

Part 8.2.2 Analytical methodology (parent compound and transformation products)

Common Name: Picarbutrazox

Product Name: Picarbutrazox Technical

Submission Number: 2017-5919

PCPA Reg. Number: Not yet assigned

Source Code: PBZ-NIN-2

Chemical structures:

| metabolites Chemical name | Code / CAS # | Chemical structure |
|--|--|--|
| tert-butyl (6-{[(Z)-(1-methyl-1H-5-tetrazolyl)(phenyl)methylene] aminooxymethyl}-2- pyridyl)carbamate MW = 409.44 g/mol | NF-171 (parent compound) / 500207-04-5 | |
| tert-butyl (6-{[(E)-(1-methyl-1H-5-tetrazolyl) (phenyl)methylene]-aminooxymethyl}-2- pyridyl) carbamate MW = 409.44 g/mol | TZ-1E / 1253511-94-2 | N H N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N |
| (Z)-O-[(6-amino-2-pyridyl) methyl] (1-methyl-1 <i>H</i> -5- tetrazolyl) (phenyl)methanone oxime MW = 309.33 g/mol | TZ-2 / 500206-79-1 | H ₂ N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N |

| Table 1. Chemical name, code and metabolites | Table 1. Chemical name, code and chemical structure for active and all major transformation products / metabolites | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| (1-methyl-1 <i>H</i> -tetrazol-5-yl) (phenyl)methanone | TZ-4 / 33452-25-4 | 9 | | | | | | | |
| MW = 188.19 g/mol | | N N N | | | | | | | |
| carbamic acid, <i>N</i> -(6-formyl-2-pyridinyl)-, 1,1-dimethylethyl ester (<i>CAS</i>) | TY-3 / 956523-98-1 | \i\l | | | | | | | |
| tert-butyl (6-formylpyridin-2-yl) carbamate (ChemSketch IUPAC) | | H O | | | | | | | |
| MW = 222.24 g/mol | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 <i>H</i> -tetrazole-5-methanol, 1-methyl-α-phenyl- (<i>CAS</i>) | TZ-5 / 33452-21-0 | N OH | | | | | | | |
| (1-methyl-1 <i>H</i> -tetrazol-5-yl) (phenyl) methanol (<i>ChemSketch IUPAC</i>) | | NN-N | | | | | | | |
| MW = 190.20 g/mol | | | | | | | | | |

Data Submission and Review History:

| Table 2. Correspondence Dates, Data # and Content for Picarbutrazox Technical | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Date Received | Data # | Content Summary | Reviewer Officer# | | | | |
| 2017-12-08 | 1 | 8.2.2 data for soil, sediment, water and fish | 1160 | | | | |

The purpose of this Category A.3.2 application is to register a new fungicide active ingredient via a joint review between Canada and the U.S.; for the environmental analytical methods, Canada is carrying out the primary review while the U.S. is responsible for the secondary review.

Good Laboratory Practices Compliance Statement:

The studies contained within this report were conducted in accordance with the Good Laboratory Practice Standards as specified in 40 CFR 160 (1989) and/or Japan MAFF (1999) and/or French Regulation Annexe II à l'article D523-8 du Code de l'Environnement (2007).

yes [x] no [] not stated / applicable []

8.2.2.3 Water

Reference:

- PMRA #2809358; MRID 50218708. 2017, Method Validation for the Determination of NF-171, TZ-1E and TZ-2 in surface water by LC-MS/MS. SGS Institut Fresenius, Project ID IF-17/04113959. (Data #1)
- 2. PMRA #2809359. 2017, Applicant DER Method Validation for the Determination of NF-171, TZ-1E and TZ-2 in surface water by LC-MS/MS. (Data #1)
- 3. PMRA #2809360; MRID 50218709. 2017, Validation of Residue Analytical Method for Determination of NF-171 and its Metabolites TZ-1E and TZ-2 in Surface Water. SGS Multilab, Project ID BPL 17-0029. (Data #1)
- 4. PMRA #2809361. 2017, Applicant DER Validation of Residue Analytical Method for Determination of NF-171 and its Metabolites TZ-1E and TZ-2 in Surface Water. (Data #1)
- 5. PMRA #2809502. 2016, Analytical Method Verification for the Determination of NF-171 and TZ-1E in Freshwater and Saltwater. Wildlife International, Project #437C-116. (Data #1)
- 6. PMRA #2809503. 2016, Applicant DER Analytical Method Verification for the Determination of NF-171 and TZ-1E in Freshwater and Saltwater. (Data #1)
- 7. PMRA #2809474; MRID 50218604. 2017, TZ-2 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Smithers Viscient, Study No. 12681.6162. (Data #1)
- 8. PMRA #2809475. 2017, Applicant DER TZ-2 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Nippon Soda, RD-03963. (Data #1)
- 9. PMRA #2809476; MRID 50218605. 2017, TZ-4 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Smithers Viscient, Study No. 12681.6194. (Data #1)
- PMRA #2809477. 2017, Applicant DER TZ-4 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Nippon Soda, RD-03964. (Data #1)
- 11. PMRA #2809478; MRID 50218606. 2017, TY-3 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Smithers Viscient, Study No. 12681.6178. (Data #1)
- 12. PMRA #2809479. 2017, Applicant DER TY-3 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Nippon Soda, RD-03965. (Data #1)
- 13. PMRA #2809480; MRID 50218607. 2017, TZ-5 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Smithers Viscient, Study No. 12681.6170. (Data #1)
- 14. PMRA #2809481. 2017, Applicant DER TZ-5 Validation of the Analytical Method for the Determination of a Test Substance in Aqueous Solutions. Nippon Soda, RD-10089. (Data #1)

Refs. 1 and 3 represent validations of the same method for the parent and two transformation products (TZ-1E and TZ-2) in surface water, performed at two different labs; Refs. 2 and 4 are the applicant's DERs of these validations. The details in Table 7a below are taken from Ref. 3 but note that the validation results from Ref. 1 (using Burbach stream water in Dietzhölztal) are equally acceptable. Ref. 1 also included a freezer storage stability study. Ref. 5 is the validation of a method for the parent and TZ-1E in fresh (i.e. well or groundwater) and saltwater while Ref. 6 is the associated DER from the applicant; details are summarized in Table 7b.

Refs. 7-14 for the determination of TZ-2, TZ-4, TY-3 and TY-5 in aqueous solutions were not initially evaluated but the degradates are residues of concern and the initial review was not supported without an ILV for these degradates of concern. ILV reports are important to demonstrate that analytical methods may be successfully used in support of potential monitoring by states, tribes, and other entities that are not familiar with the development of the method. Table 7c summarizes the validated methods for these analytes in well water, fortified well water, and

Algal Assay Procedure (AAP) medium from Refs. 7, 9, 11 and 13; Refs. 8, 10, 12 and 14 constitute the applicant's DERs of these methods.

| Items | Details | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Details of sample used | Surface water: sampled at Perrier sur Andelle, in the Andelle river. Characterization in Appendix E of Ref. 1. | | | | | | | |
| Sample preparation | Sample was filtered through a folded filter, and 5 mL was then diluted with 5 mL of acetonitrile. An aliquot was filtered through a nylon syringe filter prior to analysis. | | | | | | | |
| Method for quantitative analysis | HPLC conditions: | | | | | | | |
| and identification of parent | Column: Kinetex E | $VO C18 100 \times 3.0 \text{ mm}$ | | . 4000 | | | | |
| compound and transformation products | Mobile Phase A: Mobile Phase B: | ultra pure water Acetonitrile | ate + 0.1 mL 25 % ammonia | + 1000 m | | | | |
| | Flow Rate: | 0.6 mL/min | | | | | | |
| | Time (min) | Phase A (%) | Phase B (%) | | | | | |
| | TZ-1E 4. | Mass transition (m/z) $410.2 \rightarrow 310.2^{**}$ $410.2 \rightarrow 107.1$ $310.2 \rightarrow 107.1^{**}$ $310.2 \rightarrow 80.0$ | 1 1 45 90 90 1 1 | | | | | |
| Chromatograms of spiked sample, control sample, blank and standard solution | | vided for the reagent bl s and fortified samples s | | | | | | |
| Quantitation | curve. Standards fro | ls prepared in solvent u m Nisso Chemical Ana sis: parent purity 98.8% | lysis were supported w | vith | | | | |
| Criteria for setting LOD and LOQ | LOQ was defined as of the LOQ. | s the lowest validated le | vel while LOD was se | t at 30% | | | | |
| Stability of parent and transformation products at various stages of analysis | shown to be stable f | All standard solutions (stock, fortification and calibration solutions) were shown to be stable for 25 days when stored at $2-8^{\circ}$ C. In addition, stabilitin refrigerated final volume extracts was proven for 14 days for all 3 | | | | | | |

| Table 7a. Principle of the method for the parent and two products in surface water | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Items Details | | | | | |
| Special problems encountered and/or precautions to be taken during analysis/handling/storage of samples | Stock solutions and working solutions of the test / reference item were stored refrigerated in capped vials protected from light. | | | | |
| Total time for completion | ~15 h including data processing | | | | |

| | for the parent and one product in fresh- and saltwater PLC-UV and by HPLC-MS/MS; only the MS method data are included here. | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Items | Details | | | | | |
| Details of sample used | <u>Freshwater</u> : ground water obtained from a well on the Wildlife International site (Easton, Maryland, USA), and characterized in Appendix 3 of Ref. 5. <u>Saltwater</u> : seawater collected at Indian River Inlet, Delaware, USA, and characterized in Appendix 5 of Ref. 5. | | | | | |
| Sample preparation | Fresh (well) water was passed through a sand filter, aerated and filtered at 0.45 μm . Primary dilutions of samples were made with 0.2% formic acid in methanol as necessary and then secondary dilutions with 50:50:0.1 methanol / freshwater / formic acid. Saltwater was diluted to a salinity of ~2% using well water, then passed through a sand filter, aerated and filtered at 0.45 μm . Primary and secondary dilutions of samples were made with 50:50:0.1 methanol / HPLC-grade water / formic acid. | | | | | |
| Method for quantitative analysis and identification of parent compound and transformation products | HPLC conditions: Column: Thermo Betasil C-18 column (50 mm × 2.1 mm, 5 μm particle size) and Thermo Betasil C-18 guard column (10 mm × 2.1 mm, 5 μm particle size) Mobile phase: gradient of Solvent A (0.1% formic acid in HPLC-grade water) and Solvent B (0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile) Time Flow (min) %A %B (μL/min) 0.00 40.0 60.0 300 4.50 40.0 60.0 300 Retention time (min): TZ-1E 2.2 (fresh and salt) parent 2.5 (fresh) and 2.6 (salt) MS/MS conditions: electrospray ionization in positive mode Analyte Q1/Q3 m/z quantitation parent 410/310 TZ-1E 410/310 | | | | | |
| Chromatograms of spiked sample, control sample, blank and standard solution | Chromatograms provided for the reagent blank, matrix control blank, calibration standards and fortified samples show no interferences around the peaks of interest. | | | | | |

| Table 7b. Principle of the method for the parent and one product in fresh- and saltwater <i>Analyses were performed both by HPLC-UV and by HPLC-MS/MS; only the MS method data are included here.</i> | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Items | Details | | | | |
| Quantitation | By external standards prepared in solvent/matrix using a five-point calibration curve. Standards from Nisso Chemical Analysis were supported with certificates of analysis: parent purity 98.8%, TZ-1E 98.0%. | | | | |
| Criteria for setting LOD and LOQ | LOQ was defined as the lowest validated level. LOD was calculated by dividing the low standard concentration by the S/N ratio multiplied by 3×10^{-5} the dilution factor of the matrix blank samples. | | | | |
| Stability of parent and transformation products at various stages of analysis | Not stated. | | | | |
| Special problems encountered and/or precautions to be taken during analysis/handling/storage of samples | Not stated. | | | | |
| Total time for completion | Not stated. | | | | |

| Table 7c. Principle of the method | for four products in lab well water, fortified well water and AAP | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Items | Details | | | | | | | |
| Details of sample used | Laboratory well water: mixture of unadulterated water from bedrock well and dechlorinated town well water in Wareham, MA. Fortified well water: laboratory well water (above) fortified with a mixture of salts, i.e. sodium bicarbonate, calcium sulfate, magnesium sulfate and potassium chloride. Algal Assay Procedure (AAP) medium: sterile, deionized water formulated with 16 components listed in the cited reports. | | | | | | | |
| Sample preparation | Recovery samples were diluted 1:9 with 20:80 acetonitrile:purified reagent water (v:v) for a final composition of 18:10:72 acetonitrile:test matrix:purified reagent water (v:v:v). The high-level recovery samples were further diluted into the calibration range with 18:10:72 acetonitrile:test matrix:purified reagent water (v:v:v). | | | | | | | |
| Method for quantitative analysis and identification of parent compound and transformation products | $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | | | | | | |

| Items | Details | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Time | Flow rate | Solvent | Solvent | | | | |
| | | (min.) | (mL/min.) | A (%) | B (%) | | | | |
| | | 0.10 | 0.400 | 70.0 | 30.0 | | | | |
| | | 0.50 | 0.400 | 70.0 | 30.0 | | | | |
| | | 3.00 | 0.400 | 0.00 | 100 | | | | |
| | | 4.00 | 0.400 0.400 | 0.00 70.0 | 100 30.0 | | | | |
| | | 5.10 | 0.400 | 70.0 | 30.0 | | | | |
| | TY-3 | 2.10 | 0.100 | 70.0 | 30.0 | | | | |
| | 11-3 | CPT SAN SAN | Flooring | o disease | C 1100-4 | | | | |
| | | Time | Flow rate (mL/min.) | Solvent | Solvent | | | | |
| | | (min.) 0.10 | 0.500 | 95.0 | B (%) 5.0 | | | | |
| | | 0.50 | 0.500 | 95.0 | 5.0 | | | | |
| | | 4.00 | 0.500 | 0.0 | 100 | | | | |
| | | 5.00 | 0.500 | 0.0 | 100 | | | | |
| | | 5.10 | 0.500 | 95.0 | 5.0 | | | | |
| | | 6.10 | 0.500 | 95.0 | 5.0 | | | | |
| | TZ-5 | | | | | | | | |
| | | Time | Flow rate | Solvent | Solvent | | | | |
| | | (min.) | (mL/min.) | A (%) | B (%) | | | | |
| | | 0.10 | 0.250 | 95.0 | 5.00 | | | | |
| | | 1.00 | 0.250 | 95.0 | 5.00 | | | | |
| | | 3.50 4.50 | 0.250 0.250 | 0.00 | 100 | | | | |
| | | 4.60 | 0.250 | 0.00 95.0 | 100 5.00 | | | | |
| | | 6.50 | 0.250 | 95.0 | 5.00 | | | | |
| | Retention time: | TZ-2 | 2.8 min | 32.0 | 2.00 | | | | |
| | Retention time. | TZ-4 | | lah wall | water and AAP | | | | |
| | | 1 Z-4 | | | l well water * | | | | |
| | | TW 2 | | 101111160 | i well water | | | | |
| | | TY-3 | 3.4 min | | | | | | |
| | | TZ-5 | 3.9 min | | | | | | |
| | MS/MS condition | | nositive me | nde | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Analyte | | m/z quantit | ation_ | | | | | |
| | TZ-2 | 310.4 / | | | | | | | |
| | TZ-4 | 189.1 / | | | | | | | |
| | TY-3 | 223.3 / | | | | | | | |
| | TZ-5 | 191.2 / | 145.1 | | | | | | |
| | the matrices was examined last (to | analyze otal time up incor | d on a differ period seve rectly for th | ent day a ral weeks is batch o | ifferent in this matrix; each of and fortified well water was s), so the mobile phase may of analyses. However, this | | | | |
| Chromatograms of spiked sample, control sample, blank and standard solution | _ | ards and | | - | k, matrix control blank, ow no interferences around | | | | |
| Quantitation | obtained using n | on-matri from Ni | x-matched s sso Americ | standards a were su | cceptable results were) using a six-point calibration apported with certificates of | | | | |

| Table 7c. Principle of the method for four products in lab well water, fortified well water and AAP | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Items | Details | | | | |
| Criteria for setting LOD and LOQ | LOQ was defined as the lowest validated level. LOD was calculated using three times the signal-to-noise value of the control samples. The Method Detection Limit (MDL) was defined as the lowest concentration in test samples that could be detected based on the concentration of the low calibration standard and the dilution factor of the control solutions. | | | | |
| Stability of parent and transformation products at various stages of analysis | Not stated; however, primary and secondary stock solutions were stored refrigerated and sub-stock solutions were prepared fresh on the day of use. | | | | |
| Special problems encountered and/or precautions to be taken during analysis/handling/storage of samples | Not stated. | | | | |
| Total time for completion | Not stated. | | | | |

The method validation data for the parent compound and the transformation products are summarized in Tables 8a and b.

| Table 8a. Method validation: Parent compound and transformation products in water | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Parameter | | Surface water | | Fresh (w | ell) water | Saltwater | | | |
| | Parent | TZ-1E | TZ-2 | Parent | TZ-1E | Parent | TZ-1E | | |
| % Recovery at LOQ ¹ | 116 (96 – 150) | 101 (95 – 107) | 98 (94 – 102) | 96.1 | 101 | 91.1 | 106 | | |
| % Recovery at 10xLOQ at 100xLOQ | 102 (96 – 105) | 102 (98 – 105) | 101 (95 – 107) | 98.5 | 98.4 | 89.1 | 84.6 | | |
| Mean % recovery, 2 levels | 109 | 102 | 100 | not reported | not reported | not reported | not reported | | |
| RSD % | 15.6 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.97, 4.66 | 1.87, 1.13 | 8.91, 2.14 | 4.23, 3.57 | | |
| Method linearity | 7.5 – 375 pg/mL | 7.5 – 375 pg/mL | 15 – 750 pg/mL | $5.0-50~\mu g/L$ | $5.0-50 \mu\text{g/L}$ | 1.0 – 10 µg/L | 1.0 – 10 μg/L | | |
| Correlation coefficient | $r \ge 0.995$ sample $r = 0.9990$ | $r \ge 0.995$ sample $r = 0.9992$ | $r \ge 0.995$ sample $r = 0.9993$ | sample r = 0.9944 | sample r = 0.9991 | sample r = 0.9982 | sample r = 0.9981 | | |
| LOD | 0.015 μg/L | 0.015 μg/L | 0.03 μg/L | 25.8 ng/L | 7.56 ng/L | 60.4 ng/L | 6.4 ng/L | | |
| LOQ | 0.05 μg/L | 0.05 μg/L | 0.1 μg/L | 15 μg/L | 15 μg/L | 15 μg/L | 15 μg/L | | |

 $^{^1}LOQ$ spiking level was 0.05 $\mu g/L$ for the parent and TZ-1D in surface water, 0.1 $\mu g/L$ for TZ-2 in surface water, and 15 $\mu g/L$ for the parent and TZ-1E in fresh- and saltwater.

| Table 8b. Method validation: Transformation products in water | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| Parameter | Laboratory well water | | | Fortified well water | | | Algal assay medium | | | | | |
| | TZ-2 | TZ-4 | TY-3 | TZ-5 | TZ-2 | TZ-4 | TY-3 | TZ-5 | TZ-2 | TZ-4 | TY-3 | TZ-5 |
| % Recovery at LOQ ¹ | 96.2 | 92.1 | 88.5 | 89.8 | 106 | 99.7 | 96.5 | 96.7 | 83.7 | 101 | 98.3 | 89.2 |
| % Recovery at high spike ¹ | 106 | 107 | 108 | 91.0 | 103 | 108 | 106 | 93.6 | 100 | 99.6 | 106 | 91.9 |
| Mean % recovery, 2 levels | 101 | 99.7 | 98.3 | 90.4 | 105 | 104 | 101 | 95.2 | 92.0 | 100 | 100 | 90.6 |
| RSD % | 10.2 | 9.71 | 10.8 | 4.82 | 4.39 | 7.46 | 5.69 | 9.67 | 10.5 | 6.41 | 6.41 | 5.56 |
| Method linearity | 5 – 100 | ng/L | | | 5 – 100 ng/L | | | 5 – 100 ng/L | | | | |
| Correlation coefficient | 0.9975 4 | 0.9994 2 | 0.9990 1 | 0.9995 7 | 0.9957 8 | 0.9941 5 | 0.9948 1 | 0.9978 0 | 0.99805 | 0.9943 7 | 0.99643 | 0.9990 9 |
| LOD (ng/L) | 0.7 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 30 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 0.3 | 20 | 3 | 10 |
| MDL (µg/L) | 0.0500 | 0.0500 | | | | | | | | | | |
| LOQ (µg/L) | 0.100 | 0.100 | | | | | | | | | | |

¹LOQ spiking level was 0.1 μg/L, while the high spike was 30 000 μg/L for TZ-2, TZ-4 and TY-3 and 100 000 μg/L for TZ-5. n=5 replicates were prepared at each spiking level.

Conclusions/Other Comments: HPLC-MS/MS methods were developed for the determination of the parent and five transformation products in water and were independently validated in two surface waters, fresh (well) water, saltwater, laboratory well water, fortified well water and algal assay medium. The recovery data were acceptable (means between 70-120%). The LOQ was determined to be 0.05 μ g/L for the parent and TZ-1E / 0.1 μ g/L for TZ-2 in surface water; 15 μ g/L for both the parent and TZ-1E in fresh (well) and saltwater; and 0.1 μ g/L for TZ-3 / TZ-4 / TY-3 / TZ-5 in laboratory well water, fortified well water and algal assay medium. The reported limit of quantitation (LOQ) was determined as the lowest level of method validation (LLMV). Further work could have been done to explore the actual LOQ. This means that concentrations can be reliably quantified at the LOQ (*i.e.*, LLMV), but whether lower concentrations may also be reliably quantified is uncertain. These methods are acceptable for use in post-registration monitoring.

<u>EPA</u>: This study is classified as **acceptable**.