

Helsinki, 22 August 2018



DECISION ON A TESTING PROPOSAL

Based on Article 40 of Regulation ((EC) No 1907/2006) (the REACH Regulation), ECHA examined your testing proposal(s) and decided as follows.

While your originally proposed test for Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (EU B.31./OECD TG 414) using the analogue substance 1-phenylethanone (CAS No. 98-86-2; EC No. 202-708-7) is rejected, you are requested to perform:

1. Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex IX, Section 8.7.2.; test method: EU B.31./OECD TG 414) in a first species (rats or rabbits), oral route using the registered substance.

You may adapt the testing requested above according to the specific rules outlined in Annexes VI to X and/or according to the general rules contained in Annex XI to the REACH Regulation. To ensure compliance with the respective information requirement, any such adaptation will need to have a scientific justification, referring and conforming to the appropriate rules in the respective annex, and an adequate and reliable documentation.

You have to submit the requested information in an updated registration dossier by **29** *August 2019*. You also have to update the chemical safety report, where relevant.

The reasons for this decision are set out in Appendix 1. The procedural history is described in Appendix 2 and advice and further observations are provided in Appendix 3.



Appeal

This decision can be appealed to the Board of Appeal of ECHA within three months of its notification. An appeal, together with the grounds thereof, has to be submitted to ECHA in writing. An appeal has suspensive effect and is subject to a fee. Further details are described under: <u>http://echa.europa.eu/regulations/appeals</u>.

Authorised¹ by Kevin Pollard, Head of Unit, Evaluation E1

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ As this is an electronic document, it is not physically signed. This communication has been approved according to ECHA's Internal decision-approval process.



Appendix 1: Reasons

The decision of ECHA is based on the examination of the testing proposals submitted by you.

Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex IX, Section 8.7.2.) in a first species

Pursuant to Article 40(3)(d) and (c) of the REACH Regulation, ECHA may reject a proposed test and require the Registrant to carry out other tests in cases of non-compliance of the testing proposal with Annexes IX, X or XI.

A pre-natal developmental toxicity study for a first species is a standard information requirement as laid down in Annex IX, Section 8.7.2. of the REACH Regulation. The information on this endpoint is not available for the registered substance but needs to be present in the technical dossier to meet the information requirements. Consequently there is an information gap and it is necessary to provide information for this endpoint.

You have submitted a testing proposal for a pre-natal developmental toxicity study in rats according to EU B.31./OECD TG 414 with the analogue substance 1-phenylethanone (CAS No. 98-86-2; EC No. 202-708-7).

ECHA requested your considerations for alternative methods to fulfil the information requirement for Reproductive toxicity (pre-natal developmental toxicity). ECHA notes that you provided your considerations and you applied read-across to fulfil the respective information requirement, and no other alternative methods were available. ECHA has taken these considerations into account.

In the following ECHA has evaluated your proposal to perform the test with the analogue substance 1-phenylethanone (CAS No. 98-86-2; EC No. 202-708-7):

According to Annex XI, Section 1.5., two conditions shall be necessarily fulfilled. Firstly, there needs to be structural similarity between substances which results in a likelihood that the substances have similar physicochemical, toxicological and ecotoxicological properties so that the substances may be considered as a group or category. Secondly, it is required that the relevant properties of a substance within the group may be predicted from data for reference substance(s) within the group (read-across approach). ECHA considers that the generation of information by such alternative means should offer equivalence to prescribed tests or test methods.

Based on the above, a read-across hypothesis needs to be provided. This hypothesis establishes why a prediction for a toxicological or ecotoxicological property is reliable and should be based on recognition of the structural similarities and differences between the source and registered substances². This hypothesis explains why the differences in the chemical structures should not influence the toxicological/ ecotoxicological properties or should do so in a regular pattern.

The read-across approach must be justified scientifically and documented thoroughly, also taking into account the differences in the chemical structures. There may be several lines of

² Please see for further information ECHA Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment (version 1, May 2008), Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of chemicals.



supporting evidence used to justify the read-across hypothesis, with the aim of strengthening the case.

Due to the different nature of each endpoint and consequent difference in scientific considerations (e.g. key parameters, biological targets), a read-across must be specific to the endpoint or property under consideration. Key physicochemical properties may determine the fate of a compound, its partitioning into a specific phase or compartment and largely influence the availability of compounds to organisms, e.g. in bioaccumulation and toxicity tests. Similarly, biotic and abiotic degradation may alter the fate and bioavailability of compounds as well as be themselves hazardous, bioaccumulative and/or persistent. Thus, physicochemical and degradation properties influence the human health and environmental properties of a substance and should be considered in read-across assessments. However, the information on physicochemical and degradation properties is only a part of the read-across hypothesis, and it is necessary to provide additional justification which is specific to the endpoint or property under consideration.

The ECHA Read-across assessment framework foresees that there are two options which may form the basis of the read-across hypothesis³- (1) (Bio)transformation to common compound(s)- the read-across hypothesis is that different substances give rise to (the same) common compounds to which the organism is exposed and (2) Different compounds have the same type of effect(s)- the read-across hypothesis is that the organism is exposed to different compounds which have similar (eco)toxicological and fate properties as a result of structural similarity (and not as a result of exposure to common compounds).

Finally, Annex XI, Section 1.5. lists several additional requirements, which deal with the quality of the studies which are to be read-across.

You consider to achieve compliance with the REACH information requirements for the registered substance 4-phenylbutan-2-one (CAS No. 2550-26-7; EC No. 219-847-4) using data of a structurally similar substance 1-phenylethanone (CAS No. 98-86-2; EC No. 202-708-7) (hereafter the 'source substance').

You have provided a read-across documentation in the CSR.

You use the following arguments to support the prediction of properties of the registered substance from data for source substances within the group:



"In addition, the repeated dose toxicity studies of acetophenone and 4-phenylbutan-2-one show strong analogies in the toxicological profile (adaptive liver alterations at highest dose,

³ Please see ECHA's Read-Across Assessment Framework (https://echa.europa.eu/support/registration/how-to-avoid-unnecessarytesting-on-animals/grouping-of-substances-and-read-across).



minimal to slight hyaline droplets in the kidney, etc.) in similar dose ranges, strongly supporting the read-across approach from acetophenone. [...] It is concluded that reproductive/developmental toxicity of 4-phenylbutan-2-one can be assessed by using test data from acetophenone."

As an integral part of this prediction, you propose that the source and registered substance(s) have similar properties for the above-mentioned information requirements. ECHA considers that this information is your read-across hypothesis. More specifically, your suggestion that the target and source substance toxicological profiles are similar and strongly supporting the read-across approach from acetophenone is based on toxic findings reported under a Combined Repeated Dose Toxicity Study with the Reproduction / Developmental Toxicity Screening Test (according to OECD 422) with the source substance and a Repeated Dose 90-Day Oral Toxicity in Rodents (according to OECD 408) with the target substance.

ECHA's evaluation and conclusion on read-across

Your proposed adaptation argument is that the similarity in chemical structure and in some of the toxicological properties between the source and registered substance is a sufficient basis for predicting the properties of the registered substance for other endpoints. Structural similarity is a prerequisite for applying the grouping and read-across approach. However similarity in chemical structure and similarity of some of the toxicological properties does not necessarily lead to predictable or similar human health properties in other endpoints.

ECHA notes you have compared the target (registered) substance toxic profiles in the context of systemic toxic effects observed in the repeated dose toxicity studies while the potential of different developmental toxic effects has not been considered. Indeed, no data is available on the registered substance to make such consideration. Therefore, your justification based on structural similarity and toxicological properties has not established why the prediction is reliable for the human health endpoint for which the read-across is claimed (developmental toxicity). In addition, the metabolic pathways of the target and source substances lead to structurally different substances and you have not provided experimental data showing that these substances have similar toxic effects.

Therefore, ECHA considers that this grouping and read-across approach does not provide a reliable basis whereby the human health effects of the registered substance may be predicted from data of the source substance. Hence, this approach does not comply with the general rules of adaptation as set out in Annex XI, Section 1.5. of the REACH Regulation.

As described above, further elements are needed to establish a reliable prediction for a toxicological or ecotoxicological property, based on recognition of the structural similarities and differences between the source and registered substances. This could be achieved (if it is possible) by a well-founded hypothesis of (bio)transformation to a common compound(s), or that the registered and source substance(s) have the same type of effect(s), together with sufficient supporting information to allow a prediction of human health properties.

Therefore, your adaptation of the information requirement is rejected.

ECHA considers that a study performed with the registered substance is appropriate to fulfil the information requirement of Annex IX, Section 8.7.2. of the REACH Regulation.



According to the test method EU B.31./OECD TG 414, the rat is the preferred rodent species and the rabbit the preferred non-rodent species. On the basis of this default consideration, ECHA considers testing should be performed with the rat or rabbit as a first species.

You did not specify the route for testing. ECHA considers that the oral route is the most appropriate route of administration for substances except gases to focus on the detection of hazardous properties on reproduction as indicated in ECHA *Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment* (version 6.0, July 2017) Chapter R.7a, Section R.7.6.2.3.2. Since the substance to be tested is a liquid, ECHA concludes that testing should be performed by the oral route.

Therefore, pursuant to Article 40(3)(c) of the REACH Regulation, you are requested to carry out the study with the registered substance subject to the present decision: Pre-natal developmental toxicity study in a first species (rats or rabbits), oral route (test method: EU B.31./OECD TG 414) while your originally proposed test for Pre-natal developmental toxicity study in a first species (rats or rabbits), oral route (test method: EU B.31./OECD TG 414) with the analogue substance 1-phenylethanone (CAS No. 98-86-2; EC No. 202-708-7) is rejected according to Article 40(3)(d) of the REACH Regulation.

Notes for your consideration

For the selection of the appropriate species you are advised to consult ECHA *Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment* (version 6.0, July 2017), Chapter R.7a, Section R.7.6.2.3.2.

ECHA notes that a revised version of OECD TG 414 was adopted this year by the OECD. This revised version contains enhancements of certain endocrine disrupting relevant parameters. You should test in accordance with the revised version of the guideline as published on the OECD website for adopted test guidelines (<u>https://www.oecd-</u> ilibrary.org/environment/oecd-guidelines-for-the-testing-of-chemicals-section-4-healtheffects 20745788).



Appendix 2: Procedural history

ECHA received your registration containing the testing proposals for examination in accordance with Article 40(1) on Click here to choose date.

ECHA held a third party consultation for the testing proposals from 22 November 2017 until 8 January 2018. ECHA did not receive information from third parties.

This decision does not take into account any updates after **25 May 2018**, 30 calendar days after the end of the commenting period.

The decision making followed the procedure of Articles 50 and 51 of the REACH Regulation, as described below:

ECHA did not receive any comments by the end of the commenting period.

ECHA notified the draft decision to the competent authorities of the Member States for proposals for amendment.

As no amendments were proposed, ECHA took the decision according to Article 51(3) of the REACH Regulation.



Appendix 3: Further information, observations and technical guidance

- 1. This decision does not imply that the information provided in your registration dossier is in compliance with the REACH requirements. The decision does not prevent ECHA from initiating a compliance check on the registration at a later stage.
- 2. Failure to comply with the requests in this decision, or to otherwise fulfil the information requirements with a valid and documented adaptation, will result in a notification to the enforcement authorities of the Member States.
- 3. In relation to the information required by the present decision, the sample of the substance used for the new tests must be suitable for use by all the joint registrants. Hence, the sample should have a composition that is suitable to fulfil the information requirement for the range of substance compositions manufactured or imported by the joint registrants.

It is the responsibility of all joint registrants who manufacture or import the same substance to agree on the appropriate composition of the test material and to document the necessary information on their substance composition. In addition, it is important to ensure that the particular sample of the substance tested in the new tests is appropriate to assess the properties of the registered substance, taking into account any variation in the composition of the technical grade of the substance as actually manufactured or imported by each registrant.

If the registration of the substance by any registrant covers different grades, the sample used for the new tests must be suitable to assess these grades. Finally there must be adequate information on substance identity for the sample tested and the grades registered to enable the relevance of the tests to be assessed.