was used when deriving a NOAEL from an OECD 407 study (ECHA, 2012). The safety factor has been approved by the Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety*.

Thus, the derived NOAEL for the repeated dose toxicity data is 1000/3, or 333 mg/kg/day.

Therefore, the hexadeca-1,5-lactone MOE for the repeated dose toxicity endpoint can be calculated by dividing the δ-decalactone NOAEL in mg/kg/day by the total systemic exposure to hexadeca-1,5-lactone, 333/0.00014, or 208125.

In addition, the total systemic exposure to hexadeca-1,5-lactone (0.14 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.

*The Expert Panel for Fragrance Safety is composed of scientific and technical experts in their respective fields. This group provides advice and guidance.

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 08/14/20.

11.1.3. Reproductive toxicity

The MOE for hexadeca-1,5-lactone is adequate for the reproductive toxicity endpoint at the current level of use.

11.1.3.1. Risk assessment. There are no reproductive toxicity data on hexadeca-1,5-lactone. Read-across material δ-decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2) has sufficient data to support the reproductive toxicity endpoint. An OECD 421/GLP reproduction/developmental toxicity screening test was conducted in Sprague Dawley rats. Groups of 12 rats/sex/dose were administered test material δ-decalactone via oral gavage in corn oil at doses of 0, 250, 500, or 1000 mg/kg/day. Males were dosed for 37 days (2 weeks prior to mating and continued through the mating period until and up to termination), while females were dosed for approximately 62 days (2 weeks prior to mating, during mating, post-coitum, and up to lactation day 13). No treatment-related mortality was observed in any dose group. In addition, no changes were observed in mean body weight and organ weights (both relative and absolute). Further, no treatment-related effects were seen with respect to any fertility parameters for males and females. Similarly, pups did not show any clinical signs or external anomalies throughout the lactation period. No treatment-related changes in pup weights or ano-genital distance ratio were observed in any groups. Thus, the NOAEL for developmental toxicity and fertility was considered to be 1000 mg/kg/day, the highest dose tested (ECHA, 2013). Therefore, the hexadeca-1,5-lactone MOE for the developmental toxicity and fertility endpoints can be calculated by dividing the δ-decalactone NOAEL in mg/kg/day by the total systemic exposure to hexadeca-1,5-lactone, 1000/0.00014, or 7142857.

In addition, the total systemic exposure to hexadeca-1,5-lactone (0.14 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: 09/16/20.

11.1.4. Skin sensitization

Based on read-across δ-octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0), hexadeca-1,5-lactone presents no concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared levels of use.

11.1.4.1. Risk assessment. No skin sensitization studies are available for hexadeca-1,5-lactone. Based on read-across material δ-octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0; see Section VI), hexadeca-1,5-lactone is not considered a skin sensitizer. The chemical structure of these materials indicate that they would be expected to react with skin proteins directly (Roberts et al., 2007; Toxtree v3.1.0; OECD Toolbox v4.2). The read-across material, δ-octalactone was found to be negative in an *in vitro* direct peptide reactivity assay (DPRA) and KeratinoSens assay (ECHA, 2019). In a guinea pig maximization test, the read-across material did not present reactions indicative of sensitization (RIFM, 1981). In a human maximization test, no skin sensitization reactions were observed with read-across material δ-octalactone (RIFM, 1977).

Based on weight of evidence (WoE) from structural analysis and read-across material δ-octalactone, hexadeca-1,5-lactone does not present a concern for skin sensitization under the current, declared levels of use.

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 09/16/20.

11.1.5. Phototoxicity/photoallergenicity

Based on the available UV/Vis spectra, hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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 hexadeca-1,5-lactone in experimental models. UV/Vis absorption spectra indicate no significant absorption between 290 and 700 nm. The corresponding molar absorption coefficient is well below the benchmark of concern for phototoxicity and photoallergenicity (Henry et al., 2009). Based on the lack of absorbance, hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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^{-1} · cm^{-1} (Henry et al., 2009).

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 01/27/21.

11.1.6. Local respiratory toxicity

The MOE could not be calculated due to a lack of appropriate data. The exposure level for hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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 hexadeca-1,5-lactone. Based on the Creme RIFM Model, the inhalation exposure is < 0.0001 mg/day. This exposure is at least 14000 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: 09/16/20.

11.2. Environmental endpoint summary

11.2.1. Screening-level assessment

A screening-level risk assessment of hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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, hexadeca-1,5-lactone was not able to be risk screened as there were no reported volumes of use for either North America or Europe in the 2015 IFRA Survey.

A screening-level hazard assessment using EPI Suite v4.11 (US EPA, 2012a) did not identify hexadeca-1,5-lactone 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 ≥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

Not applicable.

11.2.2.1. Key studies. ***Biodegradation.***

No data available.

Ecotoxicity:

No data available.

Other available data:

Hexadeca-1,5-lactone has been pre-registered for REACH with no additional information available at this time.

11.2.3. Risk Assessment Refinement

Not applicable.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 09/14/20.

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://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 02/09/21.

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.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2021.112181.

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, 2017).

- 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
Principal Name	Hexadeca-1,5-lactone	Hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone	δ-Octalactone	δ-Decalactone
CAS No.	7370-44-7	3301-94-8	698-76-0	705-86-2
Structure				
Similarity (Tanimoto Score)		0.97	0.94	1.00
Endpoint		• Genotoxicity	• Skin sensitization	• Repeated dose toxicity • Reproductive toxicity
Molecular Formula	$C_{16}H_{30}O_2$	$C_9H_{16}O_2$	$C_8H_{14}O_2$	$C_{10}H_{18}O_2$
Molecular Weight	254.414	156.225	142.198	170.252
Melting Point (°C, EPI Suite)	64.69	8.52	−2.09	18.86
Boiling Point (°C, EPI Suite)	362.08	267.02	249.98	283.16
Vapor Pressure (Pa @ 25°C, EPI Suite)	3.87E-03	1.45E+00	3.64E+00	6.33E-01
Water Solubility (mg/L, @ 25°C, WSKOW v1.42 in EPI Suite)	4.37E-01	1.20E+03	3.63E+03	3.94E+02
Log K_{OW}	5.51	2.08	1.59	2.57
J_{max} (μg/cm^2/h, SAM)	0.06	25.79	50.62	12.71
Henry's Law (Pa·m^3/mol, Bond Method, EPI Suite)	3.12E+02	4.29E+01	3.23E+01	5.69E+01
Genotoxicity				
DNA Binding (OASIS v1.4, QSAR Toolbox v4.2)	No alert found	No alert found		
DNA Binding (OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2)	No alert found	No alert found		
Carcinogenicity (ISS)	No alert found	No alert found		
DNA Binding (Ames, MN, CA, OASIS v1.1)	No alert found	No alert found		
***In Vitro* Mutagenicity (Ames, ISS)**	No alert found	No alert found		
***In Vivo* Mutagenicity (Micronucleus, ISS)**	No alert found	No alert found		
Oncologic Classification	Lactone Type Reactive Functional Groups			

(*continued on next page*)

(*continued*)

	Target Material	Read-across Material	Read-across Material	Read-across Material
		Lactone Type Reactive Functional Groups		
Repeated Dose Toxicity				
Repeated Dose (HESS)	Perhexiline (Hepatotoxicity) Alert			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 (low reliability)
Skin Sensitization				
Protein Binding (OASIS v1.1)	Acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation ≫ Active cyclic agents		Acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation ≫ Active cyclic agents	
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)	Acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation ≫ Active cyclic agents		Acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation|Acylation ≫ Ring opening acylation ≫ Active cyclic agents	
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

Summary

There are insufficient toxicity data on hexadeca-1,5-lactone (CAS 7370-44-7). Hence, *in silico* evaluation was conducted to determine read-across analogs for this material. Based on structural similarity, reactivity, physical–chemical properties, and expert judgment, hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone (CAS # 3301-94-8), δ-octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0), and δ-decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2) were identified as read-across analogs with sufficient data for toxicological evaluation.

Conclusions

- Hydroxynonanoic acid, δ-lactone (CAS # 3301-94-8) was used as a read-across analog for the target material hexadeca-1,5-lactone (CAS 7370-44-7) for the genotoxicity endpoint.
  - o The target material and the read-across analog are structurally similar and belong to a class of δ lactones.
  - o The target material and the read-across analog share a δ-lactone substructure.
  - o The key difference between the target material and the read-across analog is that the target material is a lactone of dodecanoic acid, while the read-across analog is a lactone of nonanoic acid. The read-across analog contains the structural features of the target material that are relevant to this endpoint and is expected to have equal or greater potential for toxicity as compared to the target.
  - o The similarity between the target material and the read-across analog is indicated by the Tanimoto score. Differences between the structures that affect the Tanimoto score are toxicologically insignificant.
  - o The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analog are sufficiently similar to enable a comparison of their toxicological properties.
  - o According to the OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2, structural alerts for toxicological endpoints are consistent between the target material and the read-across analog.
  - o The read-across analog and the target material have an alert of containing lactone type reacting functional group under the oncologic classification scheme by OECD QSAR Toolbox. Lactones are cyclic esters that may open to serve as an acylating agent. In general, the ability to open the ring is dependent on the size of the ring. Gamma and δ lactones are considerably weaker acylating agents with some carcinogenicity potential, only if unsaturation is present in the ring α-β to the carbonyl group. The ring in the target material, as well as the read-across analog, is saturated. The data on the read-across analog confirms that the material does not pose a concern for genetic toxicity. Therefore, based on the structural similarity between the target material and the read-across analog, and the data present on the read-across analog, the predictions are superseded by the data.
  - o The target material and the read-across analog are expected to be metabolized similarly, as shown by the metabolism simulator.
  - o The structural alerts for the endpoints evaluated are consistent between the metabolites of the read-across analog and the target material.
- δ-Octalactone (CAS # 698-76-0) was used as a read-across analog for the target material hexadeca-1,5-lactone (CAS 7370-44-7) for the skin sensitization endpoint.
  - o The target material and the read-across analog are structurally similar and belong to a class of δ lactones.
  - o The target material and the read-across analog share a δ-lactone substructure.
  - o The key difference between the target material and the read-across analog is that the target material is a lactone of dodecanoic acid, while the read-across analog is a lactone of octanoic acid. The read-across analog contains the structural features of the target material that are relevant to this endpoint and is expected to have equal or greater potential for toxicity as compared to the target.

- The similarity between the target material and the read-across analog is indicated by the Tanimoto score. Differences between the structures that affect the Tanimoto score are toxicologically insignificant.
- The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analog are sufficiently similar to enable a comparison of their toxicological properties.
- According to the OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2, structural alerts for toxicological endpoints are consistent between the target material and the read-across analog.
- The read-across analog and the target material have an alert of direct acylating agent for skin sensitization endpoint by several models. Lactones are cyclic esters that may open to serve as an acylating agent. The chemical may have an assumptive weak sensitization effect as a result of protein acylation by lactones. In general, the ability to open the ring is dependent on the size of the ring. Gamma and δ lactones are considerably weaker acylating agents, only if unsaturation is present in the ring α-β to the carbonyl group. The ring in the target material, as well as the read-across analog, is saturated. The data on the read-across analog confirms that the material does not pose a concern for skin sensitization. Therefore, based on the structural similarity between the target material and the read-across analog, and the data present on the read-across analog, the predictions are superseded by the data.
- The target material and the read-across analog are expected to be metabolized similarly, as shown by the metabolism simulator.
- The structural alerts for the endpoints evaluated are consistent between the metabolites of the read-across analog and the target material.

- δ-Decalactone (CAS # 705-86-2) was used as a read-across analog for the target material hexadeca-1,5-lactone (CAS 7370-44-7) for the repeated dose toxicity and reproductive toxicity endpoints.
  - The target material and the read-across analog are structurally similar and belong to a class of δ lactones.
  - The target material and the read-across analog share a δ-lactone substructure.
  - The key difference between the target material and the read-across analog is that the target material is a lactone of dodecanoic acid, while the read-across analog is a lactone of decanoic acid. The read-across analog contains the structural features of the target material that are relevant to this endpoint and is expected to have equal or greater potential for toxicity as compared to the target.
  - The similarity between the target material and the read-across analog is indicated by the Tanimoto score. Differences between the structures that affect the Tanimoto score are toxicologically insignificant.
  - The physical–chemical properties of the target material and the read-across analog are sufficiently similar to enable a comparison of their toxicological properties.
  - According to the OECD QSAR Toolbox v4.2, structural alerts for toxicological endpoints are consistent between the target material and the read-across analog.
  - There are no alerts for the target material and the read-across analog for repeated dose toxicity and reproductive toxicity. Therefore, the predictions are consistent with the data.
  - The target material and the read-across analog are expected to be metabolized similarly, as shown by the metabolism simulator.
  - The structural alerts for the endpoints evaluated are consistent between the metabolites of the read-across analog and the target material.

Explanation of Cramer Classification

Due to potential discrepancies with the current *in silico* tools (Bhatia et al., 2015), the Cramer Class of the target material was determined using expert judgment based on the Cramer decision tree (Cramer et al., 1978).

Q1. A normal constituent of the body? No.
Q2. Contains functional groups associated with enhanced toxicity? No.
Q3. Contains elements other than C, H, O, N, and divalent S? No.
Q43. Possibly harmful divalent sulfur? No.
Q5. Simply branched aliphatic hydrocarbon or a common carbohydrate? No.
Q6. Benzene derivative with certain substituents? No.
Q44. Possibly harmful analog of benzene? No.
Q7. Heterocyclic? No.
Q8. Lactone or cyclic diester? Yes.
Q9. Lactone, fused to another ring, or 5- or 6-membered α,β-unsaturated lactone? No.
Q20. Aliphatic with some functional groups (see Cramer et al., 1978 for detailed explanation)? No.
Q21. Three or more different functional groups? No.
Q44. Free α-β unsaturated heteroatom? No.
Q18. One of the list? (see Cramer et al., 1978 for a detailed explanation on the list of categories). No. Class I (Class low)

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.

Bhatia, S., Schultz, T., Roberts, D., Shen, J., Kromidas, L., Api, A.M., 2015. Comparison of cramer classification between toxtree, the OECD QSAR Toolbox and expert judgment. Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol. 71 (1), 52–62.

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.

Cramer, G.M., Ford, R.A., Hall, R.L., 1978. Estimation of toxic hazard—a decision tree approach. Food Chem. Toxicol. 16 (3), 255–276.

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

Echa, 2013. Decan-5-olide registration dossier. Retrieved from. https://echa.europa.eu/lv/registration-dossier/-/registered-dossier/10090/1.
Echa, 2017. Read-across assessment framework (RAAF). Retrieved from. https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13628/raaf_en.pdf/614e5d61-891d-4154-8a47-87efebd1851a.
Echa, 2019. Tetrahydro-6-propyl-2H-pyran-2-one registration dossier. Retrieved from. https://echa.europa.eu/lv/registration-dossier/-/registered-dossier/27447/1.
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., 2020. Fragrance Skin Sensitization Evaluation and Human Testing, Dermatitis. https://doi.org/10.1097/DER.0000000000000684. November 16, 2020. Volume Publish Ahead of Print Issue. Retrieved from.
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/.
Rifm (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc), 1977. Report on Human Maximization Studies. Report to RIFM. RIFM Report Number 1702. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
Rifm (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc), 1981. Guinea Pig Skin Sensitisation Test with Delta-Octalactone. Unpublished Report from Quest International. RIFM Report Number 49271. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
Rifm (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc), 2008. Mutagenicity Study of Hexadeca-1,5-Lactone (Delta Hexadecalacton) in the Salmonella Thyphimurium Reverse Mutation Assay (In Vitro). Private Communication to FEMA. Unpublished Report from Flugge, C., Leuschner, J. & Winkler, A. RIFM Report Number 62189. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
Rifm (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc), 2015. Hydroxynonanoic Acid, Delta-Lactone: Micronucleus Test in Human Lymphocytes in Vitro. RIFM Report Number 68457. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
Rifm (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc), 2017. Exposure Survey 16. May 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 Report Number 76272. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
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.
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, v2.0. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, USA.