



Short Review



RIFM fragrance ingredient safety assessment, methyl 3-nonenolate, CAS Registry Number 13481-87-3

A.M. Api^a, D. Belsito^b, D. Botelho^a, M. Bruze^c, G.A. Burton Jr.^d, J. Buschmann^e, M.L. Dagli^f, M. Date^a, W. Dekant^g, C. Deodhar^a, M. Francis^a, A.D. Fryer^h, L. Jones^a, K. Joshi^a, S. La Cava^a, A. Lapczynski^a, D.C. Lieblerⁱ, D. O'Brien^a, A. Patel^a, T.M. Penning^j, G. Ritacco^a, J. Romine^a, N. Sadekar^a, D. Salvito^a, T.W. Schultz^k, I.G. Sipes^l, G. Sullivan^{a,*}, Y. Thakkar^a, Y. Tokura^m, S. Tsang^a

^a Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc., 50 Tice Boulevard, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, 07677, USA

^b Member RIFM Expert Panel, Columbia University Medical Center, Department of Dermatology, 161 Fort Washington Ave., New York, NY, 10032, USA

^c Member RIFM Expert Panel, Malmö University Hospital, Department of Occupational & Environmental Dermatology, Sodra Forstadsgratan 101, Entrance 47, Malmö, SE-20502, Sweden

^d Member RIFM Expert Panel, School of Natural Resources & Environment, University of Michigan, Dana Building G110, 440 Church St., Ann Arbor, MI, 58109, USA

^e Member RIFM Expert Panel, Fraunhofer Institute for Toxicology and Experimental Medicine, Nikolai-Fuchs-Strasse 1, 30625, Hannover, Germany

^f Member RIFM Expert Panel, 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 Member RIFM Expert Panel, University of Würzburg, Department of Toxicology, Versbacher Str. 9, 97078, Würzburg, Germany

^h Member RIFM Expert Panel, Oregon Health Science University, 3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Rd., Portland, OR, 97239, USA

ⁱ Member RIFM Expert Panel, 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 Member of RIFM Expert Panel, 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 Member RIFM Expert Panel, The University of Tennessee, College of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Comparative Medicine, 2407 River Dr., Knoxville, TN, 37996-4500, USA

^l Member RIFM Expert Panel, Department of Pharmacology, University of Arizona, College of Medicine, 1501 North Campbell Avenue, P.O. Box 245050, Tucson, AZ, 85724-5050, USA

^m Member RIFM Expert Panel, 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

Version: 110819. This version replaces any previous versions.

Name: Methyl 3-nonenolate
CAS Registry Number: 13481-87-3

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

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.,

(continued on next column)



(continued)

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 Observable 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

(continued on next page)

* Corresponding author.

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

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2020.111660>

Received 3 February 2020; Received in revised form 22 June 2020; Accepted 28 July 2020

Available online 8 August 2020

0278-6915/© 2020 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

(continued)

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.

Methyl 3-nonenone was evaluated for genotoxicity, repeated dose toxicity, reproductive toxicity, local respiratory toxicity, phototoxicity/photoallergenicity, skin sensitization, and environmental safety. Data from read-across analog methyl 3-hexenoate (CAS # 2396-78-3) show that methyl 3-nonenone is not expected to be 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 methyl 3-nonenone is below the TTC (0.03 mg/kg/day, 0.03 mg/kg/day, and 1.4 mg/day, respectively). The skin sensitization endpoint was completed using the Dermal Sensitization Threshold (DST) for non-reactive materials (900 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$); exposure is below the DST. The phototoxicity/photoallergenicity endpoints were evaluated based on ultraviolet (UV) spectra; methyl 3-nonenone is not expected to be phototoxic/photoallergenic. The environmental endpoints were evaluated; methyl 3-nonenone was found not to be persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT) as per the International Fragrance Association (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 expected to be genotoxic.

(RIFM, 2016a;
RIFM, 2016b)

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

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

Skin Sensitization: No safety concerns at current, declared use levels; exposure is below the DST.

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

(continued on next column)

(continued)

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

Environmental Safety Assessment

Hazard Assessment:

Persistence: Screening-level: 3.3 (BIOWIN 3) (US EPA, 2012a; EPI Suite v4.11)

Bioaccumulation: Screening-level: 109.5 L/kg (US EPA, 2012a; EPI Suite v4.11)

Ecotoxicity: Screening-level: Fish LC50: 9.313 mg/L (Salvito et al. (2002))

Conclusion: Not PBT or vPvB as per IFRA Environmental Standards

Risk Assessment:

Screening-level: PEC/PNEC (North America and Europe) < 1 (Salvito et al. (2002))

Critical Ecotoxicity Endpoint: Fish LC50: 9.313 mg/L (Salvito et al. (2002))

RIFM PNEC is: 0.00931 $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$

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

1. Identification

- Chemical Name:** Methyl 3-nonenone
- CAS Registry Number:** 13481-87-3
- Synonyms:** 3-Nonenoic acid, methyl ester; Methyl non-3-enoate; Methyl 3-nonenone
- Molecular Formula:** $\text{C}_{10}\text{H}_{18}\text{O}_2$
- Molecular Weight:** 170.25
- RIFM Number:** 5020
- Stereochemistry:** Isomer not specified. One stereocenter and a total of 2 stereoisomers possible.

2. Physical data

- Boiling Point:** 216.64 °C (EPI Suite)
- Flash Point:** 91 °C (Globally Harmonized System), 195 °F; CC (Fragrance Materials Association Database)
- Log K_{ow} :** 3.6 (EPI Suite)
- Melting Point:** 10.31 °C (EPI Suite)
- Water Solubility:** 52.1 mg/L (EPI Suite)
- Specific Gravity*:** 0.88500 @ 25.00 °C
- Vapor Pressure:** 0.103 mm Hg @ 20 °C (EPI Suite v4.0), 0.156 mm Hg @ 25 °C (EPI Suite)
- UV Spectra:** No significant absorbance between 290 and 700 nm; molar absorption coefficient is below the benchmark ($1000 \text{ L mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-1}$)
- Appearance/Organoleptic*:** A colorless to pale yellow clear liquid with a medium fruity, green, watermelon, pear, sweet, fresh, apple, melon odor.

*<http://www.thegoodscentscompany.com/data/rw1037561.html#toorgano>, accessed 02/06/18.

3. Volume of use (worldwide band)

- <0.1 metric ton per year (IFRA, 2015)

4. Exposure to fragrance ingredient

- 95th Percentile Concentration in Hydroalcohols:** 0.027% (RIFM, 2015)
- Inhalation Exposure*:** 0.000062 mg/kg/day or 0.0045 mg/day (RIFM, 2015)
- Total Systemic Exposure**:** 0.00055 mg/kg/day (RIFM, 2015)

*95th percentile calculated exposure derived from concentration survey data in the Creme RIFM Aggregate Exposure Model (Comiskey

et al., 2015, 2017; Safford et al., 2015a, 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, 2017; Safford et al., 2015a, 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 v2.6	OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.2
I	I	I

2. Analogs Selected:

- a. **Genotoxicity:** Methyl 3-hexenoate (CAS # 2396-78-3)
 - 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: See Appendix below

7. Metabolism

No relevant data available for inclusion in this safety assessment.

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

Methyl 3-nonenoate is reported to occur in the following foods by the VCF*:

Guava and feyoa

*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

Pre-registered for 2010; no dossier available as of 11/08/19.

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, methyl 3-nonenoate does not present a concern for genotoxicity.

11.1.1.1. Risk assessment. Methyl 3-nonenoate was assessed in the BlueScreen assay and found negative for genotoxicity, with and without metabolic activation (RIFM, 2013). BlueScreen HC 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 methyl 3-nonenoate; however, read-across can be made to methyl 3-hexenoate (CAS # 2396-78-3; see Section VI). The mutagenic activity of methyl 3-hexenoate 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 method. *Salmonella typhimurium* strains TA98, TA100, TA1535, TA1537, and *Escherichia coli* strain WP2uvrA were treated with methyl 3-hexenoate 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, 2016b). Under the conditions of the study, methyl 3-hexenoate was not mutagenic in the Ames test, and this can be extended to methyl 3-nonenoate.

There are no data assessing the clastogenic activity of methyl 3-nonenoate; however, read-across can be made to methyl 3-hexenoate (CAS # 2396-78-3; see Section VI). The clastogenic activity of methyl 3-hexenoate 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 methyl 3-hexenoate in DMSO at concentrations up to 1280 µg/mL in the presence and absence of S9 for 4 h and in the absence of S9 for 24 h. Methyl 3-hexenoate did not induce binucleated cells with micronuclei when tested up to cytotoxic concentrations in either the presence or absence of an S9 activation system (RIFM, 2016a). Under the conditions of the study, methyl 3-hexenoate was considered to be non-clastogenic in the *in vitro* micronucleus test, and this can be extended to methyl 3-nonenoate.

Based on the data available, methyl 3-nonenoate does not present a concern for genotoxic potential.

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 12/09/17.

11.1.2. Repeated dose toxicity

There are insufficient repeated dose toxicity data on methyl 3-nonenoate or on any read-across materials. The total systemic exposure to methyl 3-nonenoate 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 methyl 3-nonenoate or on any read-across materials that can be used to support the repeated dose toxicity endpoint. The total systemic exposure to methyl 3-nonenoate (0.55 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: 01/22/18.

11.1.3. Reproductive toxicity

There are insufficient reproductive toxicity data on methyl 3-nonenoate or on any read-across materials. The total systemic exposure to methyl 3-nonenoate 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 methyl 3-nonenoate or on any read-across materials that can be used to support the reproductive toxicity endpoint. The total systemic exposure to methyl 3-nonenoate (0.55 µg/kg/day) is below the TTC (30 µg/kg/day).

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: 01/22/18.

11.1.4. Skin sensitization

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

11.1.4.1. Risk assessment. The chemical structure of this material indicates that it would not be expected to react with skin proteins (Roberts et al., 2007; Toxtree v2.6.13; OECD Toolbox v4.1). No predictive skin sensitization studies are available for methyl 3-nonenonate. Acting conservatively due to the absence of data, the reported exposure was benchmarked utilizing the non-reactive DST of 900 $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$ (Safford, 2008; Safford et al., 2011, 2015b; Roberts et al., 2015). 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 methyl 3-nonenonate 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: 01/24/18.

11.1.5. Phototoxicity/photoallergenicity

Based on the available UV/Vis spectra, methyl 3-nonenonate 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 methyl 3-nonenonate 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, methyl 3-nonenonate 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 $\text{L mol}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-1}$ (Henry et al., 2009).

Additional References: None.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 10/18/17.

11.1.6. Local Respiratory Toxicity

The MOE could not be calculated due to a lack of appropriate data. The exposure level of methyl 3-nonenonate 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 methyl 3-nonenonate. Based on the Creme RIFM Model, the inhalation exposure is 0.0045 mg/day. This exposure is 311 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: 01/10/18.

Table 1

Maximum acceptable concentrations for methyl 3-nonenonate that present no appreciable risk for skin sensitization based on non-reactive DST.

IFRA Category ^a	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 ^b
2	Products applied to the axillae	0.021%	NRU ^b
3	Products applied to the face using fingertips	0.41%	$9.0 \times 10^{-8}\%$
4	Fine fragrance products	0.39%	0.027%
5	Products applied to the face and body using the hands (palms), primarily leave-on	0.10%	$4.9 \times 10^{-8}\%$
6	Products with oral and lip exposure	0.23%	$7.5 \times 10^{-5}\%$
7	Products applied to the hair with some hand contact	0.79%	NRU ^b
8	Products with significant anogenital exposure	0.041%	No Data ^c
9	Products with body and hand exposure, primarily rinse-off	0.75%	$8.8 \times 10^{-5}\%$
10	Household care products with mostly hand contact	2.7%	0.17%
11	Products with intended skin contact but minimal transfer of fragrance to skin from inert substrate	1.5%	No Data ^c
12	Products not intended for direct skin contact, minimal or insignificant transfer to skin	Not Restricted	$1.0 \times 10^{-3}\%$

Note:

^a For a description of the categories, refer to the IFRA/RIFM Information Booklet.

^b No reported use.

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

11.2. Environmental endpoint summary

11.2.1. Screening-level assessment

A screening-level risk assessment of methyl 3-nonenonate 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, methyl 3-nonenoate 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 <1).

A screening-level hazard assessment using EPI Suite v4.11 (US EPA, 2012a) did not identify methyl 3-nonenoate as possibly being either 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). Data on persistence and bioaccumulation are reported below and summarized in the Environmental Safety Assessment section prior to Section 1.

11.2.1.1. Risk assessment. Based on the current Volume of Use (2015), methyl 3-nonenoate does not present a risk to the aquatic compartment in the screening-level assessment.

11.2.1.2. Key studies

11.2.1.2.1. Biodegradation. No data available.

11.2.1.2.2. Ecotoxicity. No data available.

11.2.1.3. Other available data. Methyl 3-nonenoate has been pre-registered for REACH with no additional data at this time.

11.2.2. 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: Salvitto et al., 2002).

Exposure	Europe (EU)	North America (NA)
Log K_{ow} Used	3.6	3.6
Biodegradation Factor Used	0	0
Dilution Factor	3	3

(continued on next column)

(continued)

Exposure	Europe (EU)	North America (NA)
Regional Volume of Use Tonnage Band	NA	<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 0.00931 $\mu\text{g/L}$. The revised PEC/PNECs for EU and NA are not applicable. The material was cleared at the screening-level; therefore, it does not present a risk to the aquatic environment at the current reported volumes of use.

Literature Search and Risk Assessment Completed On: 01/16/18.

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**
- **SciFinder:** <https://scifinder.cas.org/scifinder/view/scifinder/scifinderExplore.jsf>
- **PubMed:** <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed>
- **TOXNET:** <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/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
- **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 11/08/19.

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

	LC50 (Fish) (mg/L)	EC50 (<i>Daphnia</i>)	EC50 (Algae)	AF	PNEC ($\mu\text{g/L}$)	Chemical Class
RIFM Framework Screening-level (Tier 1)	<u>9.312</u>			1000000	0.00931	

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.2020.111660>.



Appendix

Read-across Justification

Methods

The read-across analog was identified following the strategy for structuring and reporting a read-across prediction of toxicity as described in Schultz et al. (2015). The strategy is also 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, 2016).

- 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, and oncologic classification predictions were generated using OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.4 (OECD, 2018).
- ER binding and repeat dose categorization were generated using OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.4 (OECD, 2018).
- Developmental toxicity was predicted using CAESAR v2.1.7 (Cassano et al., 2010) and skin sensitization was predicted using Toxtree 2.6.13.
- Protein binding was predicted using OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.4 (OECD, 2018).
- The major metabolites for the target material and read-across analogs were determined and evaluated using OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.4 (OECD, 2018).

	Target Material	Read-across Material
Principal Name	Methyl 3-nonenoate	Methyl 3-hexenoate
CAS No.	13481-87-3	2396-78-3
Structure		
Similarity (Tanimoto Score)		0.55
Read-across Endpoint		• Genotoxicity
Molecular Formula	C ₁₀ H ₁₈ O ₂	C ₇ H ₁₂ O ₂
Molecular Weight	170.25	128.17
Melting Point (°C, EPI Suite)	−10.31	−45.17
Boiling Point (°C, EPI Suite)	216.64	155.15
Vapor Pressure (Pa @ 25 °C, EPI Suite)	20.8	421
Log K _{OW} (KOWWIN v1.68 in EPI Suite)	3.60	2.12
Water Solubility (mg/L, @ 25 °C, WSKOW v1.42 in EPI Suite)	52.1	1439
J_{\max} (µg/cm ² /h, SAM)	20.188	109.817
Henry's Law (Pa·m ³ /mol, Bond Method, EPI Suite)	1.14E+002	4.85E+001
Genotoxicity		
DNA Binding (OASIS v1.4, QSAR Toolbox v3.4)	• No alert found	• No alert found
DNA Binding (OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.4)	• No alert found	• No alert found
Carcinogenicity (ISS)	• Non-carcinogen (low reliability)	• Non-carcinogen (low reliability)
DNA Binding (Ames, MN, CA, OASIS v1.1)	• No alert found	• No alert found
<i>In Vitro</i> Mutagenicity (Ames, ISS)	• No alert found	• No alert found
<i>In Vivo</i> Mutagenicity (Micronucleus, ISS)	• No alert found	• No alert found
Oncologic Classification	• Not classified	• Not classified
Metabolism		
Rat Liver S9 Metabolism Simulator and Structural Alerts for Metabolites (OECD QSAR Toolbox v3.4)	See Supplemental Data 1	See Supplemental Data 2

Summary

There are insufficient toxicity data on methyl 3-nonenolate (CAS # 13481-87-3). 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, methyl 3-hexenoate (CAS # 2396-78-3) was identified as a read-across material with sufficient data for toxicological evaluation.

Conclusions

- Methyl 3-hexenoate (CAS # 2396-78-3) was used as a read-across analog for the target material methyl 3-nonenolate (CAS # 13481-87-3) for the genotoxicity endpoint.
 - The target material and the read-across analog are structurally similar and belong to the class of unsaturated aliphatic esters.
 - The target material and the read-across analog share an acetyl alcohol fragment.
 - The key difference between the target material and the read-across analog is that the target material has a nonenyl acid fragment and the read-across analog has a hexenyl fragment. This structural difference is toxicologically insignificant.
 - 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 v3.4, structural alerts for toxicological 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.
 - The structural alerts for the endpoints evaluated are consistent between the metabolites of the read-across analog and the target material.

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., Salviato, 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.
- 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 Chapter R.11: PBT Assessment*, November 2012 v1.1.1. <http://echa.europa.eu/>.
- ECHA, 2016. *Read-across Assessment Framework (RAAF)*. Retrieved from. www.echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13628/raaf_en.pdf.
- 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.
- 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.), 2013. Report on the Testing of Methyl 3-nonenolate in the BlueScreen HC Assay (-/+ S9 Metabolic Activation). RIFM report number 66017. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2015. Exposure Survey 08. October 2015.
- RIFM (Research Institute for Fragrance Materials, Inc.), 2016a. Methyl 3-hexenoate: in Vitro Mammalian Cell Micronucleus Assay in Human Peripheral Blood Lymphocytes (HPBL). RIFM report number 71339. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
- RIFM, 2016b. Methyl 3-hexenoate: Bacterial Reverse Mutation Assay. RIFM report number 71340. RIFM, Woodcliff Lake, NJ, USA.
- 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.
- 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., 2015a. 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., 2015b. 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.
- Salviato, 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, v1.11. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, USA.